

DA
190
D7
E98+
v.1



Cornell University Library

BOUGHT WITH THE INCOME
FROM THE
SAGE ENDOWMENT FUND
THE GIFT OF
Henry W. Sage
1891

A. 284483

23/10/14

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 091 756 225



Cornell University Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924091756225>

DOMESDAY STUDIES:

AN ANALYSIS AND DIGEST OF THE SOMERSET SURVEY

(*ACCORDING TO THE EXON CODEX*),

AND OF THE

SOMERSET GHELD INQUEST OF A.D. 1084,

AS COLLATED WITH, AND ILLUSTRATED BY, DOMESDAY.

BY

THE REV. R. W. EYTON,

LATE RECTOR OF RYTON,

AUTHOR OF "ANTIQUITIES OF SHROPSHIRE;" "KEY TO DOMESDAY, AN ANALYSIS AND DIGEST OF THE
DORSET SURVEY;" "COURT, HOUSEHOLD, AND ITINERARY OF KING HENRY II.," ETC.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

REEVES & TURNER, 196, STRAND, & 100, CHANCERY LANE.

BRISTOL: T. KERSLAKE & CO.

1880.

5

A.284483

LONDON : BOWDEN, HUDSON AND CO., PRINTERS,
23, RED LION STREET, HOLBORN.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOL. I.

	Pages	Pages	Pages
Preface			1—14
Introductory Essay			14—48
Area of Somerset		14—20	
Domesday Hidation. The Hide of Somerset		20—28	
Carucates and Plough-lands		28—31	
Lineal measures of Domesday		31	
Areal, or superficial, measures of Domesday		31—34	
The Territory surveyed in Domesday		34—42	
Royal and other Forests of Somerset	34—36		
“Pascua” of the Somerset Survey	36—37		
“Pratum” of the Somerset Survey	37		
“Terra Vasta” of the Somerset Survey	37—38		
The Somerset Moorlands	38—40		
Vineyards, Mills, Churches, Church-lands	40—42		
Domesday Population of Somerset		42—44	
“Ancillæ,” “Gabulatores,” “Villani”	42—43		
“Bordarii,” “Cotarii,” “Servi”	43		
“Piscatores,” “Fabri,” “Burgenses”	44		
Farming Stock of the Somerset Survey		44—45	
Values, Valuations, and Rents		45—48	
Chapter I. The Royal Burghs of Somerset			49—53
Chapter II. Domesday Schedule of Somerset			
Landholders			54—71
Notices of Individual Landholders		55—71	
Chapter III. “Terra Regis” of Somerset			72—87
“Vetus Dominicum Coronæ”		72—78	
Lands of the escheated Earldom		78—84	
Lands of the late Queen Edith		84—86	
Lands of Wulfward White, deceased		86—87	

1/10/14

435/
[E 5]

A.284483

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOL. I.

	Pages	Pages	Pages
Preface			1—14
Introductory Essay			14—48
Area of Somerset		14—20	
Domesday Hidation. The Hide of Somerset		20—28	
Carucates and Plough-lands		28—31	
Lineal measures of Domesday		31	
Areal, or superficial, measures of Domesday		31—34	
The Territory surveyed in Domesday		34—42	
Royal and other Forests of Somerset	34—36		
“Pascua” of the Somerset Survey	36—37		
“Pratum” of the Somerset Survey	37		
“Terra Vasta” of the Somerset Survey	37—38		
The Somerset Moorlands	38—40		
Vineyards, Mills, Churches, Church-lands	40—42		
Domesday Population of Somerset		42—44	
“Ancillæ,” “Gabulatores,” “Villani”	42—43		
“Bordarii,” “Cotarii,” “Servi”	43		
“Piscatores,” “Fabri,” “Burgenses”	44		
Farming Stock of the Somerset Survey		44—45	
Values, Valuations, and Rents		45—48	
Chapter I. The Royal Burghs of Somerset			49—53
Chapter II. Domesday Schedule of Somerset			
Landholders			54—71
Notices of Individual Landholders		55—71	
Chapter III. “Terra Regis” of Somerset			72—87
“Vetus Dominicum Coronæ”		72—78	
Lands of the escheated Earldom		78—84	
Lands of the late Queen Edith		84—86	
Lands of Wulfward White, deceased		86—87	

	Pages	Pages	Pages
Chapter IV. The Old Hundreds of Somerset			88—217
The Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084		89—93	
Old Indices of Somerset Hundreds	90—92		
Hundreds assessed by the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084		94—206	
Hundreds not assessed by the extant In- quest of A.D. 1084		207—213	
Non-identified Manors of the Somerset Survey		214—217	
Chapter V. Non-hidated Liberties of Somerset			218—219
Estate of the Church of St. John at Frome		218	
Abbatial Liberty of Muchelney		219	
Chapter VI. Appendix of Observations and Statistics			220—225
Omissions of the Somerset Domesday		220—221	
Post-Domesday Hundred of Whitley		221	
Domesday Fiefs of Somerset		221—225	
Statistics of Population	223—224		
Annual Revenues and Values of Somerset Lands	224		
The Farm Labourer at the Time of Domesday	224		
Domesday distribution of Somerset Lands	225		

VOL. II.—TABLES.

“Terra Regis in Somerseta”		1—6
“Vetus Dominicum Coronæ.”—Estates of the Crown	1—2	
“Mansiones de Comitatu.”—Estates of the Earldom	3—4	
“Terræ quas tenuit Editda Regina.”—Estates of the late Queen Edith	5—6	
“Terra quæ fuit Ulwardi Wite.”—Estates of the late Wulward White	5—6	
The Hundreds and Liberties of Somerset.—Synoptical Table of		7—8
Hundreds and Liberties assessed in the extant Gheld- Inquests of A. D. 1084		9
Hundreds and Liberties not so assessed		9
Hundreds and Liberties named in old Indices		10
Hundreds and Liberties not so named		10

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

v

	Pages	Pages
Hundreds and Liberties of Somerset assessed in the extant Gheld-Inquests of A.D. 1084	1—38	
Hundreds of "Abedicche," "Bolestan," "Andretesfelt" and "Betministra" 	11—12	
Hundred of "Bada," Burgh of Bath, Hundreds of "Bimastane" and "Brunetone Vicecomitis"	13—14	
Hundred of "Briwetone"	15—16	
Hundreds of "Cainesham," "Cantetone," and "Cungresberia"	17—18	
Hundreds of "Carentona," of "Condecoma and Manehefve," and of Cetre	19—20	
Hundreds of "Cruche," "Ciwetona," and "Chiu," Manor of "Hama"	21—22	
"Episcopi Gisonis Terra,"—The Episcopal Fief of Somerset	23—24	
Hundreds of "Hareclive" and of "Hunspill"	25—26	
Old Hundred of "Frome." Manor of "Monacheton"		
Hundreds of "Givela" and "Milvertone"	27—28	
Manors of "Torlaberia" and "Torna"		
Hundreds of "Locheslei," "Meleborne," "Porberia," and "Ringoltdeswea"	29—30	
Hundreds of North Petherton and of South Petherton	31—32	
Hundreds of "Tantotone" and "Pipministra"	33—34	
Hundred of "Witestane"		
Hundred of "Willitone"	35—36	
Hundred of "Winestoc"	37—38	
Hundreds and Liberties of Somerset, not assessed in any extant Inquest of A.D. 1084		37—42
Hundreds of Somerton, Pitney "Liet," <i>al.</i> "Cochra"	37—38	
Liberties of "Bruneton," "Cliva," "Crice," "Nortchori," and "Sudbrent," Hundred of Martock	39—40	
Liberty of Glastonbury, Edgerley, Meare, &c.	41—42	
Domesday Manors of Somerset not yet identified		41—42
Præ-Domesday Franchise of the Church of St. John at Frome		41—42
Præ-Domesday Liberty of Muchelney Abbey		41—42
The Somerset Domesday arranged according to Fiefs		43
Index of Places		45—59
Index of Persons		60—75
Corrigenda.		75

PREFACE.

AFTER many months' study of the Somerset Domesday, the Author finds nothing to disturb, but very much to support, those principles of criticism and those methods of analysis which were adopted in his "Key to Domesday", as "illustrated by the Dorset Survey." Domesday thus examined, county after county, becomes a Science more and more exact. The utilitarianism, or the indifferentism, of the age will lead many to ignore such a Science. These are they who will also despise History in any form.

Even though a Science, Domesday may become popular. There is hardly a man or a youth of English birth and with an English soul, who would not care to know something of the name and state, eight centuries ago, of the place wherein he was born and wherein he lives—something, too, of the relative condition of the class most parallel with that to which he himself happens to belong. To identify this or that locality with some place named in Domesday; to learn, if it be not so named, how and where it was represented or concealed in Domesday: these, then, are matters of popular interest. Most of these identities lie on the surface of mere words. They are well known, we would rather say, widely advertised, and largely believed. But many also are ill-ascertained, many unworthily accredited, and, beyond these, there are many identities which remain in needless obscurity, a few only which belong to the region of insoluble doubt.

To minimize obscurity;—to sift to the dregs all questions of difficulty:—these are processes which can adequately be conducted only by treating Domesday as a "Science."

Dorset and Somerset, though sister-counties in many respects of Præ-Domesday and Post-Domesday circumstance, differed from each other in far more: nay, one part of Somerset differed from another part more widely, perhaps, than did most conterminous

counties. Along the whole seaboard of Somerset, and in West Somerset, we are progressing in Domesday as in a map, to the rude shores or inland wilds of Devon and of Cornwall. In East Somerset, and in the vicinity of Bath and Bristol, we find a population and a culture akin to that of Gloucestershire. In central Somerset, and in the ridges of Mendip, Polden, and Quantock, we have mountain features, which, as marked in Domesday, contrast with the more monotonous irregularities of the Downs of Dorset.—Of goats there were many in Dorset, many also in Somerset.—Of wild horses there were none save in Somerset.

In regard to documentary evidences we would preface all that we have to say, about Somerset in particular, by something general as to the five South-western Counties of England, and about those other records which in some or all of the five cases, serve to illustrate or elucidate their Domesday circumstances and relations.

The Counties in question are Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, and Cornwall.

For these five Counties, and for no other county in England, is the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084 (two years previous to Domesday) in any sort preserved. This Inquest, which, above all other precious elements, gives us the names of the Hundreds into which each county was divided, is redundantly full as regards Wiltshire (for there are three editions thereof): it is complete as regards the Hundreds of Dorset; about Devon and Cornwall we have not ascertained as much; as to Somerset the Inquests of some three or four Hundreds, and (if ever taken) of several lesser Franchises, are irrecoverably lost.

Many have been the misconceptions and mis-statements about the Gheld-Inquest. Centuries ago, its relics came to be engrossed on similar vellum, and bound up in the same folio, with the Exon Domesday. Nay, in some parts of the Codex, pages of the Inquest are absolutely interleaved with pages of the Survey. Hence the Inquest came to be subsequently and ordinarily quoted as *The Exon Domesday*. Hence one commentator decided that it was the immediate cause and forerunner of the Great Survey; another that it followed as an immediate effect thereof.

Summarily, the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084 and Domesday Book had nothing whatever to do with each other, save that, perchance, the Domesday Commissioners may have used these, and other similar, Rolls as evidence in some regards of their enquiry.

The date and nature of the Gheld-Inquest may be told in a

very few words. Between the Conquest and the year of Domesday (between 1066 and 1085-6) King William levied the tax, sometimes called "Danegeld," more than once. He levied it as a war tax. One of the Chroniclers says precisely that *after Christmas*, 1083, King William levied a tax of *six shillings* on every hide of land. This was the Gheld-Levy of which we are now speaking; and the fragment thereof which remains to posterity is the Collectors' account of this levy in the five South-western Counties.

The Record itself contains further and internal evidence of the date and rate thus assigned. It was levied after the death of Queen Matilda, which event took place November 3, 1083. It was levied before Domesday, as we will presently shew, and Domesday was completed before Easter (April 5), 1086. Its last arrears were paid up after the Easter of some year when Easter and Lady-day, being indifferently spoken of as the said "latest term," will have nearly coincided. Such a year was 1084, when Easter fell just six days later than Lady-day, viz., on March 31; such a year the year 1085 was not, for then Easter fell on April 20.

Adding now the internal evidence of Domesday to that of the Inquisicio we shall see that, between the completion of the Inquest (Easter, 1084), and the completion of Domesday (Easter, 1086), changes, neither more nor fewer, took place than such as may reasonably and credibly be bespoken for an interval of two years or less. Many tenancies and tenants, alluded to in the Inquest, had lapsed, or disappeared, before Domesday. Many estates, held in Demesne by the Barons of the Inquest, had been subinfeuded before Domesday. Some Barons had increased their Demesne at the expense of their Villeinage, and *vice versâ*. Here and there a Manor had been taken from one Barony and added, presumably, to another.

The way in which the two Records, the Gheld-Inquest and Domesday, explain and supplement one another may be almost said to double the antiquarian value of the greater Record. The Gheld-Inquest gives the names of Hundreds, which the Domesday of the South-Western Counties, except by the merest accident, omits. *Vice versâ*, Domesday purports to give the names of all Manors; the Gheld-Inquest rarely mentions a Manor or Vill. Yet, here and there, where Domesday, by accident, omits the name of an estate, or omits altogether to survey or mention an estate, the Gheld-Inquest has given a clue to the identity of the anonymous estate, and a clue to the restoration of the omitted estate.

Again, Domesday, as a rule, gives the names of all Tenants-in-capite and of their sub-tenants. The Gheld-Inquest only gives the names of the privileged class, or of non-privileged defaulters; but among the latter we occasionally come across the name of some sub-sub-tenant, who is sure to be omitted in Domesday.

Also the Gheld-Inquest expresses the full names, and the alternative names of both barons and sub-tenants, oftener than the Exon Domesday, and much oftener than the Exchequer Codex.

Inasmuch as we purpose to give abstracts of all the extant Inquests of Somerset Hundreds, and inasmuch as those abstracts will be furnished with copious notes, we will not here enlarge further on the characteristics of the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084.

And now as to the greater Record, which for convenience we call "Domesday," by way of abbreviating its fuller and truer title of "Domesday Book."

The original notes of King William's Commissioners were not written in any manner of book, but on Rolls or Rotulets, which, if they observed any sequence at all, observed a sequence of Hundreds or localities.

No fragment of these original Rolls is known to exist. The best copy of any of them, as regards sequence and method, the best hints as to how the enquiry was to be conducted, what questions were to be asked, and who were to answer them, are supplied in the *Inquisicio Eliensis*. This Record, which seems to be either a copy of the original notes, or a copy of a copy, is in a handwriting of the twelfth century.

It may be said that the *Inquisicio Eliensis* only followed the claims and possessions of Ely Abbey, so that following them by sequence of Hundreds seem almost to have been a necessity of the case. But then the *Inquisicio* does not follow the same sequence as Domesday. It is surely a fair inference that it follows the sequence of those original notes from which Domesday was taken, though Domesday itself adopted a different sequence and arrangement.

There is no transcript of original notes like the *Inquisicio Eliensis* for any part of the Domesday Circuit with which we are now engaged. In lieu thereof we have, for Somerset, two editions—we call them paraphrases rather than copies, we call them one while extracts, one while expansions—of the Commissioners' Notes. These two editions are technically known as the Exon Domesday and the Exchequer Domesday.

Internal evidence suggests that these two recasts of the original

notes were utterly independent of one another. We cannot prove a negative, but we may well believe that the clerks who drew the Exeter Record never saw the work of the Exchequer Clerks; and, *vice versâ*, that no single entry of the Exchequer Codex was copied or abstracted from the Exeter edition. We put it as a conjecture rather than a theory, that the clerks who drew the Exeter Domesday effected their work while yet the Commissioners' Notes were in the Provinces, and before the said Notes were sent to undergo a stronger process of filtration and digestion at the Royal Exchequer.

It will have already been seen that we differ somewhat from a great commentator (the late Sir Henry Ellis), and from his remarks introductory of the "Third Volume of Domesday Documents." His contrasts between the Exeter and the Exchequer Domesday, in respect of phraseology, were well selected,¹ only that he attributed to the "Exon Survey" some few words which are to be found only in the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084.

As regards these contrasts one usual phenomenon is that the Exon Clerks were much given to "airing their Latinity," while the Exchequer Clerks, preferring brevity in all things, whether sentences or words, usually chose the shorter, and therewithal the more English forms of nomenclature. Where there is an opening for such a proclivity, we find the Exchequer Clerk translating into a Norman-French form, while the Exon Clerk abides by his favorite Latin. Two prominent instances of this are quoted by Sir H. Ellis. The Exon Clerk styles the Abbot of Battle "Abbas de Prælio": the Exchequer Clerk writes the same functionary as "Abbas de la Bataile." He whom the Exon Domesday styles *Willielmus Capra*, stands in the Exchequer Codex as *Willielmus Chievre*. Again, if the choice were between a Latin and a Saxon form of word, the Exon Clerk preferred the former to the latter. He writes the Abbot of Athelney as Abbas de Aliennia; the Exchequer Clerk is more Anglican, and writes Abbas de Adelingi.

In another field of comparison, Sir Henry Ellis remarked that the Exchequer Domesday gave to Walter de Douai a Manor of "Middeltone," not registered in the Exon Record. This mistake as to a particular may lead to misapprehension of universals.

¹ By mere inadvertence, Sir H. Ellis gives the word *Nemusculum*, of the Exon Domesday, as equivalent to the *Silva* of the Exchequer. The real equivalents were *Nemus* (Exon) = *Silva* (Exchequer); *Nemusculum* (Exon) = *Silva modica* and *Silva minuta* (Exchequer).

Douai's Manor of "Mildetuna" is in the Exon Domesday, but it is not in the same sequence as in the Exchequer Record; it is better placed by the latter; in fact, we could hardly conclude that the manor was that which is now called Milton Clevedon but for the superior arrangement of the Exchequer list. As a general rule, indeed, sequence is better and more intelligibly observed in the Exchequer Domesday; but many things, tending to the right identification of Domesday Manors, are told in the Exeter Domesday, and suppressed in the sister Record.

Each Record being all but perfect in its way, each has its few imperfections. In the matters of error or omission, where an imperfection is common to both, such imperfection is clearly chargeable on the original, which both copied or paraphrased. In matters of transcript the Exchequer Domesday makes the most omissions, the Exeter makes the most errors. A few instances of the latter will explain our meaning: more will appear in future notes.—

The Exon (p. 265) gives the extraordinary value of £3 per annum as that of a mill at *Sanforda*. The Exchequer Domesday shows that no mill-value was given in the original notes, and that £3 per annum was the value of the whole manor. The Exon (pp. 151, 152) treats a member of the Abbot of Glastonbury's Manor of Walton as though it was a distinct manor. The context shows error; the Exchequer Domesday corrects it.

The Exon (p. 455) gives two quantities of wood (*memoris*) to Bochelanda. The Exchequer correctly gives the second quantity as *pastura*.

An *ablatum*, which stands as *ix agri* on one page of the Exon, and as *xx agri* on another (pp. 83, 484), is *a priori* incorrect in the latter measurement; for so great a number of Gheld-acres would be expressed in other terms. Accordingly the Exchequer Domesday, alluding to the measurement but once, puts it at *ix acrae*.

The Exon Domesday (p. 131) twice writes the figure "II" where the context proves the figure V to have been proper. The Exchequer Domesday reads "V."

The Exon Domesday (p. 352) calls a Manor "Loduntuna," where the Exchequer writes "Lochintone." The last is clearly most correct, in that the place alluded to by both preserves the name of Luckington.

The Exeter Domesday is replete with coeval corrections, and interlineations. We see that it needed further revision. The

Scribes who wrote it were less careful, or less skilled than they of the Exchequer.

In contrasting the Exeter and the Exchequer Domesday-Books, another feature now comes before us, relevant to the Survey in general, and to that of Somerset and other Counties in particular.

The Domesday Commissioners came everywhere and necessarily into collision with QUESTIONS OF TITLE,—with questions, some already decided (perhaps unjustly), some current, some problematical;—of Title, if abnormal, if unsound;—of Title, whether established by force or by law.

In no case were the Domesday Commissioners directed, as such, to try questions of Title. In one case they happened to try such a question, but it was under a special writ of the King, and as Justiciars that they tried it. As Commissioners they did not import their decision into the Survey. The subject was not cognate to the Survey.

This thing happened at Worcester, where the Commissioners-in-Eyre were Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln; Walter Giffard, Henry de Ferrieres, and Adam Fitz Hubert, a Baron of Kent.

To resume our subject. The Domesday Commissioners everywhere and necessarily came into collision with QUESTIONS OF TITLE. In several Counties, if not in all, the Commissioners made register, of these collateral questions,—a distinct register, whose substance, generally, though not always, nor altogether, was incorporated in the ordinary notes of their Survey.

The corps of Domesday Commissioners which visited the East Anglian Counties entitled these, their Side-Registers, *PURPRESTURÆ*. The Corps of Commissioners, which visited Huntingdonshire, Lincolnshire, and Yorkshire, called their Side-Registers *CLAMORES*. What concerns us most here is that the Commissioners of the South-Western Counties entitled their Side-Registers *TERRÆ OCCUPATÆ*.

The schedule of *TERRÆ OCCUPATÆ* for Somerset is preserved, intact and distinct, in the Exon Codex. But the Exchequer Codex, though it gives us, thus intact and distinct, the *Purpresturæ* of East Anglia and the *Clamores* of Yorkshire, &c., does not similarly preserve any schedule of "*Terræ Occupatæ*" for the South-Western Counties. It is nevertheless true that the substance of such a Record is sufficiently incorporated in the text of the Exchequer Domesday. And so it is in the text of the Exon Domesday; but in the *Terræ Occupatæ* of the latter we shall find a few things which are not incorporated in the text of either record. And, as a

whole, this Side-Register of the Somerset Survey, thus distinctively preserved, leads to an intelligence of the ratio and process of the Domesday enquiry which were less full and less clear without it.

Besides the Side-Register of *Terre Occupatæ*, there is some statistical matter appended to the Exon Domesday, which has the character of a special Inquest on the affairs and estates of Glastonbury Abbey. Knowing that, at the date of Domesday, the Abbacy of Glastonbury was *in manu Regis*, and the Ex-Abbot Turstin relegated to his former cell in the Norman Abbey of St. Stephen at Caen,—that the Crown was receiving an enormous income not only from the Abbey, as vacant, but as a result of Turstin's financial genius, exercised while he was yet in power,—we cannot doubt that this appendix was drawn up under a special commission of the Crown. When further we compare its style and phraseology and most of its statistics with the body of the Exon Domesday, we cannot doubt that it was drawn up either by, or by direction of, the Domesday Commissioners.

The Appendix thus becomes more curious and more interesting. We will give some account of it, and of its apparent connexion with, and distinction from, the Survey.—The Exon Domesday, that is the normal part of the Survey, does not include the Wiltshire, nor yet the Dorset estates of Glastonbury Abbey; we should, perhaps, say, does not *preserve* any list of the said estates. It preserves a list and the very fullest details of a single Manor which the Abbey had in Devon, and of the whole of its great Somerset possessions. At the foot of this list, and with a *primâ facie* appearance of having been a portion of the Commissioners' normal Register, is a sort of *résumé*. It occupies about a dozen lines of the Exon Domesday (pp. 160, 161). It omits the single Devon Manor, and digests the Somerset Manors only. In its additions of the numbers and hidage of the Somerset Manors it is arithmetically faulty, in its enumeration of Villeins and other inhabitants thereof, it is nearly correct. It introduces the word "*Carucatæ*" twice, in a way and in a sense which is not warranted by any precedent in the text of the antecedent details of Survey. Its object is disclosed in its last two lines:—"Hæc terra emendata est in manu Turstini Abbatis de c. et xxviii. Libris," that is, the Ex-Abbot Turstin, had bettered the Abbatial income by £128 per annum.

Now this appendix is not introduced at all into the Exchequer Domesday. It was obviously no part of the routine work of the Commissioners.

That which we have further to say about this abnormal appendix to the Somerset Survey of Glastonbury estates, inserted in the Exon, but not in the Exchequer, Domesday, may well be included in what we have now to say about a coeval document, still more comprehensive and more extraordinary.

On pages 489 and 490 of the Exon Domesday, and following the Somerset schedule of *Terræ Occupatæ* (already alluded to) is a fragment of the Gheld-Inquest of 1084, a very valuable fragment, for it not only contains the assessment of the greatest of Somerset Hundreds, that of (Old) Frome, but also contains an account of the consignment of the whole Levy to the King's Treasury at Winchester.

This fragment occupies folio 526 (recto et dorso), and folio 527 (recto) of the Exeter collection of MSS.

On the dorse of folio 527 and on folio 528 (recto) of the same collection, and on pp. 490 and 491 of the printed edition thereof, is the document of which we are to speak. It has nothing to do with the Gheld-Inquest; it is much rather an appendix to the Domesday Survey of Glastonbury estates. It is a syllabus of the contents, population, and value, of the Abbatial lands in four counties, viz., Wiltshire, Dorset, Devon, and Somerset.

Strange to say, the materials for this syllabus, are, as regards Wiltshire and Dorset, nowhere preserved in the extant Exeter collection. They are to be found only in the Exchequer Domesday. But the syllabus for Devon and Somerset evidently contemplates, and is an appendix to, the Exon Survey of Glastonbury Manors in those two counties.

And then, as regards Somerset in particular.—This appendix is only a neater and clearer form of the appendix which we have already described as following the main schedule of Glastonbury estates in the Exeter Domesday. The arithmetic, already described by us as faulty, is not mended in this appendix; the accurate part of the arithmetic is repeated: for instance, as regards the syllabus of the Abbot of Glastonbury's "twenty dominical manors in Somerset," the number of teams employed is rightly summed as $75\frac{1}{2}$; so also is the number of teams (viz., 160) employed by the Abbot's Villeinage.—The number of Villeins which, in some lost original, stood correctly as cccxlvii, has been cut down to xlvii, by mere error of transcript; the number of Bordarii, viz., 325, quite tallies with the details of the Exon text, only it should have been explained that this number of Bordarii was inclusive of 25 Cotarii, named in the said text; the number of Servi (viz., 108) and of

Piscatores (viz., 10) are both true to the details of the text. But the hidage (the most important item of all) is inexplicably wrong, and the word Carrucata is again used in a sense unknown to the text of the Exeter Domesday.

On the whole, then, the History of Somerset in the eleventh century is, or may be illustrated by, an unusual number of coeval Records. A Gheld-Inquest nearly perfect, the Exchequer Domesday, and the Exeter Domesday, both perfect, the appendices to the latter, viz., a complete schedule of *Terræ occupatæ*, two syllabi of the estates of Glastonbury Abbey, and finally a syllabus of Robert Fitz Gerold's Domesday estates in Dorset, Wiltshire, and Somerset, are the Records alluded to. An index (Exon Domesday, p. 493) forming the last folio (recto and dorso) of the Exeter collection of MSS., is hardly worth notice. It does not follow the arrangement of the Codex, nor does it give one half of the contents thereof. It is framed on no intelligible principle; and it looks as if the Scribe who attempted it, finding that he was editing a medley rather than an index, had thrown up his work in despair.

It would ill become us to proceed further in our enumeration of authorities for the present work without acknowledging a great obligation to the labours of Collinson, the Somerset Historian. His discernment in the matter of Domesday nomenclature, and of the principles which should guide those who would seek the modern equivalents of Domesday forms, was as keen as that of the great Anglo-Saxon scholar, Kemble. His topographical knowledge was more than adequate to his work. His method of arrangement was not like ours, by Præ-Domesday Hundreds and Domesday Manors, but by modern Hundreds, modern parishes, and their respective tythings and hamlets. Having adhered to his method with the utmost precision and constancy, he has so much the more enlightened us on the many questions where Domesday identities can only be established by Post-Domesday evidences,—questions as to which the mere Domesday student is too apt to dogmatize or to guess. Unfortunately for his own fame and for us, Collinson never studied, and so never mastered, the Gheld-Inquest. He knew of it; he quoted it; but seems to have remained blind to its great import. Of his occasional paraphrases thereof, we cannot say “*nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*” Better studied, the Gheld-Inquest would have saved so competent a scholar and reasoner from many an error; it would have supplied him with light as to

the primordia of many a Baronial House, which he, like Dugdale before him, either misapprehended or missed.

Another deficiency of Collinson's work was in regard of Domesday itself. There are many Domesday Manors which, having failed to identify at first sight, he omitted to notice as Domesday Manors, save only in an index. And thus the promise implied by a full Index was scarcely redeemed by the text of his three volumes. This was, perhaps, a result almost necessary to his method of investigation; but for us, we deem it our first duty to find some sort of an equivalent, or apology, or explanation, for every Domesday locality, whether found, or missing, or lost. In Somerset we shall seek in vain for some names and some sites long since obliterated; but by confessing,—pointedly confessing,—our doubts and darkneses, we shall leave a mark for future investigators, more skilled or more fortunate than ourselves.

In his translation of Domesday entries, Collinson uniformly adopted the error which confused the *Carucata terra* with the *Terra ad unam carucum*. It is difficult to see how any one with the Exon survey of any county before him, could remain in such an error. Nevertheless there are Domesday scholars, of deserved repute, still living, and still writing, who abide by this inveterate misconception. Would they but study the original text more critically; would they but accept the precise interpretation furnished by the correlative expressions of the Exon Survey,—they might at length learn that the Domesday Commissioners and Scribes did not crowd nearly every sentence of their works with a vain tautology, nor yet indite matter which, well and literally translated, could fail to be significant in its every word.

One topic more before we turn to a minuter analysis of the Somerset Survey. The said Survey embodies an abnormalism of great interest, a piece of Court history not to be met with in any Chronicle—a piece of Domesday history such as is not to be found on any other page of the great Record itself.

We have elsewhere told, though not in that case instructed by Domesday itself, who were the four Commissioners who visited Worcestershire in the matter of the Survey. Comparing the method, or quality or manner of their work in Worcestershire, with the Surveys of other Counties, we may judge what Counties were in their circuit. We merely remark, in passing, that Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln, the leader of that Commission, had not an acre

of land in Worcestershire, nor yet in any other county of his presumed circuit.

Again, there is some reason for supposing that the leader of the Commission which visited Cheshire and other Counties was Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester. Osmund, Bishop of Sarum, perhaps headed the Lincolnshire Commission. Walcheline, Bishop of Winchester, was probably on some circuit where he had no personal interest, but on what circuit we have no present ground for suggesting. And now we propose to find from the *ipsissima verba* of Domesday the leader of the Commission which visited Somerset, and therewith four other South-Western Counties.—

The great Somerset Manor of Taunton had been before the Conquest, a possession of Stigand, sometime Bishop of Winchester, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury, sometime occupant of both Sees together.

After the Conquest, King William gave, or perhaps we should say, confirmed, Taunton to Walcheline, the first Norman Bishop of Winchester. The king conceded it, not as a personal and heritable feud, but as an endowment of the See of Winchester.

There are many records of this gift: but we hardly appreciate its munificence and its fulness till we turn to Domesday, and find therein a lengthy and elaborate survey of the Manor of Taunton, and therewith an enumeration, quite unusual to Domesday, of all its rights, members, and appurtenances, whether as a manor, a parish, a seat of high justice, or the caput of a great Hundred.

This Survey occupies four folio sides of the Exon Domesday. The elaborate care bestowed upon the Record and its unusual comprehensiveness, are accounted for in a postscript, which runs as follows:—

“De his terris” (the adjuncts of Taunton) “semper jacuerunt consuetudines et servitium in Tantone, et Rex Willelmus concessit istas terras sancto Petro” (the church of Winchester) “et Walchelino Episcopo, sicut ipse” (Rex.) “recognovit apud Sarisberiam audiente Episcopo Dunelmensi, cui precepit ut hanc ipsam concessionem suam in Brevibus scriberet.”

If we venture to translate somewhat freely, and to expatiate somewhat enthusiastically on this unwonted text, we trust at the same time, to say no more than years of study, and an ever growing tendency to prefer *facts* to *views* will warrant.—

In the autumn of 1085, King William having, as we know from

other evidence, recently returned from Normandy, visited, as we infer from this evidence only, the City of Salisbury.

The King now, or, perhaps we might say, immediately after his return, despatched the Domesday Commissioners on their several circuits, or as one simple annalist describes the fact, "Rex per omnes Angliæ provincias nuttit justiciarios qui loca et omnium bona describant."

The King, we repeat, was at Salisbury. The Commissioners for the South-Western Counties were there too; nay, it is probable that they were already *in Eyre*, and had commenced their Wiltshire work at Salisbury itself.

At their head was a Bishop, a Northern Bishop, whose personal interests were less implicated in the affairs of South-Western England than in those of Southern Scotland. But this Bishop was a great scholar, an energetic administrator, a deep politician, a trained diplomatist. Such was William de St. Carileph, sometime a monk of the Abbey of St. Carileph, in Maine, later still Abbot of St. Victor, at Le Mans, and now, in the fifth year of his Prelacy at Durham. On him, then, did William, King of the English, being at Salisbury, enjoin that he should take present and diligent note of the King's declared intentions touching the quality and extent of his grant of Taunton to Bishop Walcheline; and that, when he (the Bishop of Durham), should, in the course of his circuit, be in Somerset, he should enter a memorandum of such, the King's "concession," on the Rolls of his Survey,—"*in brevibus*," as the King named the elements of that, the then contemplated Record, which men afterwards called Domesday Book.¹

And the Northern prelate discharged his commission both in the letter and in the substance.

It is remarkable that at Christmas, 1085, William, Bishop of Durham, was attendant in the King's Court at Gloucester. Had he accomplished his work westward to the Land's End, or did he come off duty (for Gloucestershire was not in his circuit), being summoned to the Council and the Feast, customarily held by the King at that season of the year, and in the Western Metropolis?

On any hypothesis as to the time taken by the different processes which resulted in Domesday Book, the whole, that is, the Survey, the transcription and the codification, were completed in less than eight months; and three of the eight were winter months. No such

¹ *Breve Regis* was a nearly coeval name for the completed Domesday Codex. *Brevia Regis*, as applied to the constituent parts, was probably the expression in which the somewhat inept "*Breve Regis*," originated.

miracle of clerical and executive capacity has been worked in England since.

Necessity rather than taste obliges the Writer here again to refer to himself, not as an authority, but as an Author. He will often have to do so in the ensuing pages. Such references will generally be to "The Key to Domesday," which he compiled with "particular illustrations from the Dorset Survey." The same principles, the same rules, of Domesday mensuration and values, will derive added strength from the Somerset Survey. For any rule, however hard and fast, there are of course, differences of application, and there are phenomena which seem at first to result from two contrary and incompatible rules, but which, after all, result from one and the same rule, acting with a varied incidence.

Thus, when we say of a hide, as we often have said, that its original essence was "a tenement," or "occupation" of *uncertain* area, but originally calculated to bear a *certain* weight of taxation; and when we prove that the hide and quasi-hide of Dorset and some other counties averaged 240 acres, and the hide and quasi-hide of Somerset, 249 $\frac{2}{3}$ acres, we quote various phenomena of one and the same rule. What we discover is, merely, that Somerset, so far as it was *hidated*, was a somewhat poorer County than Dorset.

And there are other and still more discrepant phenomena with relation to the hide. When we speak of the Domesday Hidation of Dorset, we speak of an hidation, or quasi-hidation, which well-nigh covered the whole County, but when we speak of the Domesday hidation of Somerset, we speak of that which did not cover, and was not intended to cover, so much as five-sixths of the manorial areas.

In other words, the whole, or nearly the whole, of Dorset was settled, occupied, and appreciable, when its hidation was originally prescribed; and the Domesday Commissioners, finding such a state of things, registered the hidation, but at the same time cast the territory into their own more definite forms of mensuration. But there were large tracts of Somerset (more than one-sixth of the County), which had never been hidated,—never measured in any form by thought or phraseology of man. Neither did the Domesday Commissioners measure these tracts: they did not say more than a chance word about them.

Such theories and abstractions, fit rather for a peroration than a Preface, will, we trust, be better appreciated when we shall have said all that remains to be said in detail, and to be proved by instance.

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

ON THE

SOMERSET DOMESDAY.

AREA OF SOMERSET.

OUR authority (a County Topography published in 1875), states the County of Somerset to "comprise an area of 1,642 square miles." At that rate, its area will be 1,050,880 statute acres.

But the same authority gives an alternative measurement, viz., of 1,066,209 acres, for the same County.

Summing the details supplied by the same publication, and correcting a few which are accidentally erroneous, a third area presents itself. On these last data the County of Somerset contains 1,046,554 statute acres of parochial and extra-parochial measurement. The difference, viz., 19,655 acres, probably arises in the former, or gross, measurement including estuaries and other water-surfaces, such as would not be included in those parochial measurements which realise the latter total. But the Somerset of the 11th Century was not quite conterminous with that of the present day, The County of the 11th Century contained Holwell (2,356 acres), which is now annexed to Dorset, and a part of Bedminster, viz. 1,426 acres, which is now interned in the City of Bristol. This will give 1,046,554 acres + 2,356 acres + 1,426 acres;—in all, 1,050,336 acres, as constituting the Somerset of the 11th Century.

And again, the precise territory which was surveyed in the Somerset Domesday was not the whole County. About 1,256 acres,

forming the estate of Gaspar and Bonham, were not surveyed by Domesday as in Somerset; but if surveyed anywhere, then it was in Wiltshire.

Therefore, on the whole (1,050,336 acres - 1,256 acres =) 1,049,080 acres of modern ascertainment, were in some sort typified in the Domesday Survey of Somerset.

A preliminary and general statement should here be made, as to how far, and in what way, this computation of 1,049,080 statute acres was really typified in the said Survey, and how far it was excluded.—

In Dorset, where the existing area is 632,909 acres, we found (see Dorset, pp. 146-148) that about 22,278 acres were pretermitted in the Dorset Survey. It was less than a 28th part of the county, and we gave what we held to be the ratio of that exclusion in the Dorset volume.

But in Somerset, we hold that more than one-sixth of its assumed acreage is not measured nor registered in any form in Domesday; is not the subject of any of the specific estimates and measures, whether of hidage, or carucatage, or carucage, or acreage, which are propounded in the Somerset Survey. In more precise terms, if the statute acreage of Somerset be taken to have been then, as now, 1,049,080 acres, then we believe that 177,970 of those acres were omitted in the Somerset Domesday, and that 871,110 acres were registered in the said Record.

The extent of these Somerset omissions is far greater than was the case in Dorset, but their ratio is more presumable, because in many instances it can be absolutely proved. Such proofs the sequel will supply. Here it may be well to say a passing word about those spacious tracts which, under the name of "Moors," pervaded and characterized the County of Somerset.¹ Many of them, though now under the plough, are still known as "Moors" in local parlance. In the 11th Century they were, as a rule, utterly waste and profitless; in some districts they were well-nigh inaccessible; in others, avoided rather than occupied by man.

There was an antecedent probability that the Domesday surveyors would take no more note of these wildernesses than of barren crags, or the sterile sands of the foreshore.

¹ The word *moor*, in its original signification, as a marsh, or fen, has nearly passed out of usage. It is preserved in the words "moor-hen" and "morass." In Shropshire, a region of fen-land, once udrained, but interspersed with patches of scrub-wood, is still known as the "Weald-Moors."

PROXIMATE IDENTITY OF THE ANCIENT AND MODERN BOUNDARIES
OF THE COUNTY.

With two proved, and with one or two possible, exceptions, the real area of the Somerset of A.D. 1086 was that which exists at the present moment. The two proved exceptions are in the way of diminution. As already stated, Holwell, which was in Somerset at the date of Domesday, has in the present century been annexed to the County by which it is geographically surrounded, viz., to Dorset. Of Bedminster parish, which was wholly in Somerset at the date of Domesday, some portion has been since interned in the County and City of Bristol.

Of two other estates already alluded to, viz. Gaspar (*alias* Brooke) and Bonham, neither is mentioned in the Somerset Domesday. At that period, both were probably involved in the Manor and Parish of Stourton, Wiltshire, and in that parish at least they still remain. However, both are reckoned to be in the county of Somerset, and it is quite possible that such was the case at the date of Domesday;¹ for it sometimes happened that a capital manor being in one County, its appurtenants might be in another; nor would it have been within the scope of the Domesday Commissioners to take note of such accidents, especially when, as in this case, the two Counties in question were surveyed by the same Commission.

Another case of seemingly altered boundary implies no real change. The Somerset Manor of Yarnfield is, ecclesiastically, in the Wiltshire parish of Maiden-Bradley. But, as now, so in Domesday, Yarnfield is found under the name of Gernefelle, and to have been in the County of Somerset.

Two hamlets, Shrubs and Iford, which are ecclesiastically in the Somerset parish of Freshford, were said by the County Historian (see Collinson i. 125) to be in Wiltshire. This was said, apparently, because the River Avon, which divides the said hamlets from the said parish, was recognised as the boundary of the two Counties in that district. There is nothing whatever in Domesday to show or to suggest that, at that period, there was any manorial or comital distinction between Freshford and its hamlets. Collinson, it is true, made Iford to have been distinctively

¹ Whereas the Domesday areas of Gaspar and Bonham are reckoned, if anywhere, under Wiltshire, so we do not in our tables add their parochial areas to those of Somerset. If we did, it would mar the essence of our comparative measurements.

surveyed in the Somerset Domesday, but this arose in the mere mistake of identifying Iford with the Comte of Moretain's Manor of "Eford," the latter being really represented by a place called Ford, in the parish of Norton Fitz Warren.

All that we have further to say about Shrubs and Iford is that, if they be now in Wiltshire, they were probably in Somerset at the date of Domesday, and that their subsequent transfer was perhaps suggested by the course of the River Avon.

The next case of possibly changed boundaries is as between the Counties of Somerset and Devon. Guided by Domesday indicia only, we have still two distinct classes of indicia to deal with, the one apprehensible at a glance, the other bearing its testimony at the cost of many comparisons and much reasoning.

The problem is, whether a large portion of the forest and region of Exmoor, which portion may have been annexed by a Post-Domesday boundary-line to the County of Devon, may not equally be deemed, at the date of Domesday, to have pertained to the County of Somerset.

It is clear that Domesday attributes to the Royal Manors and to the Hundreds of West Somerset, areas of forest and pasture far greater than the said Manors and Hundreds can, at any time, have geographically contained. The obvious and easy way of accounting for this would be to say that some or other of these Western Manors and Hundreds absorbed more of Exmoor Forest than is now contained in the County of Somerset. But, on the other hand, a further study of Domesday shows that to other Royal Manors and Hundreds of Somerset, whether adjacent or not to these Western Manors, the quantities of forest and pasture assigned by the Record were inadequate to the seeming geometrical requirements of each case, and in some instances to the known facts of a case. Perhaps the most typical of these latter cases is that of the Royal Manor and the Hundred of North Petherton. Postponing any present examination of such details, we here submit the general theory, viz., that the assignment by Domesday, of definite forest areas to certain specified manors, was by no means tantamount to an allocation of the said areas. It was a conventional or technical process, very possibly connected with the administration of the forest laws by the appointed officers.

Summarily then, the concentration of these wide-spread areas on certain Manors of West Somerset may have absorbed some parts of the present County of Devon, but it certainly took, as it were, into

the Western Hundreds of Somerset considerable tracts of forest-land which lay, topographically, in other Hundreds and districts of the said County.

The last case of boundary change which calls for observation here, was one which, for centuries before the Conquest, had been beyond the control or adjustment of man. We allude to the physical change which, of old, wrought its wild work in Counties of the seaboard by stress of the advance or retirement of the sea. Hypothetically as regards Somerset, we assume that, since the Conquest, the gains from the sea have been equal to the losses. It is the tendency of science and of English spirit to control nature in these respects. Ages gone by, the Severn sea was at Banwell, at Churchill, and even in the precincts of holy Glastonbury. But a subsidence had been directed by nature long before Domesday, and what nature then worked, man has since been securing. Smaller changes of the last eight centuries we have neither the means nor the intention of balancing. For our present purpose, and with all seeming probability, and with no material error possible in any direction, we assume, that, in regard to its seaboard, the area of Somerset is at the present day much what it was in the eleventh century.

As with the County, so with the Hundreds of Somerset, there has been no revolutionary change for eight centuries. Some Præ-Domesday Hundreds have changed their names without changing their boundaries; some have slightly changed their areas without changing their names.

The Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084, in three instances, names double Hundreds or Liberties, which, in the matter of assessment, it treats as three single Hundreds; consequently it gives the names of 41 Hundreds or Liberties as assessed, but only gives 38 Inquests. *Vice versâ*, it masses under the name of a single Hundred a series of entries which were known at the time to have pertained to two or even three Hundreds of name, and which in the Post-Domesday æra were speedily resolved into their original singularity. The only existent Hundred of Somerset which can properly be said, as an individual Hundred, to have had no Domesday antecedent is that of Whitley.—

Whitley Hundred was devised long after Domesday, and, as will appear in the sequel, for the special object of concentrating various Manors of Glastonbury Abbey, some of which had previously lain scattered in several old Hundreds, while others were relics of two Glastonbury Hundreds contemporaneously dissolved.

On the whole, it appears that Somerset at the date of Domesday contained 65 Hundreds or Liberties of special name and recognition 12 of which were Manors of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*. It, further appears that several of these 65 Hundreds were duplicate or triplicate Hundreds, and that their sub-divisions were occasionally named and recognised as distinct Hundreds. To avoid details not proper to this stage of our enquiry, we reckon on the whole, then, that at the date of Domesday, Somerset contained upwards of 70 Hundreds, Liberties, or enfranchised Manors of name, and of more or less special recognition. Nowadays these Hundreds, Liberties, or Manors are so divided or so combined as to form 42 Hundreds or Liberties. And this numerical reduction has been mainly effected by annexing the 12 Manors of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*, and some 20 other Manors or Liberties, each to its cognate or seemingly appropriate Hundred.

ON DOMESDAY HIDATION AND THE HIDE OF SOMERSET.

On this subject, its general principles and aspects, it seems better to refer to, rather than to repeat, many things which have already been said in our former treatise on the Dorset Survey. Here we will endeavour to point out *seriatim* the different developments which followed on the same principles in the County of Somerset ; and it may be that we shall have, here and there, to demonstrate the operation of varied elements and antagonistic forces.

The Dorset Domesday nowhere recognises such a thing as a *non-geldable*, as distinct from a *non-geldant, hide*. Where such a thing existed in essence, the Dorset Domesday called it a *Carucata terræ*. The Somerset Domesday had its carucates also, and they were in the very essence of *non-geldable hides*. But there were only twelve of these carucates in the whole County. Eight of them were attached to the great Church of St. John at Frome ; four constituted the precinct and home-estate of Muchelney Abbey.

But Somerset, unlike Dorset, though like Devon, Cornwall, Gloucestershire, and other Counties, had its *non-geldable hides*. The most notable instance was that of Glastonbury Abbey, whose site, precinct, and dominical adjuncts consisted of 12 hides, a circumstance which has procured for the Post-Domesday Hundred of Glastonbury, though with a largely increased area, the abiding denomination of "The Hundred of Glastonbury Twelve Hides." Of the original estate, the Exon Domesday speaks as follows:—

"Æcclesia Glastingeberiensis habet unam mansionem" (*i. e.* Manor)
 "quæ vocatur Glastingeberia, in quâ sunt xii hidæ terræ quæ nunquam gildum reddiderunt. Has possunt arare xxx Carucæ."

So that according to our estimate of the "Ploughland" (*viz.*, 120 statute acres), each of the privileged hides of Glastonbury contained, as one of its elements, 300 acres of arable land. The other elements of each such hide we find to have been 25 acres of dwarf wood (*nemusculi*), $1\frac{2}{3}$ acres of wood (*nemoris*), 5 acres of meadow, and $16\frac{2}{3}$ acres of pasture. Here, then, the ingeldable hide averaged $348\frac{1}{3}$ acres of Domesday measurement and registration.

The above was a case of "privileged hidation,"—privileged in two distinct ways, one that the capacity of the hide was very large, the other that each hide was absolutely non-geldable. But in Somerset, as in Dorset, there were cases of highly privileged hidation, where the privilege involved no absolute, though a nearly proximate, *non-geldability*. Abundant instances will appear in our Tables. Here we would notice the late Queen Edith's Manor of Milverton. It was geldable only as two fertines, that is as one eighth part of a hide. Yet it contained, in Domesday measures, 1,920 acres of arable land, 100 acres of dwarf-wood, 6 acres of meadow, and 100 acres of pasture. Obviously the hide which would result from such elements would be a hide of $(2,126 \times 8 =)$ 17,008 acres.

One of two manors in Kingston (now Kingston Seymour) consisted of a single hide at the date of Domesday. That hide measured 2,080 acres. In Saxon times this single hide had involved the second manor. The latter is measured by Domesday as containing 840 acres more, but this smaller manor had been *re-hidated*. Its hidage in Domesday is $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides. Aldret was T. R. E. Lord of this, as yet undivided, hide. The Manor of Huntspill, held T. R. E. by Ewerwacer, was a single hide, and remained so in A.D. 1086. This hide measured 1,860 acres of Domesday registration.

In the matter of progressive hidation the cases which occurred in Somerset immediately after the Conquest savour sometimes of the curtailment or annihilation of prescriptive privilege, sometimes of the discovery of previously concealed hidage, but in no case do we find hidation to have increased with reference to temporary advantages or local prosperity, neither do we find any case where the degree or quantity of hidation was lowered with reference to any circumstance of poverty, disaster, or desolation.

In three of the Comital Manors (that is manors annexed to the Saxon Earldom of Somerset), and in three of the late Queen Edith's

Manors, the privileged hidations of King Edward's time had been withdrawn before Domesday, and replaced by hidations more or less than double in amount: and yet these manors had all devolved on the Conqueror himself. There were other like increments of hidation in many manors which had been annexed to other Fiefs. The personal interest of neither King nor Baron (whose demesnes were exempt from the Gheld-Tax) were affected by these changes. The Coliberti and the Villani alone suffered by this kind of *rehidation*.

Such changes, it should be observed, were not due to the Domesday Commissioners, for the Inquisicio-Gheldi, two years earlier than Domesday, had already recognized the higher estimates.

But with respect to the 41 Hundreds or Liberties which were assessed in the extant Gheld-Inquests of A.D. 1084, we further find that the Domesday Commissioners added some $43\frac{1}{2}$ hides to the previous estimates. Such increments resulted from no abolition of prescriptive privilege, but from the detection of previous informalities, or of previous concealments. The Commissioners had no arbitrary power of the former kind; the latter process was official, and was clearly one of their special functions.

In the Cornish Survey (Domesday, fo. 121, b. 1) it is said of the Comte of Moretain's Manor of Liscarret—"Marlesuain tenebat tempore Regis Edwardi et geldabat, pro ii hidis. Ibi tamen sunt xii hidæ." Similar expressions are used in the Survey of other manors of Devon and Cornwall; and in one or two cases something of the kind is said about estates in Somerset. Our object, in mentioning the matter here, is to point out what the expression, wherever used, may have indicated. We take such expressions to have been presentments by the Domesday Commissioners, not judicial decisions, certainly not enactments. Such cases were left by the Commissioners to the investigation of the Fiscal Officers of the Crown and to their decision. Taking for the moment one view of the term *hide*, such a passage would mean somewhat as follows—"Here is a manor which in King Edward's time stood at such a Gheld-rate, as was proper to a manor containing two farms or occupations. But as a matter of fact, we (the Domesday Jurors or Surveyors¹) find that the said manor embodies twelve farms or

¹ We think it possible that the Domesday Commissioners may have used such written Records as the Gheld-Rolls. We do not think that they used any written forms of Terrier (the Gheld-Rolls were not Terriers), otherwise they would have spelt local names in a more Anglican fashion. They got their facts from Juries,—

occupations; and we (the Domesday Commissioners) register that verdict." It was not a case of progressive hidation, nor of *Domesday Increment*, but it was a case suggestive of the future propriety of such a change.

In the mere matter of capacity, and as compared with Dorset, or with Shropshire, or with the Province of Ketstevan, in Lincolnshire, the Domesday Hidation of Somerset may in one way be shewn to have resulted from nearly the same principles. Collecting everything that is called a hide, or virgate, or fertine, or gheld-acre, in the Somerset Survey, we find the amount (within some $2\frac{1}{2}$ virgates) to have been 2,952 hides. With these hides, Domesday complicates 108 ungeldable plough-lands, which we take leave to call *Quasi-Hides*, thus making the whole area which it is convenient to call the *Area of Hidation* to have been 3,060 hides. Against this hidation Domesday registers other measures of a different description which realise to our computation (see Table, Vol. II, pp. 5, 6) precisely 760,577 statute acres. At this rate, the Somerset Hide co-ordinated with about $248\frac{1}{2}$ acres of exacter Domesday measurement. But there is in Domesday a further quantity of Somerset land which is not complicated with statements of hidation. It consists of 417 ingeldable plough-lands and of 12 carucates of land. All these may be taken as *Quasi-Hides*, so that in point of present reckoning the Hidation of Somerset may be taken as $(3,060 + 417 + 12 =)$ 3,489 hides. Against this, technically computed, area of the whole County, Domesday registers actual measures amounting to 871,110 statute acres. The result is nearly the same as in the former comparison. Instead of the Somerset Hide co-ordinating as in the former experiment, with $248\frac{1}{2}$ statute acres, it now co-ordinates with a fraction less than 250 acres. As regards the principles on which hidation was originally prescribed and assessed, they are not to be ascertained except by a series of experiments. Let us repeat some which we ourselves have conducted. (See Dorset, p. 145, note.)—

In Dorset, about 239 statute acres are the typical equivalent of the Domesday Hide. In Shropshire, the hide is represented by a little over 240 acres. In Ketstevan, the Domesday Carucate (tantamount to the hide of other Counties) seems to be represented by 244 modern acres. In Somerset, as we have above ascertained, the hide is represented by $248\frac{1}{2}$ Domesday acres, the hide and

from the oral testimony of Manorial Bailiffs or Juries. The Jurors of a Hundred were sometimes called upon for evidence; more rarely, the Grand Jury of the County was consulted.

quasi-hide combined, by about $249\frac{2}{3}$ Domesday acres. So far, then, all we can say is, that the original hidation of Somerset was somewhat more favourable than that of Dorset, or Shropshire, or Ketstevan.

But now we must enquire how it was that a principle, almost unique, should become varied by the circumstances of its application. In Dorset, Shropshire, and Ketstevan, our comparison was between hidage and modern acreage; in Somerset, it was between hidage and Domesday acreage. And the Domesday acreage and the modern acreage of Somerset are two widely different things. This we will make evident in a few words.—

The County which composed the Somerset of the eleventh century measures, by modern ascertainment, 1,049,080 statute acres: that is, it measures 177,970 acres more than were registered in the Domesday computations. And in that view, for it is little more than a view, the co-ordinate of the Domesday hide may be said to be something just over 300 statute acres. The solution of this seeming puzzle has already been given. It is simply repeating it to say that the Domesday Commission ignored something more than a sixth of the County of Somerset, or at least excluded it from their reckonings, and that, *a fortiori*, the antecedent scales of hidation had been calculated with a like principle of excluding utterly unoccupied and profitless territory.

When the Gheld-laws were first enacted, it became necessary for the sake of equitable taxation that the whole kingdom should be apportioned into hides. Where a County or district was less able than the generality to bear taxation, the hides into which it was cast became necessarily fewer in number and greater in area. This can hardly be called *privileged hidation*. If we call it *favourable hidation*, the term should be defined. We will say, then, that it was a due consideration of the lesser competency of whole Counties or whole districts.

And, as the hide of all hidated Somerset was made to contain from five to ten acres more than the hide of Dorset, so in that ratio, was Somerset a poorer County than Dorset.

And, as this variety of the hide obtained in whole Counties according as they were generally richer or generally poorer, so did it obtain to a much greater extent in different districts of the same County. In Somerset, for instance, and in the Hundred of Cutcomb and Minehead, the hide of the eleventh century co-ordinated with 1,878 acres of coeval measurement, but in the Hundred of Bath

the hide co-ordinated with $139\frac{1}{2}$ such acres, and in the Hundred of Givela (Yeovil) with $136\frac{1}{4}$ such acres.

THE HIDATION OF MANORS ACCORDING TO ESTIMATES OF INTRINSIC
OR EXTRINSIC VALUE.

Quitting for the present those larger fields of observation to which the Somerset Domesday has invited us, we will illustrate our subject by references to Manors rather than Districts.

The chief, we may almost say the only, intrinsic faculty which will have regulated the value of Somerset Manors, was fertility of soil. That this faculty was the very first to be considered when the hidation of any Somerset Manor was originally prescribed, is evident on every page of Domesday; and, as we trust, our Tables will sufficiently reflect the general truth by innumerable examples.

The converse is also to be seen in the same Tables, where a low value and a low scale of hidation surely indicate a fertility below par.

Of the various kinds of land, the arable land will have been that which most varied in intrinsic value. In short, where hidation and annual value are both low, or both high, in comparison with the estimated number of available plough-lands, we may presume the inherent sterility or fertility of the latter.

A specific case will show the force of this rule. William de Moione's Manor of Langeham (E. D. p. 337) contained a single hide, worth 30 shillings per annum, of which 3 shillings arose from the Manorial Mill. It was a very low hidage and a very low value for a manor which contained,—besides 100 acres of wood, meadow, and pasture,—6 plough-lands, that is, 720 acres of arable land; and on these $6\frac{1}{2}$ teams were actually at work. Of course, this arable land was of very poor quality; and the proof thereof is so far in the letter of Domesday.—

The Manor in question proves to be Langham, in Luxborough. Its rateable value, at the present day, is, we believe, 12s. 8d. per acre;—truly a significant perpetuation of the poverty registered in Domesday.

Take a more ordinary case, that of the Bishop of Coutance's double Manor of Twerton (E. D. p. 136). It contained 10 hides; its annual value was £13 less £3, the produce of four mills. This was more than an average value for an estate which, while it comprised only 25 acres of wood and meadow, also comprised $12\frac{1}{2}$ plough-lands (equal to 1,500 acres) on which $11\frac{1}{2}$ teams were

actually going. We judge, then, from Domesday, that the arable land of Twerton was of fully average quality.—

The present parish of Twerton does not represent the two Domesday Manors; but the rateable value of land in that district is about £1 17s. per annum.—

We infer from this case of Twerton, among others, that mill-sites and rights of multure were not taken into account in assessing the original hidation of a manor, nor had the use of such faculties operated to increase the hidation up to the date of Domesday. These, then, were among those extrinsic advantages which, though they added to the value of a manor, cannot be supposed to have affected its hidation.

A very instructive case in this matter of inherent value is that of the Manor of Norton-sub-Hamdon, in Givela (now Horethorne) Hundred. It had been given before Domesday by the Comte of Moretain to the Norman Abbey of St. Mary of Grestein. It contained 5 hides, its arable land was adapted to 5 teams, but only 4 teams were at work. Its mill realized £1 per annum. It contained 645 acres of Domesday measurement, viz., 600 acres of arable land, 20 acres of wood, and 25 acres of meadow. Here the hidation was very high, for the hide only contained 129 acres, of which 120 were arable. The annual returns were £5 per annum, which, setting the mill against the absent team, was an unusually high value for any purely agricultural estate. Now look at the present parish of Norton-sub-Hamdon. It is unquestionably conterminous with the Domesday Manor, for it measures 642 acres. It must be an exceedingly fertile spot, for its rateable value is £3 0s. 6½d. per acre.

Of the hidation of certain Somerset Manors having been originally determined with reference to extrinsic advantages, we have special examples in the Hundred of Bath, where the said advantages will have consisted in proximity to an opulent Burgh and much-frequented centre. Thus, a manor at Weston, containing only 10 plough-lands, and territorially valued at £10 per annum, had been originally assessed as 15 hides, and so remained at Domesday. Lyncombe, with its 8 plough-lands, valued at £6 per annum, T. R. E., and at £8, T. R. W., had been originally, and still remained, hidated as 10 hides. Monkton Combe was a case of the same complexion; but in many cases of manors proximate to Bath other elements seem to have come into operation, and destroyed the universality of such phænomena. As to these same extrinsic

accidents of situation and surroundings, and their influence in lowering the hidation of manors, look at the wild Hundreds of Cutcomb-Minehead, and Carhampton, where, in a plurality of manors, the single hide contains two, three, four, five, yea, even six plough-lands; where the single hide was of high annual value, never less than £1, often £2 or £3, sometimes even £4; where (as regards Carhampton Hundred at least) the average hide tallied with a positively stated Domesday area of $973\frac{1}{2}$ acres, as regards Cutcomb and Minehead Hundred, with a positive area of 1,878 acres. These were in some sort, we might say, cases of "privileged" or of "favourable hidation"; but those are hardly the best terms to apply to the manors of a whole region. No *favour* was intended by the original assessment of hidage, but much consideration was shewn. "Here is an estate," the Assessors may be supposed to have said: "it is of great extent; it is of fair intrinsic value; but, however great or fair, it is but an oasis in the desert: it is remote from all faculties of market or transport; its capacity to endure taxation we rate at a minimum: we reduce this estate of 900 acres, and that estate of 1,800 acres to a unity in the scale of hidation. That which in Eastern, or Middle, or Southern Somerset we determine to be fifteen, or ten, or five, or three hides, we here pronounce to be only one hide."

We have stated in our Dorset Treatise (p. 13) as a matter of observation and of fact, but still only as an incident, that the individual hide of Dorset Manors generally appears in Domesday in numerical conjunction with a single plough-land, or *Terra ad unam carrucam*.

The case was far different in Somerset. Except in four abnormal Hundreds or Liberties, the plough-lands were in no Somerset Hundred so few as the hides, in many Hundreds and Liberties two or three plough-lands co-ordinated with a single hide. In the Hundreds of Carhampton, and Cutcomb-Minehead, taken together, the plough-lands were as four to one of the hides.

THE SUBDIVISIONS OF THE DOMESDAY HIDE.

In this matter, precisely the same principles obtained in Somerset, as in Dorset (see Dorset, p. 14), and as in all the South-Western Counties. But, as it was practically unnecessary to introduce the *ferndel* or *fertine*, or fourth part of a virgate, into the Domesday of Dorset and Wiltshire, so it was practically imperative to use it frequently in the Gheld-Assessments of Somerset.

The ratio of this is obvious.—Where the Hide, as in Dorset, co-ordinated with some 240 statute acres, the subdivisions of the hide as a Gheld-figure, viz., the Virgate, usually, co-ordinating with 60 statute acres, or the Gheld-acre, usually co-ordinating with 5 statute acres, were expressions adequate to every case of subdivision. But in Somerset, where the Gheld-hide sometimes co-ordinated with 500, or 900, or even 1,800 acres, and where estates were more frequently and more fractionally subdivided than in Dorset, it became necessary to use an intermediate Gheld-measure. This was the Fertine. It was one-fourth of the Virgate; it contained 3 Gheld-acres. When used it co-ordinated with a statute acreage, such as might happen to form a sixteenth part of the acreage, which co-ordinated with the hide of any Hundred or manor. If a Somerset estate consisted, let us say of 960 statute acres, and if, in any case, the said 960 acres be found to have co-ordinated with a Somerset Gheld-hide, then, in that case the co-ordinate of the Gheld-virgate was 240 acres, of the Gheld-fertine was 60 acres, of the Gheld-acre was 20 acres.

Many curious illustrations of our theory as to the Gheld-measures cited in Domesday will be found in future notes.¹

THE CARUCATA TERRÆ, AS DISTINCT FROM THE TERRA AD UNAM
CARUCAM.

We have said that the Carucate (*Carucata Terræ*) is only twice mentioned in the Somerset Domesday. This is literally the case; but in the *Inquisicio-Gheldi*, and, in the Schedule of *Terræ Occupatæ*² appended to the Exon Domesday, the word *Carucata* is used twice at least, if not oftener. In these cases the word is used

¹ Some years since, the Gheld-measures and the Statute-measures of Domesday, having been quite intelligibly, distinguished as “the Saxon and the Norman measures,” an attempt was made to draw a hard and fast rule as to the proportions of the two; a hard and fast rule forsooth, between two systems, one of which varied according to the district which might be under notice, while the other was perfectly inelastic. The equation used for this purpose could have established nothing beyond the proportions of a particular case. It failed even to do that, for though the equation was correctly worked, it was founded on a passage in the Exon Domesday, which happened to be textually corrupt.

² Surveying the Royal Manor of Bedminster, the Exchequer Domesday says of the Church-land there,—“*Presbiter hujus Manerii tenet terram ad unam carrucam.*” The Exon Domesday, in strict conformity of phrase, says,—“*Presbiter habet terram unius carrucæ.*” But the Schedule of *Terræ Occupatæ*, treating this Church-land as an *ablatum* from the Royal Manor, says,—“*Quidam Presbiter tenet inde unam carucatam terræ.*” Here the word *Carucata* was improperly used. It was merely a clerical error, the Clerk describing one thing in terms of another.

as an equivalent for an "ingeldable plough-land" (*terra ad unam carucam ingeldabilis*). This, a Carucate, might be *per accidens*; but in its essence it was not this. In essence the Carucate was rather an ingeldable hide.

And, like the Hide, the Carucate was variable in extent. In one instance, the Home-estate of Muchelney Abbey, the Carucate co-ordinated with 154 $\frac{1}{4}$ acres of exacter Domesday measures. In the other instance, that of the estate of St. John's Church at Frome, the Carucate consisted with about 147 acres of the same description.

Of the Plough-land, the *Terra unius Caruce* of the Exchequer Domesday, the *Terra quam potest arare una caruca* of the Exon Domesday, we have little to add to what has been said at much length in our Dorset Treatise. We repeat that the normal capacity of the Plough-gang,¹ or One-team-land, was 120 statute acres; and we say that, as in Dorset, so in Somerset, when it was sought by the Domesday Surveyors to subdivide the Plough-gang, instead of using the term *Bovate*, they described the fractional quantity of land, according to the number of oxen proper to its culture. Thus the *Terra ad dimidiam carucam*, or half-plough-gang, of 60 acres, might stand in Domesday as *Terra quatuor bovium*; and the Quarter-plough-land, of 30 acres, might, and often does, stand, as *Terra duorum bovium*.

In stating the number of teams in actual employ, if the number appeared to be only half a team, the Exon Domesday usually writes,—*Ibi habet A or B, dimidiam carucam*. But in the case of William de Moione's Manor of *Estrat*, under-held by one Roger, it varies the expression by saying, "*Inde habet Rogerus unam hidam et unam virgatam in dominio et quatuor boves; et Villani habent unam virgam et quatuor boves.*" The Exchequer Domesday, more clear, but less accurate in details, is precise in reproducing these *eight oxen* as *unam carucam*, though it gives the whole team to the Villeins, and no fraction thereof to the Mesne-Lord. "*Ibi sunt tres Villani et unus Bordarius cum unâ carucâ*" is the expression.

This matter of Teams-in-Stock is out of place here, where we

¹ *Plough-gang*, perhaps a coined expression, is more convenient than such a term as *one-team-land*, though the latter be a closer translation of the Domesday term—*Terra ad unam carrucam*. Moreover, "plough-gang" harmonizes better with the cognate "ox-gang." In Somerset, as there were eight oxen (*boves*) in one *carruca* (team), so were there eight ox-gangs (*bovatæ*) in what we venture to call a "plough-gang."

are speaking of the divisions of the arable territory, rather than of the actual teams. However, the quotations, taken together, prove that the *Caruca*, spoken of in Domesday as proper to a certain breadth of tillage was, always a *Team of eight*.

In describing the estate of Meare as an *adjunct* (not an *adjacent estate*, as Collinson puts it) of Glastonbury, the Exon Domesday (p. 159) writes as follows,—“Huic (Glastingberiaë) adjacet quædam Insula quæ vocatur Mera, in quâ sunt lx agri terræ quos potest arare una carruca qua ibi est.” The Exchequer Domesday says,—“Ibi sunt lx acrae terræ. Terra (est) unius Carrucæ quæ ibi est.” These expressions seem to militate against our theory that the normal plough-land, the *Terra unius carrucæ*, was 120 acres, seeing that the whole estate, including such 120 acres, was but 60 acres.

But, if we examine the structure of Domesday clauses more attentively, we observe that these 60 acres are introduced into that part of the clause or clauses, which is usually devoted to statements of hidage. These 60 acres belonged, therefore, to the system of *hidation*. They were *Gheld-acres* in fact, and to write *lx agri* was only a ready way of writing, “una hida et una virga terræ” (*i.e.* $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides).

In Dorset $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides would, on the County average, suggest a co-ordinate of 300 statute acres. In Somerset, it would suggest about 375 statute acres. But, in the case before us, it is clear that the Domesday Surveyors ignored more than 8,000 acres of swamp, which surrounded the oasis called “Mera” and registered only 1 plough-land, 6 acres of wood, 6 acres of meadow, 2 arpents of vineyard, and 3 fisheries, as constituting the estates proper for their notice. Our estimate of the plough-land, *viz.*, as 120 acres, is not touched by the case.

If the present parish of Farrington Gurney be nearly conterminous with the Domesday Manor of Ferintonia (E. D. 139), the case is one which strongly supports our theory as to the contents of the *Terra unius carrucæ* having been normally 120 acres, Domesday surveys the manor as containing 7 plough-lands (or, as we hold, 840 acres of arable land) and 100 acres of meadow; in all then 940 acres. The present parish measures 923 acres.—

The difference of 17 acres between the two estimates is easily accounted for by the fact that Domesday never entertains any fraction of a plough-land so small as 17 acres, or about one-seventh thereof. The lowest denomination in this scale is the “two-ox-

land," or (as we hold) 30 acres. Except in measuring meadow land, Domesday estimates are prone to deal in something like what are now called *round numbers*.

The Domesday measures of Hantona (now Hinton St. George) are 12 plough-lands (1,440 acres), wood land 720 acres, meadow 60 acres. Here the woodland being very probably in another parish, the plough-land and meadow-land measure together 1,500 acres. And that is the precise measure of the present parish of Hinton St. George.

Other cases, whether in support of, or in apparent antagonism to, the theory that the normal plough-land of Somerset was 120 acres, will have careful consideration in future notes.

THE LINEAL MEASURES OF THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.

These were precisely the same as those used in the Dorset Survey. The Table given thereof (Dorset p. 25), will meet every case which occurs in either County, as described in Domesday.

We quote two instances of the perch being used as a lineal measure in the Somerset Survey. "Ibi habet Britellus v quadragenas et x perticas nemoris in longitudine (Exon. D. p. 248). The wood was five quarentines (or 1,100 yards) + 10 perches (or 55 yards); that is, 1,155 yards long. And again—

"Rogerius (Arundellus) habet xii quadragia nemoris in longitudine et iv quadragia et xiii perticas in latitudine" (Exon. D. p. 415). Here the width of wood was 4 quarentines (= 880 yards) + 13 perches (= 71½ yards), or 951½ yards.

The *straight Acre*, being (as our Dorset Table shows), 22 yards, is also mentioned in the Somerset Survey.

THE AREAL OR SUPERFICIAL MEASURES OF THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.

These, again, were exactly as in Dorset (See Table, Dorset-Volume, p. 30), and there were the same technical varieties of expression when dealing with equal areas. For instance, when describing any wood of 120 statute acres, the Somerset Surveyor, or Clerk might do it in any of four ways. He might say simply *una leuga nemoris*; or he might say, *una leuga nemoris, in longitudine et latitudine*; or he might say, *una leuga nemoris inter longitudinum et latitudinem*; or he might say, *una leuga nemoris in longitudine et una quadragena in latitudine*. All would imply the

same thing. But if he wrote, *una leuga nemoris in longitudine et tantundem in latitudine*, the wood, instead of being 120 acres, would be ($120 \times 120 =$) 1,440 acres. The same would have been his meaning had he written, *I leuga nemoris in longitudine et I in latitudine*; so that the mere omission of a single figure (I) in such a sentence makes a difference of 1,320 acres. We cannot help remarking, that in one case, suspecting such an omission in a clause of the Exon Domesday, we turned to the Exchequer Codex and found the figure duly inserted. (This will appear in a future note.)

BANWELL.—It will serve a present explanation, as well as fortify a future argument, to note what Domesday says about the measures of this great Episcopal Manor.—

“Episcopus habet unam Mansionem quæ vocatur Banuella et reddit geldum pro xxx hidis. Has possunt arare xl carruæ. Inde habet Episcopus duas et dimidiam leugas nemoris *in longitudine et in latitudine*, et centum agros prati et unam leugam pascuæ *in longitudine et in latitudine*.” According to our theories the measures here registered amount to 5,320 acres, viz.: of arable land, 4,800 acres; of wood, 300 acres; of meadow, 100 acres; of pasture, 120 acres. But were we to take the wood and pasture-measures to indicate the several sides of oblong figures, then, $2\frac{1}{2}$ leagues \times $2\frac{1}{2}$ leagues of wood would mean 9,000 acres and 1 league \times 1 league of pasture would mean 1,440 acres. At that rate the whole manor of Banwell would have measured ($4,800 + 9,000 + 100 + 1,440 =$) 15,340 acres.

Now, it is held by Somerset Antiquaries that the Domesday Manor of Banwell included a territory which forms no less than four existing Parishes, viz.: Banwell, 4,829 acres; Puxton, 613 acres; Churchill, 2,497 acres; and Compton Bishop, 2,535 acres.¹ Here, then, are but 10,474 acres. The computation shows, at a glance, that the second, or experimental, mode of estimating Domesday measures is extravagant and fallacious. And that is what chiefly concerns us in this part of our inquiry.

But we are further apprised that the sounder method of construing Domesday measures, the method which makes Banwell

¹ Huish-juxta-Highbridge appears to have been an outlying appendage of Banwell; but we have no means of ascertaining its acreage, and we doubt its having been measured in with the Domesday Manor. It was and is in Burnham parish, and at the date of Domesday, Walter de Douai, Lord of Burnham, rightfully or not, held Huish.

Manor to have contained 5,320 Domesday acres, seems scarcely to fit an occasion where 10,474 modern acres are, or seem to be, the correlative. For, taking the whole Hundred in which Banwell lay,—the Hundred of Winterstoke,—together, we find that 29,381 acres of Domesday registration are, or seem to be, represented by 37,001 acres of modern ascertainment. At this rate (*viz.*, an addition of about 26 per cent.) we should expect the 5,320 Domesday acres of Banwell to be represented by about 6,700 acres of modern parochial measurement. Instead of 6,700 acres we have 10,474 acres. There are several ways of meeting the difficulty thus arising, and certainly any single way will not suffice.—

Possibly, though we do not ourselves entertain the view, Collinson was right in making Walter de Douai's double Manor of Comtune to have been the antecedent of Compton Bishop. If so, we must add 4 hides to the Domesday hidage, and 632 acres to the Domesday exact measures of Winterstoke Hundred, and we must deduct 2,535 acres from the above-named parochial correlatives of Banwell Manor. This would leave the Domesday Manor of Banwell (5,320 acres) to be represented by (10,474 – 2,535 =) 7,939 acres of modern measurement. It is manifest that some other way should be found to elucidate the problem. The addition of 50 per cent. to the exacter Domesday measures is more than any theory whatever about Compton will account for. Probably, Banwell, Puxton, and Churchill, or whatever estates formed the Domesday Manor of Banwell, involved a proportion of those worthless wastes, whether barren hill or unreclaimed morass, of which the Domesday Surveyors made neither mention nor measure. Probably, too, as will be shown under Congresbury, much land was registered by the same surveyors as appurtenant to Congresbury, which is now, parochially, in Churchill or Puxton.

In the Exon Domesday (p. 342) under William de Moione's Manor of Brunfella (now Bromfield) the areal league (120 acres) is expressed in the same sentence by two different formulæ: "*Ibi habet Willelmus unam leugam nemoris in longitudine et in latitudine et unam leugam pascuæ.*" The Exchequer Domesday hardly varies the form of either expression of measure, though it names the pasture first and the wood last,—"*Ibi una leuua pasturæ et una leuua silvæ in longitudine et latitudine.*"

The Exon Domesday (pp. 135-6) under the Bishop of Coutance's Manor of Stratona (Stratton-on-the-Foss), specifies the following quantities: "*Ibi III quadragia nemoris in longitudine et II quad-*

ragia in latitudine" (This means 60 acres);—"et IV quadragia pascuæ inter longitudinem et latitudinem" (This means 40 acres). The Exchequer Domesday describes the same things as "Silva III, quarentinas longa et II quarentinas lata; Pasturæ IV quarentinæ inter longitudinem et latitudinem." Also the Exchequer Domesday transposes the items, giving the pasture first and the wood last.

Many further illustrations, of this section of our subject will occur in future notes. Here we would remark, though digressively, how contrasted passages of the two Domesdays are perpetually showing that the two were grounded on—were paraphrases of—the same original elements,—the non-extant notes of the Commissioners,—and that in no instance does any presumption arise that one extant Domesday was used by the compilers of the other. (See Preface, p. 5.)

ROYAL FORESTS.—The individual names of Royal Forests rarely transpire in Domesday Book. The Dorset Survey names but one, that of Wimborne, and it was by mere accident that it came to be named. The Somerset Survey names no King's Forest at all, under any specific name of such forest, but it gives the essence of such forests in the large areas of wood and pasture which it annexes to certain manors of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*.

The Royal Forests of Somerset, thus vaguely noticed by a technicality of Domesday, proved in the following century to be five in number, viz., Exmoor, Neroche, Selwood, Mendip, and North-Petherton.

Though, in a Domesday point of view, the Royal Forests may be said to have been annexed to the Royal Manors, this must be understood collectively of both. No particular forest can be pointed out as having been appurtenant to a particular manor. A mass of Royal Forest was annexed, for instance, to the three Royal Manors of Carhampton, Williton, and Cannington. They had among them 14,400 acres of wood and 21,600 acres of pasture, in all, 36,000 acres; which, though not altogether forest, in a physical sense, were *afforested* in a technical sense, that is, deemed to pertain to the King's Forest.

Such a quantity of King's Forest as 36,000 acres is attributed to no other three manors of the Royal Demesne of Somerset. The average allotment here was 12,000 acres to each of three manors. The proximate case was that of Bruton, to which manor Domesday allots 7,200 acres of wood and 150 acres of pasture. To North Petherton, another Royal Manor—though North Petherton Forest

was adjacent thereto—not a single acre of woodland is assigned by Domesday, and only two leagues (240 acres) of pasture.

Altogether, the twelve manors constituting the *Vetus Dominicum* of Somerset had forestal appurtenances of 58,020 acres, viz., 33,620 of wood and 24,400 acres of pasture. Thus Domesday broadly represents the five Royal Forests above mentioned. Any partial or special apportionment of this or that forest to this or that manor we must reserve for future consideration.

With regard to Forests and Chaces, or rights of Forest and Chace, granted by the Conqueror to certain great feudalists, Domesday, nowhere expressing such grants in terms, may be taken to indicate them in particular cases. One evidence on the subject is this, viz., that many manors endowed by Domesday with large areas of forest or pasture, can hardly, at any time, have contained the said areas within their ordinarily cognizable limits.

Malger, the Comte of Moretaine's tenant at Aisella (Ashill) is said to have a wood measuring 40×20 quarantines, or 8,000 statute acres. The arable land of the manor was 600 acres; the meadowland 40 acres:—two items which would well satisfy the previous value of the manor, 'when the Comte received it,' viz., £4 per annum, or the Domesday value, which, in fact, was £1 less. We have often remarked that forest areas did not tell much on Domesday valuations; but surely the Forest of Ashill was not really Malger's, but his suzerain's. Surely it was an abutment of the Royal Forest of Neroch, but given to the King's brother. In the same Hundred (Abdick), Drogo de Montacute, the Comte's tenant at Donyatt, had arable land, wood, and meadow, quite consonant with a manor of five hides and of £5 annual value. But Domesday says that he had also a "park." The park was not measured. Was it Drogo's or the Comte's?

In a more intelligible fashion, William de Moione's forest-rights, in all directions, seem to be concentrated by Domesday technicality on his two demesne-manors of Cutcomb and Minehead, which purport, in Domesday, to have embraced more than 15,000 acres of wood and pasture.

Edward of Salisbury's Manor of Hinton (Charter-House Hinton) and Norton (Norton St. Philip); Ernulf de Hesding's Manor of Rodden; Roger Arundel's Manor of Marston (now Marston Biggot); and William Fitz Wido's Manor of South Cheriton, are all distinguished in Domesday by large forest areas.

The SILVA and SILVA MINUTA of the Dorset Domesday are repro-

duced in the Somerset Survey by the same words of the Exchequer Codex, but in the Exon Codex by the words NEMUS and NEMUSCULUS. The SILVA MODICA, or wood of medium growth, is peculiar to the Dorset Survey.—

Methods of wood-husbandry perhaps varied in the two Counties. Variations of local vocabulary will have obtained co-ordinately.¹

Both Nemus and Nemusculus are sometimes found in the same Somerset manor. Thus "Claveham" (Claverham in Yatton) had a quarantine (10 acres) of wood ("nemoris"), and half a league by half a league (360 acres) of dwarf-wood ("nemusculi"). (Exon Domesday, p. 131). Again, Glastonbury, the Abbey Manor, comprised "300 agros nemusculi et 20 agros nemoris" (E. D., p. 159).

SPINETUM.—Ten acres of thorn-copse (*decem agri spineti*) were the woodland element in the Somerset Manor of Wica (now Bathwick). We take the growth to have been thorn, periodically cropped for the purpose of making or mending dead-fencing "Silva ad reficiendas sepes,"—we have somewhere seen the expression used,²—is probably intended by the Domesday Spinetum. Perhaps the "Bruaria" of the Dorset Survey was analogous to the Spinetum³ of the Somerset Survey.

PASCUA.—Under this head, there is little to add to what has been said, in our Dorset Treatise, of the synonymous *pastura*.

¹ If we leave the South-Western Circuit, and examine, for instance, the Hampshire Survey, we find Domesday dividing the woodlands after a very different fashion.

- (1) There is the *silva ad pasnagium*,—never measured, and never valued, except by a specification of how many swine it was capable of maintaining.
- (2) There is the *silva ad herbagium* usually valued, but never measured. In some cases the word *pastura* is used of such woods; but of *pastura*, in the sense adopted by the South-Western Commission, there is no mention whatever in the Hampshire Survey. The "Hampshire Downs" seem in short to have been as much ignored in Domesday as those Somerset Moors, of which we shall speak presently.
- (3) There is the *silva ad clausuram*, never measured, never valued.
- (4) There is the *silva parva*, apparently indistinct from the *silva ad clausuram*, but quite distinct from the *silva minuta* of the Dorset and Somerset Surveys. The former represents extent, the latter, growth.

Such differences in adjoining counties arose partly perhaps in the varieties of local custom and phraseology, but partly also in the varieties of method adopted by the Commissioners and their attendant Clerks in different circuits.

² In the *Inquisicio Eliensis*, we believe.—The *silva ad clausuram*, so frequent in the Hampshire Survey, is another expression of the same thing.

³ The term Spinney, still used in some Midland Counties, has come to indicate nothing but a small wood. Thorns are no longer the essence of a "Spinney," nor are thorns now grown in masses for the object of fence-mending.

The greater areas of pasture were forestal. They contributed nothing appreciable to the money-values of manors with which they were associated. The smaller areas of pasture, those attached to ordinary manors, seem to have had some tangible value.

We read under the King's Manor of North Petherton of 100 acres of meadow, and two leagues (240 acres) of pasture, which paid a rent of 20 shillings per annum.¹ Here, if we cannot rate the meadow-land at more than twopence per acre, we cannot rate the pasture-land at less than one-sixth of a penny per acre.

Another hint that some pasture-lands had an appreciable value, however small, consists in the fact of the Domesday Surveyors having cared to name such very small quantities as two acres or three acres as appurtenant to a manor.

It may be a question whether barren hill-tops, when not implicated in forestal areas, were measured at all in the Somerset Domesday. Analogy with the case of the "Moorlands" would suggest that they were not.

PRATUM.—Here again we refer to our Dorset Volume for all that needs to be said about the meadow-land in general of the two Counties. Half an acre is the smallest quantity of meadow-land that we find registered under any Domesday Manor of Somerset. We conclude that if there were that quantity in any manor, it was sure to be noted; and, if so, that it was of value.

TERRA VASTA —TERRA DEVASTATA.—The last term explains the first. The real "wastes" (as we should now call them, meaning "wildernesses") of Somerset are not registered in the Somerset Domesday.

The *Terra Vasta*, or *Devastata*, of the Records, is always significant of cases, where land, otherwise profitable, was, or had been in a temporary state, or a partial state, of non-cultivation.—

"Quando recepit (Rogerus de Corcella) erat penitus vastata," is said of part of Exford. "Non valet nisi septem solidos quia devastata est," is said of Treborough. These and similar cases will be found noticed in the Table of Carhampton Hundred.

¹ The Exon Domesday writes :—"Ibi habet Rex centum agros prati et duas leugas pascuæ quæ reddit (*sic*) per annum xx solidos."

It must not be understood that the rent arose from the pasture only. It was the wont of one of the Exon Scribes to use a singular number of his verbs after a plural nominative or nominatives. Such idiosyncrasies of grammar disappear when, as in the Exchequer Domesday, abbreviations are more freely used. In this case the Exchequer Scribe wrote "Ibi centum acræ prati et II leuua pasturæ redd. xx sol. per annum."

MORÆ.—The Moorlands of Somerset, being moors of the marsh rather than of the mountain, and though much of them be now under the plough, constitute a curious and also a very important consideration, if we wish fully to appreciate the Domesday treatment of the County:—not that the *Moræ* are very often noticed in the Survey; but that one particular notice of such territory shows the exact reason why in similar cases all notice was suppressed.

We have remarked, and we hope to substantiate in the sequel, how that more than 179,000 acres of Somerset territory were ignored in all or any of the measurements of the Great Survey. The bulk of this omission we now propound to have consisted of the Somerset moorlands,—of such of them as were deemed irreclaimable and absolutely worthless in the eleventh century.

In surveying the Bishop of Wells's Manor of Wedmore, Domesday specifies the following features, and adjuncts, of greater or less value, viz., 36 plough-lands, 6 wild mares, 2 fisheries renting 10 shillings per annum, 50 acres of wood, 70 acres of meadow, and one league (*ie.*, 120 acres) of pasture. And then, the Exchequer Domesday, being silent on the point, the Exon Domesday adds, without giving either measure or valuation,—“*Præter hoc sunt ibi moræ quæ nihil reddunt.*” Our conviction is that a vast and unmeasured moorland, such as that which the Exon Survey perfunctorily hinted at in this single instance, that of Wedmore, and which the Exchequer Domesday was uniformly silent about, was a feature and attribute of many Somerset manors, whose position and surroundings were analogous to those of Wedmore.

Now the Domesday Manor of Wedmore (10 hides) contained in the first place, all the present parish of Wedmore, except Clewer ($\frac{1}{12}$ ths of a hide), and perhaps a vill of the Abbot of Glastonbury, called Bodeslega (1 hide) whose present counterpart is uncertain, and which counterpart may or may not be in Wedmore parish. And the present parish of Wedmore contains 9,986 acres, from which if, we deduct 1,426 acres as the outside consideration for the $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides, which were not in the Bishop's Manor, there will remain 8,560 acres in contrast of the 10 hides of Bishop Giso's estate.

But Bishop Giso's estate of Wedmore further contained 8,068 acres, viz., 4,494 acres, which now are allocated to the Parish of Mark,¹ + 3,000 acres, similarly allocated to the Parish of Theale,

¹ Mark, before the Conquest, was an independent manor; but when Queen Edith gave it to the See of Wells it became a mere member of Wedmore. And so, Domesday, being silent about Mark, viewed it.

+ 574 acres, which now form the Parish of Biddisham. On the whole, then, Bishop Giso's Manor of 10 hides is now represented by $(8,560 + 8,060 =)$ 16,620 statute acres. Wherever we find the Domesday Hide thus correlated by 1,662 modern acres, we are bound to trace the cause of such a phenomenon.

There is another ascertainable fact which bears on this investigation.—According to the more positive estimates given by Domesday of what it measures and values in Wedmore, the manor was 4,560 acres, viz., arable land, 4,320 acres, woodland 50 acres, meadow 70 acres, and pasture 120 acres.

So then Domesday left $(16,620 - 4,560 =)$ 12,060 acres of the Manor of Wedmore, unmeasured, unexplored, and unvalued.

And this was the acreage of "the Moors, which paid nothing."

The moor-land attached of old to the Manor of Wedmore was merely an expression in Domesday; in another sense it is little else than an expression in the present day. The sons of the soil cannot make out why their plough-fields should be called "moors." However, if the moor-land once attached to Wedmore be not still remembered as "Mark-moor," it was so called in the last century, and "Mark's Causeway," and the "Abbot's Causeway," still remain as memorials of the time when farms previously unapproachable, save by boats, came to be visited by dry-shod pedestrians.

Another case of similar complexion with that of Wedmore is the curt notice bestowed by Domesday on the Bishop of Coutance's Manor of Kenn,—"*Ipse Episcopus tenet unam terram (not mansionem as usual) quæ vocatur Chen. Ibi est dimidia hida, et ibi habet (Episcopus) unum servum. Valet v solidos.*"—

This half-hide was probably a settlement of a few acres, effected or purposed in "Kenn Moor," where now the Church of Kenn is encompassed by a parish of 1,018 acres.

We have but to enumerate by name the "Moors" of Somerset, to show, on the whole, how credible it becomes that Domesday should have pretermitted in its measurements the greater part of those 170,000 acres which it surely did pretermitt.—

King's Sedgmoor (near Bridgewater); East Sedgmoor (between Wells and Glastonbury); West Sedgmoor (between Taunton and Langport); Stanmoor, Warmoor, Westwall Moor, and North Moor (all near Isle Athelney); Allermoor (near Langport); Westmoor, Currymoor, and Haymoor (near North Curry); Kingsmoor (on the Yeo); Ilemoor (on the Ile); Burtlemoor and Heathmoor (near Polden); Brent-marsh (of vast extent, between the Axe, the Brew,

the Parret, Mendip-hill, and the Bristol Channel); Kinnard Moor and Godney Moor (near Glastonbury); Weston Moor (near Uphill); Banwell Moor and Smeath Moor (near Churchill); Nailsea Moor (north of Kenn); and Clapton Moor (near Clapton-in-Gordano).

Having duly noticed the Moors of Somerset, unmeasured in Domesday, because of their absolute worthlessness, we have still to instance certain moors which were so measured, apparently because of their somewhat of value.—

These were not many, nor large. Possibly they were parcels of moor-land reclaimed or half-reclaimed from the general swamp, their value arising in summer-pasturage, coarse fodder, rushes, or ozier growth.

In Newton, Huntworth, and Edgeborough, three manors all included in the present parish of North-Petherton, Domesday notices three parcels of moor. The first measured 20 acres, the two last 10 acres each (E. D. pp. 442, 349, 334). Three leagues of moorland were appurtenant to Bishop Giso's demesnes at Wells (E. D. 145). The area was 360 acres. A league of moor (120 acres) was appurtenant to the same bishop's demesnes at Yatton (E. D. 147). A league of moor (120 acres) is mentioned under the King's Manor of Meleborn (E. D. p. 84). Six quarentines (60 acres) of moor were noted as in the Bishop of Coutance's Manor of Weston (now Weston in Gordano). There were 41 acres of moor in Roger Arundel's Manor of Tuxwell, and 43 acres of moor in his Manor of Fiddington, both in Cannington Hundred.

VINEYARDS are mentioned in Domesday as existing at Glastonbury, Pamborough, and Meare. All three were in the Abbot of Glastonbury's demesne. Their collective measure was eight Arpenz, or Agripennæ,—less than 4 acres then. (See Dorset p. 39, note). In the manor of North Curry (late Earl Harold's), King William had a large vineyard. It measured seven statute acres. Its value is not specified in Domesday.

MILLS.—The numbers, sites, and annual values (ranging from 6 pence to 20 shillings) of all Somerset Mills will be found in future Tables. What has been said generally about Domesday Mills in our Dorset volume need not be repeated here.

In the Somerset Hundred of Cannington we count 11½¹ Domes-

¹ We should expect to find a counterpart for the half-mill of Godelega (Gautheney) in some other manor of Cannington Hundred. Domesday fails to furnish such a counterpart.

day Mills. Five of these mills were each worth only 6 pence per annum.

Domesday furnishes many instances of a Somerset Mill which paid nothing at all in the way of rent or money-value.—*Ibi Molinus* (the constant word for Molendinum) *qui molit annonam suam*. This formula is always used as an alternative to the ordinary statement of a mill's money-value. *Annona* probably means the corn-crop of the mill-owner or manor-lord.¹

The Mills of Givela (Yeovil) Hundred were twenty-one in number. Those of Mudford and Lymington each realised £1 per annum. The King had a mill of similar value at South Petherton. In the late Queen Edith's Manor of Martock, were two mills, which, together, realised £1 15s. per annum.

There were four mills at Lexworthy, in Andersfield Hundred, which yielded a quantity of unwrought iron (*unam plumbam ferri*, or *duas plumbas ferri*) in lieu of an annual money-rent. They were probably forge-mills.²

The Hundred most abounding in Domesday Mills was the (old) Hundred of Frome.

PARISH CHURCHES AND CHURCH-LANDS.—Little, indeed, does the Somerset Domesday reveal to us under this head,—in proportion to the areas of the two Counties, far less than the Dorset Survey.

The South-Western Commission disregarded all parish churches which were not endowed with geldable territory. The Church of St. John of Frome is only an exception, in that its territory was ingeldable. Its lands will entitle it to future consideration in our Tables. As measured by the carucate, they have already been noticed. In our Tables will also be found all that the Domesday Commissioners considered to be within their purview touching Somerset churches and glebes.

¹ The Commissioners who visited Hampshire and other Counties registered this kind of Mill as "*Molinus serviens aulae*,"—a mill which sufficed only for the needs of the manor-house.

² The *Plumba Ferri*, in case of a Forge-Mill, would seem to be the duty payable to the Manor-Lord according to the amount of iron, wrought or sold. The *Plumba* itself was a bowl or dish, made of lead or iron, or brass, or even wood. It was adjusted to a certain capacity, and was used, in the first instance, to measure the ore when raised from the mine. In that case too the object was to ascertain the amount of due, or royalty, payable to the lord of the manor. At this very day, and in certain mine-districts, the term "dish" is technically applied, not merely to a certain implement for measuring ore, but to the due arising to the manor-lord on each such measurement.

Among the King's Tenants-in-Almoign are enumerated several incumbents of Somerset churches. Had they not been beneficed with land they had not been named in Domesday.

This is, perhaps, the fittest place to remark how much later than Domesday will have been the settlement of the parochial boundaries of Somerset. It is impossible to define, it is difficult even to imagine, any precise limits of those parishes, vast and old, which knew, or, it may be, did not know, to what mother-church, they pertained. Churches, some affiliated, some necessarily independent, because their right affiliation was unknown, supervened. In such a process the manorial boundaries of a district were seldom regarded. To find a modern parish co-extensive with a Domesday-measured manor, is the exception, not the rule. Where, as is generally the case, the parish exceeds the manor or manors, which seem most cognate, we account for it by the intervention of waste, or king's-forest, not registered at all in, or not in the expected part of, Domesday. But where the Domesday-measured manor exceeds the modern parish, as in the cases of Kingston Seymour, High Littleton, Twerton, Ubley, Lovinton, and Castle Cary,—there we must examine each case on its own phænomena. This we propose to do in future notes.

DOMESDAY POPULATION OF SOMERSET.

The agricultural population falls mainly under the same denominations as that of Dorset.

ANCILLÆ, female serfs, only once mentioned in the Dorset Survey, have no notice whatever in that of Somerset.

The CENSORES of Dorset, being freemen, and paying fixed money-rents, appear in the King's Somerset Manor of Cheddar, as GABULATORES, seven of whom paid rents amounting to seventeen shillings per annum.

VILLANI.—The villeins of Somerset, like those of Dorset, were *ascripti glebæ*, that is, *villeins regardant*. They were individually assessable to the Gheld-tax, and no instance has occurred to us of a Somerset feudalist discharging the Gheld-dues of his villeins. In the Gheld-inquest of the year 1084, the villeins of manors which were *in manu regis*, and of estates added to the manors of crown-demesne, are often stated to have been non-solvent of their quotas of Gheld. It is more probable that this was by indulgence, granted *pro hæc vice* by the crown, than that it was in the nature of an arrear, to be thereafter collected.

We subjoin instances of villeins holding their tenements by payment of a fixed annual rent.—

At Eppsa (supposed to have been in Carhampton Hundred) Ralph de Limesey had half a hide. It contained one plough-land and 16 acres of meadow. It had no team at work. A single villein, tenant thereof, paid an annual rent of three shillings (E.D. p. 429).

At Ashwick, in Frome Hundred, a small manor, villeins held the whole at a rent of 3s. 6d. We shall refer to the case again, as a matter of values (*infra* p. 47).

BORDARIÏ. COTARIÏ. SERVI.—As to these, and their agrarian status, the remarks made in our Dorset Volume are supplied neither with correction, nor further illustration, by scrutiny of the Somerset Survey.

Negatively, we observe that in the wild North-Western Hundreds and manors of Somerset there were few *Cotarii*.—Isolated dwellings were, we suppose, unsafe in those regions, and at that period. We further observe, that in these same regions there was no deficiency of *BordariÏ*. It is a comment on the absurd dictum of some interpreters of Domesday, who have said that the *BordariÏ* were “dwellers on the *borders* of an estate.”

PORCARIÏ.—Swineherds are registered in the Somerset, though not in the Dorset, Domesday. In Somerset many of them paid fixed rents for their use of the intra-manorial or detached woods. To the ferm of the King’s Manor of North Petherton, though the manor itself contained no registered woodland, twenty *Porcarii* contributed annual fees, amounting to £5. Obviously they had the run of North Petherton Forest, which, though locally adjacent to North Petherton, was technically deemed to pertain to a mass of King’s-Forest, registered under other Royal Manors.

A single *Porcarius*, in the King’s Manor of Bruton, paid his rent in kind. It was five hogs yearly.

These two cases, when compared, point to a surmise that five shillings was the average annual fee charged on the *Porcarius* for the exercise of his craft, and that, where the fee was commuted, a fat hog counted for one shilling.

In William de Moione’s forestal Manor of Cutcomb, six *Porcarii* paid an annual rent of thirty-one hogs.

INDUSTRIAL POPULATION.—It is remarkable that no salt-workers (*SalinariÏ*) are recorded by Domesday as operating in Somerset. We presume that the water of the “Severn Sea” did not yield such a per centage on evaporation as the water of the Dorset coast.

WICH, a name retained all over England, for a vill connected with salt-produce, was not uncommon in Somerset; but there it seems to have been rather typical of mineral or medicated springs than to have had any association with salt.

PISCATORES.—There seems to have been no resort of sea-fishers to the Somerset coast. The fishermen mentioned in Domesday were inlanders, and servants, rather than craftsmen.

FABRI are mentioned only once in the Somerset Domesday. The Abbot of Glastonbury, we marvel to relate, had eight smiths on his home-manor of Glastonbury. Though iron was a product of Somerset, ascertained before the Conquest, and though the Glastonbury Fabri were, undoubtedly, metallurgists of some kind, we cannot find any manor of Glastonbury Abbey, with Domesday indications of producing iron. At Green-Oar, on Mendip, the Abbot had lead-mines of undoubted antiquity; and Green-Oar was an outlying appendage or member of Glastonbury Manor. Perhaps the miners, or, at all events, the artizans, who primarily dealt with the raised ore, were the Fabri of Domesday.

BURGENSES.—All Domesday notices relating to the Burgesses of Somerset will be embodied in future Tables. To treat of the subject here would needlessly anticipate much that we shall have to say of boroughs as a specific class of Somerset estate.

The highest annual value of any burgage, or borough-house, registered in Domesday, was two shillings. It was the value of a house *abstracted* from the Borough of Bath by Hugolinus, the King's Interpreter, or, as he is somewhere called, "Hugolinus Legatus."

FARMING STOCK.

CARUCÆ and CARUCÆ IBI.—The special remarks which have been made in our Dorset Volume on this class of Farming Stock (Dorset p. 53) need some modification when we are engaged with Somerset.—

The general rule, or rather expectation, being that there should be a team-in-stock (*caruca ibi*) for every registered plough-land, and a single plough-land for each Gheld-hide, the practical variations from this rule were more marked and more frequent in Somerset than in Dorset. With three exceptions, and those of a contracted scale and peculiar type, in every Hundred and Franchise of Somerset the plough-lands were more in number than the original hides; in some cases they were double and even treble in number. On the other hand, the numerical inadequacy of the teams-in-

stock to the plough-lands, specified to be available, was more constant in Somerset than in Dorset.

Both these phænomena tell but one territorial tale;—an antiquated and lenient rate of taxation, scant population, and therewith imperfect occupation, an application of capital, insufficient, whatever the natural faculties of the soil.

The several classes of Somerset store-stock mentioned in the Exon Domesday are worth notice.—

EQUÆ SILVESTRES or *EQUÆ INDOMITÆ*.—Wild brood-mares; yet not so wild as to have ceased to be the property of specified owners, and the stock of definite manors. The Bishop of Coutances, the Comte of Moretain, and William de Moione were the chiefs, who seem most to have encouraged this class of stock.

ANIMALIA.—Cattle, store-cattle, feeding-cattle,—a whole class, well defined by the expression *animalia otiosa*, which, however, is only pronounced in one instance. Some cattle, however, there were which worked as well as ate. Turgisius, a tenant of William de Moione, had a working team composed of four *animalia* (Exon Domesday, p. 341).

CABALLI.—Riding horses.—Alured of Spain had such a stock.

RONCINI.—Horses of draft; but oftener used, we imagine, for burden.—Two generations since they were known as “Pack-horses.”

VACCÆ.—Milch-cows.—Often noticed in the Somerset Domesday, but not so often as to indicate that the County was to become famous for its dairy-farms. The Royal Manor of Cheddar did not boast of any kine whatever in the eleventh century. Roger de Corcelle had a small estate at Cheddar, whereon was a single cow.

OVES.—Ewe sheep.—Common to nearly all Somerset estates, and generally the most numerous of any stock of individual manors.

CAPRÆ.—She-goats, more frequent in, but not peculiar to, the hill-districts.

BERBICES.—Wether sheep, occasionally noticed.

ASINI.—Asses; very rarely mentioned.

PORCI.—Hogs;—generally distributed, but the herds not large.

It is curious that in all the Domesday enumerations of Somerset stock the purely male element is most rarely, if ever, introduced. Young stock of all kinds is also excluded. This may have been a corollary of the Survey having been taken in autumn and winter.

DOMESDAY VALUES, VALUATIONS, AND RENTS.

What we have said in our Dorset volume under this head, will,

together with a large collection of particulars embodied in future tables, serve to illustrate most branches of this subject. In single manors a low value per hide indicates "excessive hidation," as in the case of Thorne (now Thorne Falcon), where the hide was worth only 10 shillings per annum: also, a high value per hide, indicates "favourable hidation" in single manors, as in the case of Huntspill, where the hide was worth £8 per annum. In cases of whole Hundreds we get truer averages. The poorest hides of any Somerset Hundred were those of Chew Hundred¹; they averaged 14s. 8d. each. The highest value of the hide of a Hundred, viz., £2 5s. 2d. per hide, is found in Loxley Hundred, but this was a forced value, due to the financial dexterity of Thurstan, Ex-Abbot of Glastonbury. The hides of Cannington Hundred averaged an annual value of £1 14s. 1³/₄d. each, but this is only saying that the whole district was "favourably hidated."

The number of denominational hides in all Somerset was somewhat over 2,951 hides. Their collective annual value (which however covered other items of profit) was £3,650 5s. 5d. At this rate, the average annual value of the Somerset Hide was nearly £1 4s. 9d.; and if the average contents of the Somerset Hide were 300 statute acres, the average value of the statute acre was .99 decimals, of (or all but) one penny. Incidentally, Domesday supplies us with special valuations per acre of different classes of land. Forty-five acres of arable land at Weacombe, in West Quantoxhead, were actually rented by a Bordarius at 7s. 6d., or exactly 2d. per acre. Other forty-five acres in the same manor were let at 2²/₅d. per acre. A plough-land (supposed 120 acres) at Bedminster was valued at 20 shillings per annum. The rate is again 2d. per acre. Nine acres of arable land and two acres of wood at Henstridge were valued at 30 pence per annum. It was perhaps 3d. per acre for the arable land and 1¹/₂d. per acre, for the wood.

The Exon Domesday (p. 472) values a virgate in North Petherton, at 5s. per annum; which is of course £1 per hide; but not being definite as to the value or acreage of the land, we cannot infer the rate per acre.

The same Record gives 12 pence per annum as the value of 1¹/₂ fertines of pasture at Exford (in Carhampton Hundred). Here we cannot suppose the fertine to have been less than 60 statute

¹ The hide of Pitney Hundred was of a value as low as 12s. 5¹/₂d. per annum, but we do not know that this hundred had any distinct existence at the date of Domesday. That question will recur.

acres; consequently the value per acre of pasture in this instance was but little more than half a farthing.

At Escwica (Ashwick) 60 acres of arable land, 12 acres of meadow, and 3 acres of dwarf-wood were let to two Villeins of Bath Abbey at a rent of 3s. 6d. per annum. The rate was something more than one halfpenny per acre, and clearly in the nature of a beneficial lease.

CUSTOMARY DUES, in the nature perhaps of Quit-Rents, are occasionally mentioned in the Somerset Domesday. Those payable T. R. E. to certain Royal Manors, by certain other manors, were usually of so many sheep and lambs, and had been discontinued before the date of Domesday.

A whole catalogue of dues returnable to the Bishop of Winchester's great Manor of Taunton was entered in the Domesday Survey of that Franchise; but such an entry was abnormal, and the subject not within the ordinary purview of Domesday Commissioners. Interesting though it be, we forbear to enlarge upon it here.

An agricultural *rent-in-kind*, especially as it is a rare feature in the Somerset Domesday, is worth noting here. The rent was 10 bacon-hogs and 100 cheeses. It was apparently furnished, in part by the demesne servants of Robert Fitz Gerold, in part by the Coliberti Villani and Bordarii who occupied the non-dominical portion of a manor of the said Baron in Meleborne (now Horthorne) Hundred. The manor has no Domesday name, but we may anticipate a future discussion as to its identity, by saying that it was two-thirds of the Estate of Charlton-Horethorn in the said Hundred. The manor was 10 hides. It contained 1,390 acres of Domesday registration, viz., 1,200 acres of plough-land, 60 acres of wood, 30 acres of meadow, and 100 acres of pasture. The returns and rents, viz., the aforesaid hogs and cheeses, were in place of a pecuniary value of £18 which the manor had yielded to one Vitel, its owner in Saxon times. Here, assuming that the rents of the Domesday æra were adjusted so as to be nearly equal to those of the Saxon period, we get a hint as to the value of a cheese (also assumed to have been of the largest size) in the year 1086. For, we show elsewhere that the current value of 10 fed hogs was 10 shillings; and it follows that the hundred cheeses were worth £17 10s., or 3s. 6d. each. Any way, the value of this latter article appears to have multiplied less in eight centuries than that of any other agrarian product with which we are acquainted. In

the Comte of Moretain's Manor of Stantuna (now White Stanton) fifty acres of pasture are said to pay a rent of four *blumæ ferri* (E. D., 245). Again, in Saxon times, every free-man residing at Seaborough, then tributary to Eddeva's Manor of Crewkerne, paid an annual due of one *bloma ferri* to the said manor (E. D. p. 143). In the year of Domesday a villein, holding land in Alford, paid as his rent eight *blumæ ferri*.¹

Before "Turstin" was enfeoffed by the Comte of Moretain in the Manor of Cruca (now Cricket St. Thomas), the said Manor used to pay an annual due of six ewes with their lambs to the King's Manor of South Petherton; also every freeman of Cruca used to pay one *bloma ferri* to the same (E. D., pp. 82, 245). Further instances of *customary* rents will be found in Tables (Vol. II.)

¹ A *Bloma ferri* (says Halliwell) was "a mass of iron which had gone a second time through the furnace." Ray defines the word "Bloom" as "a four-square piece of iron of about two foot long." We presume that some such quantity of unwrought iron was the rent or royalty due to the Manor-Lord on the raising or conversion of a much larger mass. For our ideas and knowledge as to the "Plumba ferri" and the "Bluma ferri" we are wholly indebted to a kind friend and valued correspondent, the Rev. Edward A. Dayman.

CHAPTER I.

THE ROYAL BURGHS OF SOMERSET.

IN devoting our first chapter to this subject, we follow indeed the sequence prescribed by our Dorset Volume, but at the same time we give a priority to the Burghs of Somerset, to which none of them, except Bath, was entitled by its importance, and to which none of them, not even Bath itself, was entitled by any overt notice or advertisement of Domesday.

The Burghs of Dorset were, doubtless, Royal Burghs ; but they were distinct, and they were kept distinct in Domesday, from the estates of Ancient Crown-Demesne. In the case of Dorchester, for instance, where the same locality was a Royal Burgh, was the Caput of a wide-spread estate of Ancient Demesne, and was withal the Caput of a Hundred ; the threefold distinction was carefully marked either by the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084 or by Domesday.

But in Somerset, where every Burgh, except Bath, was but a mere appendage of some estate of Ancient Demesne, no such distinction could be made, and certainly none was attempted by the Domesday Commissioners.

BATH.—The Burgh of Bath we account to have been at the date of the Conquest, the capital of Somerset. By “capital” we mean the seat of the Summa Justicia, of the highest, though by no means the only, Crown Court which existed in the County.

Bath, previous to its constitution as a Burgh, which was towards the end of the 10th century, was but a member, however valuable, of an estate of Royal Demesne. Where the bulk of that estate was—how much or how little thereof was in the immediate vicinity of Bath—these are questions, or rather tangled problems, which we do not propose to investigate here. The Burgh, being in the first instance a member of some such estate, seems ultimately to have become the Caput of several sections of such an estate, and so straitly were some of these sections interned in the manor and Burgh of Bath that Domesday does not even mention them by name. But we are anticipating a future discussion.

The Burgh of Bath, together with whatever pertained to it of royal estate, came to the hands of King Edward, at his accession. Whether by way of dotation, or by subsequent gifts, the King

seems to have bestowed the whole on his wife, Edith. The estate, thus passing from the crown, became subject to hidation, and so became geldable. On the other hand, it retained one great note mark of royalty. It continued to be a seat of high justice. Queen Edith herself exercised the function of a high justiciar. She paid the Tertium Denarium of the crown-pleas of Bath to her brother Harold, while Earl of Somerset. Queen Edith retained Bath, and her office, as a high justiciar, after the Conquest. Surely, it was in that capacity, that on February 28, 1072, she presided in the church of Wilton, over that memorable contract, whereby the Saxon Thane, Atsor, sold the Somerset Manor of Combe to Giso, Bishop of Wells. Such a transaction could have had no validity, save by warranty of the king, or of *his vicegerent*.

At Queen Edith's death the Burgh of Bath reverted to the crown. King William seems to have *dishidated* the Burgh, and therewith, perhaps, a part of its contingent estate. Any part given to a subject, would, of course, remain hidated, and geldable. The justiciarship of Bath seems to have been entrusted to Edward of Salisbury, then Sheriff of Wiltshire. He was filling the said office at the date of Domesday. At the same date, the Burgh, and the adjacent manor of Bath-Easton, were being farmed of the King, apparently by the burgesses as a body corporate.

Edward of Salisbury now paid the Tertium Denarium of the crown-pleas of Bath to the king, as *Comes*.

So things remained, probably till William Rufus sold the burgh to John of Tours—Giso's successor in the see of Wells. The sale purported to convey the borough, and its local privileges, and all its appurtenances, as previously enjoyed, by the king's father: but it is clear that neither the external territory, sometime attached to the burgh, nor the justiciarship, passed by the grant of William Rufus, or on this occasion.

The Tertius Denarius, of Bath, having been £11, indicates that the crown-pleas of that jurisdiction realized £33 per annum. Such a revenue betokens a jurisdiction over half a county, rather than over a single borough or manor. At the date of Domesday, the Tertius Denarius of all the King's Courts in Wiltshire was only £21. In King Henry I.'s time, the Tercius Denarius of Gloucestershire was only £60.

The remaining royal burghs of Somerset having been interned in so many manors of ancient demense, and Domesday having given no distinctive list thereof, we here enumerate them.—

The Royal Burgh of LANGPORT, was, A.D. 1086, interned in the Royal Manor of Somerton. There was a court competent to try *Placita Coronæ* at Langport. William de Moione, Sheriff of Somerset, held the court. Of the proceeds thereof he will have paid £1 to the King, as King, and as Lord of Somerton. Of the same proceeds, he paid the "third penny," viz., ten shillings, to the king as *Comes*.

The royal Burgh of AXBRIDGE was, A.D. 1086, interned in the royal burgh of Cheddar. The profits and the administration of the crown court of Axbridge were, in all respects, as those of Langport.

We should suspect, from the small proceeds of these two curiæ, that their jurisdictions extended no further than the Royal Manor and Hundred of Somerton, in the first case, nor than the Royal Manor and Hundred of Cheddar in the second case.

The Royal Burgh of ILCHESTER, and the Royal Burgh of MELEBORNE, were, A.D. 1086, both accounted to be members of the royal manor of Meleborne. There was a crown court in each, and both courts were administered or farmed by the aforesaid sheriff. For the court of Ilchester he paid a *Tertium Denarium* of £6, which indicates, we think, a very considerable jurisdiction. For the court of Meleborne he paid a *Tercium Denarium* of only ten shillings, which indicates, perhaps, that the jurisdiction extended only to the king's manor (now Milborne Port), and to Meleborne (now called Horethorne) Hundred.

Coincidentally, jurisdictions were attached to the royal manors of BRUTON and of FROME, the former realizing a *Tercium Denarium* of ten shillings, the latter of five shillings;—both accounted of by the same sheriff. The jurisdiction of Bruton was, probably, over the royal manor, and the extensive Hundred of Bruton. The jurisdiction of Frome was, probably, over the manor and smaller Hundred of Frome. The Old Hundred of Frome, be it observed, consisted of three sections, viz., Wellow, Kilmersdon, and Frome. It is the last section which is preserved as the Hundred of Frome at the present day; and it was over this section only that the jurisdiction of Frome, A.D. 1086, is presumed to have extended.

How far there was anything of a burghal institution co-ordinate with the courts of judicature, established at Bruton and Frome, at the date of Domesday, let Domesday itself say. It tells us that the king had five burgesses at Briwetone, and that he had, at Frome (as at Meleborne, and at Ilchester) a market.

In the days of King Edward, when the comital manor of BRUNETON, afterwards King's Brompton, was in the hands of Ghida, the widow of Earl Godwin, there was due thereto, annually, the Tercius Denarius arising from Queen Edith's Manor and judicature of Milverton. In A.D. 1086 (The king then had both Brompton and Milverton.) this due had been discontinued. Milverton was always caput of its cognominate hundred, and, doubtless, Queen Edith's judicature extended to both manor and hundred. How far any burgh may, at any time, have co-ordinated with the said judicature we have no other evidence than that Milverton Market was established before Domesday.

Many of the above items of remark will acquire fuller illustration when we come to tabulate the Manors of the Vetus Dominicum Coronæ, and of the Earldom of Somerset. But, whereas, the King's Justice-Courts, if they did not originate in the burghs, yet had a manifest tendency to hold session therein, we would here say something more of the PLACITA CORONÆ and the TERCIVS DENARIUS of the Earl.

It was a veteran, and perhaps a somewhat indefinite dogma, that the Tercius Denarius of a County was due to its Earl.

The Tercius Denarius of the *whole* County of Dorset is said in Domesday to have been due to the late Earl Harold's Manor of Piretone (now Puddletown). Now, so far as we can learn, the Tercius Denarius of a *whole* County, could only mean the third-penny arising from the King's Courts and jurisdictions within the County, from such as were specially deputed to try Placita Coronæ. And such trials must ordinarily have been held by the King himself, or by his special Deputies, usually styled Justiciars. We submit that in Dorset and in all Counties there were exceptional Jurisdictions, competent indeed to try Placita Coronæ, but to which the King appointed no special Justiciar, and which were in nowise taxable with the Tercius Denarius of the Earl.

The Somerset Domesday tells us nothing about the Tercius Denarius of the "whole County," but only of the Tercius Denarius of certain Royal Manors and Burghs as due to certain Comital Manors or else to the King personally, as being, in A.D. 1086, Comes by Escheat. As to Lordships of Hundreds or of jurisdictions other than the King's, the Somerset Domesday, except in one remarkable instance, tells us nothing. The exception is where it reveals that, for the Manor and Hundred of Taunton, the Bishop of Winchester held certain pleas, three of which we know to have

been *Placita Coronæ*, while we cannot account for the non-mention of a fourth, viz., "murder" (E. D., p. 162). The fact probably was that neither King, nor Earl, nor Sheriff, nor Justiciar had any ingress on this highly-privileged manor and hundred. We cannot apprehend that for such a franchise the Bishop contributed aught to the *Tercius Denarius* of the Earl.

What Domesday reveals, quite digressively, about Taunton, suggests how much there may have been relative to other franchises, which Domesday had no call to reveal. That the Bishop of Wells did not try *Placita Coronæ* at Wells and elsewhere, or the Abbot of Glastonbury at Glastonbury and elsewhere, we shall be slow to believe. That anything accrued to King or Comes from such judicatures we may, leaning on the silence of Domesday, safely deny.

But let us not detract from the superior dignity of Taunton and its franchises. It was a Burgh to all intents and purposes; it had its right of market, recorded in Domesday. As much is not said of any other manor or franchise of Somerset, whether Bishop, or Abbot, or Comte, or Earl, or Baron, were its Lord. Domesday Boroughs ordinarily appertained to the Crown only.

CHAPTER II.

DOMESDAY SCHEDULE OF SOMERSET LANDHOLDERS,
A.D. 1086.

SUCH a schedule is not given in the Exon Domesday at all; and it was obviously a coeval, and a very detrimental omission; for the transcribers, working, as it seems, without an index, and intending to add no separate Index of Counties, as the consummation of their labours, have given many Schedules of Fiefs in a false sequence, and have confused the later schedules one with another. The very imperfect and ill-designed Index appended to the Exon Domesday has been already noticed (*supra* Preface p. 10).

The Exchequer Domesday is by no means free from the blemish of mis-arrangement of Fiefs. It commences a survey of Humphrey Chamberlain's estates with a proper title, viz., "Terra Hunfridi," therewith treating his fief as the last of Somerset Baronies, yet still as a barony. It enters two manors proper to this category, and then, without giving any fresh title or note of interruptions, lapses into a list of the estates of King's-Serjeants. Then it gives a chapter entitled *Terræ Tainorum Regis*, which proves, on examination, to be of the lands of the Angli Taini only, who are thus placed in an unusual precedence.

Lastly, and out of all sequence or propriety, it gives a chapter entitled "Item Hunfridi Terra et Quorundam aliorum." Here it resumes its interrupted survey of Humphrey Chamberlain's estates, and registers the particulars of three manors. Then again, without any fresh title or note of interruption, it lapses into the estates of the Franci Taini, as they are called in the Domesday of other Counties.¹

The true arrangement of the Exchequer text would have been to have inserted this last chapter immediately after the two manors

¹ This confusion possibly arose in the indeterminate and complex position of Humphrey Chamberlain himself. If least of the Somerset Barons, he might easily and properly pass with transcribing clerks as the chief of the Franci Taini of that County. Furthermore, as his very name suggests, he was, or had been, a king's-serjeant, and in that quality the clerks gave him a third post at the head of the *Servientes Regis*.

On re-examination, we find that the transcribing clerks probably became aware of their blunder when too late to rectify it. There are marginal signs in the Exchequer Domesday, evidently intended to reconnect the several items of Humphrey Chamberlain's Barony.

entitled *Terræ Umfridi*, and then, when Humphrey's Manors had all five been registered, to have inserted a new title, such as *Terræ Francorum Tainorum*.

Thus far we speak of the textual arrangement, not of the Index of the Somerset Domesday.—

Except that the Index, or first Schedule, of the Somerset Domesday (Exchequer version) indicates no distinctive chapter of the lands of the French Thaners, its sequence and method are faultless. But then this Index was not followed by the transcribing clerks: neither, if it was made after the said clerks had finished their work, did it truly represent what they had done; it only represented what they ought to have done. It is as follows:—

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| I. Rex Willelmus. | XXVII. Willelmus de Faleise. |
| II. Episcopus Wintoniensis. | XXVIII. Willelmus filius Wi- |
| III. Episcopus Sarisberiensis. | donis. |
| IV. Episcopus Baiocensis. | XXIX. Radulfus de Mortemer. |
| V. Episcopus Constantiensis. | XXX. Radulfus de Pomerei. |
| VI. Episcopus Wellensis. | XXXI. Radulfus Pagenel. |
| VII. Æcclesia de Bada. | XXXII. Radulfus de Limesi. |
| VIII. Æcclesia Glastingberien- | XXXIII. Robertus filius Geroldi. |
| sis. | XXXIV. Aluredus de Mer- |
| IX. Æcclesia Miceleniensis. | leberge. |
| X. Æcclesia Adelingiensis. | XXXV. Aluredus de Ispania. |
| XI. Æcclesia Romana Sancti | XXXVI. Turstinus filius Rolf. |
| Petri. | XXXVII. Serlo de Burci. |
| XII. Æcclesia de Cadom. | XXXVIII. Odo filius Gamelin. |
| XIII. Æcclesia de Monteburg. | XXXIX. Osbernus Gifard. |
| XIV. Æcclesia de Sceftesberie. | XL. Edwardus de Saris- |
| XV. Episcopus Mauricius. | beria. |
| XVI. Clerici Tenentes de Rege. | XLI. Ernulfus de Hesding. |
| XVII. Comes Eustachius. | XLII. Gislebertus filius Tur- |
| XVIII. Comes Hugo. | old. |
| XIX. Comes Moritoniensis. | XLIII. Godebold. |
| XX. Balduinus de Exceestre. | XLIV. Mathiu de Moretania. |
| XXI. Rogerius de Corcelle. | XLV. Hunfridus Camer- |
| XXII. Rogerius Arundel. | arius. |
| XXIII. Walterius Gifard. | XLVI. Robertus de Odburville |
| XXIV. Walterius de Dowai. | et alii Servientes |
| XXV. Willelmus de Moion | Regis. |
| XXVI. Willelmus de Ow. | XLVII. Taini Regis. |

The foregoing Index contains the names or titles of 37 individuals, and represents also eleven corporate or plural bodies. In our Dorset Volume (pp. 75—77) we have said something about a few of these individuals. What we have here to say about any of them shall be that only which cannot conveniently be introduced in our notices of the lands which they respectively held.

WALCHELINE, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, is mentioned once in the Somerset Survey, in terms which can have had no relation whatever with his possessions in that County. This is where the South-Western Commissioners, recording the returns of the late Queen Edith's (now the King's) Manor of Martock as £70 per annum of ordinary currency, add that, the returns would be £5 more, if Bishop Walcheline were to give, or could give, evidence on the point.—*Reddit per annum lxx libras numero, et centum solidos plus, si Walcelinus Episcopus fuerit testatus.*

Now, as a possession of his person or his See, Walcheline Bishop of Winchester had nothing to do with Martock. It may be that he had sometime farmed the estate under the Crown. It is more probable that he served King William in some high fiscal capacity at Winchester, the City of his See, and at that period the domicile of the Royal Treasury, and the chief seat of the Court of Exchequer. Possibly, again, Bishop Walcheline's knowledge of the rent or value of Martock arose in his having recently served the King not merely as a Baron of the Exchequer, but as a Justice-in-Eyre in Somerset.

But the more interesting question here is,—What could have prevented his testimony being asked and given on the above matter of fiscal detail?

We hazard a conjecture that he himself was a Domesday Commissioner, presiding perhaps over the Survey of distant Counties. As to which Domesday Circuit, out of perhaps nine, Bishop Walcheline may have led and managed, we have neither hint nor tittle of direct evidence. We have only negative evidences that it was not the South-Western Circuit, which included Somerset, nor the Western Circuit, which included Gloucestershire and Worcestershire, nor yet the Southern Circuit, which included Hampshire and Surrey, wherein were the chief possessions of his own See.

EPISCOPUS COUSTANTIENSIS, Geoffrey de Moubray, called Bishop of Coutances in Domesday, is frequently called Bishop of St. Lo (de Sancto Laudo) in the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084, and in the testing-clauses of coeval charters.

In Somerset, if we count as manors all additamenta, or supplementary additions to manors, this Bishop, in A.D. 1086, held 77 manors of the Crown. These contained 359½ hides. Many of these manors had been taken from Glastonbury Abbey; five had been T. R. E., possessed by Edric, and eight by Aluric, two Thanes, each of whom has the title of *Cild* appended to his name in one or more instances.

The Bishop's principal tenants in Somerset were William de Munceaux, Nigel de Gornai, and Ascelinus (surnamed by Collinson "Goellus"). Seven manors held under the Bishop by "Roger Witen," or simply "Roger," were so held by a contemporary baron, for "Roger Witen" was only another name for Roger de Corcelle.

Bishop Geoffrey died A.D. 1093. We are told, somewhat perfunctorily (Collinson I., 121) that at the Bishop's death, "many of his estates, being seized on by the Crown, were disposed of to different favourites."

Nothing is so obliterative of historical or topographical fact as these loose utterances. If they do not contain specific errors, they leave room for a multitude. We cannot find, and we deem it highly improbable, that there was any escheat, or seizure by the Crown, of Bishop Geoffrey's estates on his death in 1093. Robert de Moubray, Earl of Northumberland, was nephew, and next heir, to Bishop Geoffrey. Presumably, and in absence of direct proof to the contrary, Earl Robert succeeded to all the Bishop's English estates. It was on Earl Robert's rebellion and forfeiture in 1095, that the late Bishop's Fief escheated to the Crown. Ultimately a successor to Earl Robert's estates in Central and Northern England was found in the person of Nigel de Albini, his sister's son, and so great nephew of the late Bishop. But there is no evidence, that we have seen, of the Somerset estates of the Bishop having, at any time, reached the hands of Nigel de Albini. On the contrary, the prevailing indications are that King William II,

annexed the Seignery over this Somerset Fief to the Honour of Gloucester, an Honour which first devolved on a Norman Baron by disposition of the same King William, the said Baron being Robert Fitz Hamon.

Such was the general destination of the Coutances Fief in Somerset. But the rule, though general, was not universal. There were Coutances—Manors in Somerset, which we have not been able to trace to the subsequent Fief of Gloucester; some of these we have actually traced to the Honour of Trowbridge. Again, there was a Coutances Fief in Devon and another in Wiltshire. Portions of each devolved to the Honour of Gloucester; other portions did not so devolve.

To those who may be curious to know of the lineal descendants or eventual successors of the Bishop of Coutances' Somerset Knights, we would recommend a reference to that list of feudal tenants in the Honour of Gloucester, which was propounded by William Earl of Gloucester, grandson of Robert Fitz Hamon, in A.D. 1166, just eighty years after Domesday.¹ (See Hearne's *Liber Niger* I., pp. 161-165.)

ÆCCLIESIA DE BADA.—TERRA SANCTI PETRI DE BADA IN SUMERSETA.—A literal construction of the Exon Domesday would imply that in January, 1066, there had been two contemporary Abbots of Bath. The name of one is written as Sewoldus, Seuoldus, or Seualdus; the name of the other as Wlwardus or Wluoldus.

The Exchequer Domesday, its formula of date being *T. R. E.*, not *die qua Rex E. fuit vivus et mortuus*, would not have established the fact of a Co-Abbacy even had it named two Abbots; for *T. R. E.* might mean any two dates within the 23½ years of Edward's reign. But the Exchequer Domesday names only one Abbot of Bath in the said æra, and him it names only once. He is written as *Ulwardus Abbas*.

A mistake, and a very remarkable mistake has been made, either by the Rubricator of the Exchequer Domesday, or by his transcriber (Collinson I., p. 5).—The Schedule of Ulward White's Escheats is headed with this title.—“Has infrascriptas terras tenuit Ulwardus Abbas.” Of course the true reading is “Ulwardus Albus,” and this Schedule had nothing to do with Bath Abbey, or the question of a Dual Abbacy. With the latter question we now proceed.—

There are conflicting statements (see them collected, *Monasticon* ii. 256) about the succession of the early Abbots of Bath. Collinson (i., pp. 54, 55) gives them as follows:—

I. Elphege, promoted A.D. 984 to the See of Winchester.

II. Sewold, who presided *T. R. E.*, and was succeeded by Stigand.

III. Stigand, “who was Abbot in 1067, the second (*sic*) year of William the Conqueror, by whom he was taken into Normandy, where he died.”

IV. Ælsig, who occurs in 1075, and who died in 1087.

Another writer (Stevens) places Stigand in immediate succession to Elphege.

Among the various statements, those which are backed by any coeval chronicle or document, seem to tell nothing about the Abbacy from the death of Elphege, A.D. 984 till the year 1066. Then, according to the letter of the Exon Domesday, Wulfwold and Sewold were both Abbots. We shall presently show some probability that such was actually the case.

If we are to accept the Abbacy of Stigand, his going to Normandy with King William will have been c. March 1067 (anno 1° Willi. I.) and his immediate death will become probable enough. But, again, if we are to accept this Abbacy of Stigand, we can only accept him as Co-Abbot with Wulfwold and in succession to Sewold.

Surely that “Abbot Wulfwold” who in the summer of 1068 attested a Charter of King William to Giso Bishop of Wells, was Wulfwold Abbot of Bath, the survivor of the two Abbots of A.D. 1066.²

As to Ælsig, elsewhere called Alfscius or Elsius or Elsi, he doubtless occurs as Abbot of Bath in 1075 and in 1082, and died in 1087; but then (as we hold) Ælsig was only Co-Abbot, in succession to Stigand, and clearly for most part of Ælsig's time Wulfwold remained as Senior Abbot.

¹ Collinson's genealogical statements seem to us, as regards the earlier Norman period, unsatisfactory. For ourselves we do not profess to have studied Somerset genealogies any further than that, in some doubtful cases of manorial identity, they have shewn us how this or that Domesday Manor is now represented, by showing us who held it, and of whom it was held at periods subsequent to Domesday.

² There are probabilities of Wulfwold having been Abbot of Bath in 1061 and in 1065 (*Codex Diplomaticus* iv., pp. 148, 150.)

In confirmation of this theory there is that undoubtedly genuine and most remarkable document, called a "Convention," whereby William Hosett accepts a fee-farm grant of the Manor of Ceorlecumb (now Charlcombe) from "Wlfold Abbot and Ælfsig Abbot, and the whole Convent of Bath," the said William undertaking to pay an annual rent of £2 and to be faithful and obedient to both Abbots ("utrique Abbati") and to all the brethren in all things (see *Monast.* ii. 265, Num. vi.).

Now, this agreement was clearly made before Domesday (A.D. 1086), which certifies, not only William Hosee's possession of Charlcombe, but the improvements both in stock and value which he had effected on the tenement. On the other hand, as we shall show when we come to examine the Gheld-Inquest of Bath Hundred taken in A.D. 1084, there is a strong probability that William Hosee's tenancy under Bath Abbey had not then commenced.

So then, as regards this remarkable case of a Dual Abbacy, as it is proved to have existed towards the close of the Conqueror's reign, so is it the more probable that the Exon Domesday is verbally and simply truthful, when it indicates a similar institution as existing at the time of King Edward's death.

COMES HUGO.—The Earl of Chester is accredited by Domesday with four manors in Somerset, four in Devon, twelve in Dorset, and six in Wiltshire.

Of these twenty-six acquisitions of the Palatine Earl, twenty-one have a common ratio. The Earl had had a general but not unexceptional grant from the Conqueror of the estates of a certain Saxon, whom being in one instance styled Etnod Dapifer, we presume to have held some Stewardship in the Court of the Confessor. This Etnod is written in some passages of the Record as Alnod, in some as Elnod. His real name was perhaps Ældnoth. His life-lease of two Dorset manors under the Bishop of Sherborne had resulted to the See of Sherborne in the loss of both. Another Dorset manor he is said to have gained by ejection of a Saxon Thane. These three Dorset manors were among those above counted, as reverting after the Conquest to the Earl of Chester.¹

It is observable that, except in Devon, the Earl's Feoffee in a majority of the manors above counted is called in Domesday "Willelmus." The Gheld-Inquest of Dorset, in one instance, identifies this "Willelmus" with William Malbane. In another Dorset instance this "Willelmus" left to the Domesday tenement of Cliston (Clifton) the distinction of his own surname. The place is still known as Clifton Maubank. The name, Malbanc, also occurs somewhere in a Somerset connexion.

In all cases where Willelmus appears as Earl Hugh's Domesday tenant, in Somerset, Dorset, or Wiltshire, we may be sure that the said "Willelmus" was William Malbedeng, one of the Earl's Cheshire barons, the Caput of whose barony was Wich-Malbanc.

¹ Mr. Freeman in his fourth volume (p. 756) doubts whether this Thane's real name was not Ælfnnoth rather than Eadnoth. His collection of facts about Eadnoth is a great addition to our own, for undoubtedly it was the same person who was called both Dapifer, Constable, and Stallere under King Edward, Stallere under Harold, and eke under King William. His occurrence in Berkshire, in the affairs of Abingdon Abbey (*Freeman*, iv. 755, 756) is singularly apposite, for it exhibits him again as the antecessor of Hugh, Earl of Chester.

In the summer of 1068 when the sons of Harold, sailing from Ireland, had failed in their attempt on Bristol, they retired to plunder the sea-board of Somerset. There they were confronted by Eadnoth the Stallere. A battle ensued. The victory seemed doubtful, for, on the one hand, the sons of Harold fled, on the other Eadnoth fell.

Malmesbury suggests that both events suited King William's views; and it is remarkable that Eadnoth's son, Harding, was not allowed succession to any of his ancestral estates.

Harding appears to have thriven in other ways,—by forensic, rather than martial, genius, as Malmesbury puts it.

But when it is hinted that Harding Fitz Eadnoth, the contemporary of William of Malmesbury, was the same with Harding, Queen Edith's butler before the Conquest (*Freeman*, iv. 758), our ideas of chronology refuse to acquiesce.

We shall have to speak of Harding Fitz Eadnoth again, as called "Harding de Meriot" in 1084, and as one of the Anglo-Thanes of Somerset in 1086. Whether he was father of Robert Fitz Harding of Bristol, is a

COMES MORITONIENSIS.—Robert Comte of Moretain was the Conqueror's half-brother. His Somerset Fief, if we reckon as manors all supplementary additions registered in the Domesday Schedule headed by his name, consisted of just one hundred manors. These contained 342 $\frac{3}{4}$ hides. Besides these, the Comte had wrested some parcels of estate, late the property of the Church of Glastonbury, which were less formally registered in Domesday. To the Comte's organized Fief the same Church of Glastonbury had contributed two manors, the Church of Athelney one, the Church of St. Swythyn of Winchester one. Two of the four contributions had been purchased by exchange.

On the Manor of Bishopston, so purchased from the Abbot of Athelney, the Comte, within four years after the Conquest, erected his Castle of Montacute.

Contemporary with the Yorkshire rebellion, which, aided by Danish auxiliaries, succeeded in storming York Castle, there were demonstrations against William's power in the West and South-West. This was in September, 1069, and the disaffected English of Dorset and Somerset contemporaneously invested the Castle of Montacute. The Bishop of Coutances, with levies from London, Salisbury, and Winchester, supervened, raised the siege, and signally punished the besiegers. It may have been on this account that that warlike Prelate appears in Domesday with a Somerset Fief larger in point of hidage than even the Comte of Moretain's. Another point of comparison between the Domesday Fiefs of these feudalists is that in Hundreds where the ascendancy of one was strongly marked the other scarcely appears, and that both alike had shunned the Western and wilder districts of Somerset.

As a corollary perhaps of this, it does not appear that the Comte of Moretain, like other Somerset feudalists, appropriated the whole estates of any special Saxon or Saxons. Earl Harold was his antecessor in one instance, Robert Fitz Wimarch in one, Alestan de Boscumb in one, Godric in five, Algar in four, Ordulf in one, and Edmeratorus in two. We introduce Ordulf and Edmeratorus,¹ those wealthy Thanes, because their Devon estates were wholly assigned to the Comte.

In future notes we shall have to say much of the Comte of Moretain's Domesday tenants in Somerset. We merely enumerate them here :—

- (1) Robert Fitz Ivo, *al.* Robert the Constable. (2) Drogo de Montacute. (3) Ansgar de Montacute, *al.* Ansgar Brito. (4) Alvered Pincerna. (5) Malger de Cartrai. (6) Bretel de St. Clair.

The following occur with one or at most two tenements each :—

- (1) Turstin. (2) Gerard. (3) Hubert de St. Clare. (4) William de Corcelle. (5) William de Lestra. (6) Reginald de Valletort. (7) Dodeman. (8) Robert Fitz Walter. (9) Ricardus. (10) Hugh de Valletort. (11) Hunfridus. (12) Garmundus. (13) Radulfus Presbyter. (14) Donecan. (15) Amundus. (16) The Porters of Montacute.

BALDUINUS DE EXCESTRE.—Usually called Baldwin Vicecomes in Domesday (see Dorset, p. 74). This was Baldwin of Meules and of Sap, in Normandy, Baron of Oakhampton, Sheriff of Devon, and the chief of the Domesday feudalists of that County. He was younger son of Gilbert Comte de Brionne, sometime guardian of Duke William. He was of kin to the Conqueror, and married a cousin of the Conqueror.

His ulterior successors, through females, were the Barons Courtenay.

ROGERIUS DE CORCELLE.—Counting all *additamenta* of manors, and all duplicate manors, this feudalist held *in capite*, A.D. 1086, no less than 108 Somerset estates. Most of them were small, some were only recently acquired; waste was a characteristic of a few, value of none. Only three of the whole number gelded for more than 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ hides. These were Shipham (4 hides), Limington (7 hides), and Curi, now Curry Mallet (7 hides).

Besides these Tenures-in-Capite, Roger de Corcelle held many manors under Glastonbury Abbey,

genealogical question to which we do not here address ourselves. All we will venture to say is that, if Harding Fitz Eadnoth, Lord of Merriott, was father of the first Robert Fitz Harding, then it is morally certain that the said Robert was not the eldest son of the said Harding.

¹This name, Edmeratorus, seems of Norman coinage. The more Saxon form of the name seems to us to be that which is written in Domesday as Edmer Atre. The identity of Edmer Atre with Edmeratorus is further supported by the fact that the Comte of Moretain is similarly spoken of in Domesday as having general succession to the estates of Edmer Atre and of Edmeratorus.

a position in which, as we learn from Domesday, he had been preceded by his father. Undoubtedly his father was that "Willhelm de Curcello," whom we find in the summer of 1068 attesting the Conqueror's restoration of Banwell to Giso, Bishop of Wells.

We surmise that one Roger, who held five Somerset manors under William de Moione, was Roger de Corcelle; we are sure that Roger Witen, *alias* Roger Wytent, who held certain manors under the Bishop of Coutances, was Roger de Corcelle; and if, as a tenant of the same Bishop in other manors, he was sometimes written simply as "Roger," we do not marvel.

There were not six Hundreds in Somerset of any capacity, in which this ubiquitous and omnivorous Feudalist had not some interest.

Collinson (i. 89) tells us that Roger de Corcelle was "eldest son of Wandril de Leon, of a noble family in Normandy." Not knowing the authority for this statement, we will not venture to contradict it. We put greater faith in Collinson when (vol. iii. p. 580) he dissipates the fable which connected Roger de Corcelle with the name and Manor of Churchill, neither of which had existence at the date of Domesday. At a later period, when a church was built under the Mendip hill-range, on a part of the Bishop of Wells' Manor of Banwell, the place and parish were quite intelligibly called Churchill; and from their residence in this place many later families may have taken the name of De Churchill or Churchill. Roger de Corcelle is occasionally and somewhat perversely called "Roger de Churchill" by Collinson. The same writer is, also, as we think, mistaken in identifying Roger de Corcelle's Domesday Manor of Blachamora with Blackmore, a hamlet now in Churchill parish.¹ It is true that Roger de Corcelle's Manor of Shipham was at no great distance from Churchill; it is probable also that his small Manor of *Pantesheda* was on the very boundaries of Banwell. But Roger de Corcelle was nowhere the Bishop's tenant, neither in Banwell, nor at *Blackmore*, nor at Shipham, nor yet at *Pantesheda*. These considerations alone suffice to dislodge him from the particular territory which was the Bishop's, and was afterwards known as Churchill.

In his Domesday Index Collinson does not affect to identify *Blachamora*. We concur in this abstinence, for we quite believe that, wherever the manor was, there the name is now obsolete.

We find no satisfactory statement as to the destiny or succession of Roger de Corcelle. The Post-Domesday history of some of his manors is suggestive of two theories, but determinative of none. Either those scions of the House of Malet who eventually succeeded to many, if not most, of his estates, were his right heirs by blood, or else, he, or his right heirs, suffering absolute forfeiture, the said and other estates were regranted by the Crown to aliens from the blood of Roger de Corcelle. The leading phenomena of the case are as follows:—

Robert Malet, who lived in the time of King Henry I. (1100-1135), held no less than ten knights'-fees under the Abbot of Glastonbury. There can be no doubt that these ten fees mainly co-ordinated with the vast estates which Roger de Corcelle had held under the said Abbey at the date of Domesday (A.D. 1086). One] of them, perhaps the chief, was Shepton Mallet. We name it because its name is, so far, its history.

In the "same Fee" (by which we understand the Fief originally held under the Abbey by De Corcelle) and in the same reign (that of Henry I.) Hubert de St. Susanne held two knights'-fees of the same Abbot.

In the year 1166 William Malet held *sine medio* of the Abbot of Glastonbury twelve knights'-fees—that is, he held not only the ten fees theretofore held by Robert Malet, but the two fees theretofore held by Hubert de St. Susanne.

Another phenomenon as to the successorship of Roger de Corcelle connects itself with his Tenure-in-capite of the Crown,—with his Domesday Barony in short.—

If we combine his two moieties (3½ hides each) of Curi we get an estate of seven hides, all of which Roger de Corcelle held in demesne at the date of Domesday. In this respect of being held in demesne, and in respect of its size, *Curi* may well be accounted to have been the Caput of De Corcelle's Barony.

Blackmore was a common name. The Domesday indications about De Corcelle's Manor of *Blachamora* are that it was in West Somerset, and probably in Carhampton Hundred.

Curi, like Shepton, came to Malet, and being held by Malet in demesne, was reputed to be the Caput of Malet's Somerset Barony. Thus, too, it obtained its still abiding name of Curry Malet.

It is further apparent that a considerable number of De Corcelle's Somerset Manors, constituting some twenty knights'-fees, accrued to the House of Malet before the death of King Henry I. (A.D. 1135), and were held *in capite per Baroniam* by William Malet in 1166. And the same, or it may be others, of De Corcelle's Manors are constantly cropping up in Somerset history, as having been held "by Malet," or "of Malet," or of the "Honour of Curry Malet."

And yet we are far from saying or thinking that *all* De Corcelle's Domesday estates devolved upon Malet; nor can we affirm that Malet had nothing in Somerset but what had previously belonged to De Corcelle.

So far, then, we are short of sufficient proof that Robert Malet of Henry I.'s time, or William Malet, the steward and favourite of Henry II., were lineal heirs and representatives of Roger de Corcelle.

The Somerset historian, Collinson (i. 32), constructs with the above and with later particulars a very plausible pedigree of the Somerset House of Malet till it merged with an heiress into the House of Pointz.

Collinson clearly intended to identify the Robert Malet who held under Glastonbury Abbey, and (as we believe), under the Crown in the time of Henry I., with Robert Malet, who suffered forfeiture and banishment early in that reign.

We cannot accredit such an identity. There is no record of any restoration of Robert Malet, the disinherited. Had there been any restoration, why should it have been in Somerset only, while Robert Malet's vast heritages in Northern and Eastern England continued for ages an Escheat of the Crown?

However, if Robert Malet of Somerset were indeed the man whom Collinson took him to be, he was the heir, yea, the son of a much greater man than Roger de Corcelle. He was the son, by Hesilia Crispin, of William Malet of Graville, one of the two ablest of the Conqueror's lieutenants, a hero of Senlac, *the* hero of the Dane-stormed castle of York, of whose mysterious end much has been said, and perhaps too much surmised.¹

WALTERIUS DE DOUAI, *al.* WALSCINUS DE DUACO. Collinson's statement (vol. ii., p. 390) about the descent of this baron's estates, through a female, to the House of Paganell, is true enough as regards the Devonshire honour of Bampton, and the Somerset estates of Huntspill, Bridgewater, Pawlett, and one or two others. Collinson's account of the succession of the House of Paganell, thus aggrandized, is altogether inadequate and largely erroneous. This is of no present concern save that such loose statements mar our chance of identifying Domesday manors by their subsequent history. A single manor of Walter de Douai's Somerset Fief is traceable to the Courtenay Lords of Montgomery, but by no channel as yet revealed to us by genealogists. The Manor of Worle thus descended. Collinson traces it to the Courtenay Lords of Oakhampton in the first instance, but without evidence or, as we think, probability.

The descent from Douai to Paganell is accounted for; the descent from Douai to Courtenay is not. The two combined do not touch so much as half the bulk of Walter de Douai's Somerset Barony.

How Castle-Cary and a number of Walter de Douai's other estates came to form the Barony of Castle-Cary, Collinson does not tell us. Probably he never enquired; neither do we propose to enquire here. But we must say something about the history of the House of Lovel, forced upon us as it is by our obligation to trace each manorial item to its Domesday type.

The Lord and Baron of Castle-Cary, who, in the year 1138, figured as a partisan of the Empress Matilda, is called by Collinson (ii. 52), "William Percheval," or "William Gouel de Percheval." Collinson makes this William to have been son of "Ascelin Gouel de Percheval," who "fought at Hastings," and who appears in Domesday, not as a baron nor with any adjunctive name, but simply as "Ascelinus," a considerable holder under the Bishop of Coutance. Collinson further explains that as the father, Ascelinus, was surnamed *Lupus*, so the son, William, was surnamed *Lupellus*, or Lovel. The chronology here involved would of itself discredit the facts thus asserted.

¹ See Freeman's Norman Conquest, vol. iv., pp. 471, 789.

The Lord of Castle-Cary, the legitimatist baron of 1138, was, according to our reading of chronicles, Ralph Lovel. (One chronicler curiously writes him as Ralph "Simelt"). Him Collinson allows only to have been son of "William Gouel de Percheval, surnamed Lupellus." Hitherto it has been our fortune to have found Ralph Lovel's father written only as "William Lovel."

We leave genealogies, and descend to the year 1166, when we find that the barony of Henry Lovel consisted of 19 knights'-fees, whereof $6\frac{1}{2}$ fees were furnished-forth by manors of the Comte of Moretain's Domesday Fief. These are not involved in the present enquiry. The remaining $12\frac{1}{2}$ fees were all, save one, of old feoffment, that is they had been held in the time of King Henry I. by the fathers or other ancestors of the existing tenants under some predecessor of Henry Lovel. (Mag. Rot. Pip. 14, Henry II., Somerset.)

Look now at Henry Lovel and this list of tenants in A.D. 1166. He himself is Lord of Castle-Cary and of other manors held by him in demesne. They of course are not alluded to in this list. We learn of them from other authority, and they were Walter de Douai's at the æra of Domesday. On the list are these names, viz., Robert de Sturton, holding three knights'-fees; William de Crukez, holding two knights'-fees; Radulf de Sparkeford, holding one-knights'-fee, and Robert de Baketerpe with Robert Fitz Baldwin, holding one fee in coparcenery;—all under Henry Lovel (Hearne's Lib., Nig. i. 100-101).

Turning back to Domesday we find Stourton (in Wiltshire) Cruca, Sparkeford, and Bagatrepa (all in Somerset) to have been of the Domesday Fief of Walter de Douai.

We cannot but think that the descent from Douai to Lovel was an hereditary descent.

In the Somerset Domesday we find very frequent mention of a Saxon Thane, whose name is variously written as Alwacre, Elwacre, Eilwacre, Eurewacre, Ailwacrer, and Elwacrer.

Little but the memory of Elwacre remained at the date of Domesday. His son Ælfric still held a small estate at Brentmarsh under Glastonbury Abbey. In Somerset, Elwacre had been succeeded in two instances by Roger Arundel, in four by Serlo de Burci, in seven by Walter de Douai.

Other Somerset antecessors of Walter de Douai were Saxons of still greater note than Elwacre. His antecessor in four instances had been—

(1.) Marlesweyn, Sheriff of Lincolnshire at the Conquest, who lost all his wide-spread lands in Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, Somerset, Devon, Gloucestershire, and Northamptonshire, by joining the rebellion of 1069.—

(2.) Brici, styled in the Dorset Domesday as "Miles Regis Edwardi," was maintaining his allegiance to the Conqueror in 1068. But in 1086 his lands were dispersed. Burnham, a manor of privileged hidation, had fallen to Walter de Douai.

(3.) Ælsi, *al.* Elsi, *al.* Eils, had in five cases been the antecessor of Walter de Douai. This is probably he whom an anonymous but most able commentator¹ has identified with Æthelsige, the steward of Queen Edith and the son-in-law of Wulfward White;—both father-in-law and son-in-law, unharmed in estate, and attending the Queen's Court at Wilton as late as 1072.

(4.) One of Walter de Douai's Domesday tenants was Raimarus, a clerk. He was Walter's brother; Gerard, who held Broctun (now Bratton Seymour) under Walter de Douai, was his steward (Dapifer). The same "Rademar" and Gerard occur as his tenants in Devon.

Walter de Douai, his wife, his brother, and his steward, appear in the Chartulary of Bath Abbey as having made, or concurred in, several grants to that House. The localities concerned seem to have been Bampton, Foxcume, Castle-Cary, Bratton (*Broctuna*), and Bridgewater (*Brigga*).

ROGER ARUNDEL. Some, not unaccountable, confusion led Collinson to identify this Domesday baron with "Comte Roger the Poitevin," whose father, Roger de Montgomery, was Earl of Arundel.

Had Roger Arundel taken his name from any local association, whether in Sussex or Normandy, the Norman Scribes of Domesday would surely have written him as Roger *de* Arundel. They never did so. It is true that in the testing clause (A.D. 1068) of King William's Charter to Giso, Bishop of Wells, this witness's name stands as "Rotgerus Derundel," an additional proof to those already furnished by an able commentator on that Charter,² that it was written by an Englishman.

¹ In the Saturday Review of Dec. 2, 1876.

² See Saturday Review of Nov. 3, 1877.

We find the name "Arundel" corrupted into De Arundel eighty years after Domesday. Then the elder line and Barony were represented by Gerbert de Perci; but a cadet of the House was called "Walter de Arundell" (Hearne's *Lib. Nig.*, p. 82). The truth is, that the name of the Domesday Baron was a soubriquet—a Norman form of the French word which is now written *Hirondelle*. Many Arundels claiming, we suppose, a descent from some collateral branch of the Norman baron, remember to blazon their arms with Swallows or Martlets.

Domesday Indicia suggest that Roger Arundel was rapacious even unto sacrilege, and that his barony was of slow aggregation. He had a plurality of antecessors, of whom Ailward, *al.* Alvert, is the most frequent in Somerset. In the Dorset Survey this same antecessor is written once as Alward, once as Agelferd.

WILLELMUS DE OW (William of Ewe). Something has been said of his antecedents and destiny in our Dorset volume (pp. 17, 68, 69, 76, 121), also of his Saxon antecessor, Alestan de Boscombe (*Ibidem*, p. 120). His treason and execution in 1096 worked a full and definite forfeiture of his house and race.

We have said that the whole Fief of William of Ewe would seem ultimately to have accrued to the honour of Strigoil.

There is some appearance of this annexation having taken place before the house of Marshall entered upon that inheritance.

WILLELMUS DE FALISE. This baron had but three Somerset manors of any note—*viz.*, Estocha (afterwards known as Stoke Courci), Ottona (Wotton Courtenay), and Worsprinca (Woodspring). Brici and Algar, his antecessors at Stoke and Wotton, were Thaners of high degree. Woodspring had been held T. R. E. by Euroacre, and according to evident rule, had first been granted by the Conqueror to Serlo de Burci. The latter, by the King's consent, transferred Woodspring to William de Falaise, who had married his (Serlo's) daughter.

Collinson (i. 250) says that William de Falaise, who, with Geva, his wife, gave Stoke Church to the Norman Abbey of Lonlay, was a "descendant" of the Domesday baron. If so, William de Falaise will have left male heirs, a fact of which we have no other assurance. On the other hand, the early succession of De Courci to this one Domesday Manor of William de Falaise, suggests some genealogical fact which we have in vain attempted to fix. The manor which was called Stoke-Courcy in the twelfth century, by reason of its said destination, is now known as Stogursey. Some generations after Domesday, persons or families named De Falaise appeared in Dorset and other Counties. According to the wont of the older genealogists, and against all evidence save that of a mere name, these persons and families have been associated with the race of William de Falaise, the Domesday baron. It is perhaps within our province to offer to genealogists of a later school at least the germ of a different theory.—

William de Falaise figures in Domesday with seventeen manors in Devon, four in Dorset, three in Somerset (above identified), and one in Wiltshire.

We now turn to an old legend (we can call it no more) of the Welsh Marches. We have told (*Antiquities of Shropshire*, xi. 120) how on the fall of Earl Robert de Belesme (A.D. 1102), King Henry I., having the Chatellany of Montgomery as an Escheat, augmented it largely with distant estates, and granted it to Baldwin de Bollers, in marriage with Sibil de Falaise, his (the King's) niece.

We cannot imagine how Henry I. could have such a niece as this Sibil; nor can we say how Sibil de Falaise was related to William de Falaise, or why she or her descendants should have succeeded to any of his estates. But the records of sundry old lawsuits enabled us, while studying the history of Montgomery, to show among Sibil de Falaise's successive heirs or co-heirs, after the extinction of the male line of De Bollers, some such persons as these following, *viz.*, Reginald Fitz Urse, Robert de Courtenay, William de Courtenay, Richard Engaine, and William de Cantilupe.

Avoiding to retrace the story of descent through its several stages, we may say at once that one or other of the above descendants of Sibil de Falaise appear in the course of two centuries to have been interested in one or other of the Domesday estates of William de Falaise.

For instance, Wotton Courtenay got its distinctive name from Robert or William de Courtenay;—at Woodspring, William de Courtenay founded a priory of Augustine monks, to the honour, among others, of St. Thomas of Canterbury.

Collinson tells how this foundation was afterwards strengthened by grants of Henry and John Engaine,

whom we know to have been descended from Richard Eugaine above mentioned. Collinson's further statement that William de Courtenay, the founder of Woodspring, was "descended from William de Traci, one of Becket's assassins," we much doubt: but at the same time we have a strong impression that William de Courtenay was the grandson of another of Becket's assassins, viz., of Reginald Fitz Urse. (See *Antiquities of Shropshire*, xi. 129.)

In William de Courtenay probably perished the last descendant of Reginald Fitz Urse. After his death, Cantilupe and Eugaine seem to have been the only remaining co-heirs of Sibil de Faleise.

The above hints being intended only as a basis for further investigation, it may be as well to give another phase of the case. In Somerset and in Dorset, the eventual heirs of Sibil de Faleise got ingress into several manors which were not of the Domesday Fief of William de Faleise; for instance, they or some of them had Worle, which was Walter de Douai's at Domesday, and Kewstoke which was Gilbert Fitz Turol's.

Again, in the 13th century, a small barony in Somerset seems to have been known as the "Barony of Worlestone." The few particulars noted by Collinson in respect of this barony would seem to promise to further investigation additional light on subjects, some at least of which are germane to this episode, and to any question about the eventual heirs of Sibil de Faleise.

RADULFUS DE POMEREI.—This baron had but two manors in Somerset, but more than sixty in Devon. William Capra, or Chievre, who had upwards of forty manors in Devon, was Ralph de Pomeraye's brother. These brothers had a sister, Beatrix by name. She holds in Domesday, two Devon Manors (*Lega* and *Bradeford*), under William Capra, and a Somerset Manor (*Estaweia*) and a Devon Manor (*Chevetorna*) under Ralph de Pomeraye.

RADULFUS PAGENEL. This was Ralph Paynell of Drax, Yorkshire. He acquired his Devon and Somerset estates in virtue of a general grant of the escheated estates of Marlesweyn, one of the rebels of 1069, and up to that date Sheriff of Lincolnshire. A descendant of Ralph Paynell, marrying Juliana de Bahuntune, acquired Bampton and other estates in Devon and Somerset, parcel of the Domesday Barony of Walter de Douai, sometime called "Walter de Bahuntune." Thus, in the reign of Stephen, there were two Baronies of Paynell—one seated at Drax, the other at Bampton.

A very tangled story ensues. All we can say here, and with confidence, is that the elder male line of Paynell of Drax expired in the reign of Henry II.; that many of the estates of the said line went to collaterals, claiming through Alice Paynell, granddaughter of Ralph Paynell now under notice, daughter of William Paynell, and daughter and sole heir of a wife of the said William, viz., of Avicia le Meschin, *al.* Avicia de Roumelli, who was daughter and co-heir of William le Meschin and Cecilia de Roumelli; that Drax itself, and many associated estates, went to other collaterals whose claim was in a male line, viz., as descended from William Paynell of Bridgewater and Bampton, the husband of Juliana de Bahuntune.

The heirs of Paynell (of Drax, Bridgewater, &c.) adhered to Philip of France in the reign of John, and so lost their English estates, though one of the family was reclaiming a part of them as late as A.D. 1261. Meantime, another scion of the House of Paynell had made good a claim, or established a plea, which gained some part of the forfeited estates. He, for aught we know, retained the same.

So far as our purpose is concerned, the gist of all this is, that wherever we find a Somerset or Devon estate to have been held in the 13th century by Maurice de Gaut, or by Hugh de Nevile, or by any Luttrell, or any Paynell, we shall do well to look for the antecedents of such estate in the Domesday Fiefs of Ralph Paynell and Walter de Douai.

RADULFUS DE LIMESI. This baron was the second of his name after the Conquest. The elder Ralph was dead before Domesday, at which date his main succession was in William of Ewe (See Dorset, pp. 17, 119^{n.}, 121 *n.*). William of Ewe's heirship appears to have arisen in his mother, whom we have hitherto supposed to have been a Limesi by birth, and heiress of Ralph senior. There is another possibility in the case. It is, that William of Ewe's mother being an heiress, had taken Ralph de Limesi senior, as a second husband, and that he, while living, enjoyed her estates as well as his own. The collateral possibility is, that Ralph de Limesi senior, had, by a previous wife, a son, Ralph de Limesi (II), who of course was heir to all the elder Ralph's hereditary or personal estates.

The question wants further evidence. We do not find that evidence in Domesday. Where else are we to look for it?

ALURED DE HISPANIA.—Something may well be added to what has been said in our Dorset Volume (p. 77) about Alured of Spain. In all Counties where Domesday records him to have held lands, his usual predecessor was a Saxon Alwi, or Alwin, sometimes called "Alwi Banneson," once called "Alwi Præpositus, Regis Edwardi," the latter title probably resulting from his having charge of the Royal Manor of North Petherton. At Nether Stowey,¹ which became the caput of his barony, Alured succeeded to no less a personage than Harold, Earl of Wessex.

The male line of Alured de Hispania vanished in an heiress, perhaps his daughter. Her name was Isabella. Her husband was Robert de Candos, said to have conquered the territory of Caerleon. The pair certainly founded Goldclive Priory in Monmouthshire, and richly endowed it with lands, churches, and tithes, in Somerset and Devon. Robert de Candos is said to have died in 1120.

The male line of Candos merged again in an heiress, viz., Maude de Candos, wife, in 1166, of Philip de Columbiens. In the said year, Philip de Columbiens made a return of the eleven knights'-fees which constituted his barony (Hearne's *Liber Niger*, i. 97). Some of these fees were in Devon, but most of them in Somerset. A brief examination of the Record shows the barony to have been substantively the same as that held by Alured de Hispania, eighty years before, when it was registered in Domesday. The male line of Columbiens endured in Somerset for many generations.

The history of the Domesday Manor of Hunlavinton (Woolavington) affords a neat parallel to the descent of the Barony of Stowey.—

In King Edward's time, Hunlavinton was held by Alwi Banneson, of the Abbey of Glastonbury. In 1086 it was held by Alured de Hispania, of the same Abbey. In the time of King Henry I. (1100—1135), Robert de Candos held one knights'-fee of the same Abbey (Hearne's *Lib. Nig.*, p. 88). In 1166, Walter son of Robert de Candos was holding the same knights'-fee. So, then, though the husband of Maude de Candos had succeeded to the barony, the heir-male was yet alive. Possibly he was in cloister.

TURSTIN FITZ ROLF.—Who he was has been told in our Dorset Volume (p. 76). His antecessor in several estates, viz., Alwold, is, in one instance, written as Alwold Calvus (the Bald).

One phenomenon about his succession is worth observing. Many of his Domesday estates vested ultimately in the descendants of his Domesday tenant, Bernard Pauncevolt.

SERLO DE BURCI, whose two demesne-manors in Dorset were Whitcliff (in Swanage) and Pidere (postea Puddle Walterston), had 15 manors, and supplements of manors, in Somerset. Domesday shows him also as holding estates in Somerset and Wiltshire under Glastonbury Abbey.

His Saxon predecessor, in four instances, was Euroacer, already noticed (*supra*, p. 62), and in other four was Ælmar, sometimes designated *Almar Atter*. His Dorset Manor of Pidere had been held *T. R. E.* by Earl Harold.

Serlo de Burci had a daughter, a nun of Shaftesbury, with whom he gave Chelmatona (Kilnington) to that monastery. Another daughter he gave in marriage to William de Faleise, with Woodspring as her portion.

Serlo de Burci's greatest Somerset manor was Blachedona (ten hides), whereof he held nine in demesne. In after times his barony was usually known as the Barony of Blagdon.

To this barony succeeded, in time of Henry I. (1100-1135), Robert Fitz Martin, son (says Collinson, ii. 131) of Martin de Tours, the conqueror of Kemeys-Land and founder of St. Dogmael's.

This Robert Fitz Martin will have been he who, in 31 Henry I. (1130) was acquitted of his quota of Danegeld in respect of demesnes (constructively eight hides) in Dorset (*Rot. Pip.*, 31 Hen. I., p. 15).

The Barons Fitz Martin, the descendants of Martin de Tours, held the Barony of Blagdon till the reign of Edward II., when it went to co-heiresses married to Columbiens and to Audley.

¹ *Estalweia*, in the Exon Domesday (p. 350). Collinson (iii. 550) fails, through not collating Domesday and the Gheld-Inquest, to find the Domesday type of Alured de Hispania's Manor of Nether Stowey. He fixes on Ralph de Pomerey's Manor of *Stawei* (which was indeed a part of Nether Stowey) as the Manor of Alvered.

² Robert de Candos gave the tithes of Woolavington to Goldclive Priory. (See Collinson, iii., 437.)

There are other phenomena connected with the Fitz Martin Barony, which we subjoin merely as an index for future enquirers.—

There was no return of the barony to the Feodary of 1166; but the then baron is twice alluded to therein. As the son of Robert Fitz Martin, the said baron holds five knights'-fees under Glastonbury Abbey. These fees, lying probably in Pylle, East Pennard, Hornblotton, and High Ham, had, if so lying, been held under the Abbey by Serlo de Burci at Domesday.

At this same date (1166) Robert Fitz Martin is registered as holding three parts of a knights'-fee under the Bishop of Bath, which teaches us merely that the son of "Robert Fitz Martin" mentioned in the Glastonbury Return was a second Robert, son of him who occurs in 1130.

But the Glastonbury Return evidently points to an earlier period of Henry I.'s reign than 1130, when it makes William Fitz Walter to have been tenant of the above five fees antecedently to the two Roberts.

We cannot solve the genealogical difficulty thus arising. We only increase it by suggesting that it was Walter, father of William (each succeeding in turn to estates of Serlo de Burci), who left with the Dorset Manor of Pidere or Puddle its distinctive name of *Walterston*.

Again, in Devon, where Serlo de Burci had nothing at the date of Domesday, the Fitz Martins inherited several of the Domesday estates of William de Falcise; and these estates constituted, or went to constitute, what was called in the thirteenth century the Barony of Dartington. Now *Dertrinton* stands in Domesday as a demesne manor of the said William de Falcise.

ERNULF DE HESDING. We have said something in our Dorset volume (pp. 124*n*, 138*n*) about this baron, and his frequent antecessor, Edric. Domesday registers him with estates in Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Huntingdonshire, and Bedfordshire. Many of these estates passed to religious houses. The bulk went in partition between three co-heiresses, and are subsequently found in the lines of Salisbury (the old Earls), of Fitz Alan, and of Mont-Dubleau, *alias* De Cadurcis.

GODEBOLD.—He occurs more frequently in the Devon than in the Somerset Domesday. In the index of the latter he ranks as a baron. His real status and tenure were those of a King's Serjeant. He was captain of King William's cross-bow-men—that is, he is usually styled "Balistarius;" but in one instance he is styled "Archibalistarius."

HUNFRIDUS CAMERARIUS was a King's Serjeant (*Serviens Regis*), but his Domesday position in other Counties than Somerset was as that of a minor baron. He and Aiulf Camerarius, Domesday Sheriff of Dorset, were brethren. It would seem that Humphrey owed his advance and many of his estates to the favour of the late Queen Matilda. In connexion with this phenomenon there is an interesting episode which we cannot forbear relating, and though it pertains rather to Dorset than to Somerset, it shows how much may be made by collating the Gheld-Inquest with Domesday.—

The Gheld-Inquest of 1084 has the following case of exemption, under the Dorset Hundred of Albretesberg:—"De unâ hidâ quam tenet quædam Vidua de Hunfrido Camerario ad firmam non habuit Rex Gildum quia Aiulfus dicit Reginam perdonasse pro animâ Ricardi filii sui." Domesday shows us that the hide in question was part of Medesham (now Edmondsham); that the late Queen Matilda had given it to Humphrey Chamberlain; that the widow, who held it at farm under Humphrey, was named Eddiva; that King William was continuing Humphrey's tenancy three years after the Queen's death.

The tragic fate of Richard, second son, and chief hope, of William and Matilda, leads us to the New Forest, whose outskirts determined the boundary of the Dorset Hundred of Albretesberg. Whether Humphrey Chamberlain were in attendance on the youth in the fatal chase,—whether the widow, Eddiva, tended him when smitten to the death,—we cannot explore. For the soul of her son, Richard, Queen Matilda enjoined on Aiulf (Sheriff of Dorset) that the tenement held under (his brother) Humphrey, by the widow (Eddiva) should be free from Gheld.

The succession of Humphrey Chamberlain we must leave to the future research of others. We offer a few hints in addition to those given in our Dorset Volume (p. 137*n*).—

His Dorset Manor of Sture (Stour Pain), and his Somerset Manor of Sanforda (which, though Collinson thought otherwise, we pronounce to have been the Domesday type of Sanford Orescuilz, now Sanford Orcas),

had some later affinities suggestive of the descent of their later owners from Humphrey Chamberlain. Each manor was *dominical*, that is, Humphrey had no tenant in either higher than his *Villeins*.

In 1166, William Fitz John held 10 knights'-fees, and Roger de Villiers one fee, in the Honour of Gloucester. The Fief "which had been Robert de Gornai's," also held of the same Honour, was a Fief of ten fees. We say nothing of the pertinence of this to the present subject, though possibly it may hereafter prove to be not unconnected therewith.¹ William Fitz John, be it remembered, was Baron of Harptree.

In the beginning of King John's reign (says Collinson ii. 378), Richard de Orescuilz was Lord of Sanford Orcas, and of *Sturis* (where *Sturis* was, Collinson did not know).

A.D. 1212. The Manor of Stures (afterwards Stour Pain) was held in equal moieties of the Honour of Gloucester, by William Fitz John and Roger de Vilers. (Testa de Nevill, p. 163.)

Collinson says, or implies, that Maud and Alice, daughters and co-heirs of Richard de Orescuilz, had married, one to William Fitz John of Harptree, and that she had Sanford-Orcas and Sharncot (in Wiltshire); the other, Alice, having married . . . de Vilers, was mother of Roger de Vilers. And, accordingly, before Michaelmas, 1210, he finds (Rot. Pip., 12, John) that Roger de Vilers paid 20 merks that he might inherit the share of his mother Alice in the lands of Richard de Orescuilz.

However, we discover that Maud and Alice were not "daughters" but sisters of Richard de Orescuilz.—

By deed without date "William Fitz John de Harptree, with assent of Matildis," (surely the aforesaid Maude), "his wife, gives to Kington Nunnery (Wilts), certain tithes in his demesnes of Stures (Stour Pain) and of Sanford (Orcas surely).

Also Roger de Vilers gives to the same, certain disputed tithes of his demesnes of Stures and of Sanford, as settled by Papal deputies judging in the cause. The nuns are to hold these tithes of the Grantor and his heirs "libere, prout Ricardus de Orescuil filius Helie Orescuil *avunculus* meus illis dedit."

Now we reascend to Domesday. There we find Humphrey Chamberlain holding of the King the Wiltshire Manor of *Schernecote*. There, too, we find him holding lands (it is irrelevant to identify the lands here) of Glastonbury Abbey.

In the time of Henry I. (1100—1135), Henry Orescuil held a knight's-fee of the same Abbey, which fee, in 1166, was held by Helias, son of the said Henry.

So then, Helias de Orescuil, being the father of Richard de Orescuilz, who died s.p., and of Maude Orescuilz, Lady of Shernecote, Sanford Orcas, and Stour (Pain), who married William Fitz John of Harptree, also of Alice Orescuilz, who transmitted to her son, Roger de Vilers, a share in the manors of Sanford-Orcas and Stour,—Helias de Orescuil was son of Henry de Orescuil, living in time of Henry I. Can we doubt that Henry Orescuil was heir or co-heir of Humphrey Chamberlain?

We should add, by way of illustration, that about the year 1240, Stour Pain was held, not immediately of the Earl of Gloucester, but mediately of the Earl's feudal vassal, Robert de Gurnay. This was no nominal and artificial way of stating the tenure. Robert de Gurnay was not "De Gurnay," by descent in the male line. In the male line he was the heir and representative of those Barons Fitz John of Harptree, one of whom had married the co-heiress of Orescuilz.

SERVIENTES REGIS. The Schedule of the Exchequer Domesday, which is entitled *Terra Hunfridi*, is of the lands held in Serjeantry not only by Humphrey Chamberlain, but by other officers of the Crown. In the Exon Domesday the lands are differently arranged, but the schedule is intelligibly headed *Terra Servientium Regis in Sumerseta*. Subjoined is a list of these Royal Serjeants, and a few words about each.—

¹ Our impression is that the male line of this Robert de Gurnay expired with him. We cannot say how Havise de Gurnay, who appears within two generations of Robert, was related to him; nor yet can we satisfy ourselves of the maternal parentage of that Eva de Gurnay whose intermarriage with Thomas Fitz William of Harptree caused the male descendants of her husband to renounce their proper name of Fitz John and assume that of De Gurnay. Some genealogists have supposed that the above Eva got her name "De Gurnay" from having married secondly with Anselm de Gurnay. We have never been able to verify such a theory. The first Anselm de Gurnay, known to us, was Eva's grandson by her husband,—Thomas Fitz William Fitz John of Harptree.

HUNFRIDUS CAMERARIUS held two manors in his capacity of a *Serviens Regis*. Both were in Cari (or Curi), a locality since known as Lytes-Cary. It is in the parish of Charlton West, usually called Charlton-Mackarel. On the East was Babcary, a manor which Humphrey held in capite, and, as we take it, *per Baroniam* rather than *per Serjantiam*. On the West was the Royal Manor and residence of Somerton, where Humphrey's office as a Chamberlain may have occasionally been in request.

ROBERTUS DE ODBURVILLE. Robert de Auberville's Serjeantry was that of a King's Forester, and to foresters of King Edward he succeeded in some estates. His title was, or had been, in some instances disputed. The Schedule of Serjeantries mentions five estates as, more or less absolutely, in Robert de Odburville's tenure. Two of them had been recovered by him as his tenures *in thenagio*; two had been partially dismembered by the Comte of Moretain and Walter de Douai.

JOHANNES OSTIARIUS. John's Serjeantry was that of Usher to the King's Court. In this capacity he had six estates. Their site and other circumstances suggest that John's functions were apropos to royal visitations of North Petherton, South Petherton, or Somerton; or, it may be of Cannington, if the King ever lodged on his demesnes in that locality. John Hostiarius had also estates in Wiltshire.

ANSGER FOCARIUS (or *Le Fover*) had four estates. His Serjeantry was that of Hearth-keeper in the Royal Hall. The site of his estates suggest that the King's Hall at North Petherton may have been the sphere of his action.

ANSGER COQUUS probably followed the Court. The only Somerset estate of his Serjeantry was Lilstock, equidistant from the King's demesnes of Williton and Cannington, and near to neither. He had also an estate at Compton, in Martock, probably by recent gift of the King. He had also an estate in Devon (*viz.*, *Gatcumba*, E.D., p. 441). Here he is called Ansgerus *Serviens Regis*. Lastly, he had an estate in Wiltshire, — a part of Helprintone (now Hilperton).

ANSCHITIL PARCARIUS had three estates for his Serjeantry. Two of them seem apropos to the King's Manors of Cannington and North Petherton. A third, Mideltona (being, we suppose, Milton in Kewstoke), seems apropos to nothing in the way of King's Park or Forest. Possibly it was this Anschitil who occurs so often in the Somerset Domesday as a tenant of Roger de Corcelle.

GIRARDUS. The nature of his Serjeantry or service does not transpire. Perhaps he is the same with one who in other relations is styled Girard Fosarius. The only estate of his Serjeantry was at Earnshill, where his antecessor, Leving or Leviuc, would seem to have been identical with Humphrey Chamberlain's antecessor at Cari (Lytes-Cary).

EDMUNDUS FILIUS PAGANI. The nature of his Serjeantry does not appear. He had three estates, *viz.*, at Barton (David), at Pitcott (in Stratton-on-the-Foss), and at Walton (in Kilmersdon). Jadulf had preceded him *T. R. E.* in the two first, Ailmar in the last.

As a King's Thane, Edmund filius Pagen appears in the Hampshire Domesday. His tenure is at Derleie (in Rodbrige Hundred). Here Saulf had been his antecessor, and he had a tenant named Hugh.

UXOR MANESSEI COCI. The widow of the deceased cook, Manasses, was allowed dower in two estates of his Serjeantry. Both estates were in Chewton Hundred, and in or near Stone-Easton.

It seems clear that Manasses, the cook, was deceased at the time of the Gheld-Inquest (March 25, 1084), though the Dorset Inquest (Dorset, p. 117 *n.*) speaks of him as living, and only non-solvent in respect of some land of the monks of Sherborne which he had held.

It is curious that the Dorset Domesday treats the same land as if Manasses were living in 1086, while the Somerset Domesday clearly implies his death. The wrong by which he profited in Dorset was done by William, the King's son (Rufus); so perhaps Manasses belonged to the household of the latter.

FRANCI TEGNI.—The perverse arrangements of both editions of the Somerset Domesday has led to the suppression of this Title in both Records. Nevertheless, collating the two, we are enabled to make out a Somerset list of those who in other Counties would have come under this category. The link which, in the Exchequer Domesday, one-while runs the list of Lesser Barons into that of King's Serjeants, is Humphrey Chamberlain. One-while the said Humphrey, with three estates, heads the list of the "French Thanes." Those who were proper to such a list were as follows:—

- I. Odo Flandrensis, or Flandrigena, with one estate.
- II. Willelmus Hosatus (William Hoose), with one estate.
- III. Radulf, brother of Roger de Berchelai, with one estate.

IV. Hugolinus Interpres, with three estates.

V. Drogo de Montacute, with one estate.

VI. Hugo de Valletort, with one estate.

VII. Ricardus Interpres, with one estate.

VIII. Schelin, *alias* Eschelinus, with one estate.

IX. Eldred, *alias* Aldretus, with two estates.

X. Ansgar de Montacute, with two estates.

There is no greater evidence of the provincialisms which beset the Scribes of the Exon Domesday than where they give the Manor of *Coma*, late Earl Leofwin's, to Samson the Chaplain, and place the said Chaplain and his tenement between Humphrey Chamberlain and Ansgar de Montacute.

The Exchequer Scribes knew better. They surveyed Come (now Templecombe) as the "Terra Episcopi Baiocensis," and gave it precedence of the vast Fief of the Bishop of Coutances. Samson, it appears, was merely Bishop Odo's tenant at Combe.—

True, the Exchequer Scribes said nothing about Bishop Odo's contemporary forfeiture and incarceration. It was not Court-fashion to speak of such a thing; neither was it in the routine of Domesday Commissioners. Sometimes they were obliged to allude to incidents correlative with the event. They did not generalize thereon.

TERRE ANGLORUM TEGNORUM IN SUMERSETÆ SYRÀ (EXON).—TERRE TAINORUM REOIS (EXCH).—The list of English-born Thanes is clear enough in both Domesdays. We now reproduce it, saying what we have to say about any of them.—

I. II. Bristric (*al.* Brictric) and Ulward;—joint tenants of Bocheland (Buckland, St. Mary); had held of King Edward in 1066; since then under Peter, Bishop of Lichfield, for his life; now they hold under King William.

III. "Seward, *al.* Siward," "Siward Accipitrarius," "Sewardus Hundranus," whether one or three persons, had three estates in 1036. In the first case, no preceding Thane of 1066 being declared, we assume that Siward was then tenant; in the second case, Edmar, *al.* Edmaratorius (usually antecessor of the Comte of Moretain) was Siward's predecessor; in the third case, Siward had been tenant *T. R. E.* The soubriquet of "Hawker," or of "Hundred-man" might attach to any Siward employed casually in either, or both, capacities. The Gheld-Collectors being sometimes called *Hundranni*, suggests only that the duty of collection fell on the ordinary 'Hundredmen.'

IV. 'Hardincus filius Elnodi' (Exon.), 'Harding' (Exch.), elsewhere called 'Hardinus de Meriet' (from his Manor of Merriott), was clearly the greatest of the Somerset Anglo-Thanes. He had, in 1086, six Somerset manors, one of which (Capland) had been augmented since the Conquest by a parcel of wasted land taken from the Royal Manor of *Curi* (now Curry Rivell).

We have already quoted ample grounds for identifying Harding's father with Eadnoth the Stalhere, and with Ældnoth Dapifer, the antecessor of Earl Hugh in Somerset, Berkshire, Devon, Wilts, and Dorset. On the other hand, Harding, though otherwise tolerated by King William, inherited nothing from his father; nor does he seem, like his father, to have become wealthy or eminent. In five of his six Somerset manors, Harding succeeded to Tovi, or Tofig, who was Sheriff of Somerset at the Conquest, and who was apparently in office in the summer of 1068, when, as Tovig "Minister," he attested King William's famous Charter to Giso, Bishop of Wells. In Harding's sixth manor (Meriet) his antecessor had been Godwin—possibly that Godwin who preceded Tofig as Sheriff of Somerset, and who, if Harding's antecessor at Merriott, was living in 1066.

In the testing clause of King William's Charter to Bishop Giso (dated in 1067, but proved by its editor to have passed in 1068), one Harding appears with Wulfweard (the White), and Azor, and other Somerset Thanes. That this witness was Harding Fitz Eadnoth we cannot believe, for, among other objections to such a theory, we observe that the Charter clearly passed before the fall of Eadnoth, and that another witness was "Tofig Minister,"—Harding Fitz Eadnoth's predecessor in Somerset estate. It was not an unusual thing, nor does it militate against the genuineness of some Charters, if a witness's attestation were added some years after the actual grant and the alleged date. But even if so added, in this case it only suggests that Harding was at such later period recognized by the King. If the attestation were coeval (and we doubt not that it was), then it is improbable that the witness, Harding, was the son of Eadnoth.

It is also observable that during all the period from 1066 to 1086 there was another Somerset Hardine. Hardine held Crenemella (East and West Cranmore) in 1066, under the Abbot of Glastonbury. In 1084 Cranmore was in manu Regis so entirely as that the King held five of its twelve hides in demesne. In 1086, however, Cranmore had been restored to the Glastonbury Fief, and to Hardine, *i.e.*, the same Hardine as had held it in 1066 now held it of the Abbey.

Again, one Hardine was, on 28 February, 1072, attendaut upon Queen Edith's Court at Wilton. Neither was this the son of Eadnoth. Surely this was that Harding who, as "Herdingus Reginae Pincerna," had attested the famous Waltham Charter of King Edward in 1062 (Codex Diplomaticus, iv., 159), and whose identity with the son of Eadnoth we have already pronounced to be chronologically impossible. (*Supra*, p. 58 *n.*). It should be remembered that Queen Edith, thus holding her Curia in the Church of Wilton, in February, 1072, so held it, as the King's Vicegerent,—as dispensing high justice in those parts.

The Harding then present was a chief in her Court, if not her household. He there took precedence of Wulfward White, of Aelfwold, the Queen's Chamberlain, and of Aetbelsige, her steward.¹ Doubtless it was Harding, son of Eadnoth, who, being called simply Herdingus, had in 1084 exemptions from Gheld in two instances in Somerset. Harding Fitz Alnod has a like exemption in the Somerset Hundred of Bolestane, and 'Hardinus de Meriet' has a like exemption in the Somerset Hundred of Crewkerne (wherein Merriott lay).

Domesday (in 1086) not only shows that these entries all relate to one person, but that Harding Fitz Eadnoth had other estates than those alluded to in the Inquest of 1084.

For the probability that Harding Fitz Eadnoth was father of Robert Fitz Harding, of Bristol, and so ancestor of the second line of the Lords of Berkeley, we refer elsewhere (See Freeman iv. 753). If so, as we have said already, Robert Fitz Harding was not Harding's *eldest* son.

V. Brictric, a Thegn, retained the poor estate of Tocheswelle (Tuxwell, in Spaxton). Godwin had held it in 1066. It was then ingeldable.

VI. Dodo, *al.* Dodo de Chori, stands, in 1086, as successor to Siwold (1066) at Stawe, "in Williton Hundred."

VII. Ulf, the holder of a small estate at Hawkewell (Norton-Hawkfield) in 1066, still lived in 1086, and held the same; but with Wilmar in paragio, as the Exon Domesday alone certifies.

VIII. Alward and his brethren held one estate in 1086, their predecessor *T. R. E.* having been their father.

IX. Godwin Anglicus had held, with his mother, a virgate in Draycott, in 1066. Now Godwin holds it alone. This was Godwin de Cicemetona, who in 1086 had eleven manors (including Cicemeton) in Devon. Eight of these had been held *T. R. E.* by Adestan, or Alestan, three by Godwin himself.

X. Alden of 1066 was still in possession of 1½ hides in Stocca (part of Chew-Stoke).

XI. Brismar Anglicus had held in 1066, and still retained, a good estate (10 hides) in Halberga (now Hazlebury Plukenet).

XII. Alvered, or Alverd, had not been disturbed in his twenty years seizin of Wiche, or Wica (Bathwick). It is not improbable that this Thane was identical with Alvered, who, having been steward (Dapifer) to Queen Edith, had in her lifetime held an estate in Twerton.

XIII. Donno, *alias* Dunnus, still held, as in 1066, an estate of twelve hides in Boehelande (now Buckland Dinham). As Donnus, or Donnus, he appears in Devon with two manors similarly held by himself before and since the Conquest.

XIV. Agelric holds the Manor of Cume (Combe Hawey, we believe) in succession to Queen Edith. If the Queen herself had given the estate to Agelric, it was between the years 1066 and 1074, in which last the Queen died. Since Agelric's seizin, the estate had increased fourfold in value, *viz.*, from £1 to £4 per

¹ If we must find a Domesday Harding likely to have been identical with the Harding of Queen Edith's suite, we elect to refer to the Wiltshire Survey. There we find among the Anglo-Thanes of King William, one Harding who held three considerable estates, whose collective value was £24 per annum. Now this Harding, unlike the son of Eadnoth, but like the Lord of Cranmore, had enjoyed these self-same Wiltshire estates in the days of King Edward.

annum. Though in 1086 Agelric held in demesne one of the two Gheld-hides which constituted this estate, he had had no exemption on that account in the Gheld-Levy of 1084. This is unusual, and *per se* suggests that King William had given the estate to Agelric since 1084. Its rapid increase in value is the more remarkable.

XV. ALURIC, SON OF BRICTRIC, had succeeded his father since 1066 in the two Somerset Manors of Lideford (9 hides) and Shepwurd, *al.* Sccepworde (half a hide.) The first Manor is West Lydford, and Aluric's demesnes therein had been duly exempted from Gheld in 1084. The other manor we cannot identify.

Brictric, here spoken of, seems to us to have been a Thane, sometime of great wealth, but whose estates were rarely secured to his natural successors. Probably he had a younger son of his own name; for Aluric and Brictric, two Anglo-Thanes of the Dorset List, held in 1086, a part of Lodres, which manor had in 1066, been held wholly by Brictric. But the Gheld-Inquest of 1084, instead of naming Aluric and Brictric, and styling them "Thanes," claims for two "Elemosynarii Regis," the gheld exemption evidently proper to this, their estate. Here, then, is a second hint of the fallen fortunes of a Saxon House.

In Devon, Aluric, a Thane, enjoying several estates in 1086, had been seized in 1066, and was not, therefore, the son of Brictric. In Devon, Brictric, the father of Aluric and Brictric, seems to be he, who, being written 'Brictric,' had held two manors in 1066, which two manors were in 1086 enjoyed by his widow, Godeva.

Parallel with this evidence of the Devon Survey are the following phenomena in Somerset. In 1066 *Britstric* is recorded to have been a tenant of Glastonbury Abbey. His tenure was Wintret (Winterhead, in Shipham) and was insignificant. But in another Glastonbury Manor, Mulla (now Mells), the Abbot's tenant of a single hide, being doubtless the same Britstric, and having been seized in 1066, is described only as "Vir Godevæ." And this was because, he being dead in 1086, his widow Godeva remained the Abbot's tenant (*Exon Domesd.*, p. 156.)

XVI. BRISTUARD, a Thane holding Writhlington (6 hides) in 1086, was really a priest. His antecessor, as Thane of Writhlington, had in 1066, been Brictwold.—

Bristuard, the Priest, was, in 1086, Incumbent of the two Dorset Churches of Dorchester and Beer-Regis. His being styled an "Elemosynarius Regis," merely means that he held those Churches by the King's gift.

XVII. HUSCARLO.—This Thane had in 1066 shared with Almar, the Manor of Estrat (Street). In 1086 William de Moione had it. What remained to Huscarlo in 1086 was a virgate in Estropa (Eastrip). He was of course a surviving House-Carle of the Saxon Dynasty. That he had served in that distinguished force under Harold is improbable.

XVIII. OSMER had since the Conquest succeeded his father in a virgate at Otterhampton. Two-thirds of this virgate had in 1086 been wrested from him and thrown into the King's Manor of Canniogton.

So ends the Domesday List of the Anglo-Thanes of Somerset.

CHAPTER III.

TERRA REGIS.—VETUS DOMINICUM CORONÆ.

The title given for this class of estate by the Exon Domesday, viz., "Domicatus Regis ad regnum pertinens in Sumersetà," is quite as apt as the technical "Vetus Dominicum Coronæ" of a later date. The class consisted of such estates as the King possessed *jure regni* or *jure Coronæ*. King Edward had them in his day, not as the heir, or alleged heir, of Edmund Ironsides, but because he had been *de facto* crowned King of England. King William had them, not as the real and lawful, nor yet as the constructive, heir of his cousin Edward, but in right of his own coronation.

As to the reputed inalienability of these estates, it was a theory somewhat abated in practice by King Edward, largely respected by the Conqueror, disregarded, and, at length, subverted by his descendants.

There are two Somerset estates which have much appearance in Domesday of having been Ancient Demesne of the Crown till the Confessor gave them in dotation of his Queen, Edith. These were Milverton, with its appurtenances, and the Burgh of Bath, with its appurtenances. Estates thus given seem always, and as a matter of course, to have been subjected to hidation and to the geld-tax; and their resumption at any time into the category of *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ* seems to have been impracticable. The hidage set upon Milverton, though it was only one eighth of a hide, was not quite a fiction; the hidage set upon Bath, viz., 20 hides, was more of a reality. The Queen, before the Conquest, alienated Milverton to Giso, Bishop of Wells. Giso held the manor in 1066, but its hidation (it was now one virgate) had been doubled. The gift, after the Conquest, was revoked or disallowed by the Queen, or by King William. The Queen, at her death (Dec., 1074), was seized both of Milverton and Bath. They then reverted to the Crown, not as *Vetus Dominicum*, but by lapse, or escheat. William had both in 1086;—Milverton at the old hidage (one-eighth of a hide); Bath, still nominally hidated, but clearly under process of practical dishidation. Bath was eventually alienated from the Crown by William Rufus; Milverton also was alienated, perhaps by Henry I., perhaps by Stephen. The twelve estates, which at

the date of Domesday constituted the *Vetus Dominicum* of Somerset, had invariable and precise features: they had all been King Edward's, they had never been hidated; none of them, so far as memory went, had ever been given integrally to a subject.

But there were small portions of these estates, and there were other whole estates, which having, previous to the Conquest, been held by the Confessor, had since that event been granted by King William to Feoffees. With regard to such whole estates, we cannot determine whether they had been King Edward's in right of his Crown, or by escheat; consequently, we cannot say whether William, giving them to his vassals, alienated aught of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*. But he manifestly did so alienate portions of the *Vetus Dominicum* when he granted to a subject any part of the aforesaid twelve Royal Manors. And, when he added to any of the same twelve manors parcels of external territory, he invested so much land with that character of *Vetus Dominicum*, to which it had no antecedent and genuine title. However, the main feature of *Vetus Dominicum* was retained in all such cases of reorganization; the annexed parcels fell out of hidation; the alienated parcels at once became geldable.

As to the kings who came after the Conqueror, they made wholesale alienations of Crown-Demesnes; but we much question whether such alienation created a sound and enduring title unless it were confirmed by the alienator's successor.

Of the profuse alienations by William's grandson, Stephen, it is recorded in general terms that Henry Fitz Empress revoked them. We can specify no instance of this in regard to the Royal Demesnes of Somerset. Some, indeed, thereof reached the hands of Henry II. at his succession;—none that we know of were afterwards recovered by him.

But we must return to our proper thesis, the Somerset Domesday, and must make direct reference to the tables wherein we design a portraiture and syllabus of the more expanded Record.—

IN OUR TABLE (Vol. ii., pp. 1 & 2) OF THE VETUS DOMINICUM OF SOMERSET we take no notice either of the *ablata* or *addita* of Manors of Ancient Demesne. The former became hundredal; the latter, though severed from their hundreds, were well remembered to have been hundredal at the date of Domesday. The Record marks their hidage, though it had become a fiction. We have thought the proper place for both to be in our Tables of Hundreds.

It is worth note that in no instance of the Twelve Royal Manors of Somerset is a manor said by Domesday to be in the ferm or custody of the Sheriff of the County.

Such manors were *extra Comitatum* always. In William's time they were *extra Vice-comitatum* also.

Their being simply ingeldable is saying nearly the same thing in different terms. It was only the *Comitatus* and the *Vice-comitatus* that were geldable. The Royal Manors were fermed or managed by special *Præpositi*, not necessarily, nor always, resident, who were answerable to the Crown for fixed rents, whatever were the profits or losses of management.

The Twelve Royal Manors of Somerset, though themselves extra-hundredal, had each its appropriate hundred—that is, the King being lord of this or that manor, was thereby lord of a certain hundred; and the *Curia* of the said hundred was probably held within the precincts of the relative manor. In eleven instances of the twelve, the attached hundred was cognominate with the manor which, as it were, ruled it.

This will be seen in the aforesaid Table, which will also show how the hundred attached to the Royal Manor of Churi (now Curry Rivell) was never called the Hundred of *Churi*, but always the Hundred of *Abdick*.¹

This, then, is the only case in which a Royal Manor had a hundred not cognominate with itself. The Royal Manor of Meleborne is a seeming, but not a real, exception to the rule; for at the date of Domesday its attached hundred was known as Meleborne Hundred. It is now called Horethorne Hundred, but its area, as a hundred, is undiminished, though not quite unchanged. Since Domesday, Meleborne, *alias* Horethorne Hundred, has absorbed its ancient caput of Meleborne (now Milborn Port). But the Table will show that Meleborne, when a Royal Manor, had three outlying appendages, viz., Holwell, Ilchester, and Northover. Horethorne Hundred absorbed Holwell for ages. It is now in Dorset. But Horethorne Hundred is not known ever to have absorbed Ilchester or Northover.

WE NOW PROCEED to give some account of the structure of the Table (Vol. ii., pp. 1 & 2) which embodies the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ* of Somerset.—

Column i. gives the Domesday name of each of the twelve Royal Estates. The Boroughs expressly added to three of the twelve estates are also given in this column and under their Domesday names.

Column ii. gives the discoverable or presumed constituents or adjuncts of each Domesday Estate. None of the localities inserted in this column are named as manors in Domesday.² The names inserted were, many of them, not recognised so early. These betoken territory, or portions of territory, which were then annexed in the shape of forest or pasture to the King's Manors. Neither can we suppose that this column contains nearly all the names which now include, parochially, some portion or portions of then Royal territory. Far from it, we know that the King's Manors included the King's Forests and Pastures throughout the whole County,—lands which were remote from any of the manors named in the first column, and from the hundreds over which such manors had the jurisdiction.

In assigning these indefinite lands to definite manors, we dictate nothing as to Domesday fact or probability. Our tabular principle is to assign each estate, now known by name, to that particular manor which was Caput of the Hundred wherein the said estate was afterwards interned. We greatly doubt the literal application of this principle to all cases. We think, for instance, that Exmoor and Hawkrigde, or rather the forestal territories now occupied by those parishes, were much more likely to have originally

¹ The reason why the King's Manor of Curry did not give a name to its Hundred was perhaps to avoid confusion. The Earl had a Manor of Curry which did give its name to a Hundred. The Manor and Hundred were both called Nort-Cheri. Both manor and hundred still exist under the same name, viz., North-Curry.

² Hence this column is largely supplementative of Collinson, who seems never to have apprehended why he could not find the places which it contains in Domesday. For instance, (iii. 93), he says of Chedzoy that "it is not set down in the Conqueror's Survey," and yet he proceeds to show how Chedzoy was in the Crown till Edward I's. time, who "gave it to Simon de Montacite." A better way of putting it would have been that Chedzoy was at the date of Domesday involved and implied in the Royal Manor of North Petherton, and that Edward I.'s alienation thereof made it independent.

Again, Collinson (iii. 113) seems to find from Domesday that Barrington was a member of South Petherton. It was so, doubtless; but Domesday says nothing of the kind. All that Domesday says or records is that a small estate, once appurtenant to Barrington Regis, had been alienated therefrom to Roger de Corcelle.

Of Northover, as Collinson (iii. 306) remarks, "we have no account in the Norman Survey." This, presumably, was because at the date of Domesday it was absorbed in Ilchester. William Briwere was Lord of Northover in the reign of John, and that is the earliest evidence we can find of its previous alienation by the Crown.

pertained to the Royal Manor of Carhampton than to the Royal Manor at Williton, in whose corresponding Hundred they are now interned.¹

Column iii. gives the modern names and modern hundreds of the parishes which most nearly represent the manors and places named in columns i. and ii.

Column iv. gives the existing acreage of each such parish.

Column v. combines such acreages in appropriate groups, that is, into the groups suggested by the arrangement of Domesday.

Column vi. gives the number of plough-lands bespoken by Domesday for each Royal Manor or combination of manors,—appurtenances being of course included.

Column vii. converts these plough-lands into statute acreage, reckoning 120 statute acres as the average equivalent of the *Terra ad unam Carrucum*.

Column viii. gives to each group its Domesday quota of wood-land reduced to statute acreage.

Column ix. gives to each group its Domesday quota of meadow-land as expressed in acres by Domesday itself.

Column x. renders the Domesday pasture in like form as Column viii. renders the wood-land.

Column xi. sums the gross Domesday measurements of each group in terms of statute acreage.

Columns xii., xiii., xiv., give the number of teams employed in each group at the date of Domesday,—by the lord,—by the tenants,—by both together. These are the 'Carucæ ibi' of Domesday. Their sum (317½ ox-teams), against 417 plough-lands, shows the inadequacy of the team-power to the requirements or faculties of the Royal Domesne-lands. The same disparity is observable in Dorset, where the actual teams on the Royal Domesnes were 156 in number against faculties for 200.

Columns xv., xvi.—Mills were few on all Royal Manors, save Bruton and Milborne. The Bruton Mills, six in number, and of little value, were presumably on the Brew.—

¹ Here we append a short notice of each of the localities named in column ii. :—

ST. DECUMANS.—Except one virgate in Watchet and three hides elsewhere, the whole of St. Decuman's parish was in the King's Manor of Williton.

UFTON, HAWKRIDGE, EXMOOR, and BICKNOLLER are, as vills or parishes, probably of Post-Domesday foundation. Their sites however, with the exception perhaps of 1½ hides, were Royal territory, appurtenant to the King's Manors of Williton, or Carhampton. Their eventual internment in Williton Hundred would, *per se*, suggest that they had previously been members of Williton Manor rather than of Carhampton Manor.

CHEDZOY, a member of the King's Manor of North-Petherton, was not alienated from the Crown till the time of King Edward I.

THURLOXTON seems to have been alienated at a much earlier period. It was given to De Moione.

BARRINGTON, except a small portion thereof, given before Domesday to Roger de Corcelle, is expressly said in Domesday to be the King's. If so, it was surely a member of the Royal Manor of South-Petherton.

CHILLINGTON is also presumed to have been Royal territory and a member of South-Petherton Manor, in that the Hundred of South-Petherton, in which Chillington was subsequently interned, contained no such estate at the date of Domesday.

STOCKLINCH OTTERSEY, STOCKLINCH MAGDALEN, HAMBRIDGE,—About these vills also Domesday is silent, presumably because they or their sites were well known to be appurtenances of the King's Manor of Churi (now Curry Rivell.) The two Stocklinches have followed their presumed Caput, Curry Rivell, into Abdick Hundred. Hambridge, as a vill or a manor, has no historical antecedents. Its site is the more likely to have subsisted anciently as an anonymous tract of Crown-land. Some parts of the recently formed parish belonged to others than the King.

FOUR TOWERS, a parish of comparatively recent organization, and whose early obscurity consists best with its having been absorbed in some Royal Manor. If so, we presume, in Bruton.

KINGSDON is on similar grounds presumed to have been a member of the Royal Manor of Somerton. Its very name, moreover, proclaims it to have been sometime held by the Crown.

SITE OF CHARTER-HOUSE ON MENDIP.—This estate is well known to have been originally a portion of the Royal Manor of Cheddar. It was severed therefrom by King Henry II., who gave it to the Carthusians.

HOLWELL, not distinctively named in Domesday, is known for ages to have been in the Somerset Hundred of Melborne, postea Horethorne. The inference is that it was at Domesday date, a member of the Royal Manor of Melborne, which it followed when both were interned in Horethorne Hundred.

NORTHOVER, not named in Domesday, was doubtless a member of Melborne. Though topographically more associated with Ilchester, Northover was on that ground still a member of Melborne, for Ilchester itself was nothing else. When Ilchester, severed from Melborne, was annexed to Tintinhull Hundred, Northover naturally followed Ilchester.

The Milborne Mills were also six in number, but of far higher value.—

Collinson opines that this plurality of mills gave name to the place. The name, however, may have arisen in a single mill. The Domesday plurality and high value suggest that most of these mills were not in Melborne, but in its attached Burgh of Ilchester, where the Ivel presented better scope for such structures.

The value of the King's Mills in Somerset ranged from 15 pence to one pound. The best was at South Petherton, and of course on the Parret.

Column xvii.—The Items of Revenue enumerated in this column are not to be reckoned as additional to the King's Farms. They went rather to augment and fix the assessed value of a farm, so as to make it what it will appear to have been in a later column.

We have not noticed in this column an annual rent of £12 stated by Domesday to be paid by Bishop Giso for Wedmore as if it were a member of Cheddar. "*De hac Mansione (Cedra) tenet Giso Episcopus unum membrum quod vocatur Wetmora. Pro isto computat Willelmus Vicecomes xii. libras unoquoque anno in firmâ Regis, sed Episcopus tenuit de Rege Edwardo longo tempore ante obitum Regis Edwardi (Exon. D., pp. 82, 479).*"—

Bishop Giso's payment of a rent for Wedmore was only a temporary incident. Elsewhere (p. 147, Exon.) Domesday surveys the manor as the Bishop's in all integrity. It was worth £20 per annum when he first acquired it; he held it in 1066. He still held it in 1086, when it yielded him £17 per annum.

Wedmore was not then, in any strict sense of the term, a member of Cheddar. It was not Royal Demesne; it was *intra Vicecomitatum*, and *intra Hundredum*, and geldable. All that we can suppose is, that, owing to some claim of the Crown, Wedmore had been seized by the Sheriff, William de Moione; but Bishop Giso had been continued in formal possession, at a stipulated rent. The rent was received from him by the said Sheriff, who was probably instructed to hand it over to the King's Provost at Cheddar. The affair was quite ephemeral. Doubtless Giso had recovered full seizin even while the Domesday Commissioners were in Somerset. When Domesday itself puts the whole firm of Cheddar as £21, it surely does not include this item of £12.

Column xviii.—The Hundreds whose jurisdictional returns and profits are implied by this column to have pertained to specific manors, are not modern Hundreds but Præ-Domesday hundreds. As will be seen in due course the Domesday contents of such hundreds as Carhampton and Williton were far less than the contents of the modern hundreds which still bear the same two names.

In other ways the column requires further explanation. The Præ-Domesday Hundred of Frome included, and was known at the time to include, three sectional Hundreds, viz., those of Frome, Wellow, and Kilmersdon;—just as it is now subdivided. Yet we doubt whether the Hundred-Court, attached to the King's Manor of Frome, had cognizance of pleas in all these sections. We think that only the modern or sectional Hundred of Frome pertained to the King's Manor. Of this elsewhere.

Similarly the Præ-Domesday Hundred of Bruton was a complex hundred. We have spoken already of the jurisdiction annexed to the King's Manor of Bruton, specifying that which a Table would not admit of (*vide supra*, p. 51). Enough too has been said of the hundredal jurisdictions attached to the Royal Manors of Cheddar, Somerton, and Milborne.

Of hundredal jurisdictions attached to the King's Manors of Churi (now Curry Rivell), Bedminster and South Petherton, Domesday tells nothing. Analogy suggests that each manor had jurisdiction over its correlative hundred, as shewn in column xviii.

Columns xix. to xxvi. are devoted to statistics of Domesday population. The number of burgesses denote the relative population of five different Boroughs,—from Ilchester, which had 107 burgesses, down to Bruton, which had but five.

The more strictly agrarian population of the King's Demesnes is counted from Domesday as (976 - 217 burgesses =) 759 males, 628 of whom were villeins and boors, while 40 only were serfs. In our Dorset Volume we pointed out that serfs were usually attendant on the demesne-teams of the manorial lord. It is curious that King William, having 40½ teams on his Somerset Demesnes, had also 40 serfs. But the most surprising result of these comparative reckonings is that a Domesday acreage of 108,741 acres, 50,040 of which were arable land should co-ordinate with a labouring population so small as 759 males. It is but one labourer to every 143 acres of registered land,—but one labourer to every 66 acres of arable land; and of land

actually under team-tillage it may be computed that every 50 acres had but the proportion of a single workman.

On the King's Demesnes of Dorset, we have found (see Dorset Volume, pp. 100, 101) but one working man to every 174 acres of registered land, one man to every 33 acres of arable land, and one man to every 25 acres under actual plough-tillage.¹

The first item in each scale, that which gives a single labourer to 143 acres or to 174 acres of mixed land, indicates nothing more than the prevalence, greater or less, of forest and pasture, in certain Royal estates, over such land as required labour.

The other indications are more instructive. They are that for its arable land, Somerset had but one labourer, where Dorset had two; and that for land in actual tillage the proportion was precisely the same; that is, that where the Somerset labourer was one to every 50 acres, the Dorset labourer was one to every 25 acres.

Another meaning of the same phenomenon may be that the Somerset farmer devoted more of his available strength to his grass and pastures than he did to his plough-tillage; and that the Dorset farmer reversed the policy.

Column xxvii. In this column we show the specific and gross revenues derived by King William from his twelve Demesne Manors in Somerset. It is remarkable that while the gross revenue of such estates was in Somerset £497 19s. 7d., in Dorset it was £484 5s.

In the Somerset category we have no less than four specific instances of the commutation of the *Firma noctis* of the Confessor's time for the fixed money-ferm preferred by William. In one instance, that of the combined Manors of Somerton and Cheddar, the *Firma noctis* stood commuted for £100 10s. 9½d. per annum. In another instance, that of the three combined Manors of Carhampton, Williton, and Cannington, the commutation stood at £105 16s. 6½d. per annum. In another instance, that of the three combined Manors of North Petherton, South Petherton, and Curry, the commutation stood at £106 0s. 10d. per annum. Precisely the same commutation of the *Firma noctis* was affected in a fourth case, which combined the two Manors of Frome and Bruton.

In the case of Bedminster, Domesday does not say what part of a *Firma noctis* it had contributed in the Confessor's time; but the standing ferm of £21 0s. 2½d. looks very like a commutation for one-fifth of a *Firma noctis*.

In the above five cases, covering eleven of the Twelve Royal Manors, the commutation was reckoned in current coin; for, as we show in a note,¹ the process of counting money by 20 pennies to the ounce did not affect the value of the sum thus counted by a single farthing.

The sixth and last instance of commutation, noticed in column xxvii. of the table, was exceptional in two ways.—In the case of Meleborne, which had stood at a *Firma dimidie noctis* in the Confessor's reign, a com-

¹ In these calculations it seems necessary to combine all the manors of ancient demesne in any one County. In Somerset the excessive areas which Domesday registers under the group consisting of Carhampton, Williton, and Cannington, or under the group consisting of Frome and Bruton, or under the single Manor of Bedminster or the single Manor of Milborne, contrast strikingly with the meagre allotments of area prescribed for North Petherton, or for Somerton, or for Cheddar.

It is merely that the forest measures now seeming to be most appurtenant to the latter localities were, according to some technical rule or conventionality of forest-survey, ascribed to the former.

² Money, computed by 20 pence to the ounce (*de xx denariis in ora*), was merely money of account. The sum which made the pound was still 20 shillings; the sum which made the nummary shilling was still 12 pence. No specific coin of a pound, or of an ounce, was in existence. The terms "pound" and "ounce" were merely terms of account.

There were two kinds of *ora*, of account, so that Domesday, when it speaks of the greater kind—that which represented 20 pence,—is usually careful to say so.

The lesser *ora* represented only 16 pence. Of these *ora* it took 15 to make the pound of account. Of the greater *ora* it took 12 to make the same pound. The latter is the *ora* of the Somerset Domesday. The modern system preserves the reckoning in effect, though it changes the middle term and inverts the grade of sub-division. For we say "12 pence to the shilling, and 20 shillings to the pound." Were we to express our pound in Domesday fashion, we should say "*Una libra de xii denariis in solido*."

Sometimes in Domesday the word *ora* is used simply as a sum of money, without any statement as to its contents in pennies, e.g., "*Habet Rex 100 solidos et 5 oras pro feno*." Here the *ora* was probably the ordinary *ora* of 16 pence; consequently the five *ora* were 80 pence, or what would usually be called half a merk of silver.

mutation to £79 10s. 7d. would, *per se*, suggest such a thing as a previous *Firma noctis* of the value, or at the rate of, £159 1s. 2d. But this was not a mere commutation. It was doubtless a change which took into consideration the extra means and enhanced value of Meleborne as combined with two thriving boroughs (at Ilchester and at Meleborne itself), each of which was privileged by a right of market, and each of which had its Court of Justice, the two Courts together realizing at least £21 per annum.¹

Moreover, this enhanced ferm, of £79 10s. 7d., was to be paid in *white money*, which we may take as about five per cent. added to a ferm of current coin. At that rate the ferm of Meleborne, instead of being simply £79 10s. 7d., was about £83 10s.²

Now if we deduct from this ferm of £83 10s. the profits of Judicature (£21), and the proceeds of Burgage rents and markets (£14), we get a *Dimidia firma noctis* represented by £48 10s., which is at a low, rather than at a high, rate of commutation. The probability is, then, that what we have called the *enhanced Ferm* was enhanced by something less than the gross profits which we have instanced;—that is, that a part of those profits, say the Burgage rents, or some of them, had contributed to the *Dimidia firma noctis* before the commutation.

“MANSIONES DE COMITATU,” SIVE “TERRÆ REGIS QUAS TENUIT
GODWINUS COMES ET FILII EJUS IN SUMERSETĀ.”

THE COMITAL MANORS OF SOMERSET.

The Exchequer Domesday classes the Comital Manors of Somerset next after the Manors of Ancient Demesne, entitling all as “Terra Regis.” The King had Harold’s Earldom of Wessex, and so of Somerset, in his hand, as an escheat, by forfeiture.

The Exon Domesday makes a distinct chapter or schedule of the Comital Manors, which it heads with the title, “Terra Regis quas tenuit,” &c. (as above), and which it continues for five folios, inserting on the fourth folio, by way of a continuative title, the formula, “Mansiones de Comitatu.”

As will be seen in the sequel, these titles of the Exon Domesday are of import—of import both verbal and constructive.

THE TABLE (which we give, Vol. ii., pp. 3-4) OF THE COMITAL MANORS OF SOMERSET needs some little explanation as to its structure.—

Page 3, column v.—Some of the parochial acreages given in this column include indefinite items of estate which were not parts of the manors named in column i. On the other hand, some of these parochial acreages exclude items of estate which were in the said manors, but are not in the said parishes.—

It is impossible to fix the proportions of the several discrepancies. We have attempted a guess in the case of Capton only, to which, being in the parish of Stogumber, we have assigned an acreage, viz., 638 acres, that being the same proportion of 5,777 acres (the acreage of the whole parish of Stogumber) as the Domesday acreage of Capton bore to the Domesday acreage of Stogumber and its other constituents.

1 The Tercius Denarius of the two Courts was £7. It follows that the gross profits were £21.

2 So that the gross revenue of the *Vetus Dominium Corone*, when computed in current coin, will have been (£497 10s. 7d. + 5 per cent. on £79 10s. 7d., say £3 19s. 5d. =) £501 19s. 0d. But in the Table (vol. ii., p. 2) we have disregarded this somewhat theoretical addition of £3 19s. 5d., and have reckoned the gross revenue as if the figures given in Domesday had *all* been in terms of current coin.

Page 4. Column xiv.—The bracketed items of this column are of rents or values of estates either ablated from the Comital manors, or nominally remaining therein, while the respective occupants received the profits. In neither case did these rents or values go to augment the manor-lord's ferm of white money. Consequently, at the foot of the column they are not included in the sum of Comital revenue.—

A revenue of £8 15s. 0d. is inserted in this column, that being the sum of the *Tercii Denarii* of Ilchester, Melborne, Bruton, Langport, Axbridge, and Frome. This revenue was paid in ordinary coin; consequently we repeat this item of Comital due at the foot of the column and do not reckon it in the total (£268 14s. 1d.) of white money.

The said item of *Tercii Denarii* is given by the Exon Domesday at the foot of the Comital Manors and in immediate sequence to the Manor of Henstridge. The Table therefore introduces it in conjunction with Henstridge. But it is a question whether the due was actually returnable to the Manor of Henstridge; for the white-money ferm of Henstridge (£23) is intelligible enough without including a receipt, extravagant as an addition and different in kind. Moreover, the Exchequer Domesday does not mention this due in conjunction with Henstridge or any other Comital Manor. It introduces it at the foot of the estates which the King had in succession to Queen Edith.

In this same column the ferm of the Comital Manor of Nettlecombe is put at £4 (?) 10s 0d. de albo argento. The fact is, that the number of the pounds is omitted in both Domesdays, the shillings (ten) only given. We guess the pounds to have been *four*, but something might be said in favour of a higher figure.

Having said thus much on the structure of the Table (Vol. ii., pp. 3 and 4) we pass to a more general scope of the Fief which it represents, and to a further expansion of some of its allusions.—

We observe that, with the exception of Bruneton (the exception probably being only an omitted statement), all the Comital Manors and Comital Dues were under the custody and responsibility of William de Moione, Domesday Sheriff of Somerset. Had the Comes been in seizin of his Earldom, the Vicecomes would have been his officer and answerable to him personally. But now, the King being virtually Comes, the said officer was responsible to the King. Such is the ratio of that expression of Domesday, where Somerset is not called a Comitatus but a Vice-Comitatus.

In the time of King Edward the tertius denarius of the Royal jurisdictions of Carhampton, Williton, Cannington, and North Petherton, had been a Comital perquisite, returnable at Earl Harold's Manor of Old Cleeve. At the date of Domesday (A.D. 1086) this due, unlike the cognate due arising from Ilchester, Melbourne, &c., had been discontinued. In each case the King, as Comes, was entitled to the due. It seems superfluous that it should have been still exacted in either case. It seems strange that it should have been exacted in one, abandoned in the other.

The way in which the two Domesdays speak of this matter is as follows. The Exchequer Codex says:—

“Huic Manerio (Clive) adjacuit tertius denarius de Burgherist et” (*sic*, but read *de*) “Carentone et Willetone et Cantitone et Nordpereth.” The Exon Codex says:—

“Huic Mansioni (Clivæ) jacuit tertius denarius de Burgherist

de" *sic, recte*) "Carentonâ et de Willetonâ et de Cantetonâ et de Nort-petretâ, ea die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus." Thus one Record corrects and explains the other. It is only necessary to observe that Burgherist (Burglary) was one of those Placita Coronæ, the profits whereof (generally the culprit's goods) were due, two parts to the Crown, one part to the Comes: and further, that in this instance the word 'Burgherist' was probably used as a part for the whole. There were usually four Placita Coronæ, viz., murder, breach of the peace, burglary, and larceny: their profits were differently divided in different Counties; but we have not found any specific instance where a third of murder-pleas was secured to the Comes. In the Bishop of Winchester's great and exclusive franchise of Taunton, Domesday records that the Bishop had (apparently the whole profits of) the Placita of Burgherist, Latrones (larceny), Pacis Infractio, and Hainfare. Here were three Placita Coronæ, but the Bishop clearly had not the murder-pleas.

WE NOW PROCEED TO SAY SOMETHING OF THOSE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF GODWIN who, at the time of King Edward's death, were holding those fifteen Comital Manors of Somerset which King William, in the year 1086, had in hand as his *Escheat by forfeiture*.—

COMES HERALDUS.—Six of Earl Harold's escheated Manors remained in the King's hand at the date of Domesday. Domesday mentions three other manors as having been Earl Harold's, viz.—

(1) Eastalweia (Nether Stowey), which has the appearance of having been a Comital Manor *T. R. E.*: but it is not in the Schedule of Comital Manors, seeing that King William had given it to Alured de Hispania.

(2) Banwell, which Harold had wrested from the See of Wells. In the summer of 1068 King William restored Banwell to the Church of St. Andrew of Wells, by a charter of great interest,¹ to which we often refer. Of course Banwell was not a Comital Manor in any true sense of the term.

¹ We are indebted to F. H. Dickenson, Esq., for a reprint of this Charter and of some able commentaries thereon. The witnesses connected with Somerset and the South-Western Counties, were as follows:—

Queen Matilda; Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury; Odo, Bishop of Bayeux; Hugh, Bishop of Lisieux; Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances; Hermann, Bishop of Sherborne; Leofric, Bishop of Exeter; "Æthelnoth Abbot" (of Glastonbury); "Wulfwold Abbot" (of Bath); "Willelmus Dux" (William Fitz Osbern, Earl of Hereford); Waltheof Dux (Earl of Northampton and Huntingdon); "Edwine Dux" (Edwin, Earl of Mercia); "Robertus frater Regis" (Robert, Comte of Mortain); Rotgerus Princeps (Roger de Montgomery); "Walterus Gofthead" (Walter Giffard); "Willhelm de Curcello"; "Serlo de Burca" (read Burel); "Rotgerus *Derundel*" (read Arundel); "Thurstan" (Thurstan Fitz Rolf); "Tong *sic* Minister" (Tofig, Sheriff of Somerset); "Dinni" (*sic*, called in Domesday Donnus, Domnus, or Donna); "Elfge arde Thorne" (*sic*, but read Elfgear de Thorne); "Willhelm de Walvile" (a Devon Baron); "Bundi Stallere"; "Rotbert Stallere" (Robert Fitz Wymarch, Sheriff of Essex); "Robert de Ylie (Robert de Oilli, Sheriff of Oxfordshire); "Wulfweardus" (Wulfweard White); Herding (a Thane, distinct from Harding Fitz Elnod, or de Meriet); "Adzor" (Lord of Combe, &c., Somerset); "Brixi" (Lord of Burnham, &c., Somerset); "Brihtric" (Lord of Cliva (Kilve), Curi (postea Curry Malet), Wintret (Winterhead), Burnetona (postea Brompton Ralph), &c., &c. (Somerset).— In regard to the last witness we observe that—

There was a Brihtric who, with the several styles of *Minister*, or *Consiliarius*, or *Princeps*, had attested Charters of the Confessor in or about the years 1061 and 1062. Him we take to have been the son of Algar and the well-known victim of Matilda, the Conqueror's Queen. He is out of the question in the above testing clause.—

Besides him there were two or three Thanes of the South-West whom we cannot always distinguish personally nor yet identify with the above witness, *e.g.*, there were Brihtric Cameson; Brihtric son of Dodda; Brihtric, father of Aluric and Brihtric, whose widow Godiva was living in 1086.

(3) Lullington, which King William had bestowed on the Bishop of Coutances, who held it at Domesday, Lullington, except its valuable mill, has no Domesday feature indicative of its having been a Comital Manor. Possibly Harold had obtained it, like Banwell, by usurpation.

GHEDA COMITISSA.—Gytha, widow of Earl Godwin, and mother of Harold, had held, in January, 1066, three of the Comital Manors of Somerset. They were now (1086) *in manu Regis*, as Escheats.

One of Gytha's Manors was Bruneton, afterwards called King's Brompton, by reason of its seizure to the Crown. To the Domesday notice of Bruneton is appended the following memorandum:—"De hâc mansione ablatus est tertius denarius de Milvertona qui per consuetudinem reddebatur in eâ die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus" (Exon D., p. 95.)

Queen Edith's Quasi-Royal Manor of Milverton had, up to the day of King Edward's death, rendered the third-penny of its Judicature of Crown Pleas to the Countess Gytha's Manor of Bruneton, where the said third-penny had been customarily returnable. This third-penny, then, besides her three manors, had been a Somerset property of Earl Godwin's widow.

The Countess Gytha, after her rueful embassy on the morrow of Senlac, appears to have taken refuge in the South-West. She is accredited with having fomented the resistance offered by the men of Exeter to the Conqueror. When William, about the month of February, 1068, approached Exeter in arms, the Countess is said to have been within the City, but when it surrendered she had escaped. She is said to have resorted to Flat-Holm, an island of the Bristol Channel, and thence, with her daughter Gunhild, to have escaped to Flanders; but the learned investigator of these events (see Freeman, iv. 159, 245), seems doubtful whether Gytha's retirement to Flanders was not after the retreat of the sons of Harold from their raid on Bristol and Somerset, that is, after June, 1068.

History tells nothing of the Countess Gytha after her arrival at St. Omer. Of her daughter Gunhild, and of Gunhild's estates in Somerset, we proceed to speak.

GUNNILLA (as Domesday writes her name), the daughter of Earl Godwin and of Gytha, was old enough in January, 1066, to have independent seizin of three of the Comital Manors of Somerset. Two of these manors, since called Hardington-Mandeville and Creech St. Michael, were in the King's hand at the date of Domesday (1085-6). The third, Claverham (in Yatton) had ceased to be a Comital Manor, for King William had bestowed it on the Bishop of Coutances. The estate was inconsiderable.

Gunhild, as her epitaph relates (see Freeman iv., 754, 755), while yet a damsel, resolved on a single life, and rejected many noble suitors. She had arrived at a marriageable age before the Conquest. After her escape to Flanders, she spent some years at St. Omer, cheerful and gentle to her attendants, kind and just to her neighbours, liberal to the poor, very denying of herself. Later in life she practised much austerity. From St. Omer she went to reside at Bruges, where again she spent some years; then she visited Denmark. Returning to Bruges, she died there on August 24, 1087, a few weeks (observed Mr. Freeman) before the death of the Conqueror at Rouen.¹

TOSTIN COMES.—Earl Tostig, son of Godwin and Gytha, had held only one of the Comital Manors of Somerset. This was Winsford, far the largest of them all, for it contained 18,768 acres of Domesday measurement. It is remarkable that the Exon Domesday, describing Earl Tostig's former tenure of Winsford, says simply "quam tenuit Tostin Comes," without adding the usual formula, which fixes the respective tenures of other Comital Manors to a precise day, January 5, 1066, the day of King Edward's death.—

There are two stories about Tostig's exile.—One is that he was banished by King Edward, and that being at St. Omer he there first heard of the King's death. The other story is that Harold drove him into exile after his own coronation. We see that Mr. Freeman adopts the former story, and the Exon Domesday seems to corroborate it. The truth, perhaps, is that Harold resentenced his brother. After various wanderings and experiments against Harold, Tostig, associated with Harold Hardrada, sailed up the Humber with a powerful fleet. On September the 20th (as we reckon the date) they were engaged by the Earls Edwin and Morcar, whom they defeated at Fulford. Five days later, viz., on

¹ The bones of Gunhild, with a sepulchral inscription written on lead, were found in the Church of Saint Donatus, at Bruges, in 1786. (Freeman, iv., 159, note).

Monday, September 25, Harold, reaching Yorkshire by forced marches, defeated and slew both the invaders at the battle of Stamford Bridge. Nineteen days later Harold himself fell at Senlac.

LEWINUS COMES.—Earl Leofwin had none of fifteen Comital Manors, which King William held by escheat in 1086; but he had held *T. R. E.* the Comital Manor of Come, now Temple Combe. Earl Leofwine fell with his brothers Harold and Gurth at Senlac. His Manors in Devon were in *manu Regis* at Domesday; but William had given Combe to his own brother, Odo, Bishop of Bayeux.

There are five other Somerset Manors which Domesday records to have been held by some "Lewinus" in 1066; but there is no feature about three of them to suggest that Leofwine, son of Godwin, was the person thus interested. In two cases "Lewinus," who had been succeeded by Comte Eustace of Boulogne, may have been the Earl.

Godwinus filius Haroldi Comititis. The mention of Harold's son, Godwin, as holding two Somerset estates in January, 1066, is one of those things which exhibits Domesday as the illustrator of personal and historical matters of exceeding interest. The two estates were Nettlecomb and Langford (in Burrington), neither of them of great value; but the former was within five, the latter within ten miles of the Channel.

That Godwin was of full age in 1066, and that he was not one of the illegitimate sons of Harold, are fair inferences from his position in this schedule of the Exon Domesday. It is quite consistent with what Mr. Freeman has discovered about Harold's age, that he should have been lawfully married in early life, and have had a son or sons by such marriage, of more than full age in 1066.

The date of Harold's later and better authenticated marriage with Ældgyth, the daughter of Earl Algar, and widow of King Gruffydd, is not quite clear. No theory on the subject can possibly abate Mr. Freeman's conclusion, that Godwin was not the son of Ældgyth.

The same great authority supplies us with the probable movements of three sons of Harold in the years 1067, 1068, and 1069. Their names were "Godwine, Eadmund, and Magnus." After Senlac they seem to have retired to the South-West with their grandmother, Gytha. On the fall of Exeter (*circa* February, 1068) they crossed the Channel and took refuge with King Diarmid, of Dublin. Later in the same year they returned with a fleet of 52 ships, devastated the Somerset seaboard, sailed up the Avon, threatening Bristol, and were repulsed by the Burgesses. Returning to their havoc of the Somerset coast, they were attacked by Eadnoth the Stallere, commanding the men of Somerset. A drawn battle ensued. Eadnoth had fallen; but the sons of Harold sailed away, and after devastating the coasts of Devon and Cornwall, went back to Ireland.

In June, 1069, two sons of Harold led an Irish expedition against Devon. They seem to have landed in the Tavy, to have harried far and wide in the South and West of Devon, and threatened, if they did not attack, Exeter. They were defeated in two battles by William's lieutenants, described variously as two earls, or comtes, 'William and Brien,' and as 'William Guald and Brien, a Comte of Bretagne,' of whom we forbear to discourse in this place. Suffice it, that these elder sons of Harold appear no more in English history.

EDDEVA.—This name, and its synonymes, however we list to write them, always seem to involve some perplexing questions.—

Was the Eddeva of many a Domesday page,—the "Eddeva Pulchra," "Faira," and "Dives,"—identical with "Eadgyth of the Swan's-neck," *alias* "Edgyve Swanneshals," the concubine of Earl Harold, and the discoverer of his dead body among the corpses of Senlac?

Mr. Freeman (vol. iii, pp. 763—765) has arrayed with his usual diligence and precision the various considerations bearing on this question, and has decided that, as to the identity or the non-identity "there is no sufficient evidence."

If they were identical, we have nothing more pertinent to say than that this manifold, famous, and polyonymous, Edith, was in January, 1066, Lady of Crewkerne, in Somerset.

But if they were not identical, a further and more interesting question arises to the Somerset antiquary. And this second question may possibly give us a clue to answering the first. We will put it in this form:—Which Edith was it who enjoyed in her time the aforesaid Comital Manor of Crewkerne? Was it Edith the wealthy and the fair, or Edith the mistress of Harold?

The late Lord Lytton, much investigating and somewhat inventing, wrote a romance entitled "Harold," in which he represented Edith the Fair to have been the discoverer of Harold's body at Senlac, and to

have been beloved of Harold ; but, of course, the heroine was not allowed to have been Harold's mistress. So far, then, and with an eye to the beautiful, rather than the true, Lord Lytton created a new Edith, differing from the hypothetically one Edith, differing also from each of the hypothetically two Ediths.

But where did Lord Lytton get his idea that his heroine was akin to her namesake the Queen, and so to the house of Godwin and Gytha, and his other idea that she was in ward to King Edward ?

We cannot discover any historical authority for these ideas ; nor can we suppose that, if Mr. Freeman knew of them, he considered them to rest on historic evidence ; otherwise the theory of identity must have been suspected by him.

Now let us examine this Somerset story about Crewkerne, told as it is in the Exon Domesday.—

Here is a Comital Manor of Somerset held by Eddeva in 1066. Surely, if all the other Comital Manors of Somerset were held, at or about that time, by members of the family of Earl Godwin, Eddeva, Lady of Crewkerne, was of kin to the House of Godwin, of kin to Queen Edith, and eke to Harold himself. Surely this was not Edith of the Swan's-neck, Harold's concubine.

Look again at the Exon Survey of Crewkerne. It was far the most valuable of the Comital Manors of Somerset. Its revenue was £46 per annum. Earl Harold's Manor of Congresbury, the next in value, yielded but £28 15s. But Crewkerne also was an ingeldable manor ; it had never been hidated ; its hidage was unknown as late as Domesday.¹ No other Comital Manor of Somerset was thus privileged. Is it supposable that Harold ever had, or ever disposed of, such a manor, whether to kinswoman or mistress ? Could Harold create or import such a franchise ? Could anyone, save King Edward himself, have conferred Crewkerne on Eddeva ? Did Edward, the Saint and Celebrite, give the estate to Harold's mistress ?

Let us take one more look at the Exon Survey of the Manor of Crewkerne. It ends with the valuation aforesaid, and then adds supplementary matter.—“Reddit per annum xl et vi libras de albo argento. De istâ mansione ablata est una mansio que vocatur Esteham quam tenuit Godwinus Præpositus Regis in firmâ Cruchæ, et non potuit a Cruchâ separari die Regis Edwardi et reddidit Gildrum pro duabus hidis. Has possunt arare, ducæ carucæ. Modo tenet hanc Turstinus de Comite (Moritonensi) et valet per annum 50 solidos et quando Comes receipt tandundem.

So then Eastham, a locality still known as in the parish of Crewkerne, and still remembered to have once been a parish of itself, was in the days of King Edward held by Godwin, the said King's Bailiff at Crewkerne, which Godwin, though Eastham was a geldable estate, included its revenue in the general Fern of Crewkerne, whereof he was Provost and Fermor—under whom ?—not under Eddeva, but under King Edward. It follows that King Edward, and not Earl Harold, was Lord of Crewkerne antecedently to Eddeva. It also follows that Crewkerne, being a Royal Manor, King Edward gave it to Eddeva,¹ and that Eddeva, being of the race of Godwin, Crewkerne, in her hands, became a Comital Manor and was afterwards classed as such by Domesday.

Surely the King's grantee in this case was ‘Edith the Fair, and rich.’ Surely it was not “Edgyve Swanneshals,” Harold's mistress. The two women were clearly distinct.

The name Edith, or some of its synonyms, occurs in Domesday very often ; and what wonder if Saxon women of rank, born in the era when a daughter of Godwin and a Queen of England was named Edith, were often baptised by that name ?

The Somerset Domesday supplies only three such ladies. There was ‘Edeva,’ Lady of Doverhay, a small estate in the vicinity of Luckham. Her Norman successor was Rogér de Corcelle. Then there was ‘Aldeva Fœmina’ (as she is written), Lady of Horsington *T. R. E.*, whose Norman successor was William fitz Widon. There was also the Nnn Edith (Eddida Monialis) ; but her Somerset estate is not specified, neither is it said that, she, holding in 1086, had held it 1066. She was one of King William's Almouees.

There was also an Editda, whose tenure of Estochet (probably a part of Chewstoke) passed to William de Moione between the years 1066 and 1086.

¹ We have said that any Manor of *Ancient Demesne* granted to a subject became therewith geldable, and was subjected to hidation, real or nominal. As this rule arose with the Crown, so it may have been, in this sole instance, dispensed with by the Crown.—

But, at the same time, we do not at all care to urge this case as an exception, for we have as yet no proof, no indication, that Crewkerne, though a Royal Manor, was also a Manor of *Ancient Demesne*.

Our Table of the Comital Manors of Somerset (see Vol. ii., pp. 3 and 4) affords statistical facts which we now compare with those supplied by the Table of Royal Demesnes, on which latter we have already commented (*supra*, pp. 76, 77).

Domesday Estates.	Arable Acreage.	Wood Acreage.	Meadow Acreage.	Pasture Acreage.	Gross Acreages	Acreages under Plough.	Agrarian Population.	Mills.	Gross Revenue in Current Coin.	Parochial Acreages apparently correlative. ²
12 Royal Manors. }	50,040	33,020	681	24,400	108,741	36,100	759	xxi	£501 19s. 0d.	110,756
15 Comital Manors. }	47,640	5,412	936	20,365	74,353	32,160	958	xvii	£290 17s. 9d. ¹	71,413

In the Comital Manors, a gross Domesday area of 74,353 acres, 47,640 whereof were arable land, and 32,160 acres whereof were actually under plough, co-ordinated with a labouring population of 958 males. Here was one labourer to every 77½ acres of registered land, one to every 50 acres of arable land, one to every 34 acres of land actually tilled.

¶ The acreages proportionate to the single labourer were in several instances as follows :—

In Somerset, Royal Demesnes, 143 registered acres, 66 arable acres, 50 cultivated acres.

In Somerset, Comital Manors, 77½ registered acres, 50 arable acres, 34 cultivated acres.

In Dorset, Royal Demesnes, 174 registered acres, 33 arable acres, 25 cultivated acres.

¶ The annual profits of the fifteen Comital Manors of Somerset were as stated above—£290 17s. 9d. This included some items of revenue which did not strictly arise from land, such as mill-returns, burgage-rents, market-profits, and the Tercius denarius of six jurisdictions still, at the date of Domesday, payable to the Comital estate. These the table (Vol. ii. pp. 3 & 4) will show to have been £5 5s. 4d + 3s. 2d. + £4 + £8 15s. =) in all £18 3s. 6d. Further, as we should suppose, the Comital revenues were augmented by the whole profits of some half-dozen jurisdictions appropriate to as many manors. It is almost a guess to value these at £8 per annum. With that assumption the Comital revenues, arising from land only, will have been (£290 17s. 9d. — £26 3s. 6d.) = £264 14s. 3d. at the date of Domesday.—

This gives to each acre of gross Domesday measures (of which acres there were 74,353) an annual value of little more than ½⅔ths of a penny (viz., '8544 decimals of a penny).

Reckoning the arable land (of which the manors contained 47,640 acres) to have been the chief source of agricultural profit, if not the root of all such profits, then the net revenue of £264 14s. 3d. charged wholly on the arable land would shew a proportion of about 1½ an acre, or 13s. 4d. per plough-land of 120 acres.

Or again, divide the same net revenue among the 268 ploughs actually at work on the fifteen Comital Manors in A.D. 1086, and the result will be a profit of 19s. 9d. per annum on every plough so occupied.

“TERRA EDITÆ REGINÆ IN SUMERSETA.”

This title is taken from the Exon Domesday. The Exchequer Domesday heads the corresponding schedule with the words—“Has subter-scriptas terras tenuit Eddid Regina,” but makes the schedule to be only a section of the chapter entitled “Terra Regis.”

¹ Computed thus.—£268 14s. 1d. white money + 5 per cent. thereon, or £13 8s. 8d. + £8 15s. current coin = £290 17s. 9d. of ordinary currency.

² Both entries in this column purport little more than mere superficial phenomena. All that we learn is that, generally and collectively, the modern parishes which most nearly represent the Royal Manors include some two thousand acres of territory, which were not, or which Domesday did not register as being, in the Royal Manors.

And, *vice versa*, the collective parishes which most nearly represent the Comital Manors, do not include some three thousand acres of territory which positively were in the Domesday Manors.

This section of Domesday included six estates, as tabulated elsewhere (Vol. ii., pp. 5 & 6). These estates may have been a part of the large endowment which King Edward bestowed on Edith, daughter of Earl Godwin, on her marriage, or they may have been bestowed upon her later. In either case, the Queen held them all six in January, 1066, when King Edward died, and retained them till the day of her own death, in December, 1074. They became "Terra Regis" not by escheat of forfeiture, but by escheat of lapse—that is, they reverted to the Crown and to King William. The King had them still in hand in 1086, the date of Domesday.

In 1066 we have mention of three tenants of Queen Edith at Keynsham, viz., Ulmar, Wulfward White, and Tofig the Sheriff. In February, 1072, we have Wulfward White in attendance on Queen Edith's Court at Wilton. In 1086 the tenants of King William at Keynsham, are:—in lieu of Wulfward White, the Bishop of Coutances, Roger (probably De Corcelle) and Wulfward White's widow; in lieu of Ulmar, a Thane named Aluric; and in lieu of Tofig the Sheriff, Eustace Comte of Boulogne, and his sub-tenant, Alured.¹

Other changes which had taken place in these six estates, probably since their reversion to the Crown, were, that the hidation and geldability of three had been doubled, or more than doubled, that the revenues derived from all had been largely increased. Further particulars we reserve to future notes on the individual estates.

It is here observable that the revenues of these estates were paid just as the revenues of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*,—in ordinary coin, and not through the Sheriff. They were paid probably by Fermors or *Præpositi*, and to this the revenue derived from the Burgh of Bath is no exception, for it was paid by the corporate Burgesses who farmed the said Burgh.

In some respects, then, these reversionary estates of the late Queen were rather analogous to the Manors of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*; in one respect, viz., that they had become hidated and geldable on their first assignment to the Queen, they had lost that character.

In dealing with the statistics of the *Terra Regis*, held by King William as Reversioner of Queen Edith (see Table, Vol. ii., pp. 5 and 6), we must except the Burgh of Bath, and the Manor of Bath-Easton; for

¹ Alured, sometimes a Steward (*Dapifer*) of Queen Edith, may be the person thus holding under Comte Eustace. We have spoken of him before (*supra*, p. 70),

Domesday nowhere gives the measurements nor the agrarian population which were correlative to the "twenty hides of Bath"; and fiscally, it treats Bath-Easton as a mere appendage of the Burgh. All which things must in the sequel come under special review.

The statistics of the late Queen Edith's four Manors of Milverton, Martock, Keynsham, and Chewton, were as follows :—

The gross Domesday acreage was 30,468 acres, of which 23,520 acres were arable, and 19,080 acres actually under the plough.—

The working population numbered 404 males, which gives a single labourer in proportion to every 75½ acres of registered land, to every 58 acres of arable land, and to every 47 acres of land actually under tillage.—

The gross revenue of these four Manors at the date of Domesday was £253 per annum. But of this £8 12s. 1d. arose from mills, from burgage rents, and a market. Also the profits of four jurisdictions, (amounting perhaps to £5 per annum) were not strictly agrarian. The net revenue from land may, therefore, be put at (£253—£13 12s 1d=) £239 7s. 11d.

This gives to each acre of Domesday Registration a proportionate value of about 1½d. per annum (viz. 18860 penny and decimals of a penny). The same annual revenue of £239 7s. 11d., if apportioned on the 196 plough-lands of the territory, give an average return of £1 4s. 5d. per annum ; if apportioned on the 159 ploughs actually at work, give an average of £1 10s. 1d. per team.

The Somerset Estates of Queen Edith, which are scheduled under the Terra Regis, were those only which the King retained in his hand at the date of Domesday. She had in her life-time possessed many more. There was Puriton, which in A.D. 1086 was held by the Church of St. Peter at Rome, probably by the Queen's own gift.

In Carhampton Hundred we have Luckham and Selworthy, both distinguished by a privileged hidation, but both subinfeudated to Ralph de Limesey, and so subinfeudated probably by the late Queen.

Another Carhampton estate, Doverhay, having been held *T. R. E.* by "Edeva," was in A.D. 1086 held by Roger de Corcelle. This Edeva, if not the Lady of Crewkerne, already spoken of (*supra*, p. 83), was hardly the Queen.

Of Twerton and Combe Hawey in (Old) Frome Hundred, both Queen Edith's in her day, and both favourably hidated, we shall have much more to say under Frome Hundred. The first had been given to the Bishop of Coutances, probably by King William, before Domesday, the last to Agelric, an Anglo-Thane, probably by the King, and very shortly before Domesday.

"TERRA QUÆ FUIT ULWARDI WITE IN SUMERSETA."

The above title is taken from the Exon Domesday. The Exchequer Domesday (if transcribed accurately by Collinson, Vol. i, p. 5), gives as a title—"Has infrascriptas terras tenuit Ulwardus Abbas," where, of course, the reading should be Ulwardus *Albus*.

This sectional schedule of the "Terra Regis" merely comprehended five estates of Wulfward White, which happened to remain in his Fief as a tenant-in-capite at the time of his decease. His death, happening shortly before Domesday, threw the said estates, apparently as an Escheat, into the King's hand.

To what we have said elsewhere (See Dorset Volume, pp. 111, 112*n*, 129), about Wulfward White we may now add further particulars. He was a Saxon Thane of large and ubiquitous estate, how large and how scattered we cannot, beyond a certain point, ascertain ; for his name, being variously written in Domesday, and often

without his cognomen, we cannot always identify him. Even with his cognomen he is variously written as Ulward, Ailward, Wlgar or Wlward. How often an individual bearing either of those names, without a cognomen, may have been identical with Wulfward White, must depend on the probabilities of each case where Domesday speaks of such a man or men. But there can be no doubt that his estates as a "Thane of King Edward" were far greater than are given to Wulfward *White* in Domesday, and, accordingly, that what he lost at the Conquest was considerable.

Howbeit we have him (*supra*, p. 69) as "Wulfveard" at the Court of William in the summer of 1068, and we have him (*supra*, p. 80 *n.*) attending Queen Edith in her Court at Wilton, in February, 1072. And this perhaps is the index to his survival of the wreck of Saxondom. He had lands by gift of Queen Edith; his wife, another Edith, was enriched by the Queen. His daughter, marrying a certain Alsi, was beneficed by the Queen. And this Alsi (as we learn from an able commentator) was one of Queen Edith's Stewards, and followed his father-in-law as witness of the curial transaction above alluded to, under date of February, 1072.¹

¹ In the Exon Domesday we note that where Ulwardus Wite is said to have held the Manor of Corfeton on the day of King Edward's death, the name *Ulwardus Wite* is underlined for correction or cancellation, and the name *Alti* is written over. There was some confusion here about Alsi, we feel sure. Whether it was that Alsi had held Corfeton under his father-in-law or not, the manor was clearly confiscate in 1086, and King William had it in demesne.

CHAPTER IV.

THE OLD HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

The greater part of that which has been said in our Dorset Volume (chap. iv. pp. 109, 110), as to the Old Hundreds of that County, is true in principle of the Old Hundreds of Somerset; but, in detail, that is *mutatis mutandis*, the latter County presents a wide field of special remark.

With those Domesday Commissioners, who visited the South-Western Counties, it was not a rule to say anything about division by hundreds. Hence the text of Domesday only alludes thrice to the name of any Dorset Hundred. In Somerset the text of Domesday has two such allusions. It names the Hundreds of Taunton and of Williton, in each case by mere accident.

In Somerset, though we have not, as in Dorset, the difficulty of distinguishing whole numbers of manors, all called in Domesday by a common River-name, we have the counter-difficulty of finding the situation of a number of Domesday Manors whose names are never repeated in any later record, and which are at last forgotten even to local tradition. Obviously then, if we can neither determine the identity nor the situation of certain Domesday Manors, we cannot determine their respective Hundreds; neither can we say dogmatically what certain of the Old Hundreds contained. In such cases, then, instead of giving the modern representative of a Domesday Manor, we must either write the word "obsolete" in lieu thereof, or we must confess utter ignorance, or, worse than all, we must make a guess. Such confessions and guesses must needs be more frequent in dealing with Somerset than with Dorset.

And another point of comparison is against Somerset investigation. The Dorset Gheld Inquests of A.D. 1084, pervade the whole hidage of the county. There is not one of them missing. Their own internal evidence proves them to be all extant.

In Somerset, on the contrary, there was one hidated Liberty (Glastonbury Twelve-hides), of which it is extremely improbable that any Inquest was taken at all. Others, such as Old Cleeve, and Kings Brompton, very possibly escaped inquisition by incidental and temporary circumstance. But there is a still outstanding group of Hundreds and Liberties of which Inquests were, some actually, some probably, taken; and these Inquests, if so taken, are lost,

Our proof of this, and our further comments on the subject, should be accompanied by a Table of the Hundreds and Liberties of which the Inquests are preserved. This Table we give elsewhere (Vol. ii, pp. 7 and 8.) The proof we give here, making it the subject of a distinct section.—

INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE SOMERSET GHELD-INQUESTS OF A.D. 1084, IN PROOF THAT CERTAIN INQUESTS WERE TAKEN AT THE TIME MORE THAN ARE PRESERVED IN THE EXISTING RECORD.

Among the Postscriptâ of the Somerset Gheld-Inquest (Exon Domesday, p. 489), the following memorandum occurs.—

“De Sumersetà habet Rex de Gildo suo D.” (500) “libras et ix libras in Thesauro suo Wintoniæ; et illi qui portaverunt has Wintoniam habuerunt xl solidos de conregio suo; et inter Saginarios conducendos et Scriptorem, et forellos emeudos, et ceram, dederunt ix solidos et viii denarios; et de L(50) et i solidis et iii denariis quos receperunt Portatores Geldi non habuit Rex denarium, et non potuerunt comptotum reddere. Hos (denarios) valiauerunt sese reddituros Legatis Regis.”¹

The account here purported may be thus paraphrased :—

Of the Gheld of Somerset, there had been safely lodged in the King's Treasury, at Winchester, the sum of	£509 0 0
Previous to such lodgment, and out of the collected monies, there had been allowed to the <i>Portatores</i> , as their corrody, the sum of	2 0 0
The <i>Portatores</i> had further paid out of the collected monies, for expenses of conveyance and clerical appliances, a sum of	0 9 8
And they gave security for repaying a further sum of which, though they had received it, they could give no account	2 11 3

The gross sum, then, which had been collected in Somerset was £514 0 11

Now, the preserved Inquests (thirty-eight in number) account only for a collection of £487 2s. 11½d.; but, apparently at the last moment of collection, Malger de Cartrai, a tenant of Robert Comte of Moretain, had lodged £2 16s. 3d. with the County Receivers, that being the amount which, in several Hundreds, had been collectively charged against his name as arrears. The full sum, then, which the preserved Inquests and this Postscript show to have been collected was (£487 2s 11½. + £2 16s. 3d.=) £489 19s. 2½d.

There remains, then, a sum of (£514 0s. 11d. - £489 19s. 2½d.=) £24 1s. 8½d., which was reported of at Winchester as part of the Gheld of Somerset, and which the Inquests, as preserved, fail to account for. And this sum of £24 1s. 8½d. represents a hidage of 80 hides, 1 virgate, ⅔ fertines, which had stood, on some or other Inquests of Somerset Hundreds, as so much hidage which had actually paid its Gheld.

Here, then, we have a primary indication, nay, a positive proof, from the internal evidence of what remains of the *Inquisicio Gheldi* of Somerset, that a part thereof has been lost.

Further observations, still on the letter of the remaining Record, will serve to better this proof of deficiency, and also to enlarge its scope.—

A Table (to be given in Vol ii., p. 7) will show that the collective hidage announced in the forty preserved

¹ LEGATI REGIS.—King's Officers, generally or specially charged with Royal Commissions. In this case the *Legati* would be those persons, whether resident or itinerant, who had it in charge to receive the arrears of the Somerset Gheld-Levy.

Justices itinerant are somewhere spoken of as *Legati Regis*, but it is not probable that at this period (1084) any such Commission was about to visit Somerset.

Hugolinus, the King's Interpreter, resident, it seems, at Bath, is also called *Hugolinus Legotus*. If one of his functions were diplomatic, another may have been fiscal.

The Domesday Commissioners, who, within two years of this Gheld-Levy, visited Somerset, were, when in Eyre, styled *Legati Regis*. We do not insinuate that their future legation was settled or even meditated so early as Easter, 1084, nor is it likely that, when they did set out, they had any instructions to receive taxes. We merely wish to point out that the term *Legatus Regis* implies little else than 'Commissioner Royal.'

Gheld-Inquests of Somerset Hundreds, was 2666½ hides. Now, the sum of £489 19s. 2½d., also recorded, in the various sections of the extant Inquisition, to have been actually received in Somerset, was the Gheld proper to only 1,633 hides of solvent territory. But, besides this, the same receipts are found to have co-ordinated with a further area of 1,033 hides of exempt and insolvent territories. A simple equation will at once show how this was the case. Two thousand six hundred and sixty-six hides of territory, whether solvent, insolvent, or exempt, less sixteen hundred and thirty-three hides of solvent territory, leave ten hundred and thirty three hides of insolvent and exempt territory. Here then is good proof of the fact that the area contemplated by the extant Inquests was much greater than the area which actually paid gheld.

Or the whole question may be better investigated by a simple arithmetical problem:—If £490, collected gheld, resulted from 2,666 hides of territory, whether solvent, insolvent, or exempt, what hidage will it have taken to supply the £514 of revenue, accounted for, by those who carried the money to Winchester, as the Gheld of Somerset?

(As £490 : 2666 hides :: £514 : 2796½ hides, or thereabouts).

In other words (2,796½ hides – 2,666 =) 130½ hides, were absent from the Inquests which are preserved and were assessed or exempted in Inquests which are lost.

Now, turning to Domesday, we find that the Somerset hidations given in that Record will supply not only this territory which is missing from the Gheld-Roll, but a further territory about which we can say nothing determinate in connexion with the Gheld-Roll.

The Domesday Hidage of Hundreds and Liberties, which were certainly not assessed in the extant Gheld-Roll, proves (as we shall show in a future Table, Vol. ii., p. 7) to have been (2,938 3 2½—2,709 1 3¼ =) 229⅞ hides. There is also a Domesday Hidage for certain manors which, not having been identified nor incorporated in any of our conceptions of Hundreds, should go to this account of Domesday excess. This we will put at 12½ hides (see same Table).

We may say then that (229⅞ hides + 12½ hides =) 241½ hides of Domesday represent 130½ hides of territory which were contemplated in the lost Gheld-Inquests, and some further 111⅞ hides.

We may also presume that this residuary item of 111⅞ hides represents either extraordinary exemptions and insolvencies established for certain estates in the lost Gheld-Inquests; or else a total omission of some hidated Liberties (such as Glastonbury Twelve Hides) from all Gheld-Inquest whatsoever.

We may not dismiss this question of 'lost Inquests' without a further piece of internal evidence illustrative of the subject.

The extant Inquest of Givela (Yeovil) Hundred mentions a Hundred of "Liet" in terms which indicate not only that there was such a distinct Hundred, but that it was among those which were assessed by a distinct Inquest in A.D. 1084.

But no such Inquest as that of Liet Hundred is to be found among the extant Inquests. Its Inquest was taken and is lost. That is all that pertains to this phase of our subject.

WE SHOULD NEXT DEVOTE OUR ATTENTION to eight Hundreds or Liberties which were in distinct existence at the time of the Gheld-Inquest (A.D. 1084), but which were among those whereof no Inquisitional assessment is extant.

The names of these eight Hundreds or Liberties are given in Table (Vol. ii., p. 9). The names are taken from two lists of Somerset Hundreds contemporary with the Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084, and apparently written by the same scribes. It should be noted that all these eight Hundreds or Liberties were at the said date *in manu Regis*, and evidently by reason of their respective *capita* being in that condition. It is possible, as before hinted, that some of these Franchises escaped Inquest in A.D. 1084, by virtue of a special mandate of the King. It is probable that most of them, like Liet Hundred, were subjected to Inquest, and that such Inquest is lost. It would have been strangely abnormal that Somerton Hundred, for instance, should have escaped Inquest; for be it remembered that Somerton itself, though Caput of Somerton Hundred, was a manor of Ancient-Crown-Demesne, and so was not at the time interned in its Hundred. In other words the King was Lord of the Hundred, jurisdictionally, because such a seignury attached to his tenure of Somerton Manor. Somerton Manor was of course ingeldable, and could not be visited or assessed by any Gheld-Inquest whatever. This, if we may take the analogy of eleven other Royal Demesne Manors, with Hundreds annexed, worked no reason why the King should except Somerton

Hundred from Gheld or Inquest. That an Inquest was taken and is lost, is only less clear than in the case of Liet Hundred.

ANOTHER SECTION OF OUR SUBJECT we devote to the consideration of eighteen names of manors or liberties which have distinctive mention in one or both of the two old Indices aforesaid. These are enumerated in a Table (Vol. ii., p. 10), and some notice of each is given in parallel columns. In one or two cases further remark than could be imported into a Table seems necessary.—

AXBRIDGE, though a Burgh at the date of Domesday, is treated in that Record as a mere appendage of Cheddar, a Manor of the *Vetus Dominicium Coronæ*. This mention of Axbridge in a Præ-Domesday Index of Liberties, constitutes, in our mind, a piece of history. The Burgh, being already ingeldable as a member of Cheddar, had probably been invested by the King, Edward or William, with some further franchise or distinction. A similar impression would result from the fact that Axbridge before Domesday, perhaps before the Conquest, was the seat of a special jurisdiction, whereof the *Tercius Denarius* was due to the Comes, or Lord of the County.

ASCLEIA.—There is some doubt as to where or how this Præ-Domesday Hundred or Franchise existed. Conjecturally we state that—

Ashill, called Aiselle in Domesday, was an estate of seven hides, five of which, having been held *T. R. E.* by two Thanés, had owed a certain custom to the Royal Manor of Churi (now Curry Rivell), other two of which had been the Abbot of Athelney's. All seven hides had been taken from their Præ-Conquestual owners and given to the Comte of Moretain. The Comte, in turn, had enfeoffed Malger de Cartrai in the five first-mentioned hides, but Domesday says not a word about any like bestowal of the Athelney estate. The conclusion then is, that at the date of Domesday the Comte held the latter in demesne. If so, the previous Inquest of A.D. 1084 all but proves that these two hides of Ashill were not then deemed to be in Abdick Hundred, for the Comte's exempted Demesnes comprehended no such estate. The conjecture arises that these two hides of Ashill were Extra-Hundredal and a distinct franchise, a relic, perhaps, of some ancient immunity of the Abbot of Athelney. Furthermore, Domesday assigns to Ashill a most abnormal extent of woodland, viz., 40 quarentines by 20 quarentines, or 8,000 acres; and probably there is an inaccuracy in the Record where it annexes this forest area to Malger de Cartrai's estate, rather than to the Comte's seigneury.

Another conjecture about the Præ-Domesday Hundred or Franchise of *Ascleia* connects it with an estate called *Achileium*, in the Gheld-Inquest, *Acheleia* in the Exon Domesday, and *Achelai* in the Exchequer Domesday. This estate is now known only as "Hurst." Before the Conquest it was in Givela (Yeovil) Hundred, and held by Alwi Banneson, to whom, as in a plurality of instances, succeeded Alured of Spain. The latter was dispossessed by the King's officers, and the estate was added to Martock, a manor which came into the King's hands in the end of the year 1074, as part of the lapsed estates of the deceased Queen Edith. Ten years later, and the assessors of Givela Hundred reported the two hides of *Achileium* as paying no gheld.

These shifty predicaments may perhaps have given the estate some form or appearance of being a distinct Franchise. It is possibly the *Ascleia* of the Old Index.

A Domesday estate of Roger de Corcelle, spelt *Ascwei*, is now represented by Ashway, in the parish of Hawkrige. The similarity between *Ascleia* and *Ascwei* makes the case worth mentioning; but the Domesday status of *Ascwei* presents no feature of probable independence.

COURI.—The Hundred of *Couri*, mentioned in each Old Index, will, perhaps have been whatever of a Hundred was appurtenant to the Royal Manor of *Churi* (now Curry Rivell),—such Hundred not including the Royal Manor itself, which was, in fact, Extra-Hundredal. The said manor (as is shown in a Table, Vol. ii. p. 1) also included the places now known as Stocklinch Ottersey, Stocklinch Magdalen, and Hambridge.

As regards hidated territory, a Hundred of *Couri* will have been, so far as we know, merely nominal, or confined to half a hide of Church-land. But, possibly, such a Hundred may have originally contained a considerable tract of hidated territory. If so, such supposed Hundred had been abolished before Domesday and its contents, like the above half hide of Church land, had been annexed to Abdick Hundred.

As an alternative theory, perhaps this antiquated Hundred of *Couri* was nothing but the double manor

since known as Curry Malet. Its distinction, as the caput of De Corcelle's Barony, may have been a relic of some older pre-eminence. The question is immaterial. De Corcelle's Double Manor had also been annexed to Abdick Hundred before Domesday.

CUMBE.—The manor thus suggested by one of the Old Indices to have sometime had a distinct Hundredal status was probably the manor, called in Domesday *Cuma* or *Cume*, afterwards Combe Hawey, and now (corruptly) Combe Hay. It was an estate geldable as only two hides; but that was by manifest privilege. Till 1074 it had been Queen Edith's. Domesday presents it as being held in 1085-6 by Agelric, an Anglo-Thane. The King had apparently given it to Agelric since the Inquest of 1084; for the said Inquest, under Frome Hundred, records no exemption in favour of Agelric.—

The corollary of this argument is obvious, viz., that the King, in 1084, was holding Combe as his escheat. But neither on this account does the Inquest of Frome Hundred record any exemption for Combe, or for any other estate then 'in Manu Regis.'—

Our theory thus becomes still more probable, for that theory is, that Combe was then an independent Liberty. We looked for it under Frome Hundred, merely because, had it been in any Præ-Domesday Hundred, it must have been in that section of Old Frome Hundred which is now represented by Wellow Hundred (see Table of Old Frome Hundred in Vol. ii.).

It seems much more reasonable thus to identify the "Cumbe" of the Old Index than with the Bishop of Bayeux's Domesday Manor of Come (now in Temple-Combe), or with Bishop Giso's purchased Manor of *Cumba* (now Combe St. Nicholas). However, the Bayeux Manor had once been a Comital Manor, and enjoyed by Earl Leofwine, son of Earl Godwin.

DONHEHTVA (now Downhead). Though in our Table of the Præ-Domesday Hundred of Frome we annex Combe thereto, and though in our Table of the Præ-Domesday Hundred of Whitstone we annex Downhead thereto, there is nothing in the Inquests of 1084 to show that either Combe or Downhead was not then an independent Liberty. The Old Index, in each case, converts this negative testimony into something more positive, viz., that they were independent Franchises. At, or about the time of Domesday, Downhead was probably annexed to Whitstone Hundred, wherein it still remains.

JATTON (Yatton) was one of the *acquisita* of Giso, Bishop of Wells, made after the Conquest. For a time, perhaps, it was allowed an independent status. The Inquest of 1084 manifestly contemplated the manor as being in Chewton Hundred, and did not include it in the composite Hundred, whose Inquest is entitled "Terra Episcopi Gisonis."

There is something equally abnormal in the subsequent annexation of Yatton to the Hundred of Winterstoke.

¶ Other Episcopal and scattered manors, such as Kingsbury East, Bishops Lydeard, Wellington, and Wyvelescombe, are found in one of the Old Indices, each as a sometime independent Hundred or Liberty. As none of the four was recognised as such in the Inquests of A.D. 1084, and have never become so since, we have here collateral proof that, though the Indices were drawn up coevally with the Inquests, they embodied or referred to many facts and conditions which belonged to an æra then passing or passed away.

THE HUNDREDS ASSESSED BY THE EXTANT GHELD INQUEST OF A.D. 1084.

We now proceed to treat in detail those forty-one nominal Hundreds or Liberties of Somerset which, singly or combined, formed the subject of thirty-eight extant Inquests of A.D. 1084.

The Inquests themselves will in each case be given in substance, and on a plan which will admit of suggestions for the restoration or correction of a defaced or a corrupt text. Notes illustrative or explanatory will accompany each Inquest.

Tables of correlative Hundreds, intended to be studied in parallelism with each Inquest, will be found in Volume ii.

Such further Notes as seem proper to the Table independently of the Inquest will in each case follow after the Inquest-Notes in this volume. Thus the Tables of Volume ii, may still be kept in parallel view with the Notes of all kinds which are printed in this volume,

In Volume ii., pp. 7 and 9, will be found duplicate lists of forty-one nominal Hundreds or Liberties, above alluded to.

A further list is appended to the Table (Vol. ii., p. 7), containing the names of thirteen other Hundreds, Franchises, and Liberties of Præ-Domesday Somerset, none of which were touched by the Extant Inquests of 1084, all of which were probably independent, some of which were ingeldable, some otherwise exceptional. The object of this supplementary Table being here alluded to, is more because it gives a synoptical view of all Somerset Franchises whatsoever, existent in the eleventh century, than that we should now enter on matters which, in the sequel, must be subjected to distinct examination.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE TABLES OF HUNDREDS (VOL. II., pp. 11, 12, et seqq.).

In framing detailed Tables of the Old Hundreds of Somerset, we uniformly devote two columns to the Domesday Manors and to the Domesday hidages of such manors; two other columns to such modern parishes and acreages of parishes as we find to be most nearly parallel with the aforesaid manors and hidages.

Taking whole Hundreds together, this method gives a fair average comparison between the old and the new, between the secular and the ecclesiastical, divisions and measurements.

Were we to attempt a more minute and individual comparison, our labour would be vain, if not endless.

Some parishes comprehend manors which were in more than one Domesday Hundred or Franchise. In such cases our Tables assign the whole acreage of the existing parish to such Hundred or Franchise as may happen to have contained most of its manorial constituents.

Thus, for instance (Vol. ii., p. 1), we have measured the whole parish of St. Decuman into the King's non-hidated Manor of Williton, but in our Table of Williton Hundred we assign no modern acreage whatever to such Manors of St. Decuman's Parish as we all the while know to have been in the hidated Hundred.

Our eventual object (as may be seen in the said and other Tables of Vol. ii.) is to get the whole modern acreage of Somerset into contrast with the whole ancient hidage and quasi-hidage. To effect that, we must be careful to adopt a plan which will not lead to our measuring sundry parochial areas twice over.

The asterisk prefixed, in the first column of any Table, to the Domesday name of any manor indicates that the Hundred of such Manor is fixed, and its identification more or less facilitated, by some previous entry in the Gheld-Inquest of 1084.

In the same column, where an alternative reading of any manor-name is given, it is usually supplied from the Exchequer Domesday.

¶ Where any Hundred is partly composed of ingeldable plough-lands, they are not, in one sense, part of the Hundred. However, they are reckoned in the Tables of Hundreds, and a distinct column preceding the column of Hidages, is bestowed on their numbers. These distinct Columns we take leave occasionally to call columns of *Carucages*, that term being distinct from *Carucatage*, as elsewhere explained.

In Somerset (see Vol. ii., p. 17) there were only twelve genuine *Carucates*, but there were 525 *Carucages*; 103 of which were associated with Hundredal Hidages, while 417 formed the arable portions of the *Vetus Dominicæ Coronæ*.

94 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY. THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

THE INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR ABDICK HUNDRED, (INQUIS. GHELDI, p. 73.)

In Hundreto Abedicchæ sunt vi. xx. hidæ et x. et. viii. (read vii.) (*i.e.*, 137 hides).

Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo xviii. lib. et v. sol. i. obolum et (1) fertinum (£18 5s. 0¾d.)	hid. v. f.
pro lx. hidas et iij. virg. et fertino et dimidio	60 3 1½
Et Barones sui habent in suo dominio xxxij hidas et iij virg. et iii fert. (but read, <i>ex contextu</i> , xxxij hidas et iij fert. <u>33 hid. 0 virg., 3 fert.</u>)	

	H.	V.	F.
De his habet Comes de Moritonio, vii hidas	7	0	0
Et Abbas de Adelingeres, iij hidas.....	4	0	0
Et Abbas de Muceleneia, xiii hid. et dim et dim. virg.....	13	2	2
Et Roger de Corcella, dim. hid.	2	0	0
Et Sauardus, ii hidas, et dim. et dim. virg.	2	2	2
Et Roger Arundel, v hidas et i virg. et iij fert.	5	1	3
	33	0	3
	33	0	3
Et non habet Rex gildum de x hidis quas tenet Osmundus nepos Episcopi Gisonis..	10	0	0
Nec de iii hidis quas tenet Willelmus de Lestria	3	0	0
Nec de iii hidis quas tenet Roger ("Malger" over, <i>recte</i>) de Cartraio	3	0	0
Nec de dim. hidâ quam tenent Villani Comitis Moritonie	2	0	0
Nec de dim. hidâ quam tenet Godewinus de Cicemetona	2	0	0
Nec de dim. hidâ quam tenent Villani Rogeri Arundel	2	0	0
Nec de hidâ et dim. et dim. virgâ quas tenent Presbyter et Villani de Ileministre...	1	2	2
Nec de i fertino et dimidio de quibus Fegadri non poterant reddere nobis rationem			1½
	19	0	3½
	19	0	3½

De hoc Hundreto restant adhuc ad persolvendum de Gildo Regis c. sol. et xv. et iii. den. et 1 obol. et 1 fertino (£5 15s. 3¾d., which, at 6s. per hide, is the exact Gheld-rate on 19 hides 3½ fertins).

De hoc Hundreto redderunt Gildum xx hidæ in Hundreto Gisonis Episcopi.....	20. 0 0
Et de iii hidis et iii virgis reddidit Abbas Micelinensis Gildum in alio Hundreto.....	3 3 0
	137 0 0
	137 0 0

NOTES ON THE INQUISICIO GHELDI FOR ABDICK HUNDRED.

THE COMTE OF MORETAIN'S demesne of 7 hides was in Estapla (Staple Fitz-Pain) (Exon D., 250).

THE ABBOT OF ATHELNEY'S demesne of 4 hides was in Atiltona (now Ilton or Hilton) (Exon D., 175).

THE ABBOT OF MUCHELNEY'S demesnes, of 13 h. 2v. 2f. stood in his several manors of Ilminster, Isle-Abbotts, and Cathanger. Domesday estimates the said demesnes collectively at 13 hides, 2 virgates, 1 fertin.

ROGER DE CORCELLE'S demesne of half a hide was perhaps in Curi (now Curry Mallett). If so, it had increased to two hides before Domesday.

SAWARD, called elsewhere "Accipitrarius and Hundrannus," was a Saxon Thane. At the date of Domesday, though he retained two estates in the neighbouring Hundred of South Petherton, he had lost this in Abdick Hundred. Probably it was from 3 to 4 hides, and was given between 1084 and 1086 to the Comte of Moretain or to Roger de Corcelle. Consistently with the last supposition, Roger de Corcelle appears with estates and demesnes in Abdick Hundred at the date of Domesday, some, at least, of which he had not enjoyed in 1084.

ROGER ARUNDEL'S demesne was in Whitelackington, a manor of 10 hides. Domesday reduces the said demesne to 5¼ hides, or to three fertines less than the Inquest.

WILLIAM DE L'ESTRE'S default was in respect of some part of an estate of 5 hides, which Domesday shows him to have held under the Comte of Mortain in Bichehalda (now Bickenhall).

MALGER DE CARTRAI held several estates in Abdick Hundred under the same Comte, viz., at Ashill, Hilton, and Broadway. Domesday gives him in Ashill alone 3 hides, 3½ virgates of demesne; so that his default will have been only partial.

GODWIN was a Saxon Thane. His default was in respect of half the estate of 1 hide, which half he held in demesne under Harding Fitz Elnod (another Thane), in Bochelanda (Buckland St. Mary). The Inquest styles him "Godwin de Cicemetona," because, in Devon, he held in capite the Manor of *Cicemetona*, where were 30 plough-lands (Exon Domesday, 448).

ROGER ARUNDEL's defaulting Villeins were they who occupied some 2 virgates of the 4 hides, 2 virgates, 1 firtin, which, in 1084, constituted his Villeinage at White-Lackington.

"OSMUND, NEPHEW OF BISHOP GISO," was his uncle's tenant at Wynesham, an estate of 10 hides which the Bishop had acquired since the Conquest, and which had not as yet been formally and conclusively severed from its old Hundred of Abdick. However, the Fegadri who assessed contemporarily the "Bishops Hundred," included both Wynesham and Combe St. Nicholas (another Episcopal purchase in Abdick Hundred) in their assessment. Any entry, therefore, relating to either estate as being in Abdick Hundred is in the nature of a duplicate entry. In other words, the Abdick Hundred of 1084-6 did not really contain 137 hides. It contained only 107 hides.

THE COMTE OF MORETAIN's defaulting Villeins were occupants of a sixth part of the 3 hides which constituted the *Villanagium* of his Demesne-Manor of Estapla (now Staple Fitz Pain).

DOMESDAY tells us of a Priest and a Layman who together occupied 1½ hides, and of Villeins who occupied 10 hides 2½ virgates in the Abbot of Muchelney's Manor of Ilminster. The non-solvency of 1084 was in regard of the whole of the former tenement and of a half-virgate of the latter tenement. The question had probably been rather one of liability than of competency to pay.

THE DETAILS OF THE COLLECTOR'S ACCOUNTS left 1½ fertines of the alleged contents of Abdick Hundred unassessed. Usually the collectors were held responsible for such deficits. In this case their liability would be only 6½d. The expression "De quibus Fegadri non poterant reddere nobis rationem" demands some remark. It is probable that there was some local commission to which (nobis) the various bodies of collectors had to exhibit their accounts and tender their cash-receipts. The Scrutineers (possibly the Sheriff and his officers, possibly the Curia Comitatus), annotated the accounts, took charge of the money; and, in due course, when all the Hundredal Schedules of the County had been thus audited, the Scrutineers forwarded both documents and cash to the King's Treasury at Winchester. The conveyancers (Portatores) of the County-Gheld, were neither the Fegadri nor the Scrutineers. They were a corps which charged the funds in question with their travelling expenses and their customary fees, and had to render their own summary account to the Lords of the Treasury at Winchester. (*Vide supra*, p. 89.)

¶ "De hoc Hundreto reddiderunt Gildum xx hidæ in Hundreto Gisonis Episcopi."—

This was literally true, as our analysis of the "Bishops Hundred" will more clearly show. The 20 hides in question constituted the Manor of Combe St. Nicholas. It has never been re-united to Abdick Hundred. On the dissolution of the Bishops Hundred into three sections (viz., Wells Forum, Kingsbury East, and Kingsbury West), Kingsbury East became the caput of the new Hundred, which bears that name; and Combe St. Nicholas fell to the said New Hundred of Kingsbury East.

"THE ABBOT OF MUCHELNEY accounted for 3¾ hides of Abdick Hundred in another Hundred." So much was stated to clear the Abdick collectors of responsibility in the matter. But the sentence has for us a far wider meaning. That "other Hundred" spoken of by the Abdick collectors appears nowhere in the extant Gheld-Inquests of Somerset. In other words, some portion of the Gheld-Inquest has been lost. With this clue we are enabled to determine the precise Hundred or Hundreds whose Inquest is non-extant. Among the extant Inquests there are none which touch on the territory which is comprised in the two modern Hundreds of Pitney and Somerton. A Hundred of Somerton (though not surveyed in the extant Inquests) is spoken of in indices coeval with the Inquest (see Vol ii., p. 9), as a Somerset Hundred, but the Hundred of Pitney (adjoining to Somerton) is not so spoken of. The hypothesis (we have already stated it)—the hypothesis is that the Præ-Domesday Hundred, called Somerton, involved the Hundred now called Pitney.

And now about the Abbot of Muchelney's Gheld accounts in 1084. His total estate in Abdick Hundred consisted of 28 hides in the several Manors of Ilminster, Isle Abbotts, and Cathanger. In respect of his

demesnes, estimated in the Inquest at 13 hides, 2 virgates, 2 fertines, he was exempt from Gheld. For the Gheld on 3 hides and 3 virgates which were in Abdick Hundred, he found it convenient to settle "in another Hundred," [we suggest in Pitney (or rather Somerton) Hundred, where he will have had another Gheld-account in respect of his Manor of Drayton.] For the residue, viz., for 10 hides, 2 virgates, 2 fertines, he or his tenants, accounted, or ought to have accounted, to the Fegadri of Abdick Hundred. For 9 hides of the said residue it is evident that Gheld was duly paid; but, as we have already seen, the Fegadri surcharged the "Priest and Villeins of Ilminster" for nonpayment (of the balance alleged to be due) on 1 hide, 2 virgates, and 2 fertines.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II. pp. 11-12) OF ABDICK HUNDRED.

CHORI (now Curry Rivell), was an ingeldable and non-hidated Manor of ancient demesne. Its Church-land however was hidated, and was therefore intra-hundredal. The Priest, holding it, is ranked in Domesday among the King's *Almonees*.

ABLATA DE CHORI.—A part of Curry that had been wont to pay 10s. 8d. in the King's Ferm of Curry. The Comte of Moretain, obtaining it, the said custom was withdrawn. The Comte annexed the laud to his Tenant Britell's Manor of Swell.

ESTAPLA (now Staple Fitz Paine). The Comte's Manor, as measured in Domesday, was about 1400 acres. The present and corresponding Parishes of Staple Fitz Pain and Curland are more than double in extent. At Domesday, then, half the parish was in the King's adjacent Forest of Neroch.

"Unus ortus adjaacet huic mansioni (Estaple) in Lanporda qui reddit per annum 50 anguillas." A garden (on the Parrot), at Langport, was an appurtenance of the Comte's Manor of Staple. It paid a rent of 50 eels. Langport itself was some 12 miles away. It was then an appurtenance of the Royal Manor of Somerton.

ILMINSTER. The old valuation given, viz., £26 per annum, is not that at the time of seisin, but that at the time of the late Abbot of Muchelney's decease (*quando Abbas obiit*). Abbot Liward seems to have died between 1084 and 1086. The Abbey at the latter date was *in manu Regis*. Its estate of Ilminster had fallen £6 in annual value.

IIA. Both portions of Isle-Abbotts, that is Godric's and Edwin's, had been held by those Thanes in 1066. They were post-Conquestual acquisitions of Muchelney Abbey.

CATHANGRE. This also was a post-Conquestual acquisition of Muchelney Abbey, held in 1066 by the same two Thanes, and by Wadell. Domesday expresses the monks' demesne curiously, viz., as "half a hide less 15 acres." Gheld acres are meant. The simpler expression of the whole would have been 3 fertins, or else '9 acres.' Collinson (940), says that part of Cathanger lay in the Hundred of Williton and Free-Manors. The nearest point of that Hundred is 14 miles away. Such abnormalisms do sometimes occur, but we venture to think that, if such a severance ever befel Cathanger, it was after Domesday.

BICHEHALDA (Bickenhall). On the forfeiture of the Comtes of Moretain, William de L'Estra's descendants held *per Baroniam*, of the Honour of Moretain and ultimately of the Crown. Bickenhall was the caput of their Barony.

The customs due before the Conquest from Bickenhall to King Edward's Manor of Chori (now Curry Rivell) are thus detailed in Domesday:—"Hæc mansio (Bichehalda) reddebat per consuetudinem tempore Regis Edwardi in Chori, mansione Regis v. oves cum agnis; et unusquisque liber homo unam blomam ferri. Sed postquam Willelmus (de Lestra) terram accepit de Comite (Moritonie) non fuit reddita hæc consuetudo." (*Vide supra*, p. 48.)

AISSELLA. The custom due from Ashill to Chori Regis was a payment of 2s. 6d. per annum; since Malger de Cartrai's fcoffment by the Comte of Moretain it had been discontinued. Of the Manor taken by the Comte from the Abbot of Athelney, Domesday gives no particulars, save the extent, viz., 2 hides. (For other remarks on Ashill, see pp. 35, 91 *supra*.)

BOCHELANDA. Peter Bishop of Chester, usually said to have been consecrated in 1067, was not consecrated before 1070. Probably it was while yet a Royal Chaplain that King William bestowed on him certain churches and estates in Somerset and Dorset, among the rest 1½ hides in Buckland St. Mary. The Bishop retained, as tenants, the two Saxon Thanes who had held Buckland before the Conquest. They paid him a fee-farm rent of 10s., though the estate was worth just double. The Bishop, whose death and

burial are ordinarily dated in 1085, was deceased before Easter, 1084. (See Key to Domesday ;—Dorset, p. 122 *n.*), when the Gheld-Inquest was completed. His two Thane-Tenants seem in that year to have paid their quota of Gheld, for, had they not, their default would have been recorded. However, from that date till Domesday, their fee-farm rent, now accruing to the Crown, had not been paid.

HACHIA (now Hatch Beauchamp).—It was the hide held *T. R. E.* that owed a ewe and lamb to the King's Manor of Chori (now Curry Rivell). It had been withdrawn since Robert the Constable's seizin.

Robert, here called Constable, was probably Constable of Montacute Castle. He is elsewhere called Robert Fitz Ivo. He was ancestor of the Barons Beauchamp of Hatch. There are some cross-statements about the hidage of Hatch. One passage of the Exon Domesday would make it 5½ hides, another 6 hides, another 5 hides (as in the Table). The Exchequer Domesday confirms the last reading.

DONYATT, a triple Manor.—Its custom to Cheri Regis, now disused, was 5 ewes with their lambs. The park mentioned as an appurtenance, was a solecism in the Somerset Survey.

CRICKET MALHERBE.—So called as being held by the family of De Malherbe under the Barons Montacute, the lineal heirs of Drogo, the Domesday Tenant. (See Hearne's *Liber Niger*, i., 94).

BRADON.—The present parish is called South Bradon. It contains a hamlet called North Bradon, and an adjoining parish, formerly known as Goviz Bradon, has now neither church, house, nor inhabitant. There is no evidence whereby we may determine how the four Domesday Manors are severally represented by the three later appellations, but we suspect that the site of Goviz-Bradon corresponded with Harding Fitz Ælnoth's Manor. The present parish of South and North Bradon contains only 390 acres, and of course does not adequately represent the area of the four Domesday Manors. These four manors, we observe, made a complement of 5 hides, and four of the said hides were held in 1086 by Feoffees of the Comte of Moretain. It is further remarkable that each of the said four hides had been charged, in King Edward's time, with a customary render of a ewe and lamb to Chori Regis (now Curry Rivell). No such render had been made since the seizin of Drogo de Montacute and Malger de Cartraí.

BROADWAY.—The present parochial acreage represents the Domesday Manor, of about 140 acres. The remaining 1932 acres represent a part (perhaps 200 acres) of the tithing of Capland. The rest (say 1732 acres) of the present parish will have been in the King's Forest of Neroche.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR BULSTONE HUNDRED (INQUIS.-GHELDI, fragment p. 489).

	H.	V.	F.
In Hundreto Bolestanæ sunt x et viii hidæ et dim. virgæ (18 hides, 2 fertines).			
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £4 2s. 6d. pro xiii hid. iii. virg.	13	3	0
Et Barones Regis habent in suo dominicatu ii hidas et dim. virgæ.			
De his habet Girardus i hidam	1	0	0
Et Harding filius Alnodi i hidam et dim. virgam.....	1	0	2
	2	0	2
Non habet Rex gildnm de i hida quam tenet Ansgar Brito	1	0	0
Nec de dimidiâ hidâ quam tenet Britellus de Sancto Claro	0	2	0
Nec de dimidiâ virg. quam tenet Ogissius.....	0	0	2
Nec de dim. hidâ de quâ Fegadri receperunt denarios per consuetudinein quam clamant	0	2	0
	2	0	2
		18	0
And the Inquest leaves 2 fertines of land, and 9d. in money unaccounted of in the } details though comprehended in the heading.....		0	0
		18	0

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF BOLESTAN HUNDRED.

GIRARDUS was a King's Serjeant. His exempt hide was the whole of his estate at Ernesel (now Earnshill, in Hambridge).

HARDING FITZ ALNOD was the Saxon Thane of whom we have already spoken (*supra*, pp. 58 *n.* and 69).

His estate in Bolestan Hundred was 1 hide at Capland (in Broadway and Beer Crocombe parishes). To this had been added a half-hide which had originally been an outlying dependency of the King's Manor of Curi (now Curry Rivell). Harding's exemption in 1084 was for so much ($1\frac{1}{2}$ hides) of the collective estate ($1\frac{2}{3}$ hides) as he held in demesne. Hence we evolve two canons.—

1. Any severance from a Royal Manor, though such Royal Manor were ancient demesne, and non-lidated and ingeldable, became, upon severance, part of the adjoining Hundred. An hidation was also set thereon. According to such hidation it became geldable, though, contingently, the whole or a part thereof might be *pro undâ vice* non-geldant.
2. If the occupant of an *additamentum* held any part thereof in demesne, he being also a tenant *in capite*, he was entitled *pro tanto* to exemption from Gheld.

ANSGER BRITO'S insolvent hide was one of the six hides which he held at Isla (now Isle Brewers) of the Comte of Moretain.

BRITELL DE S.T CLARE'S insolvent half-hide was so much of the 3 hides which he held at Sewella (now Swell) of the same Comte.

THE INSOLVENT HALF-VIRGATE OF OGISSIUS was so much of 1 hide and half a virgate, which he held under Roger de Corcelle. The whole estate (1 hide and half a virgate) is called in Domesday "Lamore." It was a portion of the Abbot of Mulcheney's great Manor of Drayton. It had been wrested from the Abbey. Another part of Drayton was, like Lamore, in Bolestan Hundred; but the bulk of the Manor was in Pitney Hundred, of which no Inquest is extant.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., pp. 11-12) OF BOLESTAN HUNDRED.

CAPILANDA.—The status of this manor was, and is, full of anomalies. It was in Bolestan rather than in Abdick Hundred, and yet it was surrounded by manors of Abdick Hundred. Parochially it lay in two parishes, Beer Crocombe and Broadway, both of which, as manors, were in Abdick Hundred. It comprised as an appendage an outlying member of Curry Regis, but other members or severances of Curry Regis were in Abdick Hundred. However, one other, now to be mentioned, was in Bolestan Hundred.—

SEWELLA (now Swell).—The three hides of this manor were inclusive of a single virgate which *T. R. E.* had been an appurtenance of the Royal Manor of Curry (now Curry Rivell). The Exon Domesday notes the circumstance as follows:—"De hâc mansione (Sewella) jacebat i virga in Curi, mansione Regis, die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus: et reddebat 10 sol. et 8 den. in firmâ Regis; sed postquam Britellus terram accepit de Moritonensi Comite non fuit hæc consuetudo reddita mansioni Regis."

LA MORA.—"Est de xx hidis de Draituna," that is the Abbot of Muchehney's great Manor of Drayton, though reckoned in Domesday (fo. 174) to be 20 hides of Abbatial property, was less by 1 hid. 0 virg. 2 fert., which had been wrested from him by Roger de Corcelle.

IN DRAITUNNA.—Another portion (supposed to be $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides) of Drayton, seems to have been in Bolestan Hundred, and is to this day in the Hundred of Abdick-cum-Bulstone. The bulk of Drayton was in Pitney Hundred, under which will be found further details of tenure and occupation. To this share of Drayton we conjecturally assign 1,785 acres of Domesday measurement, viz., plough-land, 360 acres; wood, 710 acres; meadow, 9 acres; pasture, 706 acres. The proportionable division of the present parish of Drayton gives only 361 acres in comparison with the said 1,785 acres.

THE MODERN HUNDRED of Abdick and Bulstone includes four vills, which had no distinctive notice in Domesday. These are:—Curland, 749 acres; West Dowlsh, whose acreage is involved in the 1,282 acres of Dowlsh Wake, in South Petherton Hundred; Stocklinch Ottersey, 299 acres; and Stocklinch St. Magdalen, 199 acres. Of these, Curland was involved in the Domesday Manor of Estapla (Staple Fitz Pain). Stocklinch Ottersey and Stocklinch St. Magdalen seem to occupy territory which at the date of Domesday may have been (like Barrington adjoining) among the unvalued and unregistered appurtenances of the Royal Manor of South Petherton. But a stricter analogy would suggest that the two Stocklinches were outlying appendages of the Royal Manor of Curry (now Curry Rivell). We have accordingly placed them on the Table (Vol ii, p. 1) of Ancient Demesnes.

We have done the same with the modern and ecclesiastical parish of Hambridge, merely because its acreage (3,833 acres) is largely supplied from the two Royal Manors of Barrington and Curry Rivell.

However, it should not be forgotten that other parts of the said acreage were supplied from the parishes and manors of Isle Brewers (in Bulstone Hundred), and of Pucklington (in Abdick Hundred).

NOTES ON THE JOINT HUNDREDS OF ABDICK AND BULSTONE.

After taking from these Hundreds the 30 hides, which at the date of Domesday belonged properly to the "Bishop's Hundred," and after adding thereto those parts ($4\frac{2}{3}$ hides) of Drayton, which have ever been in Bulstone Hundred, these joint Hundreds appear with a Domesday complement of $125\frac{1}{3}$ hides. The said $125\frac{1}{3}$ hides of Domesday will appear to have represented not merely the local contents of all the manors which nominally composed the two Hundreds, but a considerable territory which, topographically, was not in the said Hundreds nor yet in any of those Royal and ingeldant manors which were dominant over or adjacent to the Hundreds. Specifically there were attached to the component manors of these Hundreds no less than 43,021 acres of Domesday calculation, while the now existing parishes of the said Hundreds contain only 31,968 acres. The 43,021 acres, thus calculated from Domesday data, consisted of—plough-land, 16,860 acres; of wood-land, 24,225 acres; of meadow-land, 539 acres; and of pasture-land, 1,397 acres. The excess is easily accounted for when we observe that the wood-land appurtenant to the Comte of Moretain's Manor of Ashill was 8,000 acres, while the present parish of Ashill is only 1,799 acres. Again, to the Abbot of Muchelney's Manor of Ilminster were attached 6,480 acres of wood, and 2,400 acres of plough-land, the present parish, being altogether, only 4,050 acres. And to the same Abbot's Manor of Isle Abbots were attached 6,480 acres of wood and 780 acres of arable land, the present parish containing only 1,935 acres. Lastly, the proportions of wood-land and pasture due to so much of the Abbot of Muchelney's estate of Drayton as was in Bulstone Hundred were 710 acres of the former and 706 acres of the latter; while the correlative proportion of the acreage of Drayton parish is only 361 acres. And to add still more to our conceptions of the Domesday contingents of the manors of these Hundreds, we have Drogo de Montacute's unmeasured park annexed to his Manor of Donyatt. We say no more here than that this is an instance where the excess of Domesday measures, attributed to the Manors of this or that Hundred, must be sought in other Hundreds, such as exhibit parallel deficiencies of Domesday measurement.

In this instance we observe that the territory correlative with the hide was about 344 acres of Domesday measurement; but that, compared with the parochial acreages of modern ascertainment, the hide is represented by $255\frac{1}{2}$ acres. And this is only saying what we have often said before, viz., that the original and normal hide was a conception which took small account of such elements as wood-land or pasture-land.

The rents and values of the Hundreds of Abdick and Bolestan at the time of King Edward's death, or at the existing tenant's entry, are not always specified in Domesday. Such as are specified in that Record afford therefore no adequate basis for a full comparison.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR ANDERSFIELD HUNDRED (INQ.-GHELDI, p. 73).

In Hundreto de Andredesfelt sunt viiii hid. et 1 virga (<u>9 hides, 1 virgate</u>)	H. V. F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo 42 solidos pro vii hidis	7 0 0
Et Barones Regis habent in dominio ii hidas et 1 virg.	
Inde habet "Willelmus" (de Moione) " <u>Vicecomes</u> " 1 hid. et 1 virg. (read iii virg.)	1 3 0
Et Ansgar Focarius dimidiam hidam.....	0 2 0
	<u>9 1 0</u>

WILLIAM DE MOIONE'S demesne.—The text of the Inquest gives 1 hide, 1 virgate; but the context implies 1 hide, 3 virgates. And this emendation is verified by Domesday, where it gives 1 hide, 3 virgates as the extent of William de Moione's demesne in Brunfella (Bromfield).

ANSGAR FOCARIUS was a King's Serjeant. His estate in Andersfield Hundred was Durlleigh ($2\frac{3}{4}$ virgates). Domesday instead of quoting his demesne, as the Inquest does, at 2 virgates, allows him but $1\frac{3}{4}$ virgates. Ausgar Focarius was also a tenant of Alured de Hispania in part of the Manor of Goathurst, adjoining to Durlleigh.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II, PP. 11-12) OF ANDERSFIELD HUNDRED.

BROMFIELD seems to have passed from the Fief of De Moione to that of De Montacute. We know of no fact of genealogical descent to account for the transfer.

ENMORE AND LEXWORTHY.—Four estates given by Domesday under the names of "Animera" and "Lechesurda" are now in Enmore parish. They contained collectively 1½ hides. It is probable that Blachesalla (now obsolete as to name) belonged to the category which thus attains the more likely complement of 2 hides.

BLACHESALLA is identified by Collinson in his Domesday Index with Blackshill, a place as to which he is otherwise silent. From the sequence of the Domesday Record we infer Blachesalla to have been certainly in Andersfield Hundred, and from what has been said above, to have been in Enmore parish. If any such name can now be traced in Enmore parish, our conviction that it is "obsolete" is, of course, unsound.

GOATHURST.—In 1165-6 Philip de Columbiere stood in general succession to the Domesday Barony of Alured de Hispania, viz., as heir of De Candos, who was heir of De Hispania. In 1165-6 Hugh, son of Malger de Gaherste, held 1 knight's-fee in the Barony of Philip de Columbiere (Liber Niger, i. 97).

LEGE, *alias* LENGE.—This manor, very summarily described in Domesday, nearly corresponded with the present parish of East Lyng. It contained the now hamlets of West Lyng, and Outwood. But it also contained the famous "Isle of Athelney," and therein the site and precinct of Athelney Abbey. Domesday, instead of styling Lenge the "Caput Abbatie"—instead of saying "Ibi sedet Abbatia Adeliniensis," says only, "non reddidit gildum tempore Regis Edwardi." Moreover, the estate is mentioned last of all in the Abbot of Athelney's Domesday Schedule. Nor does the Exchequer Domesday, which sometimes avoids the misarrangements of the Exon Codex, and which gives to East-Lyng its truer name of Lenge, enlighten us at all as to the dignity of the locality. For all that is declared in either Domesday the manor was no longer exempt from Gheld in 1086; and, indeed, there is the same conclusion from the Inquest of 1084, which records no exemption for the Abbot of Athelney's demesne in Andersfield Hundred.

ANDERSFIELD HUNDRED.—The rents and values of the manors of this Hundred, at periods antecedent to Domesday, amount, so far as they are specified in that Record, to £14 12s 6d. This includes the value of East Lyng at the earlier period. The manors which show any positive increase in value since the Norman seizure belonged to the Fiefs of De Moione, De Corocelle, and Arundel.

The trysting-place of Andersfield Hundred was never at Creech St. Michael, though there was its Caput. It was at Andersfield, a hamlet in the parish of Goathurst.

The existing Hundred differs only from the Præ-Domesday Hundred in that it contains Creech St. Michael. The Domesday complement of manors, supposed to have formed the old Hundred, realizes 9 hides, 1 virgate, 3 fertines. The previous Inquest had stated the area to be 3 fertines less. It is simply a case of Domesday Increment.

We will now combine the Domesday measures of Andersfield Hundred with those of Creech St. Michael, and see how the combination compares with modern ascertainment.

DOMESDAY MEASURES OF CREECH ST. MICHAEL AND ANDERSFIELD HUNDRED COMPARED WITH THE ACREAGES OF MODERN PARISHES.

Domesday Name.	Inquisition- al Hidage.	Domesday Hidage.	Plough- lands.	Arable. Acres.	Wood. Acres.	Meadow. Acres.	Pasture. Acres.	Total Domesday Acreage.	Cognate Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.
Crice	{ not re- corded. }	H. V. F. 10 2 0	8	960	10	8	1440	2418	{ Creech St. Michael }	2304
Eleven estates of Andresfeld Hundred, enumerated on Table, Vol ii, p. 9.	9 1 0	9 1 3	38	4560	438	30	120	5148	{ Bromfield Durligh Enmore Goathurst East Lyng }	9119
		19 3 3	46	5520	448	38	1560	7566		11,423

The difference between the Domesday acreage of the above manors and the modern acreage of the above parishes is 3,857 acres. It is the measure, perhaps, of some forest-rights of the Crown which, though they intruded topographically in this Hundred, were registered by Domesday in connexion with the Forests of

other Hundreds ; more certainly it embraces a quantity of profitless moorland lying in the vicinity of Durleigh and Isle-Athelney, which the Domesday Commissioners rejected from their estimates.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR BETMINISTRA (BEDMINSTER) HUNDRED (SEE INQ.-GHELDI, P. 69).

" In Hundreto Betmiustræ sunt vi hidæ et dimidia " (6 hides, 2 virgates).

	H. V. F.
" Inde habet Rex xxiiij solidos pro iiij hidis de Gildo suo "	4 0 0
" Et Osbertus Giffardus habet inde in dominio suo i hidam "	1 0 0
" Et Turstinus (habet) i hidam quam tenet in elemosinâ de Rege quietam "	1 0 0
" Et pro dimidiâ hidâ, de quâ Fegadri receperunt denarios et vadiaverunt foris ante Barones Regis non habet Rex gildum suum "	} 0 2 0
" De hoc Huudreto debentur Regi de Gildo suo iiii solidi "	<u>6 2 0</u>

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF BEDMINSTER HUNDRED.

OSBERT GIFFARD was exempt from Gheld in respect of one hide, his demesne in the Manor of Knowle, which, being altogether two hides, he held of the King *in capite, per Baroniam*.

TURSTIN was a Tenant-in-Almoign. His estate was at Leigh (now Abbots Leigh). It was only one hide. It was wholly exempt from Gheld in virtue of the King's special order in behalf of his Tenants-in-Almoign, and their acquittance of the impost.

FEGADRI. The collectors had received all the money (denarios) due on $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides, the geldable portion of the Hundred. But they had neglected to pay over to the King's Barons the Gheld, viz., three shillings which was proper to one half-hide. They had acknowledged their default, and given security for its future emendation. Meantime, the said 3 shillings were entered on the Gheld-Roll as a debt to the Crown.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 11-12) OF BETMINISTRA HUNDRED.

BISHOPWORTH.—Three of the four Saxons, who *T. R. E.* occupied this Hundred, were evidently persons of distinction. Collinson usually supposes Algar to have been the Earl of that name. This is against the letter of the Exon Domesday, which makes Algar Lord of Bishopsworth, and other Somerset manors, to have been living at the time of King Edward's death (January, 1066). Algar Earl of Mercia had deceased long previously.

Herlewin, who held (in 1086) Algar's estate in Bishopworth, under the Bishop of Coutances, held also Clapton-in-Gordano in the same succession to Algar and under the same Bishop. The portion of Bishopworth thus held by Herlewin in 1086, was afterwards called Bishopworth-Arthur, being held, like Clapton, by a family named Arthur, perhaps descended from Herlewin.

The portion of Bishopworth held in 1066 by Edric, and in 1086 by Asceline, under the aforesaid Bishop of Coutances, was afterwards called Bishopworth-Lions. Collinson (ii. 284) has ignored one of the Domesday manors altogether, and has told that of Azeline's manor, which was proper to Herlewin's.

KNOWLE and BISHOPWORTH were included parochially in Bedminster, a manor of ancient Crown demesne, and caput of this Hundred. Manorially, they were not as yet interned therein, at the date of Domesday.

BEDMINSTER, the Royal Manor, or rather the parish which contained the said manor, is now represented by 4,161 statute acres. Of these, 1,426 acres have been interned in Bristol City, and so are no longer in Somerset.

LEGA (now Abbots Leigh) is, as a parish, 2,223 acres, and is in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, not in that of Bath and Wells.

The portion of this territory which, at the date of Domesday, was in the Hundred of Bedminster, was very small; the bulk thereof was an element of the King's Manor. Both parts of Leigh devolving eventually on Robert Fitz Hardinge, he gave both to the Augustines of Bristol. Hence the distinctive name of Abbots Leigh. At the Dissolution, Abbots Leigh, which had meanwhile become a Liberty, was annexed, not to its ancient Hundred and Liberty of Bedminster, but to the Hundred of Portbury. The phenomenon was a common one with confiscated church lands,

The result of all these changes is that we cannot say what proportion of the present parish of Bedminster (4,161 acres) originally belonged to the King's Manor, nor what to the Hundred. Similarly we have no means of discerning the like proportions in the case of the parish of Abbots Leigh (2,228 acres). For Tabular purposes, then, and being compelled to assign a parochial antitype to each Domesday estate, we assign the whole acreage of Bedminster parish to the King's Manor, and the whole acreage of Abbots Leigh parish and Bishopsworth parish to Bedminster Hundred.

COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF THE OLD HUNDRED OF BETEMINISTRA.—The Inquisitional Hidage (A.D. 1084) was 6½ hides. In Domesday it seems to have been unaltered. The more positive measures of Domesday amount, for the four manors, to 1,160 acres, viz., for 8 plough-lands, 960 acres; of wood, 97 acres; of meadow, 33 acres; of pasture, 65 acres. This gives 178½ Domesday acres as the equivalent of the Domesday Hide, an unusually low proportion; but in proximity to the City of Bristol the hide would naturally contract in estimated extent, as it would increase in relative value. Accordingly, except in Turstin's impoverished estate, the Domesday value of each hide of Beteministra Hundred is £1 per annum. This is a fair value for any Somerset hide, but it is a high value for a hide of 178½ acres.

For the sake of contrasting whole and definite manorial areas with apparently parallel parochial areas we give a digest of the Domesday measures of Bedminster Hundred and Bedminster (Manor) combined:—

	Hides and Quasi-Hides.	Plough-lands.	Arable land. Acres.	Wood. Acres.	Meadow. Acres.	Pasture. Acres.	Total Acres. (Domesday.)	Parochial Acreages.
Bedminster Hundred	6½ hides.	8	960	97	33	65	1160	{ Abbots Leigh 2228 Bishopsworth 1637
Bedminster Manor	26 quasi-hides.	26	3120	2880	34	0	6034	Bedminster . . . 4161
	32½ Hides, &c.	34	4080	2977	72	65	7194	8026

Here the Domesday measures are seen to come within 332 acres of the measures of modern ascertainment—a phenomenon most satisfactory as shewing, where the causes of disagreement were only partial, how nearly Domesday surveyorship corresponded with our own.

IN HUNDRETO BADÆ SUNT IIII XX HIDÆ ET XV HIDE (95 HIDES).		H.	V.	P.
Inde habet Rex de gildo sno £10 18s. 3d. pro 36 hid. et 1 virg. et dimid.		36	1	2
Et Rex et Barōnes sui habent in suo dominicatu 43 hidas et ½ virgam.				
De his habet Rex 1 hidam in dominio	1	0	0	
Et Abbas Badensis xxix hidas	29	0	0	
Et Abbatissa Sti Edwardi iiii (supply hidas)	3	0	0	
Et Arnulfus de Hesdine iiii (supply hidas) et dimid. virgam.....	4	0	2	
Et Episcopus de Sancto Laudo iiii (hidas)	3	0	0	
Et Willelmus Hosatus 1 hidam et virgam et dimid.	1	1	2	
Et Radulfus de Berceia dimid. hidam.	0	2	0	
Et Alured de Wica 1 hidam et dim. virgam	1	0	2	
	<u>43</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	43 0 2
Et non habet Rex gildum pro 1 hidâ et 1 virgâ quam tenet Robs Greno	1	1	0	
Nec pro 1 hidâ quam tenent Villani Regis de Estona	1	0	0	
Nec pro 1 virgâ quam tenet Sawynnus Præpositus de Arnulfo de Hesdine.....	0	1	0	
Nec pro xiii hidis quas tenet Hugolinus Legatus	13	0	0	
	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	15 2 0
				<u>95 0 0</u>
Nou habuit Rex Gildum de Burgo Badæ quod reddebat geldum pro xx hidis tempore } Regis Edwardi.....				20 0 0

De hoc Hundreto et de Burgo Bade sunt adhuc retro Lib. 10 et 13 solidi de quibus ("debuisset Rex habere" corrected) "non habuit Rex Gildum suum."

(And note that £10 13s. at 6 shillings per hide, is the Gheld corresponding to [15½ hides + 20 hides =] 35½ hides of land).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF BATH HUNDRED.

THE KING'S ESTATE in this Hundred was 2 hides in Estona (Bath Easton), which fell to him on the death of Queen Edith. Half thereof was in demesne, half in villeinage. The former half (viz., 1 hide) was exempt from Gheld; the latter half (also 1 hide) was insolvent *hac vice*.

THE ABBOT OF BATH'S Demesnes in 1084 were probably 8½ hides in Weston, 5 hides in Bathford, 5¾ hides in Monkton Combe, 7 hides in Lyncombe, and 2¾ hides in Charlcombe (together equal to 29 hides). All these quantities except the last are quoted as Abbatial demesnes in Domesday. The last is quoted as the demesne of William Hosatus, now the Abbot's Tenant of Charlcombe. (Compare p. 58 *supra*).

THE ABBESS OF ST. EDWARD (Shaftesbury) appears in Domesday with no possible estate in Bath Hundred. It is an omission of the great Record, a thing not lightly to be suspected, but nevertheless a fact.

ARNULF DE HESDING'S MANOR in Bath Hundred was 5 hides in Weston. His demesnes are reduced to 3 hides, 3½ virgates in Domesday, while the Provost, Sweyn, his tenant of 1 virg. in 1084, vanishes from the Survey of 1086. The default and the disappearance were probably due to mortal sickness or death.

THE BISHOP OF ST. LO (or Coutances) had 4 hides in Wica (Bathwick). His demesne there, in Domesday, is 3⅓ firtins more than in 1084.

WILLIAM HOSATUS was, independently of his tenure under Bath Abbey, a tenant-in-capite (as a *Francus Tegnus*) of 1½ hides in Tatewica. His demesne is written in Domesday as only 1 hide 1 virgate, but the context proves it to have been a half-virgate more, as in 1084; for his villeinage was only half a virgate.

RALPH, BROTHER OF ROGER DE BERKELEY, stands in Domesday as tenant-in-capite of 2 virgates in Tata Wica.

ALURED, a Saxon Thane, appears in Domesday as tenant-in-capite of 2 hides in Wica, one of which he held in demesne. The name given to him in 1084 was from this his estate at Wick (now Bathwick).

ROBERT GRENO'S default was probably in respect of land held under Roger de Corcelle. There were at least three Roberts tenants of Corcelle, viz. Robert Greno, Robert Herecom, and Robert fitz Herbert. Except in a few cases they are not mentioned by any name but 'Robertus' in Domesday. Robert Greno's expressed name only occurs as tenant of Wittochesmeda, which, even if in Bath Hundred, was only a hide altogether, and therefore not all the estate to which the Inquest refers. That Wittochs-meadow was in Bath Hundred, its high value would suggest. We may further suggest that the Robertus who held a half-hide in Freshford under De Corcelle was Robert Greno.

HUGOLINUS LEGATUS appears as *Hugolinus Interpres* in Domesday. As a *Francus Tegnus* he held *in capite* 9 hides in Woolley, Bath-Easton, and Claverton. He also, as *Hugo Interpres*, holds 3 hides in Bathampton under the Abbot of Bath. It is clear that his tenures had diminished by one hide since 1084, and moreover that his default at the earlier period arose in his rendering no Gheld-account at all, neither satisfying liabilities nor claiming exemptions. To the latter he was certainly entitled in respect of 4½ hides held in demesne.

THE BURGH OF BATH had been *T. R. E.* geldable as 20 hides. The Fegadri of the Hundred seem to have been in doubt as to whether it was still assessable; so they corrected their first statement, that the Gheld was a due, by a statement that they had not received it. This assessment on the Burgh of Bath will be more fully discussed in the sequel.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL., II. PP. 13-14) OF BATH HUNDRED AND BOROUGH.

BADE CAPUT ABBATLE, that is, Caput of the Abbacy and site of the Abbey. Twenty-four burgages, the Abbey Mill, and twelve acres of meadow, formed the whole estate. It had no hidage, neither nominal nor actual, and was ingeldable. The annual value (£2) consisted entirely of the Burgage-rents (£1), and the Mill (£1). The meadow therefore was appurtenant to the Mill.

WICA.—In the third estate the Bishop of Coutances's demesne is expressed as "iii. hid., xi. agri." These were gheld acres, eleven whereof were equal to 3⅓ fertines.

BATH.—The several parishes into which Bath is now divided are said to contain (3348 + 186 =) 3534

acres of land. They represent, in area, the estates of Lyncombe, Widcombe, three Bathwicks, and Walcot, all given in the above Table. They further include the area of the old Burgh, and of 12 acres of the Abbot's fee which were probably in the Burgh. The exacter measures recorded in Domesday for the same territory *exclusive* of the Burgh, amount to 2347 acres. The difference (1187 acres) should therefore go to the credit of the Domesday Burgh, or its suburban Liberties. There were 17 Domesday hides in the Hundredal territory, and these, if taken to be represented by 2347 statute acres, give about 138 acres as the correlative of the hide in the vicinity of Bath.¹

TADWICK.—The three Saxon Thanes antecedent William Hosee are said to hold *pariter*. Their collective tenure is half a virgate short of the total held by Hosee. The demesne of the latter is given as 1 hide, 1 virgate, 1 fertin in Domesday. It should be 1, 1, 2, as in the Table. The acreage (845) given in the last column to Tadwick is that of Tadwick and Swainswick combined. Swainswick is not in Domesday. Its hidage was involved in that of some neighbouring manor.

FIRFORDA.—FESCHEFORDA.—WDEWICA.—Here we note first the Domesday variety in expressing the same name, Freshford; next how Roger de Corcelle, holding 2 parts of Freshford *in capite*, became the Bishop of Coutances's tenant in a third and greater part, where he is called Roger Witen; lastly, how Roger Witen's half-mill in Freshford balances Ralph Flanbard's half-mill in Woodwick, close to Freshford. Woodwick as a vill and parish is now destroyed, its site is in Freshford, where fields called "Woodward's" preserve some trace of the name.

However, the present parish of Freshford, though including Woodward, does not include one half of the area of the four Domesday Manors. Unquestionably the said manors were inclusive of South-Stoke, now a parish of 860 acres which has no representation in Domesday unless so included. Of this the Table takes due account.

Iford (says Collinson), though in Freshford Parish, is in the County of Wilts. This question we have already discussed (*supra* p. 17). It is of no relevance to our present calculations.

KELSTON, alias KELWESTON, is a manor which we pronounce, with good warrant, to have been omitted in the Somerset Domesday.—Domesday gives to the Abbess of Shaftesbury but one Somerset Manor, viz., "Come." "Come" is incontestably Combe Abbas, formerly in Milborne, now in Horethorn Hundred; and the Inquisicio-Gheldi alludes to this estate of the Abbess in its proper place, viz., in the Milborne Inquest. But the Inquisicio also alludes to a manor in Bath Hundred wherein the Abbess had "three hides of demesne."

No such manor is registered in Domesday! It was omitted in error. This omitted manor was Kelston. If there is no other evidence, save this of the Gheld Inquest, that the Abbess held Kelston before Domesday, that evidence is sufficient, especially when we find ample testimony that she continued to hold it till the Dissolution.

The hidage which, in the Table, is assigned to Kelston is five hides. It is arbitrarily assigned; but the present acreage of the parish, the extent of the demesne in 1084, and the necessity of finding five hides to complete the Hundred of 95 hides, as announced by the Inquest of 1084, all favour such an assumption.

NORTH-STOKE, SOUTH-STOKE, ST. CATHERINES, AND WALCOTE, are none of them mentioned by name in Domesday. But, as we have said, Walcote was, as to its area, implied in one or other of the Domesday Manors which are now involved with Bath; and South-Stoke, as to its area, went to augment the Domesday areas of Freshford; so we say, of North Stoke and St. Catherines, that their hidage was implied in some of the Domesday Manors which figure in the first column of the Table. On these accounts and to balance any such quantities of exceptional hidage we insert in the last column of the Table 2683 acres of parochial measurement in addition to the quantities otherwise assigned to parishes of a known Domesday type. By no other device can we bring the gross hidage of a given Hundred into fair comparison with the gross modern acreage of the same territory.

¹ This calculation as to the equivalent of the hide in a small and definite district is quite exceptional. The equivalent expands the moment that the calculation embraces a larger area of experiment. Such calculations are useless therefore for the more general investigations which we shall presently have to pursue.

But the exception is, in its way, most remarkable. It is an instance of what (Dorset, pp. 11-12) we have called *Superhidation*, viz., that estates situate in any favoured locality were hidated *ab antiquo* according to an extrinsic value, not according to their specific extent or fertility.

ESTONA. This estate of the late Queen Edith, though geldable as to two hides, in 1084 and 1086, had *T. R. E.* been geldable as one hide. Domesday gives no value, for this estate, but says "Hæ ii hidæ fuerunt de dominicâ firmâ Burgi Badæ die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus, et nunc sunt." This has nothing to do with liability to gheld. It means that Queen Edith having in her day had the Burgh of Bath, had received a fee-farm rent for the same, and that the fee-farm rent of her estate of Bath-Easton had been included therein, and that this arrangement continued under King William's possessorship of both estates.

HAMTONA (Bathampton).—Here we have a Domesday Manor and a modern parish in apparent coincidence. The Domesday Manor measures 908 acres (*viz.*, 720 acres of plough-land, 100 acres of wood-land, 28 acres of meadow, and 60 acres of pasture). Add to this as a supposed proportion of waste, 24 acres, and we have the modern parish of 932 acres. The proportions of Domesday-value average £1. 2s. for each hide, 18s. 4d. for each plough-land, and the same for each team in employ.

WITOCHEMEDA (White-ox-meadow or Wittocks meadow).—This estate, topographically in the Parish of Wellow and the Domesday Hundred of Frome, will nevertheless have been, at Domesday, a member of Bath Hundred. We place it therefore in the Table of Bath Hundred; and this will satisfy what has been already said about Robert Greno, and the certainty that he held at least $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides, and probably $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides, in Bath Hundred, while his tenement in Freshford was only half a hide. Robert Greno, it will be observed, was in each case (Freshford and White-ox-mead) the Tenant of Roger de Corcelle; but in that Baron's Domesday Schedule no less than seven pages of the Exon Codex separate the notices of the two estates. In the same Codex, and opposite the notice of *Witochesmeda* is a marginal mark, like a reversed note of interrogation. Perhaps this mark indicated the Rubricator's consciousness that in placing this estate among Roger de Corcelle's manors of Frome Hundred, he was adopting a geographical rather than a Hundredal arrangement.

BATH FORUM HUNDRED.—**LIBERTY OF HAMPTON CUM CLAVERTON.**—These two modern Divisions ostensibly contain all that the old Hundred of Bada contained, except the Vill of White-ox-mead, now annexed by parochial attraction to Wellow and the Hundred of Wellow, which Hundred is merely a subdivision of the old Hundred of Frome.

These same modern divisions contain, what the old Hundred of Bada did not contain, *viz.*, Queen Edith's, afterwards King William's, Burgh of Bada.

The area of the same modern divisions, measured parish by parish, is 19,665 statute acres. Domesday gives what we call positive measures of all corresponding manors, but not of the Burgh. These manorial measurements of Domesday imply 15,341 statute acres, to which we venture to add 1095 acres, as the proximate measures of Kelston (omitted in error by Domesday). Thus we get 16,436 acres as the measure of the aforesaid manors, prescribed, if not by Domesday, yet by Domesday supplemented and corrected. The difference then between the two measurements, ancient and modern, is $(19665 - 16436 =) 3,229$ acres.

This difference of 3,229 acres we are obliged by our theories to conclude to have been about the measure of lands attached to the King's Burgh of Bath, of which lands Domesday gives no details whatever, neither plough-land, wood, meadow, nor pasture. It is conceived (see p. 104) that some 1187 acres of this Burghal land may have been adjacent to the Borough and of valuable consideration. The rest may have consisted of wood-land, or pasturage, in any part of the modern Hundred of Bath Forum or the modern Liberty of Hampton cum Claverton.

In part anticipation of a future question we may here state that the Burgh of Bath may possibly have had appendages, other than those above alluded to. If any probability of that kind should hereafter arise, we shall have to bear in mind that those possible appendages must have been external, must have been in other Hundreds, and can have constituted no part of the 3229 acres which we have found to have been locally within the same limits as the modern Hundred and City.

HIDATION OF BATH, AND BATH HUNDRED.—On this matter the Inquisicio and Domesday, correcting or confirming one another, give us more precise information than in the matter of positive measurements. They tell us that the Burgh was geldable at 20 hides; that the Hundred contained 95 hides.

If the Burghal lands be taken, as above, at 3229 modern acres, then the co-ordinate of the Burghal hide is $161\frac{1}{2}$ acres. If the Hundredal lands be taken at $(19,665 - 3229 =) 16,436$ modern acres, then the correlative of the Hundredal hide is 173 acres. If both Burgh and Hundred together are represented by 19,665 modern acres, then the correlative of each hide is 171 acres. Now the highest of these acreages

(173 acres) is but a low co-ordinate for the hide of any extensive district of Somerset. However, the district in question was rich, with comparatively little of brushwood or pasturage, except such as has been conjecturally assigned to the Burgh of Bath. It was a district, in short, of 19,665 Domesday acres, whereof 12,840 acres, or perhaps 14,027 acres, were arable land, and 364 acres were certainly meadow.

But the acreage (161½ acres) co-ordinate with the Burghal hide was most extraordinarily low, especially when we reflect that it results from a supposition of involving much wood and pasture. And, more than that, the hidage prescribed for any estate of Queen Edith would be ordinarily presumed to have been a privileged hidage, that is, to have involved a very large instead of a very small acreage.

So that, at length and at best, we are but in a dilemma. Either the Domesday hidage of the Burgh of Bath was a fiction as to land, and represented local wealth and trade, rather than territory; or else, if genuine as to land, it was also large as to proportionate acreage and must have contemplated some territory which lay in other Hundreds. The probability of the latter will appear in future remarks on Frome Hundred and on the Manors of Wellow and Kilmersdon.

The tabular form in which (Vol. ii, pp. 13-14) we still further abbreviate the few particulars given in Domesday about the Borough of Bath will be best supplemented by the full Domesday entry and some annotations thereon. The entry in question runs as follows:—

“Terra Edithæ Regine in Sumersetd.—Rex habet unum Burgum quod vocatur Bade quod tenuit Eaditda Regina die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus; et reddidit geldum pro xx hidis quando Vicecomitatus gildabat. Ibi habet Rex lxxiv Burgenses qui reddunt per annum iv Libras. Et Barones Regis habent C. Burgenses, x minus; qui reddunt per annum huic Burgo lx solidos. Ibi habet rex vi domus vastatas. Cum predictâ Estonâ reddit per annum Burgum istud lx libras ad numerum et unam marcâ auri; et Edwardus Vicecomes reddit de tercio denario hujus Burgi xi Libras de xx in orâ. Exceptis his lx Libris et Marcâ Auri quas supradiximus, reddunt Burgenses C. solidos de Monetâ. De predicto Burgo est ablata una domus quam tenet Hugo Interpres, et valet, per annum ii solidos. (Exon Domesday, p. 106).

Reddidit geldum pro xx hidis quando Vicecomitatus geldabat. The reputed hidage of King Edward's time still obtained in 1084, when the Gheld-collectors of the Hundred treated the Gheld which they supposed to be due on the Burgh as an arrear. The fact probably was that the Hidage-gheld had already been commuted for the fee-farm rent recorded in Domesday, viz., £60 (hy tale) and one merk of gold (equal to £6 13s. 4d.) The word *Vicecomitatus* in this passage means the County of Somerset exclusive of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*. The Exchequer Domesday substitutes the word *Scira* for *Vicecomitatus*.

Ibi habet Rex lxxiv Burgenses, &c. The King had 64 Burgesses in Bath; his Barons had 90. The Burgage rents quoted in the Text were payable, in the first instance, to the Borough-Reeve. They were not transmitted by him to the Crown except as part and parcel of the *Firma Burgi*, viz., £63 6s. 8d.

The Tercius Denarius of Bath, here spoken of, had been due in Queen Edith's time to some Comital Manor not specified in Domesday. It indicates that Bath still retained, while in Queen Edith's hands, that high jurisdiction, that right to try Crown-Pleas, which can only have accrued to the Burgh while in the hands of a King. It was the third of the Crown-Pleas of both the Borough and Hundred of Bath, and if we guess aright, of other Hundreds also. It was now (A.D. 1086) payable by a great Officer of State to the King, the King being Comes by Escheat of Earl Harold.

EDWARDUS VICECOMES, the Officer in question, was Edward de Salisbury, Sheriff of Wiltshire at the date of Domesday. It by no means follows from his payment of the third-penny of Bath that Edward de Salisbury was farming the Burgh at the date of Domesday. More probably his function was the administration of High Justice in several great local Courts. In Wiltshire he was responsible to the King, as to the Earl, for the *tercius denarius* arising from such great Courts, at Salisbury, at Marlborough, at Cricklade, and at Malmesbury, none of which places were under his jurisdiction as Fernor, nor yet as Sheriff. And, curiously enough, his responsibility as regarded the *Tercius Denarius* of Bath (*Bade*) is entered in duplicate, as £11, and promiscuously with his Wiltshire liabilities; nay, this *Tercius Denarius* of Bath was nearly double that arising from Salisbury or from Malmesbury, the two most productive of the Wiltshire Courts.

Reddunt Burgenses centum solidos de Monetâ.—This was extra to the *Firma Burgi*. The Burgesses paid the King £5 per annum for the privilege of coining money. There was, at the date of Domesday, no other licensed mint in Somerset save that at Bath.

Hugo Interpres, elsewhere called *Hugolinus Interpres* and *Hugolinus Legatus*,—evidently a diplomatic

officer of the Crown. He had withdrawn one Borough-house or Burgage from contribution to the civic assessments. It was a valuable House, worth more than any other Burgage instance in the Somerset Domesday. The withdrawal was a wrong to the community, not a pourpresture on the Crown.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR BEMPSTONE HUNDRED. (INQ.-GHELDI, PP. 69-70).

In Hundreto Bimastanæ sunt xliij hidæ et iij fertini (<u>43 hid. 3 fert.</u>)	II. V. F.
Inde Rex (habet) de Gildo suo £9 13s. (read 14s.) 3d. pro	32 1 2
Et Barones Regis habent in dominio suo x hid. et dim. (<u>10 hid. 2 virg.</u>)	
De his habet Episcopus Giso v hidas et iij virgas in dominio	5 3 0
Et Walscinus de Duaco ii hid. et iij virg.	2 3 0
Et Letaoldus ii hidas quas tenet de Abbate Glastingberiensis quæ nunquam gildaverunt	2 0 0
	10 2 0 10 2 0
Non habet Rex geldum pro virg. et dim. (should be, consistently, 1 virg. et 1 fert.) quas } tenet Rogerus de Corscella	} 0 1 2 0 1 1
	43 0 3

De Hoc Hundreto sunt adhuc retro "18 *denarii*" de Gildo Regis quæ debent esse redditi. (But, if we take the text of the Inquest, the true arrear was 2s. 3d. ; and if we change the textual 1½ virgates to the constructive 1¼ virgates, which are necessary to tally with the premises, still the correlative arrear would be 1s. 10½d., or 4½d. more than is alleged).

THERE IS A SUPPLEMENTARY INQUEST to the above, taken apparently on 8 hides, 1 virgate of land, which the Thaness of Walscunus de Donai alleged to pertain to Bimastane Hundred. This secondary Inquest, when cast into form, will warrant the following Table :—

Præter supradictas £9 14s. (<i>sic</i>) 3d. persolverunt adhuc homines Walscini de Duaco in } hoc Hundreto xxvii (read xxxvii) solidos et 6 denarios pro vi hidis et i virga	} 6 1 0
Et Walterus (<i>i. e.</i> Walscinus) habet, præter has, hidam et dimidiam in dominio.....	1 2 0 1 2 0
	1 2 0 1 2 0
Et non habet Rex gildum pro dimidia hidâ de eadem terrâ quam tenet Rainewalo de } Waltero (de Duaco)	} 0 2 0 0 2 0
	8 1 0

To this should have been added some such words as the following, but they are omitted.

"Ideo de hâc terrâ sunt adhuc retro 3 solidi de Gildo Regis." The actual Inquest concludes with the following misarranged, but intelligible, sentence :—

"Hanc terram qui tenent Walscini dicunt Tagni pertinere in Hundreto Bimastanæ." (The Thaness of Walscunus who hold this land aver it to belong to Bempstone Hundred).

NOTES ON THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI OF BEMPSTONE HUNDRED.

BISHOP GISO's estate in Bimastane Hundred was Wedmore (10 hides). Though its value at the date of Domesday was £17 per annum, he sometime paid a yearly rent of £12 to the Royal Manor of Cheddar. But the Bishop had held it (free) under King Edward (Exon Domesday, p. 82). Domesday lowers the Bishop's demesnes in Wedmore from 5¾ hides to 4¾ hides.

WALTER DE DOUAI's 2¾ hides of demesne were in Weare (6 hides). Domesday gives him 3½ hides of demesne in that manor.

THE SPECIALITIES OF THE GLASTONBURY ESTATE of 2 hides had all vanished before Domesday. The Abbot had no such tenant as Letaoldus. Edingworth was in 1086 held by Walter de Douai under the Abbot. The non-liability to Gheld is no longer predicated for its 2 hides in Domesday.

The estate, intelligibly written Iodena Wirda in the text of the Exon Domesday, is miscorrected into Lodena in the margin. The same mistake of reading the Domesday I as L has been enacted by the printers of the Exchequer Domesday. They spell the name as Lodenwrde. (For other instances of this error see *Antiq. Shropsh.* vii. 50 *n.*, x. 207).

ROGER DE CORCELLE's demesne at Bodeslega is actually measured in Domesday as $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, held under Glastonbury Abbey. So the Inquest was right in stating the same measure of his liability, but wrong in lowering the said measure in its constructive account, and still more wrong in lowering his arrear to 18d.

WALTER DE DOUAI's $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides of demesne were 1 hide in Brean and half a hide in Burnham. What constituted the $6\frac{1}{4}$ hides of his Vassals' estate in this supplementary Hundred does not appear. We should suggest,—in Burnham, 3 hides; in Brean, 1 hide; in East Huntspil, 3 virgates; in Huish, 2 virgates, and in Alston Maris, 1 hide;—together, $6\frac{1}{4}$ hides. All these estates, except East Huntspil and Alston Maris, have, since Domesday, been retained in the Hundred of Bempstone. At some time or other, East Huntspil and Alston Maris have gone, seemingly by parochial attraction, into the Hundred of Huntspil and Puriton. (Conf. Collinson, ii, 393).

RAINEWALO'S arrear was in respect of a half-hide, which he held in demesne out of 2 hides, which he held collectively, in Walter de Douai's Manor of Burnham.

¶ Instead of the collective hidages of the Inquest (viz., 51 hides, 1 virgate, 3 fertines), we can only find Domesday elements to realise 50 hides, 3 virgates, 3 fertines, and 2 gheld-acres, for Bimastane Hundred.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 13-14) OF-BIMASTANE HUNDRED.

OF WEDMORE, as held by Bishop Giso in fee-farm, and as a member of the Royal Manor of Cheddar, there is (Exon Domesday, p. 82) this alternative statement:—"De hac mansione (viz., Cedra) tenet Giso Episcopus unum membrum quod vocatur Wetmora. Pro isto computat Willelmus Vicecomes (William de Moione) xii libras in quoque anno, in firmâ Regis (de Cedra). Sed Episcopus tenuit de Rege Edwardo longo tempore ante obitum Regis Edwardi."

The Bishop's holding Wedmore by a rent of £12 per annum was, of course, a very different thing to his holding the Manor *in capite, per Baroniam*. The Domesday Commissioners merely state the two sides of the question;—the precedent, as against the actual practice. They pronounce no decision. "Præter hoc" (that is, besides the measured areas of plough-land, wood-land, meadow, and pasture), "sunt ibi moræ quæ nihil reddunt." Here is a fine illustration of one phenomenon of the Somerset Domesday, viz., that where a manor contained vast areas of utterly profitless territory, such areas are in no wise included in the exacter measures registered in the Survey. Of that we have said much already (*supra*, pp. 38-39), and shall say more anon (*infra*, pp. 109, 110).

CLIVE-WARA.—Long before the Conquest, the Abbot of Glastonbury had both Wedmore and Clewer by gift of St. Wilfrid, Archbishop of York. The Abbey lost these estates soon after, and Wedmore was for some time in the Crown. The Abbey, though it never recovered Clewer nor Wedmore, got a grant from King Edwy of the Manor of Panborough, then a member of Wedmore, and containing 2 hides. Such a manor will have comprised not only Panborough itself, but North Load (also in Wedmore parish), and, unless North-Load represent the Domesday Bodeslega, some additional territory in Wedmore parish, which Domesday calls 'Bodeslega.' When Panborough-Isle (only a few acres) was, on account of its vineyards, annexed to the Abbatial demesne of Glastonbury, it passed perforce into the Hundred of Glastonbury Twelve-hides, where it still remains; but "Bodeslega" and whatever, besides Long-Load, may be represented in the name "Bodeslega," was still in Bimastane Hundred at the date of Domesday. Collinson (Vol. i, p. 40) will have Bodeslega to be Butleigh, but the Domesday name of Butleigh is Boduccheleia, as we shall see in the sequel. One might perhaps accept Bagley, in Wedmore parish, as the representative of the Domesday "Bodeslega;" but one cannot find that Bagley was a Glastonbury fee at any post-Domesday period. Collinson, by the way, bestows (Vol. i, p. 187) upon Bagley in Wedmore the Domesday note which was proper to Bagley in Exford. It is better worth notice that the Exchequer Domesday gives to "Bodeslega" only 3 virgates; but the Exon Domesday, by coeval correction, says *iiii* virgates. The latter is, of course, the more correct; only, had the scribe earlier discovered the true state of the case, he would have written "i hide" rather than "*iiii* virgates."

MARK, at the date of Domesday, constituted an unnamed portion of Bishop Giso's Manor of Wedmore, by which it had been previously absorbed. This estate of Mark, probably little less than moor-land (*i. e.*, marsh-land), had, nevertheless, been named and defined long before Domesday. The connexion, or rather distinction, between Wedmore and Mark, is curiously shown in two ancient Deeds (see *Monasticon* ii, 287, Numm. vi & vii).—

Circa 1060-1065, "King Edward greets Harold, Earl; Ailnod, Abbot (of Glastonbury); and Tovid, Sheriff" (of Somerset), apprising them that he, the King, has given to Bishop Giso for behoof of the Church and Clergy of St. Andrew at Wells, the land of Wedmore, "adeo plene et libere sicut unquam plenius mihi manu stetit."

In A.D. 1066, the Lady Edith, widow of King Edward, greets the "Hundred of Wedmore," and certifies that she has given to Bishop Giso, in support of the canons of the same church, the land of "Merke," "ita plene et libere sicut mihi plenius manu stetit"—for the soul of King Edward and her own soul.

That Wedmore, passing from the Crown to Bishop Giso should become a Hundred before the Conquest is not remarkable;—that, as such a Hundred, it should have included an estate of Queen Edith, is curious; that Queen Edith, "on the day of King Edward's death," held such an estate as Mark is a fact which Domesday, unwontedly, omits.

ALWARDITONA (Chapel Allerton).—This was a case of excessive hidation. The measured contents of the three manors here combined were only 1300 acres (viz., 960 acres of plough-land, 40 acres of meadow, and 300 acres of pasture). This leaves only 118 acres of profitable laud to the gheld-hide. What extent of moor and waste may have attached to the three manors does not appear. Nor does the present extent of the parish (viz., 1169 acres) say much more than that the ancient manor-land was considerably, and perhaps indefinitely, greater.

HECUIWICCA, alias ECEWICHE.—The Gheld measure of this manor is expressed in Domesday as "1 virga et dimidia et viii agri;" a curious form of saying "2 virgæ et 2 agri."

The place is obsolete as to name and site. Its inclusion in Bempstone Hundred is suggested by its preceding Alesistune (Alston Maris) in Domesday.

HUNESPIL.—Walter de Douai's two virgates of demesne in (East) Huntspil seem to have been geldant in 1084. We infer the intermediate assumption of so much land by the Lord, and the surrender of a previous tenant. Conversely, in Huntspil proper, Walter de Douai paid gheld on a whole hide in 1084, but is accredited with half thereof, as demesne, in Domesday.

BIMASTANE HUNDRED.—The annual rents and values of estates in this Hundred had amounted to £68 16s. at periods antecedent to Domesday, when they had fallen to £58 5s.

¶ It would seem that the old Hundred of Bimastane was formed chiefly with the object of concentrating the tenures of Walter de Douai, both those which he held *in capite* of the Crown, and those which he held, contiguously, under Glastonbury Abbey. The Seignieury of the Hundred appears to have accrued rather to the Episcopal Lords of Wedmore than to have remained with any of the successors of Walter de Douai. However, the old and long-continued trysting-place of the Hundred was a monolith in Chapel-Allerton Parish; and Chapel-Allerton was, at the date of Domesday, a member of De Douai's Baronial Fief.

BEMPSTONE HUNDRED, besides the Parishes whose names associate them with certain Domesday Manors, involves the Parishes of Theale (3000 acres), of Biddisham (574 acres), and of Mark (4494 acres). None of these places have any distinctive notice in Domesday, and it may be doubted whether, as Vills or Manors, Theale and Biddisham had any so early recognition. Manorially and territorially all were implied in Bishop Giso's Manor of Wedmore, which Manor, at that rate, is now represented by 18,054 statute acres, less some fourteen or fifteen hundred acres, which, though in Wedmore Parish, formed the independent Manors of Clewer and North-Load (perhaps the Bodeslega of Domesday).

To correspond with this Manor of Wedmore, containing, let us say, 16,600 statute acres, Domesday states measured areas of no more than 4560 acres, viz., plough-land 4320 acres (for 36 plough-lands); wood 50 acres; meadow 70 acres; pasture 120 acres. But Domesday adds to this statement the striking clause—"Præter hoc sunt ibi moræ quæ nihil reddunt."

So then Domesday is practically silent about the extent of some twelve thousand acres of marshes (then and still called *Moors*), which environed the localities now known as Wedmore, Biddisham, and Mark, and which, though utterly worthless, belonged to the Episcopal Manor of Wedmore. The whole or great part of this marsh-land is still known as Mark-moor.

¶ The comparative measures of the *wholc Hundred* of Bimastane (now Bempstone) will supply a parallel illustration of the rule thus supplied for investigating certain very remarkable phenomena of the Somerset Domesday. The said measures are as follows:—

The Inquisitional Hidage of the Hundred was (A.D. 1084) 51 hides, 1½ virgates. The Domesday Hidage (A.D. 1086) was 50 hides, 3¾ virgates, and 2 gheld acres. The Domesday measures of the constituent

manors amount to 14,676 acres, viz., for 107½ plough-lands, 12,900 acres; of wood-land, 74 acres; of meadow-land, 562 acres; and of pasture-land, 1140 acres.

The recently measured areas of the Parishes constituting nearly the same Hundred are 32,972 acres.

The discrepancy between the Domesday and modern measures of this Hundred is 18,296 acres, or considerably more than half the Hundred. We may be sure that it was, as in the special case of Wedmore, marsh-land or other profitless area.

The Domesday Hide will be found, in this instance, to coincide with about 288 acres of Domesday measurement, and with 646½ acres of modern ascertainment.

¶ The annual value of Bempstone Hundred had fallen from £68 16s. to £58 5s. within the twenty years preceding Domesday. At the latter period it was at the rate of about £1 2s. 10d. per hide and of 9525 decimals of one penny per Domesday acre: also at the rate of 10s. 10d. each, when calculated on the plough-lands of the Hundred.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR BRUNETONE HUNDRED, OTHERWISE CALLED THE HUNDRED OF BRUNETONE VICECOMITIS, AND LATER STILL THE HUNDRED OR MANOR OF BROMPTON RALPH.

In Hundreto Brunetonæ sunt <u>5 hidae.</u> (Inq. Gheldi, p. 69).	H. V. F.
Inde habuit Rex de Gildo suo 24 solidos pro 4 hides	4 0 0
Pro dimidiâ hidâ quam tenet Ogisus ignorans quod debet Gildum reddere non habet)	
Rex Gildum snum	} 0 2 0
Pro dimidiâ hidâ de quâ fegadri receperunt denarios non habuit Rex gildum snum.....	0 2 0
	1 0 0
	5 0 0

De hoc Hundreto sunt retro adhuc 6 solidi de Gildo Regis (which, at 6 shillings per hide, is the charge on the insolvent items).

NOTES ON THE GHELD INQUEST OF SHERIFF'S-BROMPTON HUNDRED.

In this instance, better perhaps than many, we are enabled, with the aid of Domesday, to show the precise incidence of the gheld-tax on a limited area.

The whole hundred was 5 hides, and, whereas none of it was held by any Baron in demesne, every hide and part of a hide was geldable in A.D. 1084. Of the 5 hides, 4½ hides paid their gheld, that is Turgisus, and his Villeins paid £1 1s. for the gheld due on 3½ hides in Brompton; and Ogisus and his Villeins paid 6s. due on 1 virgate of demesne, and 3 virgates of Villeinage (together one hide), in Clatworthy. And the remaining half-hide, though geldable, did not pay gheld, for Ogisus, part of whose demesne it was, was not aware of the liability. Probably it was part of his estate, which, while in the Abbot of Glastonbury's hands, had been ingeldable by prescription. When church-lands were usurped by laymen, at the Norman Conquest, it frequently happened that prescriptive privilege ceased to enhance the value of the spoil.

As to the Gheld on a half-hide, retained by the Fegadri, though received, it was part of the payment by Turgisus and his Villeins. It was probably retained by the Fegadri as their own fee for collecting the Gheld in this and some other Hundred.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 13-14) OF SHERIFF'S-BROMPTON HUNDRED.

THE HUNDRED OF BRUNETONE had as its Lord, in 1084 and 1086, William de Moione, then Sheriff of Somerset. Hence it was called, in a coeval Index of Somerset Hundreds, the Hundred of Brunetone Vicecomitis. And this was further to distinguish it from the then recognized Hundred of Bruncton Regis, now represented chiefly by the Manor of King's-Brompton.

The Hundred of Brunetone Vicecomitis came subsequently to be called the Hundred of Brompton Ralph. This was from Ralph de Moione, a descendant of the Domesday Lord. Both these Hundreds, Brompton Regis, and Brompton Ralph, have long been absorbed by the Hundred of Willifon and Frec-Manors. One principal feature in the two manors of this Hundred is that, since the seizin of William de Moione, their value had doubled.

THE COMPARATIVE MEASURES of this Hundred were as follows:—Domesday seems to concur with the Inquest of 1084 in a hidage of 5 hides. The exacter measures of Domesday give a total of 2696 acres, viz.

for 19 plough-lands, 2280 acres; of wood, 45 acres; of meadow, 11 acres; of pasture, 360 acres. Here then, the hide concurs with 539 acres of Domesday measurement,—a proof merely of beneficial hidation.

The actual area of the two modern parishes which we next compare with the two Domesday Manors is 5538 acres, *i. e.*, more than double the Domesday measures. This discrepancy arises, in part, from the parish of Clatworthy containing two estates, Syndercombe and Middleton, which were by no means in Sheriff's-Brompton Hundred, but in the Domesday Hundred of Williton. And the Domesday measures of these two estates were 1184 acres more.

Yet still, and besides all this, there can be no doubt that these parishes contain some sixteen or seventeen hundred acres, which at the date of Domesday were counted into the King's Forests of West Somerset. In our Tables we take small account of these exceptional cases; that is, whereas we measure the whole parochial areas as in Sheriff's-Brompton Hundred, so we measure the exceptional hidage and acreage of Syndercombe and Middleton as in the Domesday Hundred of Williton.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR BRUTON HUNDRED, (INQ.-OHELDI, p. 74.)

	bid.	v.	f.
In Hundreto Briwetona sunt cc hidæ et xxxij (232 hides).			
Inde Rex habet de Gildo suo £50 2 solidos pro.	167	0	0
Barones Regis habent in dominio suo xxx hid. et vii hid. et dim. hid. et dim. virgan	37	2	2
De his habet Willelmus (de Moione) Vicecomes	6	3	0
Drogo (habet) dim. <i>virg.</i> (read <i>hid.</i>) et iii fertinos	2	3	0
Turstin, filius Rolfe (habet) iv hidæ	4	0	0
Serlo de Burceio (habet) iii hidæ	3	0	0
Hunfridus Camerarius (habet) i hidam	1	0	0
Edmundus (filius Pagani, Francus Tegnus) habet 2 hid. 1 virg. et dim.	2	1	2
Escelinus (Francus Tegnus) habet 1 hid. 1 virg. et dim.	1	1	2
Walterus da Badentona " <i>(alibi Walscinus de Doai)</i> " habet vii hid. iii virg. et dim	7	3	2
Hugo de Valtort (habet) 1 hid. iii virg.	1	3	0
"Comitissa Bononiæ" (habet) "ii hid. iii virg."	2	3	0
Aluricus (Aluric f. Brietric, Anglus Tegnus) 5 hid. et dim. hid. et dim. virg.	5	2	2
Hardinc (Harding fil, Elnod, Anglus Tegnus) 1 virg. et iii fert.	1	3	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	37	2	2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
Et Lambertus de Watileia adquietavit 1 hidam tenementum Fegadrorum		1	0
Et non habet Rex Gildum suum de i hida quam tenet Ranuewal	1	0	0
De ii hidis quas tenet Turstinus filius Rolfi	2	0	0
De iv hidis quas Radulfus " <i>hastent</i> " (Radulfus Has tenet?)	4	0	0
De iv hidis quas tenet Britellus	4	0	0
De i hidâ quam tenet Willelmus de Radio (Willelmus de Radulfo?)	1	0	0
De i hidâ quam tenet Gonsel (Gonselinus de la Rivière)	1	0	0
De virgâ et dimidiâ quam tenet Drogo de Monte Acuto	1	2	0
De dimidiâ hidâ " <i>q etona</i> " (quæ est in Cillemetonâ?)	2	0	0
De i hidâ et iii virg. et i fert. quas tenet Isaac	1	3	1
De i hidâ . . . et dimid. (i hid. et i virg. et dimidia?) quas tenet Hugo de Valtort	1	1	2
De dim. virgâ quam tenet Erneis	1	2	0
De i hid. et dimid. quam tenet Willelmus de Durvill	1	2	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	18	2	3
De iii hidis quas tenet Algarus de Haltona non reddidit gildum in hoc Hundreto	3	0	0
Et de v hidis quas tenet Malgerus non reddit gildum in hoc Hundreto	5	0	0
Et de i virgâ et iii fertinis de quibus Fegadri nescierunt reddere rationem non habet } Rex Gildum	1	3	0
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	27	0	2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	27	0	2
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	232	3	0

De hoc Hundreto debentur Regi de Gildo suo £8 2s. 9d. Note.—This arrear of £8 2s. 9d. is, at the rate of

6 shillings per hide, exactly proportionate to 27 hides 2 fertines, the sum of the nonsolvent items. Note also, that though the Fegadri, at the head of the account, announced the Hundred of Bruton to consist of 232 hides, the details of their account show that it contained $232\frac{1}{4}$ hides.

NOTES ON THE GHELD INQUEST OF BRUTON HUNDRED.

WILLIAM DE MOJONE's exemption is for 6 hides of demesne in *Briveham*, and for 3 virgates also; the latter being an *additamentum* to *Brewham*, all of which he occupied as demesne.

DROGO DE MONTACUTE's exemption on $2\frac{3}{4}$ virgates was for his demesne at *Knowle* (in *Shepton Montague*). Domesday shows this demesne increased to $3\frac{1}{4}$ virgates.

TURSTAN FITZ ROLF's exemption was for 4 hides held in demesne, in his estate at *Pitcombe*.

SERLO DE BURCI's exemption is for 3 hides of demesne at *Lovington*. Domesday lowers the said demesne by $1\frac{1}{3}$ fertines (that is by 5 gheld-acres). According to Domesday he also held 2 hides in demesne at *Watehella* (*Wheathill*), but probably his Tenure in *Wheathill* was under *Glastonbury Abbey*.

HUMPHREY CHAMBERLAIN's exemption was for 1 hide, his demesne at *Babcary*, as reasserted in Domesday.

EDMUND FITZ PAGAN's exemption is for 2 hides, $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates,—his demesne at *Barton St. Davids*. Domesday reckons his demesnes at *Barton* to be $3\frac{1}{4}$ hides. The change was perhaps due to some rearrangement of his estate, effected between 1084 and 1086.

ESCHELINUS's exemption for 1 hid. $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, was in respect of an estate which he held wholly in demesne at *Fodington*, in *Babcary*.

WALSINUS DE DOUAI's demesnes at *Castle Cary*, put in the Inquest at 7 hides $3\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, are rated in Domesday as 8 hides. The addition is of 6 gheld-acres.

HUGH DE VALLETORT's exemption is for $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides of demesne at *Fodington*. Domesday repeats the estimate.

THE COMTESSE IDA OF BOULOGNE's exemption was for $2\frac{1}{4}$ hides, held by her in demesne at *King Weston*. Domesday reiterates the measure of demesne.

ALURIC FITZ BRICTRIC's exemption for 5 hides $2\frac{1}{2}$ virgates is illustrated by Domesday according him just that extent of demesne in his Manor of *Lideford* (*West Lydford*).

HARDING FITZ ELNOD's exemption for $1\frac{3}{4}$ virgates is modified by Domesday according him $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates in his estate at *Discove*.

LAMBERT DE WHATLEY's exemption was in this wise. He was serving as one of the Fegadri for Bruton Hundred. Instead of taking the official fee of 6s. out of the money received, he got exemption for just that sum, otherwise due on a hide of land which Domesday shows him to have held in *Lovington*, under *Serlo de Burci*. Lambert took his name from *Whatley*, a *Glastonbury* estate in *Frome Hundred*, rather than from *Watehella* (*Wheathill*), an estate of *Serlo de Burci* in *Bruton Hundred*.

RANNEWALO.—The arrear charged on him was in respect of an estate held by him under *Serlo de Burci* at *Wincanton*. It was 4 hides, but he had paid gheld on only 3 hides. Domesday, in due course, certifies that the latter had been in *King Edward's* time the gheld-rate of *Wincanton*.

TURSTIN FITZ ROLF's arrear was perhaps in respect of land (2 hides) on which one or some of his tenants at *North Cadbury*, *South Cadbury*, *Weston*, *Clapton* or *Compton* had failed to pay, or perhaps he himself was holding so much land in demesne under some superior Lord and had neglected payment. In the former case, the particular tenement is undistinguishable in Domesday. In the latter case such tenure of *Turstin* had been cancelled before Domesday.

RADULFUS HAS TENET is probably the reading for *Radulfus Hastent*. *Radulf* Has was perhaps that *Radulf* whom Domesday shows to be holding 5 hides in *Berua* (now *North Barrow*) under *Walter de Doai*. His demesne in 1086 was only 3 hides, $2\frac{1}{2}$ virgates.

THE SURCHARGE ON BRITEL DE ST. CLARE may have been as to any four hides of the many hides which he held under the *Comte de Moretain* in this Hundred. The Fegadri found him to be holding, in 1084, the whole of one manor in *Redlynch* under the *Comte*. The said manor was exactly 4 hides.

WILLIAM DE RADIO reappears nowhere in Domesday. One *Willelmus* was *Corcelle's* tenant at *Witcham*; another was *Walter Giffard's* tenant at *Yarnfield*. If the reading of the text be altered to *Willelmus de Radulfo*, then such a *William*, being sub-tenant of a sub-tenant, would not appear in Domesday. His Lord would be *Ralph Rufus* or *Ralph Treucart*, neither of them a tenant *in capite*.

CONSELINE DE RIVIERE'S arrear was in respect of a hide which he held under Robert Fitz Gerold in Bruton, and which had been severed from the King's Manor.

A NON-SOLVENT HALF-HIDE IN CILLEMETON (Kilmington) was a similar severance from Bruton. In 1086 Serlo de Burci had it.

DROGO DE MONTACUTE'S arrear on $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates was due to some insufficient reckoning as to so much of his demesnes, held under the Comte of Moretain, or so much of his estate at Knowle, above mentioned. In the latter case his Villeins will have been the failing accountants.

ISAAC, like William de Radio, appears as a tenant nowhere in Domesday. The contemporary Dean of Wells was named Isaac.

HUOH DE VALTORT'S non-payment on 1 hide, $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, was commensurate with the whole of an estate which Domesday shows him to be holding in Fodington under the Comte of Moretain.

ERNEIS'S non-payment on a half-virgate was an arrear on his estate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides in Bruton, held under Roger de Corcelle.

WILLIAM DE DURVILL is perhaps represented in Domesday by "William Geral," tenant under Roger Arundel of 3 hides in Penselwood, two of which were then in demesne.

ALGAR DE HALTON'S three hides in Bruton Hundred, whereof he accounted not to the Fegadri of that Hundred, do not re-appear in Domesday; nor does his account appear in any of the preserved Inquests of other Hundreds, nor yet in any Postscript of the Inquisition, as a whole. It is probable that he was liable to Gheld as sub-tenant of some tenant *in capite*. Domesday gives a Manor of Halton. It is now represented by Holton in Whitley Hundred, which was, undoubtedly, at the date of Domesday, in Bruton Hundred, just as its site, between Blackford and Wincanton, would suggest. But this Halton was only a manor of two hides; and it was held by Albric, not Algar, under Humphrey Chamberlain.

AS TO MALGER (DE CARTRAI'S) insolvent 5 hides in Bruton Hundred, they lay in Chintun (now Keinton Mandeville), or in Cloppetun (Clapton in Maperton), or in Bertona (Barton St. David), and were held by him under the Comte of Moretain. The Inquest of Abdick Hundred similarly charged Malger de Cartrai with a default on 3 hides, and the Inquest of Wiliton Hundred with a default on 2 hides. The last-named Inquest adds that "he paid the due in another Hundred."

This was not exactly the case. No other Inquest contains such an item of account; but, apparently after all the Inquests were complete, Malger de Cartrai settled with the King's Officers by a lump payment of £2 16s. 3d., in lieu, we presume, of all his liabilities. The affair is expressed in a sort of rider to the Inquisicio (Inq.-Gheldi, as preserved in Exon Domesday, p. 489). The words are as follows:—"Malgerus de Cartraio dedit Regi de Gildo suæ terræ pro ix hidis et (1) virgâ et dimidiâ lvi solidos et iij denarios." We note that the money paid was exactly proportionate (at 6s. per hide) to the land defined; but that the latter was something short of the 10 hides on which the Inquests had declared Malger de Cartrai to be chargeable.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 15-16) OF BRUTON HUNDRED.

BRUTON HUNDRED (OLD).—In respect of hidage this was, next to Frome, the largest of the Præ-Domesday Hundreds of Somerset. Bruton itself, though it gave name to the Hundred, and was doubtless *Caput* of the Hundred, was not, at that period, interned in the Hundred. Bruton was a Manor of the *Vetus Dominicium Coronæ*, non-hidated and consequently in no Hundred whatever. How or when the Old Hundred of Bruton came to be dissevered and to constitute the three Hundreds of Bruton, Catsash, and Norton (Ferris), we cannot declare. The severance probably took place within fifty years of Domesday, that is before the accession of Stephen. But the Somerset Historian (see Collinson i, 211), was surely endorsing a monkish fable when he told how William the Conqueror gave the Hundred of Brewton "to one of the family of Cantilupe whose descendant, Alexander de Cantilupe, bestowed it with the Market of Brewton and the land of Cumbe, on the Priory of Brewton, &c., &c. In which said Monastery the Hundred remained till the dissolution," &c. Had the Somerset Historian better studied the *Inquisicio-Gheldi* he would have seen that the Hundred of Bruton, which remained with Bruton Priory till the dissolution, was a very different Franchise to the Hundred of Bruton as it stood in the Conqueror's time. The story was, of course, got up by some Monk of Bruton for the sake of investing the House of Cantilupe with an undue antiquity. But of the grant by Alexander de Cantilupe in the time of Stephen we will say no more than that it can only

have been of the dismembered Hundred of Bruton, and that on that we found our faith that the Old Hundred was severed before the time of Stephen.

Of the disseverance of Old Bruton Hundred before the 4th year of Henry II. (A.D. 1158) we have sure proof; for in that year the King gave to Nicholas de Stuteville 40 solidates of Crown-land, which are expressed to have been in Norton Hundred (Rot. Pip. 4 Hen. II.).

BRUTON, as a parish, is by no means conterminous with the Royal Manor. As a parish it embraces several items of estate which were rather in the Hundred than in the Manor of Bruton at the date of Domesday. Their collective hidage was 7 hides, $1\frac{1}{4}$ virgates.

DISCOVE and REDLYNCH, though they have been sometime extra-parochial, are situate in Bruton parish, which parish itself has been sometime added to Bruton Hundred. Nor can we find that Discove and Redlynch, as a Chapelry, have any recognised parish, distinct from that of Bruton.

ABLATA BRIWETONA.—The *ablatum* in Reliz (Redlynch) stands as *ix agri* in one passage of the Exon Domesday, and as *xx agri* in another. Being Gheld-acres, of which 12 went to the virgate, the former is the most likely reading. Moreover, it is supported by the Exchequer Codex. The quantity (9 Gheld-acres) appears rightly in our Table as 3 fertines.

BRIWEHAM.—South and North Brewham, the components of $12\frac{3}{4}$ Domesday hides, measure (according to our theories) 2020 acres in that Record; that is about 299 acres to the hide,—a mere case of privileged hidation. But the two parishes together cover an area of 4697 acres, of which we may reckon that 2677 acres were at the date of Domesday in the King's Forest of Selwood.

WITHEAM.—Though Roger de Corcelle's *ablatum* from Brewham was called Witham in Domesday, and is probably now within the parish of Witham Friary and in Frome Hundred, our Table supposes that at the date of Domesday it was, like Brewham, still reputed to be in Bruton Hundred.—

This manor is the subject of several Domesday entries. The Exon Codex (p. 407) calls the Tenant of King Edward's time "Erlebold," and adds "Hæc Mansio jacebat in Brewham, Mansione Willelmi de Moione die Regis Edwardi, et non potuit ille Tangnus qui eam tenebat separari a Mansione Brewham." The same record (p. 343) giving account of William de Mohun's Manor of Briweham, says "De hæc Mansione sunt ablata ii hidæ quas tenebat Herleboldus de Roberto filio Wincaræ, et non potuit de mansione (de Briweham) separari die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus. Modo tenet eas Rogerus de Corcella." The Schedule of *Terra Occupata* (Exon Domesday, p. 484) repeats the latter story and gives the annual value of the *ablatum* as in the former entry (p. 407). Now Brewham was and is in Bruton Hundred. We include, therefore, this old member of Brewham in our Table of Bruton Hundred. But the acreage, whatever it was, of Corcelle's Manor, we are obliged to estimate as part of the acreage of the parish of Witham, the whole of which is now in Frome Hundred.

PIDECOMA (PITCOMB).—Five hides to 627 acres (Domesday measures) is but $125\frac{1}{2}$ acres to the hide. The present parish (2330 acres) includes some 1700 acres of the appurtenances of the Royal Manor of Bruton. The hidation was of the manor only, and was excessive.

MIDDELSTONE (Exchequer Domesday), MILDELTUNA (Exon Domesday).—One and a half hides to 240 acres (Domesday measures) is 160 acres to the hide. The present parish (1221 acres) includes some 981 acres, either of King's Forest or of the appurtenances of Bruton.

The Exon Domesday introduces Mildeltuna between Manors of the remote Hundreds of Winterstoke and Bimastane, a circumstance tending to discredit its identity with Milton-Clevedon. The Exchequer Domesday is far more precise and intelligible, naming Middleton between Bratton and Wincanton, two undoubted Manors of Old Bruton Hundred. That Milton Clevedon was afterwards a member of the Barony of Castle-Cary, is further evidence that it was the same Milton as had figured in Walter de Douai's Domesday Schedule.

OPETONE (Upton Noble).—Three hides to 605 acres (Domesday measures) is c. 202 acres to the hide. The parish, of 677 acres, is a mere assignment of such an area to Upton, as a Chapelry of the Abbot of Glastonbury's Church of Batcombe. It seems, indeed, that the Abbot had a post-Domesday Seigneurie over the Manor of Upton. If so, we may be sure that it was one of the seiznres of Abbatial estates, effected by the Bishop of Coutances, and that, though the Bishop's title seems absolute in Domesday, it did not so remain. At that rate we should suppose Letmer, the Bishop's antecessor at Opetone, to have held it *T. R. E.* under Glastonbury Abbey.—

There are many similar cases, where a Glastonbury title, suppressed at the Domesday epoch, appears to have been afterwards revived. Possibly this had to do with the restoration by William Rufus, of the exiled Abbot Turstin, a great financial genius, and much devoted to the mundane interests of his Church.

CAMEL (now Queen's Camel).—This manor was in the King's hands at the date of Domesday by reason of the Escheat of the Earldom of Somerset. It seems strange that the Assessors of Bruton Hundred should, in 1084, have recorded no exemption in favour of the King's demesnes in that Hundred. Of the 15 hides of Camel the King held 5 hides in demesne. It is presumed that the Assessors in this instance, knowing the said 5 hides to be ingeldable *hæc vice*, did not care to include them in their Hundred, but that they included the 10 hides of Villeinage which formed the rest of the manor. Hence the Assessors, measuring the Hundred as 232 hides, will have excluded five hides of its proper area. The Table of this Hundred, restoring these 5 hides, consequently makes it a Hundred of over 237 hides. This, though it be called a *Domesday increment* on the hidage of 1084, was not an increment of the ordinary kind. The Ferm of £23, payable in *white money*, would be equal to about £24 3s. of ordinary currency.

The Domesday measures of the manor amount to 2,100 acres, of which only 200 were wood and pasture. The existing parish is 2,491 acres. The latter involves, then, some 391 acres, which were probably appurtenant to the King's Forest, or to the widely ramified Manor of Bruton.

LOVINTONA.—Six hides to 1,212 acres (Domesday measures) gives \bar{c} . 202 acres to the hide. The parish, of 822 acres, is less than the Domesday Manor by 388 acres.

CARI (Castle Cary).—The Caput of Douai's Barony, and of his successors of the House of Lovel. Fifteen hides to 3,220 acres (Domesday measures) gives $214\frac{2}{3}$ acres to the hide. The parish contains only 2,625 acres of the old manor.

CHINTONA ET BERTONA.—Domesday omits something in speaking of the alterations which had been made in regard to the two Manors of Kinton and Barton.

It would seem that the Comte of Moretain, to increase his tenant, Malger's, estate at Kinton, had abstracted one hide from Barton, from the estate held there by Roger de Corcelle, and 1 hide from Edmund Fitz Pagan's estate in Barton. Neither of these abstractions are noted in the Schedule of Moretain Manors; but it is plain that the hidage (2 hides) was independent of what is entered as remaining with De Corcelle and Fitz Pain. (Confer pp. 91, 96, *supra* ASHILL).

BABECARI.—Of Humphrey Chamberlain's Manor in Babcari, Domesday says:—"Hæc est addita terris Bristitiū." Humphrey Chamberlain had many Domesday manors, which, having fallen to the late Queen Matilda, among the Escheats of Brihtric Algarson, Lord of the Honour of Gloucester, had been conferred by the Queen on the said Humphrey. Wherever, as in the present instance, an estate had accrued to Humphrey under other antecedents, the estate is said to be "added to the lands of Brihtric." All that is meant is that Brihtric Algarson was not Humphrey's antecessor in such cases, but some one else. In this instance his antecessor was Bruno.

FODINDONA.—"Quando Eschelinus accepit ad firmam de Rege." Eschelinus had probably in the first instance, only had the ferm of his estate at Fodington. Now he has the fee. Eschelinus occurs in the Dorset Survey with similar marks of increasing Royal favour. (See Dorset, pp. 112 n., 131 n., 132 n.). His name is still embodied in the Dorset Manor of Shillingstone, formerly Schelin's Ockford.

ESTURT.—*Duo Portitores de Monte Acuto*. The two persons thus enfeoffed by the Comte of Moretain in Stert were, we presume, the Gatekeepers of his somewhat distant Castle of Montacute.

BABCARY, FODINGTON, and STERT, are divided into six Domesday Manors, which contained in all 12 hides. The exacter Domesday measures are 2,004 acres, which gives 167 acres per hide. The parochial area of Babcary is 2,393 acres.

WESTONA.—Of Ailin's (or rather Alwyn's) tenure in Weston (now Weston Bampfild) Domesday says, "Quam tenuit Ailin die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus et poterat sibi eligere dominum secundum voluntatem suam, cum terrâ suâ." The curter and more obscure expressions of the same thing, used in the Exchequer Domesday are, "Potuit ire quo volebat cum terrâ suâ," or "Potuit recedere cum terrâ." The Franchise alluded to was the "power of advowry" inherent in a class of Saxon Thegns, and frequently continued to them after the Conquest. The franchise is illustrated in this very case of Ailwyn, but not the Norman clemency. Ailwyn, having two estates in Weston, *T. R. E.*, had, it seems, sought the

advowry of Turstin Fitz Rou le Blanc. This hero of Hastings had ousted the Saxon from the larger estate, but had allowed him to remain tenant of the smaller (only 2 virgates). Ailwyn still (*adhuc*) holds it in 1086.

WESTON MILL.—The Domesday particulars of this Mill are noteworthy. It was divided into what the Record calls *halves*. The *half* attached to Turstin Fitz Rolf's larger manor was worth 3s. 9d. per annum. The *half* attached to the Comte of Moretain's lesser manor was worth 2s. 6d. per annum. We here learn what Domesday means, or may mean, by "half a mill," and how it was that the two halves were not necessarily coequal in value.

BLACKFORD.—The two Domesday manors measure 1,035 acres; the present parish is only 578 acres. It was originally a Chapelry of Maperton, so that the assignation of its parish was arbitrary. Blackford, at the date of Domesday, was undoubtedly in Bruton Hundred, and would now be in Catsash, but the anomaly of a Glastonbury manor being in Bruton Hundred, procured the assignment of the larger estate to the territorial collection called Whitley Hundred. The smaller manor (Turstin Fitz Rolf's) followed the larger into Whitley Hundred, so far as the name went. This was by parochial attraction and common repute; but we must remember that the Blackford of Domesday was much larger than the present parish, and so a part at least of the difference is sure to be remaining under some other name in Catsash Hundred.

HALTON.—The Domesday measures are 252 acres. The present Parish is 491 acres. It is clear that the Manors and Parishes of Blackford and Holton should be viewed for a moment in combination. Blackford was a Glastonbury Manor, and so in due course it was taken from Catsash Hundred, and annexed to the Abbot of Glastonbury's improvised Hundred of Whitley. But Blackford being, ecclesiastically, only a Chapelry of Maperton, included within its Chapelry or sub-parish, the Manor of Holton. Thus, Holton, not being recorded as a Glastonbury Manor, will have perhaps been drawn by parochial attraction, as we term it, into Whitley Hundred. Holton having since become a distinct parish, it was the more necessary thus to have traced and explained the growing difficulty of its position in Whitley Hundred. But there is another curious feature in this case.—

The Domesday measures of the three Manors of *Blachafort*, *Blackaford*, and *Haltona*, amount to 1297 acres, but the parochial areas which have gone to Whitley Hundred, under the names of Blackford and Holton, are only 1069 acres. It is obvious, then, that at least 228 acres of the Domesday Manors still remain in Catsash Hundred. This, too, can be reasonably accounted for. We take it that the acreage so remaining corresponds with Turstin fitz Rou's hide of Blachafort, that it never was in Blackford Chapelry, and that it now remains, under some other name than Blackford, in Catsash Hundred. Guessing, we should guess that it now is absorbed in South Cadbury.

We recur for a moment to the former subject, viz., Holton. It was Humphrey Chamberlain's at Domesday. He is stated to have held it *in capite* of the Crown. Nothing that has been said above should disguise our own conviction that Alnod, Humphrey Chamberlain's antecessor, had held Holton as he had *T. R. E.* held Blackford, under Glastonbury Abbey. Domesday, declaring the latter tenure, suppresses the former. Its recognition will render the anomaly of Holton going to Whitley Hundred more explicable than we, adhering to the mere letter of Domesday, had made it.

WHEATHILL.—Here again is a manor which having, before the Conquest, owned the Seignury of Glastonbury Abbey, and which appearing in Domesday under no such subjection, was yet ultimately annexed to Whitley Hundred;—a sure token that the Abbatial interest therein was again, and in some sort, recognized.

Its Domesday measures are 480 acres. Its parish, allotted to it as a Chapel later than the 13th century, is only 312 acres.

CHILMATONA (Kilmington).—Of the Abbess of Shaftesbury's tenure of this Manor in 1086, the Exon Domesday says—"Hanc dedit Serlo de Burceio Abbatie Sancti Edwardi cum filiâ suâ." The Exchequer Domesday says—"Ecclesia Sti Edwardi tenet de Serlone Chelmitone pro filiâ ejus quæ ibi est."

Both Domesdays concur in representing Kilmington as still a member of Serlo de Burci's Fief, and the Abbess as only his tenant. The previous Gheld-Inquest had accordingly given the Abbess no exemption in respect of her demesnes at Kilmington. She did not as yet hold it *in capite*. Ultimately it became a part of her Barony, that is, she held it of the King, *sine medio*.

STOKE TRISTER.—Originally, as we suppose, Stoke D'Estre, and so called from Richard del Estre, who

appears (*Liber Niger*, p. 98) in 1166 as holding the "Villa del Estre,"¹ by service of a third part of a *Fee of Moretain*.

This Richard del Estre was probably descended from William de Estra, who appears twice in the Somerset and four times in the Dorset Domesday as a Feoffee of the Comte of Moretain. In the present instance, however, that is in the cases of Stoke Trister and Cucklington, the Comte's Domesday tenant was Britell de St. Clare. As a general rule, Domesday estates of Britel de St. Clair seem to have descended to the house of De Esselegh, quite a different family to that of Del'Estre. But, whereas in the case of Stoke Trister and Cucklington we can find no symptom of a descent to De Esselegh, it becomes the more probable that they passed to some other family, such as that of Del Estre.

BRUTON HUNDRED.—The annual rents and values of the Manors of this Hundred, at periods antecedent to Domesday, are, nearly all, recorded in the Survey. Their amount was £265 5s. They had fallen to £227 8s. 6d. in A.D. 1086.

BRUTON MANOR AND HUNDRED.—We here insert a Table showing the Quasi-hidage and Hidage of the Royal Manor of Bruton, and of the Old Hundred; showing also the Domesday measures of each, and in parallelism therewith the modern acreage of the same aggregate territory. The modern acreage of that part of Witham which was originally taken from Brewham cannot be ascertained. It is now in Witham Parish and in another Hundred. This modern acreage then has been suppressed in the following Table, though the Domesday measures of the same territory are retained. So far then the exact parallelism between the Domesday and modern measures is not maintained. (See Table on page 118).

The Hidage and Quasi-Hidage of the Hundred of Bruton and of the Capital Manor are together equal to $287\frac{1}{16}$ hides. (See p. 118) The average hide of the same combined territories was therefore represented by 192 acres of Domesday measurement; and is now represented by about 205 acres of modern ascertainment.

It seems desirable to give the comparative measures of the Hundred of Bruton as *distinct* from those of Bruton itself,—the King's Manor. The former will be found to be nearly as follows.—

The Inquisitional Hidage of the Hundred (A.D. 1084) was taken as 232 hides. The Domesday Hidage (A.D. 1086) seems to have been $237\frac{1}{16}$ hides. The Domesday measures of the manors constituting the Old Hundred amount to 41,756 acres, viz., for 289 plough-lands, 34,680 acres; of wood-land, 5,062 acres; of meadow-land, 1,269 acres; of pasture-land, 745 acres. (See p. 118).

The recently measured areas of the constituent parishes of the Hundred are (all Bruton and part of Witham excepted) 54,753 acres. (See p. 118). Therefore the modern acreage exceeds the correlative Domesday measures by more than 13,000 acres.

The Domesday Hide of Bruton Hundred corresponds with 176 acres of other Domesday measurement, and with about 231 acres of modern ascertainment.

THE HIDE of Bruton Hundred averaged an annual value of 19s. 2d. in 1086. Ten or twenty years previously it had averaged at least £1 2s. 4d. per annum. The Domesday acre was worth about $1\frac{3}{10}$ d. *per annum* in the year of the Survey.

Connected with the LIMITS OF BRUTON HUNDRED, or rather of that section of Bruton Hundred which is now known as Norton-Ferris Hundred, there is an exceptional question, which, inasmuch as it also touches on the question of the boundary between Somerset and Wilts, should be fully stated.—

GASPAR, alias BROOK, and BONHAM are two hamlets, measuring together 1,256 acres, and standing on the very confines of the two counties. Neither of these estates is mentioned by name in the Domesday Survey, whether of Somerset or Wilts. There can be little doubt that they were then absorbed in the Survey of the Wiltshire Manor of Stourton, a manor held by Walseline de Douai, and under him by Radulfus;—doubtless that same Radulfus who held North Barrow, in Somerset, under the same Baron.

Consistently with their Domesday amalgamation with Stourton we have the existing fact that these two hamlets still remain in the Parish of Stourton. Ecclesiastically, then, they are and have been in Wiltshire rather than Somerset. Collinson, neither in his History, nor in his Map of Somerset, took any notice of

¹ Hearne's reading of this passage might be suspected, for it seems extraordinary that a vill called 'Stocæ' (Stoke) in Domesday, passing to the possession of Richard de L'Estre should be styled "Villa del Estre" at so early a period as A.D. 1166. However the subsequent appellation of "Stoke del Estre" (now corrupted into Stoke Trister) makes the process of change more intelligible and more credible,

118 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

these two hamlets. He took ecclesiastical boundaries for his guide, and possibly did not advert, even in thought, to the civil question which we now discuss. There is not enough in any of the above considerations to prove that these two hamlets have not, from time immemorial, been civilly and manorially in Somerset. But whether it is by tradition, or by some comparatively recent arrangement, that they are placed in the Somerset Hundred of Norton-Ferris, we cannot determine. In our Tables of Bruton Hundred we exclude them altogether; for whereas their hidage was not registered by Domesday as in any supposable part of that Hundred, so we should lose the leading principle of our comparisons were we to reckon their actual area in parallelism with any complement of Somerset hidage.

Bruton Manor and Old Hundred.	Quasi hides.			Plough-lands.	Wood acres.	Meadow acres.	Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Measures, Acreage.	Parochial Acreage.																																	
	H.	v.	F.																																							
BRUTON SECTION.																																										
Bruton,—Vetus Dominicum.....	50	0	0	6000	7200	38	150	13388	} 3631																																	
Bruton, Members of (in parish)...	7	1	3	1680	0	23	30	1733																																		
Brewham, N. & S.	12	3	0	1860	200	60	0	2120		4697																																
Ablata de Brewham (Witham) ...	2	0	0	360	5	20	30	415		(alibi)																																
Pitcombe.....	5	0	0	600	5	22	0	627		2330																																
Yarlington.....	7	0	0	840	180	0	0	1020		1207																																
Milton Clevedon.....	1	2	0	240	0	0	0	240		1221																																
Upton Noble.....	3	0	0	360	240	5	0	605		677																																
CATSASH SECTION.																																										
Queen's Camel.....	15	0	0	1800	100	100	100	2100	2491																																	
Lovington.....	6	0	0	1080	80	52	..	1212	822																																	
Castle Cary.....	15	0	0	2400	720	100	0	3220	2625																																	
Sparkford.....	5	1	0	600	20	40	100	760	950																																	
Almsford.....	5	0	0	720	20	20	20	780	844																																	
North-Barrow.....	5	0	0	600	30	25	0	655	751																																	
South-Barrow.....	5	0	0	600	40	8	20	668	752																																	
Sutton Montis....	5	0	0	600	8	16	0	624	494																																	
Alford.....	5	0	0	600	0	50	0	650	698																																	
Kinton Mandeville.....	6	0	0	600	0	30	0	630	770																																	
Barton St. David.....	6	0	0	960	0	74	84	1118	945																																	
Bahcary.....	12	0	0	1920	0	68	16	2004	2393																																	
West Lydford.....	9	0	0	960	120	60	30	1170	1750																																	
Maperton.....	10	0	0	1440	250	15	10	1715	1534																																	
South Cadbury.....	3	0	0	360	0	0	0	360	800																																	
North Cadbury.....	16	1	2	1860	53	54	70	2037	2676																																	
King Weston.....	5	0	0	960	3	25	22	1010	1666																																	
Weston Bampfild.....	4	3	0	480	24	32	0	536	631																																	
Compton Paunceford.....	6	0	0	720	40	15	0	775	672																																	
WHITLEY SECTION.																																										
Blackford.....	5	0	0	840	47	115	43	1045	578																																	
Holton.....	2	0	0	240	6	6	0	252	491																																	
Wheathill.....	3	0	0	480	0	0	0	480	312																																	
NORTON FERRIS SECTION.																																										
Wincanton.....	4	0	0	1440	150	110	30	1730	4130																																	
Bratton Seymour.....	4	0	0	960	60	4	0	1024	1093																																	
Shipton Montague ..	10	2	0	1440	522	50	0	2012	2425																																	
Kilmington.....	7	2	0	960	420	20	0	1400	} 2746																																	
Yarnfield.....																																										
Stoke Trister.....	3	0	0	600	120	16	0	736	1090																																	
Cucklington.....	7	0	0	720	720	22	0	1462	2365																																	
Charlton Musgrove.....	5	0	0	1440	360	0	120	1920	2275																																	
Pen Selwood.....	3	0	0	360	519	12	20	911	1101																																	
<table border="0" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width:10%;"></td> <td style="width:3%; text-align:right">287</td> <td style="width:3%; text-align:right">0</td> <td style="width:3%; text-align:right">1</td> <td style="width:3%;"></td> <td style="width:10%; text-align:right">40,680</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align:right">12,262</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align:right">1,307</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align:right">895</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align:right">5,5144</td> <td style="width:10%; text-align:right">58,389</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deducting the measures of the Capital Manor.....</td> <td style="text-align:right">50</td> <td style="text-align:right">0</td> <td style="text-align:right">0</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align:right">6,000</td> <td style="text-align:right">7,200</td> <td style="text-align:right">38</td> <td style="text-align:right">150</td> <td style="text-align:right">1,3388</td> <td style="text-align:right">3,631</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align:right">237</td> <td style="text-align:right">0</td> <td style="text-align:right">1</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align:right">34,680</td> <td style="text-align:right">5,062</td> <td style="text-align:right">1,269</td> <td style="text-align:right">745</td> <td style="text-align:right">41,756</td> <td style="text-align:right">54,758</td> </tr> </table>											287	0	1		40,680	12,262	1,307	895	5,5144	58,389	Deducting the measures of the Capital Manor.....	50	0	0		6,000	7,200	38	150	1,3388	3,631		237	0	1		34,680	5,062	1,269	745	41,756	54,758
	287	0	1		40,680	12,262	1,307	895	5,5144	58,389																																
Deducting the measures of the Capital Manor.....	50	0	0		6,000	7,200	38	150	1,3388	3,631																																
	237	0	1		34,680	5,062	1,269	745	41,756	54,758																																

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) OF KEYNSHAM HUNDRED (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 67).

	H.	V.	F.
In Cainesham Hundret sunt c et iiij hidæ (104 hides).			
Inde habuit Rex de Gildo suo £15 pro L. hidis	50	0	0
Et Rex et Barones sui habent in dominiatu suo xxx hid. et dim. (30½ hides).			
“De (his)” habet Rex in suo domiuiò xv hidas	15	0	0
Et Episcopus Constantieusis iij hid. et iij virgas	3	3	0
Et Abbas Glastingeberiensis iij hid. et dimidiam	4	2	0
Et Abbas de Bada v hid. et i virgam	5	1	0
Et Presbyter de Cainesham i hidam	1	0	0
Et Aluricus de Cainesham i hidam	1	0	0
	<u>30</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
	30	2	0
Et non habuit Rex Gildum pro ix et vii et dim. (but read x et vii et dim., <i>i. e.</i>) xvii hid. et dim. hid. quas tenent Villani Regis de Cainesham	17	2	0
Willelmus.			
Nec pro dim. hidà quam tenet Hubertus (<i>sic</i>) de Episcopi Constantieni	2	0	0
Nec pro i hidà et dim. quam tenet Heroldus de Alveredo	1	2	0
Nec pro i hidà quam tenet Nicholaus de Alveredo	1	0	0
Nec pro iij hidis quas tenet Rogerus de Stanton	3	0	0
	<u>23</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
	23	2	0
	<u>104</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

“De hoc Hundreto debentur adhuc Regi de Gildo suo vii Libræ et xii dim. (£7 I. 0.) (And this is, at 6s. per hide, the exact gheld on 23½ hides; whereas the letter of the Inquest, unamended, would have led to an arrear of £6 15s. on 22½ hides, a result which would have destroyed the symmetry of the whole Inquest).

NOTES ON THE INQUISICIO GHELDI FOR KEYNSHAM HUNDRED.

THE KING'S 15 hides of demesne were in Keynsham Manor. Domesday puts them at 15½ hides. It also states William Hosatus to have been then Fermor of the Manor.

THE BISHOP OF COUTANCES' demesnes (3¾ hides) are exactly reproduced in the Domesday notice of his Manor of Coutune (now Compton Dando).

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S demesnes, 4½ hides, are exactly reproduced in the Domesday notice of the Abbot's Manor of Mercesberia (Marksbury).

THE ABBOT OF BATH'S demesnes (5¼ hides in 1084) are reduced to 2½ hides in Domesday, viz., 2 hides in Priston and ½ hide in Stanton (Stanton Prior). It is presumable that Walter Hosatus, holding in Domesday Wemmadona (Wilmington in Priston) 3 hides, of the Abbey, had been enfeoffed since 1084, and that his feoffment embodied 2¾ hides erst held by the Abbey in demesne. At that rate the demesne of Wilmington, 2¾ hides in 1084, appear in Domesday as 2½ hides only;—a mere incident of the supposed feoffment. Compare the case of Charcombe, *supra*, p. 58).

THE KEYNSHAM PRIEST'S exemption for one hide of demesne is not reproduced in any statement of Domesday. But Domesday, giving the whole Manor of Cainesham (Keynsham) as 50 hides, mentions details which imply only 49 hides. The omitted hide was of course the glebe in question.

ALURIC DE KEYNSHAM appears in Domesday as holding 1 hide of Tainland in Keynsham, of the King *in capite, sine medio*. Hence the right of exemption.

THE VILLANAGIUM of Caynesham appears in Domesday as 17 hides. What the King's demesne had gained, viz., half a hide, the Villanagium had lost, since 1084.

THE BISHOP OF COUTANCES' tenant, Hubert, reappears nowhere in Domesday. It is clear that about the time of the Inquest (1084) Hubert had been succeeded by Willelmus. “Willelmus” accordingly appears in Domesday as holding 5 hides in Ferenberga (Farmborough) under the Bishop. The insolvent half-hide of 1084 was then part of this estate. Willelmus appears thirteen times in Domesday, as the Bishop's tenant. Sometimes he is called Willelmus de Moncellis,

AFTER THE WORDS 'HEROLDUS DE ALVEREDO,' we venture to add 'et Alyeredus de Comite Eustachio.' Alured, who holds 3 hides in Celeworda (Chelwood) under Comte Eustace of Boulogne, was probably Alured de Merleberge. It is suggested that Alured had a sub-tenant, Harold, the defaulter of 1084. No such sub-tenant appears in Domesday, and, even had the sub-tenancy still existed, it would not be likely to be stated in that Survey.

ALURED, again mentioned, is, unquestionably in this instance, Alured de Merleberge, tenant *in capite* of other 5 hides in Chelwood (Exon D., p. 416). Moreover Domesday repeats Nicholas as Alured's tenant in the said estate. Nicholas's default in 1084 was on 1 hide, *i. e.* one third of his demesne, and one fifth of his Fee.

ROGER DE STANTON reappears in Domesday as "Rogerius," holding *in capite* 10 hides in Estantona (Stanton Drew), a member of Caynesham. His non-exemption in 1084, for some $5\frac{1}{2}$ hides of demesne, is as difficult to understand as his surcharge on 3 hides. Possibly his tenure was not deemed to be *sine medio* in 1084, but rather of the estate of Ulward Wyte, his Saxon antecessor, not then deceased. However, Ulward Wyte, though living at the date of the Inquest (A.D. 1084), will have been under some forfeiture or disability as to his estates in Keynsham Hundred; for he has no exemption for any demesne, neither in Stanton nor Burnett, nor in another member of Keynsham (unnamed). Say that his lands were *in manu Regis*. That would account for his non-exemption, and be consistent with his successor at Stanton (*viz.*, Roger), and at Burnett (*viz.*, his own widow) appearing in Domesday with definite demesnes in each place.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 17-18) OF KEYNSHAM HUNDRED.

CAINESSAM.—The King's Dominical Manor seems to have involved the six manors named as parishes in the last column of the Table. As usual, none of these except Cainessam are named in Domesday, simply because they were involved members of Keynsham, and none of them as yet subinfeudated. The hidation of the whole was $32\frac{1}{2}$ hides; or, if we add the glebe of Keynsham Church (omitted among the Domesday details), then $33\frac{1}{2}$ hides. This, the Dominical Manor, with its non-subinfeudated members, was worth £103 per annum at the date of Domesday. It was farmed under the King by William Hosee, having yielded only £80 per annum when that officer undertook the function. ("Reddit per annum c Libras et viii numero; et quando Willelmus Hosatus recepit ad firman reddebat iiii xx Libras.") The subinfeudated members of Cainessam constituted $16\frac{1}{2}$ hides of the 50 hides which represented the whole estate. Of these five members, two are undistinguished by name in Domesday, while three which are named prove to be represented in the two later parishes of Stanton-Drew and Burnett.

COMTUNA (now Compton-Dando).—The Domesday notice proper to this manor has been erroneously assigned by Collinson to the Bishop of Salisbury's manor of Chilcompton. Under Compton Dando, Collinson has misapplied the Domesday description of Comte Eustace's Manor of Contitone. We do not affect to know where Comte Eustace's Manor of Contitone was. It was not in Keynsham Hundred.

FERENBERGA.—The Exon Domesday erroneously writes '2 hidæ' and, '2 carucæ' in the description of the principal manor of Ferenberga. The context disproves the first error; the Exchequer Domesday corrects both. They merely result from a Scribe twice misreading the figure V for the figure II.

SANFORT (now Saltford).—The apparent change of name should be accounted for. The marginal cross † placed in the Exon Domesday opposite "Sanfort" seems to indicate a nearly coeval discovery of error. The non-mention of an estate, held *T. R. E.*, by four thegus, among the "Terræ Occupatæ," is also suggestive of suspicion. There are four Sandfords in Somerset, *viz.*, Sanford Arundell, Sanford Brett, Sandford Orcas, and Sanford-in-Winscombe. The above manor is none of them. For the above Sanfort we venture to read Salford, or Saltford. The latter manor has no other mention in Domesday. Another argument for the supposed identity is this. There is some Domesday analogies between "Sanfort" and a part of Winford (in Hartcliffe Hundred). Each was in the list of the Bishop of Contances, each was held under the Bishop by Roger Witen, elsewhere called Roger de Corcelle; each was of the high relative value of 30s. per hide. Similar analogies held afterwards in respect of Saltford and Winford. Each was subjected in Seignery to the Honour of Gloucester, in succession to the Bishop of Contances: each appears to have been held of the said Honour by the family of Baieux. (See Collinson, ii. 306, 431).

STANTONA (Stanton Prior).—The Domesday details are deficient by 2 virgates. Such deficits of detail are not uncommon in Domesday. Kemble, the great Anglo-Saxon scholar, happening by misfortune to light upon a manor thus defectively described in Domesday, took it for an exemplar, and by a series of

equations constructed a Table of Gheld-measures which represented the Gheld-virgate to be equal to 10 Gheld-acres. We need not repeat that the *Virgata-ad-Gheldum* was 12 Gheld acres.

KEYNSHAM HUNDRED.—The hidage, which we have collected from Domesday, squares exactly with the hidage predicated by the Gheld-Collectors of 1084.

This Hundred was one of unusual fertility and wealth. The plough-lands of the wealthier parts of Somerset were seldom more than one to the hide. Here there are 161 plough-lands to 104 hides. The annual value of the Somerset hide was seldom more than 20 shillings. In Keynsham Hundred it was £1 7s. 4½d. at the date of Domesday. It is quite in accordance with such phenomena that the Domesday hide should be found to be now represented by a number of acres less than the average of 250. In this instance 223¼ acres suffice to equalise the hide.

According to our computation of the exacter measures supplied by Domesday for the collective manors of this Hundred, its gross acreage was 21,679 acres. The more scientific method of modern land-surveying establishes an area of 23,253 acres. But it should be observed that the Domesday measures of this Hundred only allow 550 acres for the item of *Pascua*. Probably pasturage, in small quantities or of scanty growth, was occasionally ignored by the Survey. For instance, according to Domesday the two Manors of Chelwood were destitute of pasturage, yet, together, they fed 30 she-goats and 180 sheep.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR CANNINGTON HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, P. 72).

In Hundreto Cantetonæ sunt 45 hidæ, 1 virga et 3 fertini.

	H.	V.	F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £9 18s. pro.....			33 0 0
Et Barones Regis habent in Dominio x hid. et dim. et ii fertinos (<u>10 2 2</u>)	H.	V.	F.
De isto dominio habet Wills (de Moione) Vicecomes 4 hid. 1 virg. 2 fert.....	4	1	2
Et Wills de Falesia 2 hidæ	2	0	0
Et Roger de Corcella, 1 hid. 3 virg. 1 fert.	1	3	1
Et i virg. et dimid. (Read Johannes Hostiarius 1 virg. et dimid.)	0	1	2
Et Anscetillus Parcarius 1 hidam	1	0	0
Et Leno, 1 virgat	0	1	0
Et Osmer, 1 virgat.	0	1	0
Et Ecclesia de Cantelona (read Cantetona) dimid. hidam	0	2	0
Et i Sancti-Monialis, 1 fert.....	0	0	1
	<u>10</u>	<u>2 2</u>	<u>10 2 2</u>
Et non habet Rex geldum de dim. hida quam tenet Fulcerus de Stochelanda	0	2	0
Nec de dimidiâ hidâ quam tenet Rotbertus de Spachestona	0	2	0
Nec de dimidiâ virgâ quam tenet Willelmus filius Roberti.....	0	0	2
Nec de dimidiâ virgâ quam tenet Bristrius	0	0	2
Nec de dimidiâ hidâ quam tenet Hugo de Hispania.....	0	2	0
Nec de i fertino quam tenet Hugo de Tenera	0	0	1
	<u>1</u>	<u>3 1</u>	<u>1 3 1</u>
			<u>45 1 3</u>

De hoc Hundreto sunt adhuc retro de Geldo Regis 10s. 10½d. (which, at 6 shillings per hide, is the exact charge, on 1 hide, 3 virgate and 1 fertin).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF CANNINGTON HUNDRED.

Domesday makes WILLIAM DE MOIONE's demesnes to be 4 hides 2 virgates, viz., 3 hides 3 virgates in Stockland (Bristol), and 3 virgates in Sedtammetona.

WILLIAM DE FALAISE's demesne of 2 hides reappears in Domesday as 2 hides in Estoccha (Stogursey).

ROGER DE CORCELLE's demesnes (1h. 3v. 1f. in 1084) are reduced to 1 hide in Cerdesline (Charlinch), and half a hide in Currypool, by Domesday. This probably was by intermediate feoffment of one or other of his numerous tenants,

JOHN USHER's demesne in 1084 was $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, evidently in Cannington. Domesday shows his newly enfeoffed tenant, Robertus, with the same proportion of demesne in Cannington.

ANSCHETIL PARKER appears in Domesday with an estate written Hederneberia. It was 1 hide, all held in demesne apparently. We cannot identify *Hederneberia* *alias* *Herdeneberie* (as the Exchequer Domesday writes it) with any modern locality. Nevertheless, it was clearly in Cannington Hundred.

LENO of the Inquest appears as Licius, the King's Almoner, in Domesday. His estate was at Beer, in Cannington. It was one virgate, of which he then held only three-fourths in demesne.

OSMER was a Saxon Thane who succeeded his father. His estate was 1 virgate in Otterhampton. Before Domesday came to be written, two-thirds of this virgate had been annexed by some merciless official to the King's Manor of Cannington. One-third of his heritage remained in Osmer's demesne.

The exemption of CANNINGTON CHURCH for 2 virgates was for so much of its glebe as was held by the Incumbent in demesne. The whole glebe was $2\frac{1}{2}$ virgates. Domesday names the Incumbent as "Erchenger, a Priest and Almoner of the King." His demesne was still 2 virgates. From these entries we evolve the following principle:—*Though a Manor of Ancient Crown-Demesne was Extra-Hundredal, non-hidated, and ingeldable, its church and glebe were usually Intra-Hundredal, hidated, and geldable; for an estate was not the less geldable because a part thereof was, pro hae vice, non-geldant.*

To this Canon there is a remarkable exception in the case of the Church of St. John, at Frome. It had in all respects the franchises of Ancient Demesne.

THE NUN exempted by the Inquest was named Edith. The locality of her estate is not given in Domesday, where she appears among the King's Almoners as "Eddida Monialis." Her exemption was for only one fertine. Of that we shall say more anon.

FULCHER DE STOCKLAND does not reappear in Domesday. His default in 1084 was probably due to death. He was probably Corcelle's tenant in $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides in Stockland. If so, his successor in such tenancy was Anschetil Parker above mentioned. In Domesday, however, Anschetil, instead of 2 virgates of demesne at Stockland, holds $3\frac{1}{2}$ virgates.

ROBERT DE SPAXTON also vanishes from Domesday, and perhaps for the same reason,—death. His estate was probably a hide in Spaxton, held under Alured de Hispania, and held, half thereof, in demesne. If so, then in Domesday Alured himself appears with an estate, so held half and half, but held *in capite*. The whole theory becomes more probable in that Alured had no such estate in hand in 1084, otherwise his demesne of a half-hide had been exempt.

WILLIAM FITZ ROBERT's default in respect of the gheld of a half virgate is perhaps accounted for by the tenancy of one "Willelmus" in Domesday. His whole estate was $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates in Stringstone, held of Roger de Corcelle. William fitz Robert will appear with his full name in Taunton Hundred, where he was clearly a tenant of Roger de Corcelle.

THE DEFAULT OF BRISTRIS in respect of half a virgate is illustrated in Domesday by mention of an estate of half a virgate, held by Bristric, an English Thegn. It had paid no gheld in King Edward's time, says the Record, "scd tamen ibi est dimidia virgata terræ." The Assessors of 1084 had earlier made the same discovery. They merely meant to detail a certain half virgate as belonging to their Hundred and necessary to be entered in a balanced account like theirs. They did not decide it to be geldable. According to ordinary rules it was not, for Bristric held it wholly in demesne.

HUGO DE HISPANIA, insolvent as to half a hide in 1084, was probably Alured de Hispania's brother. He reappears in Domesday as one "Hugh" holding a hide in Planesfield, under that Baron.

Similarly, HUGO DE TENERA, insolvent as to 1 fertin in 1084, may have been a second Hugh, viz, he who appears in Domesday as holding 1 hide in Mulsella under Alured de Hispania. Roger Arundel's tenant at Fiddington and Tuxwell was also named "Hugh," but his concern in the former was too great to be a probable antithesis of the entry of 1084.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 17-18) OF CANNINGTON HUNDRED.

THIS HUNDRED is distinguished in Domesday by its abundance of she-goats, by the low value of its mills, and by containing two estates (at Tuxwell and Fiddington), wherein were 41 acres and 43 acres of moor which the Surveyors thought proper to specify. Whereas none of the great marsh-moors of Somerset

intruded on this district, it is possible that the moors in Tuxwell and Fiddington were of some profit to the owner,—not marshes at all then.

That which Domesday says about the Nun Edith's estate is worth noting.—“Eddida monialis habet xii agros terræ quas tenet in elemosynâ de Rege. Ibi habet Eddida 4 aumalia et 4 porcos et 11 oves et quater-viginti agros nemoris et pascuæ; et valet per annum 5 solidos.” (Exon Domesday, p. 179).—

The twelve acres, here spoken of, were gheld-acres; the eighty acres were statute acres. Therefore in this case the gheld-acre was equal to $6\frac{2}{3}$ statute acres. Now, as the hide contained 48 gheld-acres, the hide, in such an instance as this, will have been co-ordinate with 320 statute acres. We have shown in another page that if all the hides and quasi-hides of Somerset be taken together the average correlative of each hide is about 250 acres. Again, it is worth observing, that whereas the Fegadri of 1084 had treated the Nun's estate as a single fertine, Domesday treats it as four fertines, the equivalent of 12 gheld-acres, or of one virgate. The contrast is merely one between privileged, or prescriptive, or nominal hidation, and ascertained fact. Such is the principle, however, which results in what we call “Domesday Increments.” This is the way in which it came to pass that the Hundreds of A.D. 1084 were often outmeasured by their Domesday antitypes.

The value of the Nun's estate, 5 shillings per annum, was at the rate of £1 per hide, or five-pence per gheld-acre, or three-farthings per statute acre. They are all inexplicably high for an estate which ostensibly consisted of nothing but wood and pasture.

CANNINGTON HUNDRED.—Accepting the Domesday hidage of this Hundred to have been $46\frac{1}{2}$ hides, and the corresponding measures, deducible from the text of Domesday, to have been 15,003 statute acres, the hide in this instance is paralleled by 320 Domesday acres. But the acreage of modern ascertainment is, for nearly the same territory, 19,756 acres. This gives $422\frac{1}{2}$ statute acres in parallelism with the hide. The discrepancy between the two calculations is at once adjusted by stating a fact which will become more evident in the sequel, viz., that about 4,750 acres of the existing parishes of the Hundred were in the King's Forest at the date of Domesday. As to the Domesday values of land in Cannington Hundred, they were about £1 14s. 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per hide, and rather more than 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per acre of Domesday recognition.

RACHEDEWORDE (written Racheifuorda in the Exon Domesday) is translated into “Rakesworth” by Collinson (i. 43). The etymological change is undeniably specious, but no such locality as Rakesworth is discovered by Collinson in the body of his work; nor has the author of these Notes been more successful.

Domesday sequence indicates that Rachedeworde was in Cannington Hundred, and suggests that it was like the next preceding manor (Cilleton, now Chilton) in Cannington parish. Radway (afterwards Radway fitz Pain) seems the most likely representative of Rachedeworde; not that *Rachedewai* and Rachedeworde are identical names, but that the two names may have been formed from different features of one locality.

ESTROHELANDA (Stockland Bristol).—The mill-value, expressed as “x nummi” in the Exon Domesday, is registered under the equivalent expression of “x denarii” in the Exchequer Codex.

The modern parish of Stockland (1,150 acres) represents but a section of its Domesday manorial elements ($9\frac{1}{2}$ hides). The old parish was, accordingly, larger than that of Cannington.

ESTOCHA (postea Stoke-Courci).—The identity of this manor with the moderu “Stogursey” is unmistakable. The two virgates “added thereto” before Domesday, we venture to place in—

OVER STOWEY, which as Collinson (i. 259) intimates, has no distinct Domesday notice. From the same writer we infer that William de Faleise's successors in Estocho had a considerable interest in Over Stowey. This interest we presume to have represented the *additamentum* of Domesday. But the bulk of Over Stowey, we hesitate not to say, was typified or implied in that share of Stockland which Domesday assigns to Ralph Paganell. Paganell's share of Stockland (Bristol) eventually went to St. Mark's Hospita at Bristol. So also went the Manor and advowson of Over Stowey (See Collinson, i. 247, 248).

As to DODINGTON, about two miles N.W. of Over Stowey, it now constitutes a parish of Cannington Hundred, and is said to measure 543 acres. It is not named in Domesday. Very possibly, like the adjoining Manor of Holford, it was not then in Cannington Hundred. Dodington is one of those localities whose Domesday status seems too uncertain, even for conjecture. However, we should guess that it was dependent on some manor of Alured de Hispania's fief, seeing that its Post-Domesday tenants had lands also in Alfoxton and Ditch.

SEDTAMMETONA, an addition of Moione's Manor of Estocheland, is translated (in Collinson's Index, Vol. i,

p. 43) as "Stanton." A place, called *Sedernmede* in the time of Henry V. (See Collinson, iii. 90), seems to indicate the preservation, at that date, of a much more apposite etymology; but we can find neither *Sedernmede* nor *Sedernnton*, in present existence. In such cases the presumption is that the thing added was near to the thing augmented.

GODELEGA, identified with Gautheney in Charlinch. The sequence of Domesday supports the idea that Godelega was in Cauntington Hundred. The half-mill of Godelega has no Domesday counterpart, neither in Cauntington nor in any other Hundred: so this, sometimes efficient guide to a right identification, fails us here. The mention of five "Coceti" in the Domesday Manor of Godelega is abnormal in any of the Western Hundreds.

TERRA COLGRINI.—The manor so described, comes in Domesday between Godelega and Otterhampton. The name originated with Colgrin, Lord of the Manor in 1063. Names of that period, thus recently improvised, have seldom endured. Of course the spot now representing "Colgrin's land" is not discoverable except by conjecture. That the estate was in Cauntington Hundred is not a mere guess.

ESPACHESTONA (Spaxton).—Alured de Hispania seems to have taken one estate in Spaxton into his own hand between 1084 and 1086 (See note above, p. 122. 'Robert de Spaxton').

TOCHESWILLA (Bristric's half-virgate in Tuxwell). The Fegadri of 1084 had evidently looked upon this estate as ingeldable, non-hidated, and indeed, Extra-Hundredal. The note of the Domesday Surveyors—*Sed tamen ibi est dimidia virgata terræ* purports a suspicion of error as regarded non-hidation.

STRINGESTONA (Stringston).—The text of both Domesdays gives the *additum* of Stringston as two fertines. The Schedule of *Terræ Occupate*, appended to the Exon Survey says, "two fertines and two parts of two fertines," that is $3\frac{2}{3}$ fertines, or 3 fertines 1 gheld-acre, in all.

ASHOLT or ASHOLT (1,252 acres), on the Quantock Hills, and now in Cauntington Hundred, is not in Domesday says Collinson (i, 237). He traces it to Richard del Estre in time of Henry II., then to William de Reigni, and, in 1282, to John de Nevill holding it *in capite* per 1 f. m.—

It seems strange that a manor of such a type and of such antiquity should not have had its germ in Domesday. Del Estre's tenure thereof would induce one to look for the prototype of Asholt among the Fees of the Comte of Moretain. But it is not there; neither had the Comte any fees in Cauntington Hundred. Possibly then the Domesday original of Asholt may have been that manor of Roger de Corcelle's fief, which was one virgate, and was written as—

TERRA OLTA in the Survey. "Terra Oltæ," on the other hand seems to have no other subsequent representative than this possible one of Asholt.

THE INQUISICIO-OHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR CONGRESBURY HUNDRED (SEE INQUIS.-GHELDI, p. 70).

"In Hundreto Cungresheriæ sunt x et viiii hidæ" (that is xix hides)	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
"Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo xiii sol. et vi den. pro ii hidis et i virgâ".....				2	1	0
"Et Rex et Barones sui habent in suo dominicatu v hidas et i virgam" (5 hides, 1 virg)						
"De" (his) habet Rex iii hidas et dimidiam in dominio.....	3	2	0			
"Et Ordricus" (habet) "iii virgas" (in dominio).....		3	0			
"Et Ordulfus" (habet) "dimidiam hidam" (in dominio) ...		2	0			
"Et Alwardus" (habet) "dimidiam hidam".....		2	0			
	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	5	1	0
"Et pro xi hidis quas tenent Villani Regis de Cungresheriâ non habet Rex Gildum"	11	0	0			
"Et pro dimidiâ hidâ quam tenent Villani de Ecclesiâ Cungresheriensi non habet Rex Gildum".....		2	0			
	<u>11</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	11	2	0
				<u>19</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

"Restant de hoc Hundreto lxxix solidi ad persolvendum" (And 69 shillings at the rate of 6 shillings per hide will be found to be the exact gheld on $11\frac{2}{3}$ insolvent hides),

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF CONGRESBURY HUNDRED.

The reputed hidage of Congresbury Hundred was, in 1084, nineteen hides; and the details supplied in the Inquest square exactly with that assumption. However the Hundred of Congresbury really contained 20 hides; only the Fegadri of 1084 failed to detect or to assess one out of two hides, which being severances of the Manor of Congresbury, were still portions of the Hundred. Accordingly, Domesday found in the Manor and its severances, 20 hides.

Furthermore, the Domesday Commissioners recorded the King's demesne to be 5 hides, and his Villeinage only $9\frac{1}{2}$ hides; they added a half-virgate to the Thegn Ordulf's demesne, and a whole virgate to the Thegn Alward's: they showed that the Villeins who, in 1084, held the Church-land of Congresbury, held, in 1086, under Maurice, Bishop of London, as Incumbent of the said Church:—in indicating a severance of one hide from the Manor of Congresbury as having fallen to the tenure of Giso, Bishop of Wells, they probably instanced the very hide which had escaped the cognizance of the Fegadri of 1084.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 17-18) OF CONGRESBURY HUNDRED.

MANSIO VOCATA CONGRESBERIA.—The King's share in the Manor of Congresbury, viz., that which he held in demesne or allowed to his Villeius was $14\frac{1}{2}$ hides. It was in custody of William de Moione, then Sheriff of Somerset. The annual value (£28 15s.) *quando Willelmus Vicecomes recepit*, still obtained at the date of Domesday. It was in *White Money*, supposed to be of more value, by 5 per cent., than money of the ordinary denominations.

Three hides of the Manor are called in Domesday, "Tegmland," that is, the King's Ferm was not increased by any money payment of the three Thegns in possession. Had they paid any money-rent to the King, to the Sheriff, or to any Fermor, their land would have thereby become "Reeve-land."

THE CHURCH-FEE of Congresbury was two virgates. Incumbents of such Churches are usually called in Domesday *Elemosynarii Regis*:—Tenants in Almoign, that is.

THE ABLATA, otherwise called the *Terre occupatae*, of Congresbury Manor were two hides and a pasture. These hides had not been *ablated* in any sense implying force or fraud. They were held by a Bishop and by two Barons with full Royal sanction. They were geldable, and by no means *ablated* from the Hundred.

PASCUA DE WEIMORHAM.—This *Ablatum* from Congresbury is noticed by Domesday under Bishop Giso's Manor of Yatton. The Exon Domesday, after surveying the 20 hides of Yatton, says,—"*De hisdem prædictis hidis tenet Hildebertus iv hidas de Episcopo, &c., &c. De his iv hidis quas Hildebertus tenet, habuit una femina, Ailrun, unam hidam pariter, die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus. Cum istâ hidâ quam tenuit Ailrun jacet*" (there is involved) "*una pascua quæ vocatur Weimorham quæ jacebat in mansione Regis de Congresberia die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus.*"

Yatton, be it observed, about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles North of Congresbury, was, at the date of Domesday in the Hundred of Chewton.

CONGRESBURY AND WICK ST. LAURENCE.—The Domesday Manor of Congresberia (20 hides) contained all that is now in the parishes of Congresbury and Wick St. Laurence, viz., 5,973 acres (as in the Table). So far the Domesday Hide may be said to coordinate with $298\frac{1}{2}$ statute acres.

But the more positive measures of Domesday establish for Congresbury a much larger area than is reached by 20 hides, if the hide be thus measured or defined.—The items of precise Domesday measurement are, according to our estimate of such measures, as follows.—Arable land, 6,000 acres + Wood-land, 1,830 acres + Meadow-land, 270 acres + Pasture, 1,440 acres = 9,540 acres. This now is 3,567 acres in excess of the aforesaid parochial measurements. It follows from these data that Earl Harold's Manor of Congresbury had attached to it a quantity of arable land, wood-land, and pasturage, which has never been brought within the parochial boundaries of Congresbury and Wick St Laurence.—

Some of these old manorial adjuncts may have lain at a distance, but near at hand, and from adjacent parishes, we can collect the following areas which were not in the Domesday Manors cognate with the said Parishes.—The Bishop of Wells' Manor of Banwell, for instance, contained 5154 acres less than are now to be found in its four cognate Parishes of Banwell, Puxton, Churchill, and Compton Bishop. The same Bishop's Manor of Yatton contained 2342 acres less than the present Parish of Yatton contains. The collective Manors of Kewstoke, Woodspring, and Middleton, sometime held by Serlo de Burci, Gilbert Fitz

Turold, and others, contained 358 Domesday acres less than are contained in the correlative parishes of Kew-stoke and Locking.

Such were the surroundings of Congresbury, We need not to inquire further how it came to pass that, in its Domesday aspect, the Manor was invested with undue proportions.

THE HIDE of Congresbury Hundred was parallel with 477 acres of contemporary measurement. The Hida'tion was 'privileged' ab antiquo.

The Domesday value of this Hundred (viz. £38 15s. + £1 8s. 9d.,—per centage on white money) £40 3s. 9d., was at the rate of more than £2 per hide, and of $1\frac{1}{10}$ pence per acre; also at the rate of 16s. 1d. per plough-land and of 17s. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per team in actual employ.

The number of Villeins, Boors, and Serfs, abiding in Congresbury Hundred in A.D. 1086, was 107. This gives a single labourer to every 89 acres of Domesday general measures; to every 56 acres of plough-land, and to every 52 acres of land actually ploughed.

THE INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR CARHAMPTON HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, P. 69).

H. V. P.		
In Hundreto Carentonæ sunt xl hidæ et i virga et iiii fertin et dim.	(40 1 3 $\frac{1}{2}$).	
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £10 11s. 6d. pro xxxv hid et i virga	35 1 0
Et Barones Regis habent in dominicatu suo v hidas i fertin minus	(4 3 3).	
De his habet Radulfus de Limiseio hidam et dimid.	1 2 0
Et Radulfus de Pomeria dimidiam hidam	0 2 0
Et Willelmus de Falesia i hid. et virgam et dimidiam	1 1 2
Et ii Sancti-Moniales et dim. (read "ii virgas et dimid.")	0 2 2
Et Wills (de Moione) Vicecomes, iiii virgas et fertinum (unum)	0 3 1
(Et) Rogerus (de) Corcella dimidiam virgam	0 0 2
	4 3 3	4 3 3
		40 0 3
The Inquest is incomplete. Arrears of 1s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. should have been added, that being } the gheld-rate on i virgate and $\frac{1}{2}$ fertin of seemingly insolvent land	}	} 0 1 0 $\frac{1}{2}$
		40 1 3 $\frac{1}{2}$

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF CARHAMPTON HUNDRED.

RALPH DE LIMESY's demesnes in 1084 were 1 hide in Luckham and half a hide in Selworthy. Domesday registers these quantities, but gives him further demesnes of 1 hide 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ virgates at Bossington, Allerford, and Treborough. These estates were all favourably hidated in comparison with their extent, and had clearly paid full gheld in 1084. Ralph de Limesey's changed position probably means nothing more than that he was ousting certain tenants and taking their tenements in hand.

RALPH DE POMERAYE's demesne reappears in Domesday as 2 virgates in Ar (now Oare).

WILLIAM DE FALISE's demesne is reduced in Domesday to 1 hide 1 virgate in Ottona (now Wootton Courtenay).

DUE SANCTIMONIALES of the Inquest are called "Dnæ Nonnæ" in Domesday. Their estate was at Honecota (Holnecote, near Luckham). King William had given them the land of two Thaues in Almoign. It was 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, as in the Inquest. Domesday says nothing about its geldability.

WILLIAM DE MOIONE's demesne of 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ virgates is reduced to 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ virgates in Domesday. His said demesne was in Exford and at *Bradeuda*, a locality now lost. Since 1084 he had probably enfeoffed certain tenants.

ROGER DE CORCELLE's demesnes appear to increase in Domesday. Those which exemplify the Inquest were perhaps in Exford and at Stoke Pero,—one fertine in each. But there may be a doubt whether some of his non-identified estates, though inserted in our Table of Carhampton Hundred, were really in that district. Yet, unless we include these non-identified estates in Carhampton Hundred, Domesday will hardly supply manors sufficient to fulfil the Inquisitional type of the said Hundred. When once we enter on the field of conjecture, all sorts of possibilities present themselves. What if this wild district were

imperfectly surveyed in the Record of A.D. 1086? What if it were ill-defined, and if estates which now appear in the far-stretching Hundred of Williton-and-Free-Manors, were in the 11th century parts of Carhampton Hundred?

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 19-20) OF CARHAMPTON HUNDRED.

DONESCUMBA.—COMBA.—These two untraceable localities are named in Domesday in sequence with other manors of Roger de Corcelle, which other manors were unquestionably in Carhampton Hundred. That is our reason for placing them in the Table of that Hundred. The same reason operates in the cases of ALRA and ESTANA, also manors of Roger de Corcelle.

DDEESHAM, PILLOC, SEINDUNE, TERRA TEDRICI, WIDIETA, BLACHAMORA.—These six estates of Roger de Corcelle are mentioned consecutively with estates which were rather in Cannington or North Petherton Hundred than in Carhampton. However, in these cases the sequence of Domesday is no guide; for the estates are grouped rather with reference to the undertenancy of Anchetill (Parker) or of William (de Almareio) than to any geographical affinities.

Collinson (i, pp. 39-45) has identified four of them with "Doddisham," "Pileigh," "Windiates," and "Blackmore in Churchill"; but two of these identifications are clearly wrong, while the other two convey no impression to our ignorance. The *Terra Tedrici* got its name from its owner (Teodorio), of the Confeſſor's time. Names, improvised at that date, have rarely endured.

PILLOC.—Though this estate be not Pileigh, its survey in Domesday is curious. The Surveyors first quote an old and nominal hidation of the manor, and then divide it according to its real contents:—

"Godricus tenuit (*T. R. E.*) et reddidit gildum pro dimidio fertino" (equal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ gheld-acres). "Hanc potest arare dimidia carruca. Hanc tenet Anchetillus (Parcarius) de Rogero (de Corcella) et est totum in dominio præter x agros (Gheld-acres?) et habet ibi unam carrucam et duos Bordarios qui tenent prædictos x agros, et (habet) 3 agros prati, et 7 agros Pascuæ: et valet 6 solidos." (Exon Domesday, pp. 396-397).—

There may be a doubt whether the "ten acres" were gheld-acres or statute-acres. The former would be in better keeping with the usual Domesday arrangement, which generally subdivides hidational terms into hidational quantities. At that rate the statute acreage of the estate will have been at least 120 acres, viz., plough-land, 60 acres, + (10 gheld-acres, or at least), 50 statute acres, + meadow, 3 acres, + pasture, 7 acres. But it may be that in this instance the "x agri" were statute acres. In that case the measure of the whole estate will have been 80 acres.

For such an estate, an hidation of "half a fertin" was of course either highly favourable or largely fraudulent. For a half-fertine paralleled by 80 acres means a hide of 2,560 acres. The hides of Carhampton Hundred were more comprehensive than those of any great Hundred in Somerset, but their average was less than 1,000 acres per hide.

EPFSA.—This manor is placed by us in Carhampton Hundred merely as following in Domesday after five other manors of Ralph de Limesey, which undoubtedly were so. Collinson's identification of the place with "Episbury" we do not appreciate. "Eppsa" is probably obsolete as to name.

CIBWRDA, COMBA, SORDEMANNEFORD.—These three Manors of William de Moione are mentioned in Domesday consecutively with his Manors of Williton Hundred. Collinson identifies Comba with "Combe Flory" (which was never a Moione fee), and Sordemanneford with "Shoremansford." The latter place we cannot find. However, there was an estate written "Stortmanforde," some time given by one of the House of Moione to Cleeve Abbey (see Collinson, iii. 511).

LEGA is quite impalpable. Mainfred, who was De Moione's Domesday Tenant at "Coarma" (Quarum, in Winsford) and Cibwrde (supposed to have been in Carhampton Hundred), was his tenant also at Lega. Collinson does not identify this Lega, nor yet Cibwrde.

MANEURDA, another Moione estate, was perhaps in Milverton Hundred. However, its Domesday name associates it with Maneheva (now Minehead); but they were distinct Manors.

ESTAWAIT, ALVERONECOTA, MENA.—These also were Manors of De Moione. Though we do not venture to identify them, the sequence of Domesday strongly suggests that they were in Carhampton Hundred (Old). The probability that they were also in the parish or vicinity of Cutcomb rather aids than opposes that suggestion, for Woohetreu (Oaktrou), which divides them in the Record, was certainly in Cutcomb parish and almost certainly in Carhampton Hundred.

CARENTONA, OR OLD CARHAMPTON HUNDRED.

The Inquisitional Hidation (A.D. 1084) of this Hundred seems to have been 40 hides, 1 virgate, 3 fertines, 1½ gheld-acres. The Domesday Hidation (A.D. 1086) of its supposed constituents, is 40 hides, 1 virgate, 3 fertines.

The more positive Domesday measures of the said constituent manors indicate 39,368 statute acres, viz., 20,670 acres of plough-land, 3,132 acres of woodland, 124 acres of meadow and 15,442 acres of pasture. By a curious accident (for it is only an accident) the modern parochial measurements which seem most nearly to pertain to the same area as the Old Hundred, realize 39,100 acres. So then the hide of Carhampton Hundred co-ordinates with 973½ Domesday acres, and seems to co-ordinate with nearly 967 acres of modern ascertainment.

This last coincidence is quite fortuitous. It arises in the simple fact that the Domesday Manors of the Table intruded somewhere into other parishes than those measured in the Table.

The real and very remarkable conclusion which still remains intact, is that the hides of a whole Somerset Hundred did each of them, on an average, co-ordinate with 973½ Domesday acres. This was hidation, privileged and lenient both; privileged in respect of a few exceptional manors, held before the Conquest by Queen Edith, or the Abbot of Athelney, or Edric, or Algar, or Osmund Estramin, or other great Thegns; lenient throughout a whole region. In point of annual value the lands of this hundred had rather improved in the 19 years which had followed the Norman occupation. The values had risen from £48 3s. 9d. (which were the values when each Norman took possession) to £54 5s. 1d., the aggregate values when Domesday was written.—

This latter valuation was at the rate of £1 6s. 9d. for each Domesday Hide, and of .3307 (decimal) pence for each Domesday (statute) acre. But if the said revenue be calculated to have arisen solely from the arable land of the Hundred (viz., from 20,670 acres) then the return per acre of such land will have been (decimally) 1.587 pence.

It should be further noted that though the arable land of Carhampton Hundred was 20,670 Domesday acres,—that is, enough to employ 172½ teams—there were only (so we have counted them) 112½ teams in actual stock. This, again, would tend to make the value of land in this Hundred, at the Domesday epoch, low in comparison with the value of land in other Hundreds.

Lastly, in the matter of labouring population, viz., Villeins, Boors, and Serfs.—Domesday probably omits a few heads, but the number of those given for the whole of the Manors enumerated in the Table (Vol. ii, p. 19) is, proximately, 385. So then, with a gross Domesday acreage of 39,368 acres, whereof 20,670 acres were accessible to the plough, and whereon 112½ teams were at work, there was a labouring population of little more than 385.—

The proportions to each registered male will have been 102 acres of registered land, or 53½ acres of arable land, or (nearly) 35 acres of land actually under cultivation.

The population, or rather, the depopulation was not so great as in the Royal Demesnes of Somerset, nor so great as in De Moione's Chatellany of Dunster, nor quite so great as in the Præ-Domesday Hundred of Williton, but it was greater than in any other district of Somerset, these excepted.

¶ THE MODERN HUNDRED of Carhampton includes estates which the Domesday Hundred did not contain, viz., Carhampton, a Crown estate, and non-hundredal at the date of Domesday. Cutcomb, Dunster, and Minehead, which, at the same period, went to form the Hundred of Cutcomb and Minehead.

With the Præ-Domesday Inquest of the latter Hundred we now proceed.—

THE INQUISICIO GHELDI FOR THE TWO SEVERAL HUNDREDS OF CUTCOMB AND MINEHEAD; ONE ASSESSMENT SUFFICING FOR BOTH (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 68).

In Hundreto de Condecoma et in Hundreto Manehefv̄a sunt 10 hid. 1 virga.	H. V. F.
Inde habuit Rex de Gildo suo (xxxii) solidos et iiii denarios pro v hid. et virgâ, et dimidiâ	5 1 2
Et Willelmus de Moione habet in dominio suo v hid. dim. virgâ minus	4 3 2
	10 1 0

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF THE HUNDREDS OF CUTCOMB AND MINEHEAD.

The whole of this dual Hundred seems to have been made up of the home estates of William de Moioine, then Sheriff of Somerset. They were, in fact, the Chatellany of his Castle of Dunster, written in Domesday as "Torra" or "Torre."

We gather from Domesday with tolerable certainty the manors composing those $10\frac{1}{4}$ hides of which the previous Inquest had spoken summarily. According to Domesday, 3 Knights have $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides of

Cutcomb.....	1	0	2
The Villeins and Borderers of De Moioine's dominical estates have $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides	4	2	0
He himself holds in demesne 4 hides, 3 v., 2 fert., if we take half of Dunster as demesne	4	3	2
Total	10	2	0

Between the years 1084 and 1086, it thus appears that De Moioine had not altered his nominal demesne.

But the Domesday Commissioners had found another virgate in the Hundred. Probably it was the virgate which they entered as an *additamentum* to Stanton. If so, it will have been in Carhampton Hundred at the time of the Inquest, and have been added to De Moioine's Chatellany between 1084 and 1086. Whether it had been added to his demesne or not, Domesday does not say, but the usual construction of such a text would suggest that it had.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II, PP. 19, 20) OF CUTCOMB AND MINEHEAD HUNDREDS.

The comparative measures are as follows.—The Inquest of A.D. 1084 gives $10\frac{1}{4}$ hides to the Liberty. Domesday seems to give $10\frac{1}{2}$ hides to the same.

The more positive measures of Domesday indicate 19,726 acres for the same, viz., of arable land (corresponding to 34 plough-lands) 4,080 acres; of wood, 758 acres; of meadow, 38 acres; of pasture, 14,850 acres.

The only known correlatives of these Domesday Manors are in the three parishes of Minehead, Cutcomb, and Dunster. These parishes measure 14,677 statute acres. It follows that among the *Appendicis* of the Chatellany of Dunster there were at least (19,726 - 14,677 =) 5,049 acres which lay in other parishes than those aforesaid, and topographically in other Hundreds,—possibly adjacent, possibly remote. However this may have been, the Domesday hide of De Mohun's Chatellany coordinated with 1,878 acres of coeval measurement.

The privileged hidations of Aluric, præ-Conquestual Lord of Dunster, of Algar, Lord of Minehead, and of Almer, Lord of Cutcomb, remained unabated for William de Moioine, the first Norman Sheriff of Somerset. Under De Moioine's rule, the lands of this Franchise had risen in value from £11 11s. to £16 18s. 6d. per annum. This latter valuation was at the rate of £1 12s. 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. for each Domesday hide, and of $\frac{1}{4}$ th of a penny per Domesday acre.

But if this revenue be calculated as having arisen wholly from the arable land (viz., 4,080 acres) of the Franchise, the annual value of each such acre will be something very near to one penny. And again on the arable land actually tilled by 29 teams, viz., on 3,480 acres, the proportion of value per acre would be 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ d.

The number of Swineherds, Villeins, Boors, and Serfs employed on this territory was 139. That calculation gives only one Labourer to every 142 acres of registered land, to every 29 acres of arable land, and to every 25 acres of land actually ploughed. The two last items show no marks of comparative poverty or neglect; but the gross population in comparison with the whole of the registered land was as scanty as the population of the King's demesnes.

The ratio of these phenomena was probably the same. As, at the date of Domesday, the King's Forests throughout Middle and West Somerset were constructively held to be appendages of the Royal Manors of the West, so perhaps were De Moioine's woods and pastures, far remote, deemed to be appurtenant to his Chatellany.

¶ The anomalies resulting from measuring and comparing, as we have, so many separate districts, suggest that we should now take a wider area and deal with the collective phenomena of the region which we will venture to call North-Western Somerset.—

130 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

THE THREE MODERN HUNDREDS OF CARHAMPTON, WILLITON-AND-FREE-MANORS, AND CANNINGTON, GROUPED ACCORDING TO THEIR EXISTING CONTENTS, BOTH OF PARISHES AND THE ACREAGE OF PARISHES.

CARHAMPTON HUNDRED contains 16 parishes, viz.,—	ACHES.	
One parish, Carhampton, not in the Old Hundred	5,199	
Twelve parishes of the old Hundred of Carhampton... ..	39,100	
Three parishes of the Old Hundred of Cutcomb and Minehead	14,677	
	<u>58,976</u>	58,976

WILLITON HUNDRED contains 31 parishes, viz.,—		
One parish, St. Decumans, including Williton, not in the Old Hundred	3,758	
Twenty-one parishes of the Old Hundred of Williton.....	60,408	
Two parishes which were Non-Hundredal at Domesday, viz., Brompton Regis (8,810 acres) and Old Cleeve (6,579 acres)	} 15,389	
Two parishes which formed the Hundred of Sheriff's Brompton at Domesday, viz., Brompton Ralph (2,690 acres), and Clatworthy (2,848 acres)		} 5,538
Four parishes not created nor named at the date of Domesday, but whose area belonged to some Royal Manor of this quarter, or to one or other of the three first mentioned Hundreds, and were represented in the Old manorial constituents of the same, viz., Bicknoller (1,390 acres), Hawkridge (3,725 acres), Upton (3,779 acres), and Exmore. ¹ (so far as it is in Somerset, 20,765 acres)	} 29,659	
		<u>114,752</u>

(One parish (Halse) is not reckoned here, as to its acreage, because it was in the Domesday Hundred of Taunton, and has been added to Williton at a comparatively late period.—

CANNINGTON HUNDRED contains 10 parishes, viz.,—		
One parish, Cannington, not in the Old Hundred ..	4,635	
Nine parishes of the Old Hundred of Cannington	19,756	
	<u>24,391</u>	24,391
		<u>198,119</u>

(A tenth parish, Dodington, is not reckoned here, for, though now in Cannington Hundred, we know not where it was at Domesday).

THE INQUISITIONAL HIDAGE, so far as it is given for parts of the above territory, was—		H. V. F.
For Carhampton Hundred 40 hides, 1 virg., 3½ fert. ; for Cutcomb and Minehead Hundreds, 10 hid., 1 virg.	} 50 2 3½	
For Williton Hundred 92 hid., 2 virg. ; for Sheriff's Brompton Hundred, 5 hides		} 97 2 0
For Cannington Hundred 45 hides, 1 virgate, 3 fertines	45 1 3	
	<u>193 2 2½</u>	193 2 2½

The Domesday, but non-Inquisitional hidage given for other parts of the above territory was—

For Brompton Regis Manor 10 hides ; for Old Cleeve Manor 4¼ hides	<u>14 1 0</u>	14 1 0
The Quasi-Hidage of the three Manors of Ancient Crown demesne, viz., Carhampton, Williton, and Cannington, of which there was never Inquisition nor hidation, is here computed at 100 quasi-hides ²	} <u>100 0 0</u>	100 0 0
		<u>307 3 2½</u>

¹ We have already (*supra*, pp. 74, 75, 75, n.) intimated doubts about the actual status of these four parishes at the date of Domesday. Whatever we may conclude on the point, it does not affect the present calculation. We are measuring a whole district, a district which, at any rate, included the sites of all four parishes.

² There were 100 plough-lands in these three Royal Manors. The plough-land with its co-ordinates of wood, meadow, and pasture, is what we call a quasi-hide.

The normal hide or quasi-hide of North-Western Somerset is therefore represented by about 643 parochial acres, but, as we shall presently show, by a still greater Domesday acreage.

Many extravagant forms of the hide have been already noted and accounted for (*supra*, p. 21). They were apparent, not real, because deduced from exceptional cases.

But here, where a large area of Domesday hidage and a supposedly correlative area of modern acreage are brought into comparison, we might expect a result nearer to the general average of the County, which as we have said before, was about 300 acres per hide. We have no such result, and, if we had, it would be accidental and fallacious. The hidage spoken of included, indeed, all the parochial areas spoken of; but it included much more elsewhere. And again, much of the hidated land, whether near or distant, was of a nature which did not count for much in the numerical computation of hidage.

We will now calculate from Domesday data, and from the, problematically, exact measures of the Survey, what we will, for a few moments, assume to have been the same North-Western district as we have measured by hidage and modern acreage.—

						ACRES.
172½ plough-lands of Carhampton Hundred are taken to indicate an arable area of						20,670
338½ plough-lands of Williton Hundred, to indicate an arable area of						40,620
108½ plough-lands of Cannington Hundred, to indicate an arable area of						12,990
60 plough-lands of King's Brompton Manor, to indicate an arable area of						7,200
33 plough-lands of Old-Cleeve Manor to, indicate an arable area of						3,960
34 plough-lands of Cutcomb and Minehead Hundred, to indicate an arable area of						4,080
19 plough-lands of Sheriff's-Brompton Hundred, to indicate an arable area of						2,280
100 } plough-lands of the three Royal Manors of Carhampton, Williton, and Cannington, are here } taken to indicate an arable area of						12,000
865 plough-lands at 120 acres each indicate an arable area of						103,800
Other acreages, given by Domesday for the same territory purport to be :—						
	Woodland.	Meadow.	Pasture.	Moor.	Totals.	
In Carhampton Hundred	3132	124	15,442	0	18,698	
In Williton Hundred	3760	268	24,436	...	28,464	
In Cannington Hundred	625	563	741	84	2,013	
In King's Brompton Manor	4320	60	4,320	0	8,700	
In Old Cleeve Manor	720	24	0	0	744	
In Cutcomb and Minehead Hundred	758	38	14,850	0	15,646	
In Sheriff's Brompton Hundred	45	11	360	0	416	
In the three Royal Manors of Carhampton, Williton, and Cannington, collectively	14,400	104	21,600	0	36,104	
	27,760	1192	81,749	84	110,785	110,785
					Total..	214,585

On the whole, then, the Domesday measurements of the above territory exceed the measures of the corresponding parishes by (214, 585 - 198,119) 16,466 acres. And the Domesday Hide of this district was apparently co-ordinate with 697 acres of land coevally measured.

There can be but one construction of all this. It is that much of the woodland and pasture, attributed by Domesday to the King's Manors and to other Manors, of this region, really comprehended forests and uplands pervading districts which were geographically external. When we come to North Petherton Manor and Hundred, for instance, we shall see that none of the King's Forest of North Petherton was deemed by Domesday to be appurtenant there. And there are other like instances.

And again, there is some reason for thinking that a portion of the woodland areas attributed by Domesday to certain Manors of North-Western Somerset are now deemed to be in Devonshire.

As to the hide and its co-ordinates, the hide was too elastic to be called a measure of anything but values or advantages. A hide in a wilderness might be co-ordinate with 2000 acres; close to Bath or Bristol a hide of far less than 200 acres was not uncommon.

132 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR CHEDDAR HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, P. 68).

In Hundreto Cetdre sunt <u>vii hidæ et iii virgæ.</u>			H.	V.	F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo xxx solidos pro v. hidis...			5	0	0
De his (7 $\frac{3}{4}$ hides) habet Godwynus 1 virgam in dominio.....	0	1	0	0	1
Non habet Rex Gildum pro 1 hidâ et 1 virgâ quam tenet Rogerus Wytent de Episcopo					
de Sancto Laudo	1	1	0		
Nec pro 1 hidâ et 1 virgâ quam tenet Rotbertus filius Herberti de Rogero de Corcella	1	1	0		
	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
				<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>
					<u>0</u>

De hoc Hundreto debentur adhuc Regi xv solidos de Gildo suo (and 15 shillings is the sum apposite to 2 hides 2 virgates).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF CHEDDAR HUNDRED.

GODWYN was a Saxon Thane (Anglicus Tegnus), who yet enjoyed that small estate (1 virgate) in Draycott, which he and his mother had held *T. R. E.* It was all exempt from the gheld-tax.

Draycott was a vill lying between Cheddar and Stocca (now Stoke Rodney). It was, manorially, separate from both. Parochially, it was divided between the two ; but, in later years, it has been formed into a parish, whose 1,800 acres include not only the ancient Manor of Draycott, and some further portions of the two parishes of Cheddar and Rodney-Stoke, but also the district, formerly extra-parochial, of "Nyland with Batcombe."

ROGER WY TENT.—In this short Inquest, the person called, as a tenant, Roger Wytent, was the same with him who, as a Baron, is called Roger de Corcella. (See Notes on the Inquest of Locheslei Hundred.)

The Bishop of St. Lo is Geoffrey de Moubray, usually styled, in Domesday, Bishop of Coutances (de Constantiis). The arrear stated against Roger Wytent was on 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ hides. His Manor of Stocca (now Stoke Rodney) had gelded *T. R. E.* for 4 hides, whereas both the Exon and Exchequer Domesday state it to contain really 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ hides. The surcharge of 1084 was on the difference.

ROBERT FITZ HERNERT will have been he who, called simply "Robertus," holds under Roger de Corcelle the Manor of Ceder, which, though part of Cheddar parish, was clearly external to the great Manor of Royal Domesne, also called Cheddar. Robert Fitz Herbert's manor appears (Exon. Domesday, p. 405) to have been 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ hides, but the proportions of demesne and villeinage are not stated in Domesday. The Inquisicio almost decides the former to have been 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ hides.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 19-20) OF CHEDDAR HUNDRED.

STOCCA (postea Stoke Giffard, now Stoke Rodney). Domesday divides Stocca between Roger Witen and his Villeins, as 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ hides to the former, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ hides to the latter. That is, it divides the manor according to the old hidation (4 hides) of King Edward's time, not according to the new hidation (5 $\frac{1}{4}$ hides) which seems to have been detected by the Assessors of 1084, and which Domesday itself recognises (by an interlineation) as the true hidation.—

"Ibi tantum pascuæ quod reddit 2 solidos per annum." This item is superadded to an estimate of the Pascua of Stoke, which measures it as two square leagues, that is, as 2880 acres. The two quantities probably lay in different directions. What the acreage of the smaller item may have been we can only guess. Supposing the value per acre to have been $\frac{1}{16}$ th of a penny, the acreage will have been 384 acres. (See Table below).

The recently depreciated value (from £6 to £4) of this Manor is inexplicable. The available plough-land was adapted to 5 teams. There were 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ teams on the estate. The other stock and the staff of labourers (15 males) were both above the average. We suspect that the two values were accidentally transposed in the Record. If so, the error being common to both Domesdays, will have been the error of the scribes who took the original notes.

DRAYCOTT.—The acreage (1210 acres) assigned in the last column of the Table to Draycott, requires explanation. The ecclesiastical parish of Draycott, embodied A.D. 1862, contains 1800 acres. It included

the once extra-parochial places of Nyland (*alias* Andresey) and Batcomb,—together 590 acres. These places were in the Old Hundred of Glastonbury-Twelve-Hides. In a future Table of that Hundred they and their acreage will therefore be found. It follows that (1800—590 =) 1210 acres of the present parish of Draycott remain to be placed; and it is clear that they must be placed in parallelism with the Domesday Manors of Cheddar, Draycott, and Stoke.

The small Manor called "Draicotta" in Domesday, though it has left a name for the modern parish, cannot have absorbed more than a hundred of these acres. The remaining 1110 acres of the present parish were supplied partly by the once Royal Manor and parish of Cheddar, partly out of the Domesday Manor and parish of Stocca. Our Table, then, is so far inaccurate that it gives to Cheddar Hundred the whole of 1210 acres, some part of which was not in the Domesday Hundred, but in the Royal Manor. To adjust this, we discharge from the above Table the acreages of two estates which, though in the Domesday Hundred of Cheddar, were within the parish of the Royal Manor.

ABLATA DE CEDDRA, MANSIONE REGIS.—The Inquisition of A.D. 1084 clearly did not reckon on this small *ablaturum* from the Royal Manor of Cheddar as *then* interned in, or added to, the Hundred. It seems probable that it was given to Robert de Auberville after the Inquest and before Domesday. His estates elsewhere had changed somewhat during the same interval, and he had been involved in litigation. He was the King's Forester, and a grant out of a Royal estate might have been in the nature of compensation.

An hidation of 2 fertines was coincidentally set on the estate, and such, we conceive, was the essence of the "increment" which Domesday seems to add to the Hidation of the Inquest.

THE ROYAL MANOR OF CHEDDAR (including AXBRIDGE, and an estate on MENDIP, afterwards given to the Carthusians of Witham). THE DOMESDAY HUNDRED OF CHEDDAR.—

The subjoined Table purports a comparison between the Domesday Manorial measures and the modern parochial measures of one and the same district. The difference (4374 acres) between the two merely suggests that so much of the district was deemed unworthy of registration by the Domesday Surveyors. Cheddar Moor and Cheddar Cliffs may well have supplied such a wilderness.

	Plough-lands.	Arable Acres.	Silva.	Pratum.	Pascua.	Total Domesday Acres.		Modern Parishes.	Acreage of Parishes
Cheddar Regis	20 car.	= 2400	720	15	1440	4575	20 Quasi Hides	Cheddar	6998
Alsbridge								540	
Site of Charter House								2410	
Ceder	4 car.	= 480	..	15	..	495	7½ hides	In Cheddar ...	Supra
Draicotta	½ car.	= 60	60		In Cheddar	1210
Stocca	5 car.	= 600	120	15	{ 2880 } { 384 }	3009	Draycott, & RodneyStoke	2345	
	29½	= 3540	120	45	4704	9129	27½		

The measurements of the Hundred, as distinct from those of the Royal Manor, will be (including all Draycott in the Hundred) as follows—Arable land, 1140 acres + wood, 120 acres + meadow, 30 acres + pasture, 3264 acres = 4554 acres, represented by 7½ hides and 3555 modern acres.

The hidage and Quasi-Hidage (say 27½ hides), divided among 9,129 Domesday acres, gives 326 acres to the hide. The same hidages divided among 13,503 parochial acres gives 486 statute acres to the hide.

In the Hundred, taken by itself, the hidage (7½ hides) divided among 4,554 Domesday acres, gives 578 acres per hide. The same hidage divided among 3,555 parochial acres, gives 450 acres per hide. The extravagant proportion of 578 acres to a Domesday hide is easily accounted for. The Bishop of Coutances' Domesday Manor of Stocca was probably the extent of the parish of Stoke Rodney. More than that,—its hidation as 5½ hides was favourable. On the very face of Domesday each hide of the five meant 760 acres of appreciable land.

The Domesday value, whether £4 or £6, presents no anomaly. Value was, as we have often said, mainly calculated on the extent of the arable land, and on the ratio of its culture. This land was only 600 acres of the vast Manor, and, its five plough-lands being ploughed by 6½ teams, an annual value of £6 for the whole Manor would be intelligible, while, as we said before, a value of £4 would seem too little.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR CREWKERNE HUNDRED, (INQ.-GHELDI, p. 71.)

In Hundreto Cruchæ sunt xxxix hidæ (39 hides)			
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £6. 10s. 6d, pro xxi hid. et iii virgis		21	3 0
Et Barones Regis habent in Dominio <u>xiiii hidas.</u>			
De his habet Sanctus Stephanus Cadomensis vii hid. quæ nunquam gildaverunt ...	7	0	0
Et Willelmus de Ou v hidas	5	0	0
Et Hardinus ii hidas.....	2	0	0
	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
		14	0 0
Et uon habet Rex gildum pro ii hidis et i virgâ quas tenent Villani Willelmi de Ou	2	1	0
Nec de i hidâ quam tenent Villani Hardini de Meriet	1	0	0
	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
		39	0 0

“De hoc Hundreto debentur Regi 19s. 6d. de Gildo suo.” (Aud note that 19s. 6d. is the exact sum proper to 3¼ hides at 6 shillings per hide).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF CREWKERNE HUNDRED.

CREWKERNE CHURCH, and its Fee of ten hides, had been given by the Conqueror to his Abbey of St. Stephen at Caen. Domesday does not record the ingeldancy of seven hides thereof as asserted in the Inquest, but it is clear that these ingeldant hides were those held by the Abbot in demesne or by his Villeins; while three hides, held by a certain knight under the Abbot, were clearly geldant. By a mere error, the details given by Domesday deal only with 9½ hides of the estate. The Exchequer Domesday supplies no correction. It is not an uncommon omission (See above, p.).

WILLIAM DE OU's exempt demesne (5 hides) was part of his estate of Hantone (Hinton St. George). Domesday repeats the measure of demesne. Of the thirteen hides which constituted the whole estate; eight hides were held by William de Ou's Villein-tenants. The latter in A.D. 1084 were in default as regarded the gheld due on 2¼ hides.

“HARDINUS,” called in the same Inquest “Hardinus de Meriet,” and elsewhere called “Hardinc filius Elnodi,” holds in Domesday 5 hides in Meriet (now Merriott). Domesday increases his demesne to 2½ hides. His Villeins, defaulters as to the gheld of one hide in 1084, will at that period have held 3 hides. In Domesday they appear holding 2¼ hides.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II, PP. 21, 22) OF CREWKERNE HUNDRED.

CHRUCA.—Of Eddeva, Lady of Crewkerne before the Conquest, we have spoken already. It may be doubted whether we rightly insert the Manor of Crewkerne in our Table of that Domesday Hundred. Being wholly and *ab antiquo* ingeldable and non-hidated, it was, technically Extra-Hundredal; and that was the reason why the Inquisitors of A.D. 1084 had made no allusion to the estate. However, the addition of Crewkerne to the Old Hundred makes the old and new Hundreds precisely identical, and thus facilitates some important calculations.

ESTEHAM (now Easthams in Crewkerne).—“De istâ mansione (Chrucâ) ablata est una mansio quæ vocatur Esteham quam tenuit Godwinus Præpositus Regis in firmâ Cruchæ et non potuit a Cruchâ separari die Regis Edwardi et reddidit gildum pro duabus hidis. Has possunt arare duæ carrucæ. Mode tenet hanc Turstinus de Comite (Moritoniensi) et habet ibi duas carrucas in dominio, &c.” (Exon D., pp. 97, 98). In the Comte of Moretain's Domesday Schedule the above entry is partly explained, partly varied.—“Comes habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur Esteham quam tenuit Goduinus Præpositus Regis de Cruca cum firmâ Mansionis, et non potuit recedere de Crucâ cum istâ terrâ, et reddidit gildum pro duobus hidis, &c.,” (Exon D., p. 252).

Godwin's tenure of Easthams had been simply as a member of the Manor of Crewkerne, also farmed by Godwin *T. R. E.* The *ablation*, spoken of, took place on the Comte of Moretain's seizin. So much is clear;

but it is not clear how Godwin, King Edward's Provost, and Fermor of Crewkerne under King Edward, could have stood in that position, Eddeva being at the same time Lady of Crewkerne. We have endeavoured to explain this enigma already. (*Supra*, p. 83).

SEABOROUGH.—Of the Bishop of Salisbury's two tenements in Seaborough, Domesday says as follows, "Istæ duæ terræ jacuerunt in Crucca (Crewkerne) ita quod Tegni qui tenuerunt non poterant separari et reddebant mansioni Regis Cruccæ xii oves cum agnis et de unoquoque homine libero unam blomam ferri." (*Vide supra*, p. 48).

GODWIN, Provost and Fermor of Crewkerne *T. R. E.*, was possibly identical with Godwin, Sheriff of Somerset *circa* 1060-1, who within the last five years of the Confessor's reign ceded the Shrivalty to Tofg, and who was still living at the Conquest (1066). Godwin Anglicus, *alias* Godwin de Cicemeton, seems to have been a different person. He, though with a much reduced estate in Somerset, Dorset, and Devon, still held rank among the Anglo-thanes of King William at the date of Domesday.

HUNDRED OF CRUCHE (A.D. 1084) MEASURED AND COMPARED WITH THE MODERN HUNDRED OF CREWKERNE.

Domesday Names of Manors.	Domesday Plough lands.	Equivalent acres of arable land.	Acres of wood.	Acres of Meadow.	Acres of Pasture.	Domesday acreage in gross.	Modern names of places, representative of Domesday Manors.	Modern Acreages
Chruca	40	4800	80	60	240	5180	{ Crewkerne and Eastham Misterton..... Wayford	5331
Esteham	2	240	20	12	..	272		1417
Ecclesia de Chruca..	13	1560	..	20	120	1700		1618
	55	6600	100	92	360	7152		8366
Hantona	12	1440	720	60	..	2220	Hinton St. George	1500
Meriet	6	720	..	10	30	} 1685	Merriott	1693
Meriet	7	840	..	25	60			
Seneberga.....	1½	180	10	9	30	} 518	Seaborough	581
Seneberga.....	2	240	10	9	30			
	83½	10,020	840	205	510	11,575	Six Parishes.	12,140

The Domesday Hidage being taken at 80 hides, that is at 40 quasi-hides for Crewkerne (which was not hidated) and 40 real hides specified by the Record, we have in comparison 11,575 acres of Domesday measurement, and 12,140 acres of modern ascertainment. The hide then here corresponds with $144\frac{1}{4}$ acres of Domesday measurement, and with $151\frac{3}{4}$ acres of modern survey.

We reckon that 565 acres only of this, generally fruitful, district were ignored in the Domesday Survey as waste or profitless. The other proportions are those of the richer portions of the County. The gross value (A.D. 1086) was £88 10s. 0d., which is at the rate of £1 2s. 1½d. per hide; but then we must recollect that the hides so valued were very small hides; so that the rate of value per Domesday acre is more than 1½d., which is almost the exact rate per modern acre.

Deducting from the full value of £88 10s. some items of revenue not strictly agricultural, the single plough-land of Crewkerne is paralleled by nearly £1 of remaining revenue. Though there were 83½ plough-lands in the Hundred there were only 68 ploughs going. The revenue proportioned to each would be £1 3s. 4d.

¶ The number of Coliberti, Villeins, Boors, and Serfs employed in this Hundred was 272. This gives a single labourer to every 43 acres of land as registered in Domesday; to every 37 acres of arable land, and to every 30 acres of land actually ploughed. So, the soil being fruitful, the appliances both of team power and manual labour were unusually good for Somerset. Compare the case with that of the wild Hundred of Cutcomb and Minehead. The actually cultivated area was so little in that Hundred that the labour which might be brought to bear thereon was greater than in Crewkerne Hundred, but, in point of gross area and gross population, there were more than three men in Crewkerne Hundred on a space which in Cutcomb and Minehead Hundred held but one.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR CHEWTON HUNDRED (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 70).

In Hundreto Cumetonæ sunt vi xx hidæ et vii et dim. (<u>127 hides, 2 virgates</u>).		H.	V.	ƒ.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £21 5s. 3d. pro lxx hid. et iij virg. et dim.		70	3	2
De his (127½ hides) habet Rex et Barones sui in suo dominicatu xxxiij hidas et dim. virgam (<u>33 hid. 2 fert</u>).				
Inde habet Rex x et viii hidas in dominio	18	0	0	
Et Episcopus Giso vi hidas	6	0	0	
Et Episcopus de Sancto L. (Laudo) iiii hidas et iiii virgas	4	3	0	
Et Aldret hidam et dimidiam	1	2	0	
Et Serlo de Burceo iiii hidas dim. virgâ minus	2	3	2	
	<u>33</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	33 0 2
Et non habet Rex Gildum suum pro xi hidis quas tenent Homines Regis de Cumetona (read <i>Ciwetona</i>)	11	0	0	
Nec pro iij hid. et iiii virgis quas tenet Serlo de Episcopo de S'to L(audo)	4	3	0	
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Hugo Malus-Transitus (Maltravers)	1	0		
Nec de iij hidis et i virgâ quam tenet Walterus Cenomannensis (of Le Mans) de Gilberto filio Turoldi	4	1	0	
Nec pro iiii hidis et <i>dim.</i> (marked for cancellation) i virgâde terrâ <i>Manose</i> (cancelled; and " <i>Manase</i> " <i>i.e.</i> Manassæ substituted)	3	1	0	
	<u>23</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	23 2 0
				<u>127 2 0</u>

De hoc Hundreto sunt adhuc retro de Gildo Regis £7 1s. 0d. (*i. e.*, exactly the sum proper to 23½ defaulting hides, at 6s. per hide.)

NOTES ON THE INQUEST FOR CHEWTON HUNDRED.

An Index of Somerset Hundreds, coeval with the Inquisicio, names this Hundred '*Ciwetona*':—a more accurate spelling than Cumetona. (See Vol. ii, p. 9).

THE KING'S exempt demesne of 18 hides was in Chewton itself. So was the defaulting Villeinage of 11 hides. Domesday, surveying '*Ciwetona*,' marks exactly the same proportions of Demesne and Villeinage.

BISHOP GISO'S exempt demesne, of 6 hides, was in Yatton. Domesday repeats it.

THE BISHOP OF ST. LO'S (Coutances') exempt demesne was in Cameley. Domesday repeats it.

ALDRET'S exempt demesne was in Brockley. Domesday increases it to 2 hides.

SERLO DE BURCI'S exempt demesne was in Comton (now Compton Martin). Domesday reduces it to 2 hides 3 virgates.

"SERLO" (probably Serlo de Burci) had before Domesday ceased to hold anything of the Bishop of Coutances. His previous tenure we should guess to have been either in West Harptree or High Littleton. If the former, Serlo will have been superseded by Ascelinus, if the latter, then by Ralph Rufus.

HUGH MALTRAVERS was in this case, as in many, the Tenant of William de Owe. His tenure in Chewton Hundred was 2 virgates at Hanton (now Hinton Blewitt). His default in the Inquest was, accordingly, on one half the estate.

WALTER OF LE MANS reappears in Domesday as Tenant of Gilbert fitz Turald. He held 6½ hides in Tumbeli (Ubley) and Estona (Ston Easton). His default on 4½ hides was for the portions of the said estates which he held in demesne.

THE "LAND" OF MANASSER COCUS, a deceased Royal Serjeant, was in Estona (Ston Easton) 1½ hides, and in Haia (now obsolete) 2 hides. Domesday, giving those quantities, corresponds exactly with the Inquest (as above corrected). At the date of Domesday both estates had passed to the tenure of the deceased Serjeant's widow.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II, PP. 21-22) OF CHEWTON HUNDRED.

THE MANOR OF CHEWTON was, in the Inquest of 1084, assessed as part of the Hundred of which it was the Caput. This was never done in the case of Royal Manors of Ancient Domesne: but Chewton, when given to Queen Edith, had ceased, technically, to be a manor of that type. Whether it were given as dower or by King Edward's favour, it thereupon became hidated and geldable. It was also necessarily interned in its appropriate Hundred; to that Rule there was only one exception, viz., the Manor of Milverton.

The four parishes given in the Table as representing the Domesday Manor and Church-fee of Chewton (Mendip) measure 12,197 statute acres. But the same Domesday Manor and Church-fee (unless there be some scribal error common to both Domesdays) measured but 8,340 acres of specific territory. The balance (viz., 3,857 acres) was probably in the Forest of Mendip, a Royal Forest of the *Vetus Dominicum*, in which Queen Edith's Manor can have had no participation.

It is true that there were attached to the late Queen's Manor 120 acres of Wood and 2,880 acres of Pasture; but these were in the Hundred; they were no part of the Royal Forest. That was not in the Hundred.

ECCLESIA DE CIWETUNA.—The Abbot of Jumieges (in Normandy) held Chewton Church.

JATUNA, Yatton, taken after Domesday into Winterstoke Hundred, in order to associate it with the Bishop of Wells' Manor of Banwell in that Hundred.

Weimorham pasture, though annexed to Yatton at the time of Domesday, was an *ablatum* from the King's Manor and Hundred of Congresbury. The whole of Yatton parish is 6,476 acres. It represents 22 Domesday hides, which gives about 294 acres as representing the hide. The exact measures given by Domesday for Yatton and Claverham, specify only 3,769 acres. But, of the 20 hides of Yatton, Domesday only gives details of eighteen.

BROCHELEIA.—Though Domesday clearly intends to class Aldret among the *Franci Tegni*, he held Brockley before the Conquest. He occurs in the Wiltshire Domesday in a like position. He was, we presume, a Normanizing Saxon. If he lost some estates after the Conquest, he gained others.

CHINOESTONA (now Kingston Seymour). One manor in Kingston, that which Domesday describes as containing a single hide, affords an instance of highly favourable hidation. This single hide represented 2,086 acres of Domesday measurement. Fulcherann's single plough-land, only $\frac{1}{17}$ th of the whole, is not allowed in Domesday to qualify the general statement that the whole of the hide was held by William de Monceaux and his Villeins, viz., one virgate by the first, 3 virgates by the Villeins.—

The hidation of the other Manor of Kingston ($4\frac{1}{2}$ hides) was not at all favourable. It contained simply seven plough-lands, or (as we reckon) 840 acres. The hide then was in one case represented by 2,080 acres, in the other by 187 acres. A Domesday Postscript certifies that the two Manors of Kingston (in all $5\frac{1}{2}$ hides) had been geldable *T. R. E.*, as only one hide. It seems probable that the extra-hidation of $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides had been set entirely on the smaller Manor, and from what will appear in the sequel, that it was a *Domesday Increment*, *i. e.*, set after the Inquest of A.D. 1084.

The present parish of Kingston measures less than the Domesday Manors. The Ecclesiastical divisions were probably settled long after Domesday, in fact there were no churches either at Brockley or at Kenn in the 11th century.

YATTON, BROCKLEY, AND KINGSTON SEYMOUR together formed an isolated portion of the Old Hundred of Chewton.

COMTONA. MORTHONA. (Compton Martin and Moreton).—The 10 hides of Domesday are hardly represented by the 2,308 acres which constitute the parish of Compton Martin, and its member, Moreton; though, *per se*, 231 acres are more than a parallel for the hide of this district. The exacter measures of Domesday coordinate the said 10 hides with 2,520 acres: so that, by this infallible test, the two Domesday Manors will have contained some wood or pasture more than is in the present parish.

HANTONE (now Hinton Blewitt).—Both Domesdays sum this estate as 8 hides. It is clear that there were but 7 hides, as the details show. Even thus the modern parish (1,102 acres) gives but $157\frac{1}{2}$ acres to represent the hide. The exacter measures of Domesday indicate 780 acres of plough-land, 120 acres of wood, and 60 acres of meadow;—in all 960 acres. It is the entry of the Inquest of 1084 and that of Domesday, relating to this Manor, which prove William de Ou's Tenant "Hugo" to have been Hugh Maltravers, or, as the Inquest calls him, "Hugo Malus-Transitus."

TUMBELI (now Ubley).—It was a propensity of the Norman Scribes of Domesday to prefix an arbitrary letter where they found difficulty in the pronunciation of an English name. Collinson (iii, 326) not adverting to this propensity, states that Ubley is not named in Domesday, and misapplies the Domesday notice of 'Tumbeli.'—

The parish of Ubley (1,800 acres) represents the Domesday hide by 360 acres. It was therefore a case of favourable hidation. The exacter measures of the Domesday Manor are, as we reckon them, 600 acres of arable land, 720 acres of wood, 720 acres of pasture, and 35 acres of meadow;—in all 2,075 acres.

ESTONA (Stone Easton).—The parish, containing 1,374 acres, is somewhat in excess of the three Domesday Manors. To these Domesday (by exact measurement) accords 1,174 acres. The hidation (7½ hides) gives about 190 acres to the hide.

HAlA is now lost. It was certainly in Chewton Hundred, and in one of the parishes indicated by the Table.

FERENTONA.—The Domesday measures are 7 plough-lands, or, as we hold it, 840 acres + meadow, 100 acres; in all 940 acres. The existing parish (viz. Farrington Gurney) measures 923 acres. It is a valuable illustration of our theory as to the average acreage of a 'plough-land.'

AMELBERGE (now Emborough).—The only manor surveyed in Domesday under this title was but a part of the present parish, the part to wit which was in Chewton Hundred. The part of Emborough, not in Chewton Hundred, was in the Domesday Hundred of Whitstone. It was called Whittenhall (Collinson, ii. 134, 157).

HIGH LITTLETON AND HALLATROW.—This seems a case of excessive hidation. But the present parish of High Littleton (containing only 1,273 acres) cannot contain the whole of the two Domesday Manors. The latter measure, according to our interpretation of Domesday, 1,478 acres.

CHILCOMPTON.—The parish (1,233 acres) gives about 246½ acres as the correlative of the Domesday hide. When Domesday gives measures amounting to no more than 57½ acres for the whole of this Manor we infer that half of it was inappreciable. However, though there were only 3 ploughlands, there were 4 teams in stock, which savours of improvement.

CHEWTON HUNDRED.—The Inquest of 1084 reckoned this Hundred to contain 127½ hides. If, in our Table, we have rightly collected its Domesday elements, the Hundred then contained 7¾ hides more, that is 135¼ hides.—

We suggest that the Commissioners had found 4½ more hides in Kingston (Seymour), 2 more hides in Yatton, 1 more hide in Hinton (Blewitt) and a virgate more in some other manor, than had been conceived by the Fegadri of 1084.

Of the seventeen parishes which corresponded with the Manors of the Præ-Domesday Hundred of Chewton, sixteen form the existing Hundred.

The migration of Yatton to Winterstoke Hundred has already been explained. The Old Hundred, allowing about two-thirds of Emborough parish not to have been included therein, is now represented by some 37,741 acres. Taking the Domesday hidage to have been 135¼ hides, we have about 279 acres to represent the hide of Chewton Hundred.

But we should rather compare the Domesday hidage (135¼ hides) of this Hundred with the more positive areas assigned by Domesday to the collective manors which compose such Hidage.—

These more positive measures amount to 29,208 acres, that is, of arable land (presumed to be an equivalent of 170½ plough-lands) 20,460 acres; of registered wood-land, 2809 acres; of meadow-land, 787 acres; of pasturage and measured moor-land, 5152 acres.

This gives to everything that is called a hide in these Domesday Manors the very intelligible proportion of 215½ Domesday acres to each hide. But what are we to say about the (37741 - 29208 =) 8533 acres, by which the acreage of modern ascertainment exceeds, as we see, the acreage of Domesday? We say first and most simply that these 8533 acres were not measured by Domesday as contingent on the manors which surely composed the whole Hundred of Chewton, but possibly a part of them was measured into the adjoining Hundred of Congresbury. We say next, that a part of these 8533 acres belonged to the King's Forest of Mendip, and so was measured by Domesday elsewhere, that is in connexion with some extra-Hundredal estate, or estates, of the *Vetus Dominicium Coronæ*. We say, lastly, that the other part or balance, whatever it may have been, of these 8533 acres, was not measured by Domesday at all, that it con-

sisted possibly of some barren portions of the Mendip Hills, more surely of a tract of marsh-land (*moræ*) in the vicinity of Yatton, of which Domesday measures only 120 acres; and those 120 acres we presume to have been so measured because they differed from the unequivocal swamp, and were pasturable. (See above, p. 40).

THE DOMESDAY VALUE of Chewton Hundred, viz., £137 1s. per annum, was at the rate of £1 0s. 3d. per hide, and of 1.1261 (penny and decimals of a penny) per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 16 shillings per ploughland, and of 17s. 11d. per team in actual employ.

The number of Coliberti, Villani, Bordarii, Cotarii, and Servi abiding in Chewton Hundred in A.D. 1086 was 462. This gives a single labourer to every 63 acres of Domesday measurement, to every 44 acres of plough-land, and to every 40 acres of land actually ploughed.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR CHEW HUNDRED (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 73).

	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
In hoc Hundreto sunt xxxv <u>hidæ</u> (35 hides).						
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo vi libras et x et viii denarios minus (<i>i.e.</i> , £6 less 18d., } or £5 18s. 6d.), pro x et ix hidis et iii virgīs }				19	3	0
Et Barones Regis habent in Dominio v <u>hidas</u> (5 hides).						
De his habet Odo Flandrensis iii hid. et iii virg.	3	3	0			
Et Serlo de Burceio, i virgam	0	1	0			
Et Alduinus i hidam	1	0	0			
	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	5	0	0
Et non habet Rex gildum de iiiij hidis quas tenent Ulveva	4	0	0			
Nec de vi hidis et i virgā quas tenent Villani Regis de Stocha.....	6	1	0			
	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	10	1	0
De hoc Hundreto debentur adhuc Regi de Gildo suo 6l sol. et 6 den.				35	0	0

(And note that £3 1s. 6d. at 6 shillings per hide, is the gheld on 10½ hides).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF CHEW HUNDRED.

ODO FLANDRIGENA reappears in Domesday with 3½ hides in demesne, at Timesherua (now Timshury).

SERLO DE BURCI reappears in Domesday with an estate called Cilela (3 virgates), an estate called Stocca (2 virgates) 'added to Cilela,' and another Stocca (2 virgates). Only in CILELA does the Record assign him a special demesne. It is 2 virgates, and so double the demesne on which he had exemption in 1084.

ALDUI reappears in Domesday as an Anglus Tegnus. His demesne in Stocca is put by the Exon Domesday at 1½ hides. The context proves it to have been only 1 hide, as in the previous Inquest.

OLVEVA reappears in Domesday as the Bishop of Coutances' tenant at Norton (uow Norton Malreward). Her demesne was 4 hides.

VILLANI REGIS DE STOCHA.—Chew-Stoke, we suggest, was before the Conquest, a Royal Manor, but held *T. R. E.* by none but minor Thegns and Villeins. It is not named in Domesday as a manor of ancient demesne, possibly because the King, at that period, retained no demesne whatever therein. Yet it appears from this Inquest that two years previous to Domesday, King William, already divested of any demesne in Chew-Stoke, had 6½ hides in Villeinage (or in what the Inquest suggests to have been Villeinage) there. No such estate continued in Domesday. In the interval (so we infer), the King had bestowed all this Villeinage on some or other of the various Lords or Thegns who figure in Domesday as owners of parcels of land in ESTOCA or *Stocca*, or *Estochet*, and about whose said tenements we can find no other account.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 21-22) OF CHEW HUNDRED.

HAUEKEWELLA (now Norton Hautville). Ulf and Wolmar, joint tenants of this small estate, are classed by Domesday among the *Angli Tegni*, holding *in capite* of the King. The Fegadri of A.D. 1084 had accorded them no exemption consistent with such a position. In conformity with what has been suggested above, we suggest here that the said Fegadri having been doubtful about the status of these Saxons, had ranked

them among the "Villani Regis de Stoca," leaving their liability to Gheld an open question. The Domesday tenement of Alward and his Brethren in *Estoca* or *Stoche* had similarly been non-exempted in 1084, and yet they rank in Domesday among the *Angli Tegni*. Their case strengthens the suppositions above expressed.

Norton Hautville, it should be observed, originally a Chapelry or affiliation of the Church of Chew Magna, became, in course of time, a manorial adjunct of that same Episcopal Fee (see Collinson ii, 107).

ESTOCA, *al.* STOCHA.—This estate is noticed in Domesday next after Hauekewella. The Exon Domesday gives a confused account of its occupation. "Inde habet (Alwardus) ii hidas, et dimidiam (hidam) et dimidiam virgam et ii carrucas in dominio et villani aliam terram et dimidiam carrucam. Ibi habent fratres i Villanum et xiii Bordarios et i servum et i roncinum," &c. :—as though the land belonged to Alward and the bulk of the inhabitants, and the live stock belonged to his brethren. The Exchequer Domesday, if simpler, is also clearer. It says, "Terra est 2 carrucis quæ ibi sunt cum i Villano et i servo et 13 Bordariis."

ESTOCHE, *al.* STOCHE.—The Exon Domesday, giving the second and third Thane only 2 virgates each in this manor, is corrected by the context as well as by the list of *Terræ occupatæ* (Exon Domesd. p. 476), which says that their joint tenements were i hide, i virgate. This manor we suppose to be now represented by a place called Bechenstoke or Birchenstoke. Collinson (ii. 319) mentions Bechenstoke under Nempnett Thrubwell, but says it was on the confines of Chew-Stoke. Whatever its original parish, we incline to think that it was manorially a part of Chew-Stoke, and so in the old Hundred of Chew.

Collinson explains that the name Bechen-Stoke was but a corruption of Beauchamp Stoke. It happens too, that Beauchamp of Hatch, who held this manor in the 12th century, was lineally descended from Robert Fitz Ivo, the Domesday possessor of Estochet. So much for the probable identity recognized in the Table.

On the other hand, it is observable that Beauchamp of Hatch, instead of continuing to hold Beauchamp-Stoke as a Moretain Fee, and as part of his *tenure in capite per Baroniam*, came to hold it of the Honour of Gloucester. This anomaly arose probably in Chewstoke coming to be annexed wholly to the said Honour of Gloucester, and Beauchamp becoming Tenant of all. The distinctive name of Beauchamp-Stoke was thus a sort of memorandum of Beauchamp's anterior feoffment in a part.

STOWEY.—Collinson (ii. 110) has found the Domesday type of this Manor in a place written *Stawe*, which we venture to think was in Williton Hundred. Of that, hereafter.—

Stowey, in Chew Hundred, we cannot find in Domesday. Its subsequent history is very meagre, but is not quite unsuggestive. Our idea is that, parochially, Stowey was a Chapelry or affiliation of the Bishop's Manor of Chew Magna, but that, manorially, it never had any such relation. As a manor, or part of a Manor, we suppose that Domesday either buries it in one of the Bishop of Coutances' Manors of Chew Hundred, or else suppresses it among the manorial members of Chewstoke. In either case its probable destination would be to the Seigneurie of the Earls of Gloucester. And though we cannot find such a circumstance categorically stated, we find that "Hamo Fitz Richard" was sometime Lord of "Stowey in Chew Hundred," and this Hamo we know to have been elsewhere a Tenant in the Honour of Gloucester.

CHEW HUNDRED.—This Hundred (as tabulated, Vol. ii, pp. 21-22), purports to have contained in 1086 2 virgates, 3½ fertines more than it was stated to contain in A.D. 1084. This is but an ordinary increment.

The six parishes, instanced in the Table as representing the Domesday Manors of Chew Hundred, measure 7377 acres, which gives about 205 acres as the correlative of each Domesday Hide. But it is probable that the Domesday Manors contained something more than is measured by the six parishes; that some of them—Norton Malreward for instance—had complements of land which are now to be found in the parishes of Chew Magna or Dundry, which latter, as Manors, belonged to another Hundred than Chew.

We shall get at the true acreage of the Domesday Hundred by summing the exacter measures of the Record. These amount to 7514 acres, viz., of arable land (answering to 40 plough-lands), 4800 acres; of wood, 1844 acres; of meadow, 266 acres; and of pasture, 604 acres.

The Domesday Hide of Chew Hundred was, at this rate, parallel with 210 acres of coeval reckoning.

The Domesday value of Chew Hundred, viz., £26 5s. per annum, was at the rate of 14s. 8d. per hide, and of about .8285 (decimals) of a penny per acre; also at the rate of 13s. 1½d. per plough-land; and of 16s. 8d. per team in actual employ.

The number of Villeins, Boers, and Serfs working in Chew Hundred was 108. This gives a single

labourer to every 69½ acres of the land registered in Domesday, to every 44½ acres of arable land, and to every 35 acres of land actually ploughed.

THE MODERN HUNDRED OF CHEW contains the parishes of Chew Magna (5014 acres) and Dundry (2799 acres). These parishes and most part of their united areas (of 7813 acres) formed at the date of Domesday the one manor of Chew-Magna, which was then in the Bishop's Hundred. The exacter Domesday measures of Chew Magna are 7590 acres.

Combine the Domesday measures of Chew Hundred and Chew Magna Manor and you have a total of (7514 + 7590 =) 15,104 acres.

Combine the parochial acreages of the modern Hundred of Chew, and you have a total of (7377 + (Chew Magna and Dundry) 7813 = 15,190 acres of modern ascertainment. The proximity of the two results, after a lapse of nearly eight centuries, is marvellous.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR HAM MANOR (INQ. GHELD, P. 75).

	H.	V.	F.
" In <i>Mansione</i> Hame sunt xvii hidæ.			
Inde habet Rex 42 solidos de gildo pro vii hidis	7	0	0
Et Abbas de Glastingesberia habet in dominio suo v hid et dim. et dim. virg.....	5	2	2
Non habuit Rex Gildum suum de xi hid. et dim. virgâ quas tenet Serlo de Buceio de	}	2	0
Abbate Glastingberiensis			
Nec de v virgis quas tenet Rotbertus de Othorvilla de predicto Abbate	1	1	0
Nec de i hidâ quam tenent Villani Abbatis	1	0	0
De hac <i>villâ</i> debentur Regi xxvi sol. et iii den (corresponding to)	4	1	2
	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
	17	0	0

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF HAM MANOR.

Domesday repeats the whole detail of the Inquest, but makes Serlo de Burci to have 2h. 2v. 2f. in demesne, and adds another Abbatial tenant, viz., Girard Fosarius, who will have duly paid his Gheld in 1084.

Domesday, in the details of the Manor of Ham, omits all notice of one hide out of the seventeen which it prescribes for the whole estate. The non-geldant hide, which the Inquest says was held by the Abbot's Villeins, was probably the same. If so, it will have been unoccupied, both in 1084 and 1086.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 21-22) OF HAM MANOR.

THE MODERN ACREAGE of Ham Parish is 4,229 acres, as given in the Table. The Domesday exacter measures of the Manor are 2,496 acres, viz., arable land, 2,400 acres; wood, meadow, and pasture, 96 acres.

The Domesday hide is here paralleled by about 147 Domesday acres, 141 acres of which were arable land.

¶ The Domesday value of this manor, viz., £15 10s. per annum, was at the rate of 18s. 3d. per hide, and nearly 1¼d. per acre of Domesday; also at the rate of 15s. 6d. per plough-land, and 17s. 5d. per team in actual employ.

The number of Villeins, Boors, and Serfs abiding on this manor, A.D. 1086, was 68. This gives a single labourer to every 37 acres of Domesday registration, to every 36 acres of plough-land, and to every 30 acres of land in actual tillage.

The probable reason why 1,733 acres of this manor were ignored in Domesday was, as usual, that they were profitless.

142 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI FOR THE "BISHOP'S HUNDRED" (A.D. 1041), (INQ.-GHELDI, PP. 70-71).

De i pate (parte) terræ Gisonis Episcopi, quæ pertinet ad honorem Episcopii sui, sunt hic cc hid. et x et viii hidæ (218 hides).

Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £40 4 sol. pro vi.xx hid. et xiiii hid.....	134	0	0
De his (218 hides) habet Episcopus in dominio xlvihi hidis (hidas)	48	0	0
Non habet Rex gildum suum.—			
Pro iii hidis quas tenet Osmundus nepos Episcopi (Gisonis)	3	0	0
Nec pro ii hidis quas tenuit Manasses	2	0	0
Nec pro i hid. et dim. quas tenet Alvered, homo Rogeri Arundelli	1	2	0
Nec pro ii hidis quas tenet Johannes Hostiarius	2	0	0
Nec pro i hidâ quam tenent Teodoricus et Egebertus	1	0	0
Nec de i hidâ quam tenet Ricardus de Sutuna	1	0	0
Nec de i hidâ quam tenent (tenent) Worno et Macarius	1	0	0
Nec de iii hidis et dim. quas tenent vacuus Villani Episcopi	4	2	0
Nec de vii hidis quas tenet Isaac præpositus Canonicorum Sti Andree	7	0	0
(Nec de) vi hidis (quas tenent) Canonici Sti Andree	6	0	0
(Nec de) i hid. et dim. quas tenet Benselinus Archidiaconus	1	2	0
Nec de v hidis et dim. quas tenent vi presbyteri Parrochiani	5	2	0
	<u>36</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>36</u>	<u>0</u>
			<u>0</u>
			<u>218</u>
			<u>0</u>
			<u>0</u>

"De ccxviii predictis hidis sunt adhuc retro £10 16s. qui deberent esse redditus in thesauro Regis" (and the money will be found to be exactly 6s. per hide on the 36 hides in arrear).

There is another clause in this Inquest which, being improperly placed after the words Parrochiani, we here annex as being really a Postscript, and as having nothing to do with the arithmetic of the Table :— "Et de i hidâ de quâ Ansgerus et socii sui qui colligerunt gildum Regis dicunt se recepisse denarios non habet Rex gildum suum." It means that Ansger and his fellow collectors had taken six shillings out of the £40 4s. actually collected, and had consequently forwarded only £38 18s. to the King's Treasury. The deduction was their due, as the Fegadri or Collectors for this large Hundred. Ansger is probably identical with Ansgar Cocus, a King's Serjeant, and landed proprietor. (See under Thurlbear Hundred, *infra*).

NOTES ON THE GHELD INQUEST OF THE "BISHOP'S HUNDRED."

"De unâ parte terræ Gisonis Episcopi," that is, the Inquisicio did not deal with the whole of Bishop Giso's estates. Four manors, viz., Banwell, Yatton, Wedmore, and Wanstrow, were still reputed to be in their proper Hundreds of Winterstoke, Chewton, Bimastan, and Frome. They have, none of them, at any subsequent period, been collected into any Episcopal Hundred. They still remain in their præ-Domesday Hundred, except Yatton, which has been taken from Chewton Hundred and annexed to Winterstoke.

BISHOP GISO'S demesnes, 48 hides, as asserted in the Inquest, are exactly reproduced }
in Domesday, viz.—In Wells, 12 hides. In Evercreech, 3 hides. In Chew Magna, } Total 22 hides.
4 hides. In Westbury, 3 hides.

In Kingsbury East, 6 hides. In Combe St. Nicholas, 8 hides. In Chard, 2 hides. }
In Litelanea, 1 hide. } Total 17 hides.

In Wivelescombe, 3 hides. In Wellington, 3 hides; and in Bishops Lydeard, 3 hides. } Total 9 hides.

Grand Total, 48 hides.

OSMUND NEPOS EPISCOPI.—His default was for 3 hides in Winsham, where he held 10 hides (four of them in demesne) under his uncle,—Bishop Giso.

MANASSES.—Manasses Cocus was dead at the date of the Inquest. His land, 2 hides in Wells, was *in manu Regis*;—improperly so, for he had held it under Bishop Giso. In Domesday Manasses's widow appears holding the tenement of the King; but the injustice of this is noted in the Record.

ROGER ARUNDEL appears in Domesday as holding 2 hides (1 hide, 1½ virgates in demesne, and 2¼ virgates

in villeinage) in Aisxa (Ash). His tenant, Givoldus, holds 1 hide, 1 virgate "added to Ash." It was Arundel's demesne probably (though reckoned as $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides) that was insolvent in 1084. And, if he held it *in capite* of the King, it was, doubtless, insolvent because exempt. At that rate, Alvered, the alleged defaulter of 1084, will have been Arundel's Bailiff, rather than his tenant. If, however, Alvered, the alleged insolvent of 1084, were Arundel's tenant, the insolvency was probably due to Alvered's death. Accordingly Alvered disappears from Domesday, and Givoldus takes his place, though with a tenement somewhat smaller than which had been surcharged in Alvered's name two years previous. Giso, Bishop of Wells, was a claimant of the Seignery over Ash. It had been his *T. R. E.* This led to the estate being doubly surveyed in Domesday, once as in the Bishop's Fief, once as in Roger Arundel's.

JOHN USHER reappears in Domesday as holding two hides in Walintona (Wellington) under Bishop Giso.

TEODORIC and EGBERT do not reappear by name in Domesday. They were probably two of the unnamed *Milites* who figure in Domesday as tenants of Bishop Giso at Kingsbury (East), Wivelescome, and Bishop's Lydeard.

RICHARD DE SUTTON of the Inquest reappears in Domesday as 'Ricardus,' and as holding 5 hides in Wells and 5 hides in Chew under the Bishop. Bishops-Sutton and Knighton-Sutton were then, and still are, members of Chew Magna.

WORNO belongs to the same category as Teodoric and Egbert, above mentioned.

MACARIUS reappears in Domesday as holding $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides in Evercrech under the Bishop.

Four and a half hides "quas tenent vacuas VILLANI EPISCOPI" are insolvent in 1084. They were nominally appurtenant to the Villeinage of one or more of the Episcopal estates, but being unoccupied, or at least, untilled, it is obvious that no gheld could arise therefrom. Such is probably the ratio of many similar entries in the Inquest of 1084. The alleged tenants were perhaps deceased, perhaps only destitute.

ISAAC, PROVOST OF THE CANONS OF ST. ANDREW, was Head of the Chapter of Wells;—represented by the 'Dean' of later nomenclature. Neither Dean Isaac nor "Archdeacon Benseline" are expressly named in Domesday as Landowners in the "Bishops Hundred;" but Litton ($8\frac{1}{2}$ hides) seems to have constituted their joint estate. Domesday merely records Litton as held by "Canone of St. Andrew" under the Bishop. Its area, $8\frac{1}{2}$ hides, corresponds exactly with the (7 hides + $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides =) $8\frac{1}{2}$ hides on which Isaac and Benseline paid no gheld in 1084. They probably denied all liability, whether of themselves or their Villeins.

The "*Canons of St. Andrew*" were further insolvent as to 6 hides in 1084. Here the "Canons" mean the whole Chapter of Wells. The Capitular estate was 14 hides in Wells. The six hides, on which, apparently, they refused to pay gheld, reappear in Domesday as the precise extent of their demesnes.

The "*six Parish Priests*," insolvent, or exempt, or claiming exemption as to $5\frac{1}{2}$ hides of the Bishop's Hundred, we can hardly expect to identify in Domesday. In that Record Bishop Giso has among his tenants, a Priest at Evercrech, and a Clerk at Kingsbury (East). In Wells itself "Fastradus and Radulfus," holding 2 hides each, "de dominio Episcopi" were perhaps Parish Priests, and their liability as to such tenements was perhaps problematical. Other names of tenants such as Erninsins, Ailward Crocco, Edric, Hildebert, possibly belonged to Parish Priests;—and indeed of Ailward Crocco and Edric, holding a hide each in Wells, Domesday, expressly records that they had "never paid gheld in King Edward's time."

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 23-24), OF THE BISHOP'S HUNDRED.

The details of hidage supplied by Domesday do not fulfil the hidage of Domesday Totals quoted in the fifth column of page 23 of the Table. Two virgates omitted in the Domesday details and 1 virgate super-added, give a Hundred (of $219\frac{1}{2}$ hides) just one virgate short of the more general estimate (of $219\frac{1}{2}$ hides).

THE BISHOP'S HUNDRED contained according to the Inquest (of A.D. 1084) 218 hides. The Domesday materials realize (as in the Table) $219\frac{1}{2}$ hides. The difference of $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides may pass as an ordinary Domesday Increment, without any attempt to account for it specifically.

The Table shows how the Inquisitional and Præ-Domesday aggregates which formed the Bishop's Hundred, have since Domesday, been resolved into four distinct Franchises. Of the new Hundreds, that of "Kingsbury East" got its name from containing the Manor of Kingsbury East. "Kingsbury West," another New Hundred, got its name, not as involving any Manor of Kingsbury West (for there was no such Manor), but as involving manors which lay Westward of the manors which formed the Hundred of Kingsbury East.

WELLS.—The Domesday Manor of Wells involved the bulk of seven parishes specified in the Table. Three were in Wells itself; the other four have no nominal mention in Domesday, being involved, as aforesaid. The Domesday Manor of Wells further included Worminster, then a manorial appendage of Dinder. But Worminster, though still a Tithing of Wells, has been parochially annexed to North Wootton, so that its acreage, whatever it may be, will be found involved in that of North Wootton, whose acreage we give in our Table of Whitstone Hundred.

PRIDDY.—The parish measured in the Table as 1,361 acres, is the Civil Parish. The Ecclesiastical Parish is 5,000 acres, but is merely a modern combination of heterogenous elements, bearing no analogy to ancient divisions. Priddy, reckoned as 5,000 acres, consists not only of Priddy itself (1,361 acres), and of parts of Wookey (3,420 acres), and of Westbury (2,968 acres), and of Wells St. Cuthbert, all in the Hundred of Wells, but also of parts of Chewton Mendip, and of East and West Harptree, whose acreage, as given in the Tables of other Hundreds, is none the less for having contributed to the formation of an ecclesiastical district.

EVERCRECH.—The details of this Manor, given in Domesday, are less by one virgate than the alleged total. When this is the case, the presumption is that the omitted parcel of land was untenanted at the moment.

When, as in the Table, the parish of Evercrech is entered as containing 4078 acres, it is not strictly correct to classify those 4078 acres as in the "Bishop's Hundred." Chesterblade, no doubt, was a manorial appendage of Evercrech, and was, therefore, in the "Bishop's Hundred." But Stoney Stretton and Bagbury, though in Evercrech parish, were not the Bishop's, manorially. They were members of the Abbot of Glastonbury's Manor of Pilton, and so were, in fact, in Whitstone Hundred at Domesday.

WELLS FORUM HUNDRED.—The present Hundred contains, which the Bishop's Hundred did not contain, West Cranmore. At the date of Domesday West Cranmore was considered to be in Frome Hundred, and the Bishop of Wells had as yet no concern therein. When, at length, a later Bishop wrested West Cranmore from Glastonbury Abbey, he procured its annexation to his own Hundred of Wells.

CHIU (Chew Magna).—The details of this Manor, as given in Domesday, are one virgate less than the alleged total of 30 hides. On such a circumstance we have spoken above.—

The Domesday Manor was clearly inclusive of Dundry, now parochially distinct. The exacter measures given by Domesday for *Chiu* amount to 7598 acres. Chew Parish measures 5014 acres, Dundry parish measures 2799 acres. Together they are 7813 acres,—a very satisfactory indication of their being co-representatives of the one Domesday Manor.—

It is worth notice that, among the Bishop's tenants at Chew, Domesday mentions one Aluric de Stawe. It might be surmised from this that Stovey, unnamed in Domesday, was so unnamed as being a member of Chew Magna. We have discussed the question already. We think that, parochially, it was a member of Chew Magna, but that, manorially, it was a member of some manor which was in the Domesday Hundred of Chew.—

In after-times, Chew Magna itself became interned in Chew Hundred; and probably that was its position before the Conquest; only, when Bishop Giso was forming his Episcopal Hundred, he contrived to annex Chew Magna thereto.

CERDRE (Chard).—The summary Hidage given by Domesday is 8 hides. The details, supplied by the Exon Codex seem to realize 10 hides—probably by the mere error of giving the Villeinage as vi hides, when it ought to have been iiii hides.

LITTELANEIA (EXON Domesday) LITELANDE (EXCHEQUER Domesday).—Collinson interprets *Littelände* as *Leighland*, which, being in Old Cleeve, is quite out of question here. The name, in either Domesday form, is now obsolete. There are two peculiarities in the Domesday notice of Littelaneia. In general, when the Record means to certify the Pre-Conquestual seizin of any manor by the Bishop, it says that Giso held it "die quā Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus;" but of Littelaneia it only says that Giso held it "tempore Edwardi Regis." Again, in no case, where Bishop Giso is said to have held a manor on the day of King Edward's death does Domesday declare the value of such manor "Quando Episcopus recepit." But in the case of Littelaneia, Domesday does declare such an older value (it was £2). The ground of the prevalent usage was, of course, that Bishop Giso, having sat before the Conquest, the older value "quando recepit" could not be ascertained at the date of Domesday. The inference, then, as regards the peculiar expressions about Littelaneia, would be, that Bishop Giso had held the estate sometime in King Edward's

reign, that he held it not in 1066, but that he had since recovered it. Thus its value, "quando receipt," would easily transpire at the date of Domesday. As to how Littelaneaia may be now represented, that must needs be matter of conjecture.—

HUISH EPISCOPI has, from time immemorial, been a possession of the See of Wells. King Edward's Charter to Giso, Bishop of Wells, purports to have been dated at Windsor on May 20, 1065. Some of the Villi (viculi) which the Charter gives as appurtenances of the Bishop's Manor of Cynesgybyrig (Kingsbury East) were very distant from the latter manor. We may instance Cuma (Combe St. Nicholas), Cardren (Chard), Winesham (Winsham), Cungareshbyrig (Congresbury), and Banawelli (Banwell). Two other appurtenant *viculi*, not so distant, perhaps, from Kingsbury as the above, are written consecutively in the Charter as Lytleinge and Hiwise. The first is the Littelaneaia, *alias* Litelande of Domesday; the last is Huish Episcopi, and was not mentioned in Domesday at all. Our conjecture is that, in Domesday, Littelaneaia stands for itself and for Huish, while, since Domesday, Huish Episcopi has been the only recognized name for the same joint estates. We have imported this view into the Table.

CUMBA (Combe St. Nicholas), WINESHAM (Winsham).—We will say nothing more about King Edward's alleged Charter of 1065 than that it is instructive on matters of topography, and that it shows, if not any genuine grants of the King, yet still, what the Church of Wells claimed before the Conquest. At that rate we may assume that the said Church had some ancient title to these estates. It is still more certain that in January, 1066, the Bishop of Wells was not seized of either estate, and that when Domesday was written he had obtained or recovered them both. Accordingly, in the case of Combe, Domesday gives the value of the manor, *quando Episcopus accepit*, and, in the case of Winsham, it gives the value, *quando Osmundus* (the Bishop's nephew and Feoffee) *recepit*.

COMBE ST. NICHOLAS and WINSHAM were near the ancient Episcopal estate of Chard, and, at the time (between 1067 and 1084) when Bishop Giso obtained them, they were reputed to be in Abdick Hundred. The Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084 makes indirect but clear allusion to both estates, in what it says under Abdick Hundred (*supra*, pp. 94-95). No less clear is it that the Inquest of the "Bishop's Hundred" concludes both estates as already in that Franchise. The period of transfer is thus apparent. Since Domesday, both estates have been removed from the "Bishop's Hundred" (which was, in fact, dissolved), and have been annexed to that section of the Bishop's Hundred which is still known as the Hundred of Kingsbury East. Their proximity to Chard suggested the arrangement.

It should be observed that at the date of the Conquest and of Domesday, the whole of the parish of Winesham was not in Abdick Hundred, nor is this part of the parish touched by the above remarks. The portions of the parish (*viz.*, Street, and Leigh, and Whatley) which were thus unimplicated, were at the date of Domesday in South Petherton Hundred. And so they continued till the mere force of *parochial attraction* drew them into the Hundred of Kingsbury East.

HUNDRED OF KINGSBURY WEST.—This section of the dissolved "Bishop's Hundred" was made to include the four Domesday Manors of Wivelescome, Wellington, Bishop's Lydeard, and Aisxa (now Priors Ash).

The Domesday Wivelescombe was inclusive of Fitzhead. King Edward's previous Charter is good proof of that theory. The Charter names, among the *Villulae*, appurtenant to *Wivelescombe*, "*Fifehyda et other Fifehyda*"—*i. e.*, two Five-hides—now compounded into one Fitzhead.

So, too, must the Domesday Walintona be taken to have included West Buckland. The first of the *Villulae* which King Edward's alleged Charter of 1065 annexes to Bishop Giso's Manor of Wellington is written *Bocland*.

LIDEGAR (Bishops Lydeard).—The details given by Domesday amount to one virgate more than the alleged total hidage. Probably the Villeinage should have been stated as "4 hidæ unâ virgatâ minus."

AISSA (Priors Ash).—This was *T. R. E.* a member of Bishops Lydeard, held by two Thegns, Ælric and Sweyn, under Giso, Bishop of Wells. Harold, first Earl and then King, wrested the two Thegnages from the Church. At the Conquest they fell to the Crown, by escheat of Harold. King William gave them to Roger Arundel. Collinson (*ii.* 497), after erroneously identifying Roger Arundel with Comte Roger the Poitevin, tells truly how Roger Arundel eventually conferred Ash on Taunton Priory. Hence its name of Ash Priors. We need not add that it was never recovered by the See of Wells.

146 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

THE BISHOP'S HUNDRED. ITS COMPARATIVE MEASURES, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

We append, in a Tabular form, a list of the manors which formed the "Bishop's Hundred" of A.D. 1084, and which constituted the 219½ hides found in Domesday, and collected in the Table (Vol ii, p. 23).

The exacter Domesday measures of each manor are then supplied; and the whole is compared with the acreage of the corresponding, or nearly corresponding, modern parishes.

	Plough-lands.	Acreage of Plough-lands.	Acres of Nemus.	Acres of Pratam.	Acres of Pascua.	Acres of Mora.	Total Acreage of Manors.	Total Acres of Sub-divisional Hundreds.	Total Parochial Acreage of each Hundred.						
Wella	60	7200	460	300	4320	360	12,640	18,580	30,204	Wells Forum	Wells, 3 Parishes ..	1,4918			
..	Binegar	1216
..	Dinder	1072
..	Wookey	3420
..	Priddy	1361
Evercriz	20	2400	120	60	200	..	2780				Evercreech, &c.	4078
Westburia	8	960	240	30	1230				Westbury	2968
Lituna	7	840	30	60	1000	..	1930				Litton	1171
Chiu	50	6000	1440	100	50	..	7590				7590	7813	Chew.	Chew Magna	5014
Kingsbury East ..	24	2880	..	100	360	..	3340				Kingsbury, E.	Dundry	2790
Cedre	20	2400	960	15	960	..	4335	Kingsbury East ..	3646			
Liteland	8	960	20	12	100	..	1092	12,895	18,757	..	(Chard	5162			
Cumba	16	1920	120	12	60	..	2112	Tatworth	1552			
Winsham	16	1920	90	6	0	..	2016	Huish Episcopi	2314			
Wivelescome	36	4320	80	34	200	..	4634	Combe St. Nicholas ..	4203			
..	Winsham (Part of) ..	1880			
Walinton	33	3960	180	110	720	..	4970	13,032	21,370	Kingsbury W.	Wivelescome	5984			
..	Fitzhead	1208			
Lidegar	16	1920	240	30	360	..	2550	Wellington	5195			
Aissa	7	840	10	8	20	..	875	West Buckland	3671			
219½ Hides	321=	38,520	3990	877	8350	..	52,097	52,097	78,153	..	Bishops Lydeard	4686			
											Ash Priors	635			
												78,153			

¶ The difference between the Domesday registration and the modern measurement is 26,056 acres for the whole "Bishops Hundred." It indicates some portions perhaps of Royal Forest, registered by Domesday elsewhere, that is under some or other of the Royal Manors. It indicates, more certainly, large extents of Moors and Uplands, which, though within the Bishop's territory, the Domesday Surveyors ignored as worthless, and did not register at all.

The Domesday value of the "Bishop's Hundred," viz., £267 10s., was at the rate of £1 4s. 4½d. per hide; and of 1.232 (penny and decimals of a penny) per registered acre; also at the rate of 16s. 8d. per plough-land. On the 321 plough-lands of the "Bishop's Hundred" there were working 262½ teams in A.D. 1086. The whole value of the Hundred, if assessed on the working teams, would give £1.0s. 4½d. per team.

The number of Swineherds, Villeins, Boors, and Serfs abiding in the Bishop's Hundred A.D. 1086 was 614. This gives a single Labourer to each 85 acres of Domesday registration; to every 63 acres of plough-land; and to every 52 acres of land actually ploughed.

THE INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR HARECLIVE HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, P. 68).

In Hundreto Hareclivæ sunt 80 hidæ et 1 virga.

Inde habuit Rex de Gildo suo £18 6s. pro lx et i hidis 61 0 0

Et Barones Regis habent in suo dominicatu xvi hidas et iii virgas.

De his habet Episcopus de Sancto Laudo v hid. et iii virg. in dominio 5 3 0

Et Abbas de Glastingeberia xi hidas 11 0 0

16 3 0 16 3 0

Et non habet Rex Gildum suum pro i hidâ et dimid. quam tenet Fulcherarius de

Episcopo de Sto Lando } 1 2 0

Nec pro dim. hida quam tenet Nigellus de Gornaio 0 2 0

Nec pro dim. hida quam tenet Godwynus Anglicus 0 2 0

"De hoc Hundreto debentur adhuc Regi de Gildo suo 15 solidi."

2 2 0 2 2 0

(Note 15 shillings, at 6s. per hide, is the correct assessment on 2½ hides.)

80 1 0

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF HARTCLIFFE HUNDRED.

THE BISHOP OF ST. LO, otherwise Geoffrey Bishop of Coutances, held Eshtuna, where he had 5½ hides of demesne at the date of Domesday. Consistently with both Records, Long Ashton, still in the Hundred of Hartcliffe-cum-Bedminster, is identified with Eshtuna.

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S demesne of 11 hides reappeared in Domesday as his demesne in Weritona (now Wrington). Since then, the manor has been abstracted from Hartcliffe Hundred, and annexed to the more Abbatial Hundred of "Brent-cum-Wrington."

FULCRAN'S default was rather in respect of some part of the five hides which he held singly in Winford under the Bishop of Coutances, than of any part of the 3 hides which he held in Butcombe, or of any part of the 10 hides which he held conjunctively with Nigel, in Backwell, of the same Bishop.

NIGEL DE GORNAI was not only joint Lord of Backwell in this Hundred, but he also held *Berua* (10 hides), of the same Bishop. With *Berua* he left the name of his race. It is still Barrow-Gurnay. His default on a half-hide was probably the result of some uncertainty as to the extent of his demesne.

GODWIN ANGLICUS will reappear in Domesday as a King's Almonee, and as holding two virgates *in capite* at Ragiol (now Ridge Hill). One would have expected an exemption rather than a default to have been recorded against his name.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 23-24) OF HARTCLIFFE HUNDRED.

ALDUICA. RAGIOL. RAGIOL.—Domesday describes one of Serlo de Burci's estates at Ridge Hill as an *additamentum* of his estate at Aldwick, and then describes his second estate at Ridge Hill as an *additamentum* of the first estate at Ridge Hill. The Schedule of *Terræ occupatæ* (Exon. Domesday, p. 483) says of the three estates collectively:—"Hæc terra nunquam pertinuit ad Euerwaere." The meaning of this is that, whereas Serlo de Burci's ordinary title was as successor to the estates of the Saxon Euerwaere (*alias* Alwacre, or Euroacre, or Euerwacher, or Euroacro), he derived these three estates from no such antecessor.

GODEWIN ANGLICUS is described in Domesday as "ille idem qui prius habuit totam mansionem eâ die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus." Godwin, we conclude, was the unnamed Thane who, *T. R. E.*, had held one of Serlo de Burci's estates at Ridgehill. But he can only have been one of the four unnamed Thanes who had held Serlo de Burci's other estate there.

ROGER WITEN, occasionally so called when only tenant of some other chief, was himself of Baronial degree. His usual style, in Domesday, is "Roger de Corcelle."

CALUICA.—The *ablatum* from Chelvey, of 1 virgate, is not to be understood as in diminution of Matthew de Moretain's hide there, but as wrested by the Bishop of Coutances from the præ-Conquestual estate of Turchill, probably before Matthew's seizin. The Bishop's title to one hide in Midgehill, and his succession to Turchill in the whole of Backwell, probably suggested this further appropriation, or "occupation," as the process was called.

MEGELA (Midgehill) is noticed low down in the Bishop of Coutances' Domesday Schedule, and far apart from his other manor in this Hundred. The entry is clearly postscriptive.

HARTCLIFF HUNDRED.—The Domesday scrutiny seems to have added 1¾ hides to the hidage recorded for this Hundred in 1084.

The eighty-two Domesday hides, compared with a parochial acreage of 21,102 acres, give the very specious proportion of 257½ acres per hide.

The exacter Domesday measures of the several manors of this Hundred amount to 24,409 acres. This is just 4,444 acres in excess of the modern parochial measurements, which amount to 19,965 acres.

Nearly all this difference is accounted for in the single instance of Wrington, whose parish (5749 acres) is 4095 acres less than its Domesday Manor of 9844 acres.

The present Hundred of HARTCLIFFE-CUM-BEDMINSTER includes all that was in the Præ-Domesday Hundreds of Hareclive and Bedminster, except Wrington, which has been transferred to the Abbatial Hundred of Brent-cum-Wrington, and except a small part of Abbots-Leigh, which has been transferred to Portbury Hundred by a process hereafter to be shown. The present Hundred of Hartcliffe-cum-Bedminster includes that which neither of the two Præ-Domesday Hundreds aforesaid included, viz., the mass of the Manor of Bedminster, which, at the date of Domesday, was a Royal Manor and external to any Hundred whatever.

LULSGATE, *alias* "St. Katherine's, Felton Hill," is now, and in some sort, a parish of this Hundred; but

it is quite a recent formation, taken out of the several parishes of Winford, Backwell, and Wrington, whose areas are given in the above Table on the pre-existing basis.

NEMPNETT THRUBWELL, with its tything of Regilbury, and its adjunct of Birchin Stoke (formerly Beauchamp-Stoke) constitutes a parish of 1772 acres; which parish Collinson (ii. 318) placed in the Hundred of Hartcliffe-cum-Bedminster. Other authorities place the parish in the remoter Hundred of Keynsham. Manorially, we suggest, the whole parish consisted of parcels taken from diverse Domesday Manors, and these parcels became parochially consolidated by most of them having been granted, sooner or later, to Flaxley Abbey. Thus, also, the previous manorial and hundredal distinctions of such parcels may have been swept away. Still theorizing, and with very inadequate data to guide us, we should guess that if a small portion of Nempnett parish was once in Butcome Manor and so in Hartcliffe Hundred, other portions may have been appendant to Blagdon, in Winterstoke Hundred, to Moreton, or Compton Martin, or Ubley, or West Harptree in Chewton Hundred, while part, viz., Birchin-Stoke seems to have been in Chew Hundred.

As it is necessary to our plan to give the acreage of every modern parish under some Hundred or other, we have preferred to follow Collinson in placing Nempnett in Hartcliffe Hundred. This increases the parochial acreage of that Hundred to 21,102 acres.

THE COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF HARTCLIFFE HUNDRED (Old).—Here each of 82 hides was parallel with about 297 acres of Domesday Registration. The Domesday value of the Hundred, viz., £96 18s. 0d. per annum, was at the rate of £1 3s. 7½d. per hide; and of about ⅔ths of a penny per registered acre; also at the rate of 14s. 8d. per plough-land.

The indications are those of a poor territory: for though the Revenue per hide was normal, each hide consisted of so large a complement of acres, that the revenue per acre becomes depressed. The revenue also, if assessed only on the arable land, is below the average of Somerset Hundreds.

THE INQUISICIO GHELDI FOR HUNESPILL HUNDRED (A.D. 1084).

In Hundreto Hunespillæ quod tenet Walscinus de Duaco est tantum i hida.

De hâc (hidâ) habet Rex, de Gildo suo, vi solidos.

Et cum hoc Hundreto fuerunt recepti 18 solidi pro iiii hidis quæ erant de Hundreto Locheslegæ.

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF HUNESPILL HUNDRED.

WALSCELINE DE DOUAI'S Manor of Huntspill was a Hundred in itself. Its constitution as a single hide was an ancient privilege. Its contents, certified in Domesday, were 1860 acres. Though Walsceline de Douai pays gheld on this whole hide in 1084, he appears in Domesday as holding half thereof in demesne.

The three hides of LOCHESLEY HUNDRED which, in 1084, rendered gheld to the Collectors of Hunespill Hundred, were three hides held by Alured de Hispania in demesne, and in Woolavington, a member of the Abbot of Glastonbury's Manor of Shapwick. The Collectors of the Gheld for Lochesley Hundred enter Alured de Hispania as in arrear for such a proportion of the tax.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 23-24), OF HUNESPILL HUNDRED.

The single hide which by ancient privilege measured the geldability of this Manor and Hundred is represented in Domesday by 1,860 acres of contemporary measurement, viz., plough-land, 1,560 acres; meadow, 100 acres; pasture, 200 acres. The area of the existing Parish of Huntspill is 5,944 acres, but the excess over the Domesday Manor is not quite so great as, at first sight, it may appear: for the Parish includes Alston-Mareis, which at the date of Domesday was a distinct Manor of Bimastane Hundred, represented by one hide, or, correlatively, by 400 acres of more exact measurement. On the whole then, we have (1,860 + 400 =) 2,260 acres of Domesday measurement, contrasting with 5,944 acres of modern ascertainment. In other words, there were in Huntspill Parish (5,944 - 2,260 =) 3,684 acres, which were either Extra-Mauorial and appurtenant to the King's Forests of Somerset, or else so utterly waste as to have been ignored by the Domesday Surveyors.

THE DOMESDAY VALUE of Huntspill Manor, viz., £8, was at the rate of £8 per hide, and of 1⅓d. per acre of Domesday estimate; also at the rate of 12s. 3¼d. per plough-land, and per team, actually employed.

The number of Villeins, Boors, Cottars, and Serfs abiding in Huntspill Hundred, in A.D. 1086, was 38. This gives a single Labourer to every 49 acres of Domesday registration; to every 41 acres of plough-land and to every 41 acres of land actually ploughed.

INQUISICIO OHELDI (1084) FOR FROME HUNDRED (INQUIS.-OHELDI, PP. 489-490).

In Hundreto Frome sunt ccc hidæ ii minus (*i. e.*, 298 hides).

De his habet Rex de Gildo suo £50 18s. 6d. pro clx et ix hid. et iii. virgis		169	3	0			
	H. V. F.						
Et Barones Regis habent in dominio c hidas et xv ; dim. virg. minus (114 3 2).							
De his habet Episcopus de Sto Laudo xiii hid. et dim. virg.		13	0	2			
Et Hardinus de Viltona ix hidas iu dominio		9	0	0			
Et Rogerus Arundellus vii hidas et virgam et dimid.		7	1	2			
Et Abbas de Montebor ii hid. et dim.		2	2	0			
Et Abbas Glastiugeberiensis xx hid. et dim		20	2	0			
Et Osbernus Giffardus v hid. et i virgam.		5	1	0			
Et Balduinus Vicecomes xiiiij hid. et dim.		14	2	0			
Et Dū (Dunus, <i>al.</i> Dunuo) ix hidas		9	0	0			
Et Alveredus iiiij hid. et iii virg.		4	3	0			
Et Edmundus ii hid. et iii virg.		2	3	0			
Et Bristuardus Presbyter v hidas.		5	0	0			
Et Edwardus x hid. et dim. virg.		10	0	2			
Et Abbas de Bada vi hidas.		6	0	0			
Et Crenemere habet Rex, v hidas in dominio		5	0	0			
		114	3	2	114	3	2
Non habet Rex gildum de dim. hidâ quam tenet Alveredus Pincerna		0	2	0			
Nec de 2 hidis et dim. quas tenet Hunfridus Camerarius		2	2	0			
Nec de 1 hidâ quam tenet Ricardus		1	0	0			
Nec de dim. hidâ quam tenet Herbertus		0	2	0			
Nec de 1 virgâ quam tenet Vitalis		0	1	0			
Nec de dimid. virgâ quam tenet Pancevoldus		0	0	2			
Nec de dimid. hidâ de elemosinâ de Cenemerresduna		0	2	0			
Nec de iii virgis quas tenet Rotbertus filius Herberti		0	3	0			
Nec de hidâ et dimidiâ q'r (quarum) Fegadri retinuerunt Gildum per consuetudinem		1	2	0			
Et de v hidis et iii virgis de quibus Fegadri receperunt Gildum 34 sol. et 6 den. non		5	3	0			
habet Rex Gildum							
		13	1	2	13	1	2
					298	0	0

N.B.—Here is a clear indication of the mode by which the Gheld-Collectors secured their fee or stipend. They retained the Gheld collected from a fixed and customary quantity of hidage. In the case of a large Hundred like Frome, the fee would be 9 shillings, that is the Gheld paid on 1½ hides. For an ordinary Hundred, say of 100 hides, the proportionate fee will have been 3 shillings; and there can be no doubt that the Frome Hundred of the Inquest, though taxed *en masse*, was well understood at the time to be composed of three ordinary hundreds. The further retention by the Fegadri or Collectors of £1 14s. 6d. of the collected money had nothing to do with their perquisites. This money was still due to the Crown.

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF FROME HUNDRED.

THE BISHOP OF COUTANCES' demesnes of 13h. 0v. 2f. are traceable with precision in Domesday, viz., in Lullington 4 hides, in Orchardleigh 3 hides, in Newton St. Loe 6h. 0v. 2f., = 13h. 0v. 2f.

HARDINUS DE VILTONA *habet ix hidas in dominio*. No such person as Hardinus de Wilton is to be found in the Somerset Domesday. No Tenure *in capite* such as would consist with this entry of the Gheld Inquest of 1084 (under Frome Hundred) is reproduced in Domesday. Here then we must resort to conjecture, or abandon all hope of resolving a serious difficulty.

Hardinus de Viltona, let us suppose, was the person whose name is in all other cases written as Herveius or Herveus. The Dorset Gheld-Inquest calls him *Herveius Camerarius*; the Dorset Domesday enrolls him

among the King's Serjeants as *Herveius Cubicularius*. The Wiltshire Gheld-Inquest records three exemptions in his favour as a Tenant *in capite*, under the name of *Herveius*, three more under the name of *Herveius de Wilton*. In the Wiltshire Domesday he appears as "Herveus de Wiltune, Serviens Regis."

In short, Hervey de Wilton was one of the Conqueror's Chamberlains, and held estates *in capite* in the two Counties of Dorset and Wilts. The name, Hervey, was, we will assume, unfamiliar with the Fegadri of Frome Hundred in 1084, so they changed it into Hardin (meaning Hardine or Harding), a name which they knew well. If such an hypothesis be admitted, a fact at once follows, viz., that A.D. 1084 Hervey de Wilton, a Royal Chamberlain, held of the King an estate or estates in Frome Hundred (Somerset), an estate or estates of such capacity as that his demesnes therein were nine hides. There is no such estate registered in the Somerset Domesday; there is nothing in Domesday compatible with the conditions of Hervey (or Hardin) de Wilton's tenement in 1084.

Here then there arises the presumption of a Domesday omission. We show elsewhere that the two Manors of Wellow and Kilmersdon were omitted in Domesday, and that they were probably included among the twenty hides which had nominally been attached to the Burgh of Bath, when in the hands of Queen Edith. At her death (A.D. 1074) these estates, including Bath itself, passed to the Crown.

Our further conjecture is that before the year 1084 the King had entrusted or given to his Chamberlain, Hervey, one or both of the Manors of Wellow and Kilmersdon; and that the reason why Harvey's tenure *in capite* does not appear in the Somerset Domesday, is, that the estates which he held were excluded from that Record.

Against these ideas there is a grave objection. If the Fegadri of 1084 included Wellow and Kilmersdon in Frome Hundred, it is difficult to imagine how they could assign so few as 298 hides as the contents of the said Hundred.

Where there is so little to go upon, and so much suspected error, theories of solution are apt to abound, one, perhaps, as unsound as the rest. For instance, suppose we identify Harding, Lord of Cranmere, and of several Wiltshire estates in 1066 and 1086, with Harding, Butler to Queen Edith, in 1062 and (probably) in 1072, it is easy to imagine that such a person might chance to be called "Hardin de Wilton." But then the Lord of Cranmere in 1066 and 1086 was only a Tenant of Glastonbury Abbey—not entitled, therefore, to any remission of Gheld-tax. Moreover, in 1084, Harding was not Lord of Cranmere in any sense. Cranmere was *in manu Regis*; it was under temporary escheat. The King himself had the gheld-exemption to which the demesnes of Cranmere were entitled. The last and simplest conjecture is, that in 1084 Hardin de Wilton, whoever he may have been, held, not one, but several estates in Frome Hundred, and that in 1086 they had been taken from him and given to another. If so, we should guess the chief, if not the sole, Reversioner to have been the Bishop of Coutances, and that he at once enfeoffed his knights in the whole acquisition.

ROGER ARUNDEL's demesnes in this Hundred appear to be reduced by Domesday to 7 hides, 1 virgate, viz., 5½ hides in Beckington and 1½ hides in Mersitona (now Marston Biggott).

THE ABBOT OF MONTEBOURG's estate in this Hundred is surveyed without a name in Domesday (Exon D., 180-1). The demesne, 2½ hides, is the same. Collinson altogether ignores any Somerset estate of this Norman Abbey. We will deal with the difficulty, here implied, in a subsequent note.

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY has, apparently, in Domesday, more than 21 hides of demesne in his Manors of Frome Hundred, viz., 10 hides in Mells, 7 hides in Camerton, and 4 hides, 2 fertines, and 1 acre in Milton (Puddimore). The latter, probably, was the seat of the increase, which was due to some arrangement intermediate between the Gheld-Inquest and Domesday.

OSBERN GIFFARD's Domesday demesnes were 4½ hides in *Telma* (*alias Telwe*) and 3½ virgates in *Uāc̄berga*, by which names we understand Elm and Woodborough. Collinson, reading in the Exchequer Domesday as *Telwe*, a word which was probably meant to be written *Telme*, takes the said word to indicate Wellow. A similar inadvertence led him to miss Ubley as the true representative of the Domesday *Tumbeli*. Of these etymologies we speak elsewhere. Wellow, both the Manor and the Hundred, were ultimately annexed to the Honour of Gloucester,—in itself an assurance that they had at no previous time been Osbern Giffards.

THE SHERIFF BALDWIN's estate was Hemington (21 hides). Domesday reduces his demesnes therein to 8 hides. He was Sheriff of Devon.

DUN was a Saxon Thane. His estate, Bochelanda (now Bucklaud Dinham) was 12 hides. Domesday gives him therein $8\frac{1}{2}$ hides of demesne.

"ALVERED" of the Inquest, is Alured de Hispania. His demesne of $4\frac{3}{4}$ hides is fixed by Domesday as in Loduntuna or Lochintone (Exchr. Domesday). This is probably Luckington, in Kilmersdon parish.

EDMUND FITZ PAGAN was a Norman Thane (Francus Tegnus). His demesne of $2\frac{3}{4}$ hides is fixed by Domesday as in Walton, *i. e.*, Walton-in-Kilmersdon. Collinson's omission to study the *Inquisicio Gheldi* has here led him into error. He makes Walton-in-Kilmersdon to have been Ralph de Mortimer's Manor of Walton. The latter was "Walton in Gordano," in Portbury Hundred.

BRISTUARD PRESBYTER was a Saxon Thane (Anglus Tegnus). His estate was Writlington (6 hides), five of which re-appear as his demesne in Domesday.

EDWARDUS of the Inquest is Edward Vicecomes (of Wilts), *alias* Edward de Salisbury. Domesday reproduces his demesnes precisely, *viz.*, as 5 hides in Hantona, and 5 hides, 2 fertines in Nortuna. The two places are Charter-House-Hinton, and Norton St. Philip, both in Wellow Hundred.

THE ABBOT OF BATH's demesnes of 6 hides were 5 hides in Corston, and 1 hide in an estate which he held wholly in demesne, and which Domesday writes as *Evestia* or *Evestie*. We conjecture this to have been that part of Iford which was not in the parish of Freshford and Hundred of Bath, but which was in the parish of Hinton (now Charter-House-Hinton), and Hundred of Frome, and which is accordingly in the present Hundred of Wellow, a subdivision of Frome. We consider the specific name *Evestie* to be obsolete; we do not suggest any etymological connexion between *Evestie* and Iford.

THE ENTRY ABOUT CREMERE indicates that at the date of the Inquisition the King had in hand the whole of East and West Crammere (in all 12 hides), and that he held 5 hides thereof in demesne, while 7 hides will have been held by Gheld-paying Villeins. However, within the next two years, that is before Domesday was written, the whole estate was *restored* to Glastonbury Abbey, and to Harding, the Abbot's tenant. We say *restored*, because such had been the status and tenure of Crammere before the Conquest.

Domesday, as usual, speaks only of two Epochs, that which ended in January, 1066, and that which begun and ended with the Survey of 1085-1086. It takes no note of the intervening seizure of Crammere by the Crown.

ALVERED PINCERNA's estates appear in Domesday as Cloford (10 hides), and in Echewica (Eastwick) 1 virgate. He held both of the Comte of Moretain.

HUMPHREY CHAMBERLAIN does not occur in Domesday with any tenure which we can suppose to have been in (Old) Frome Hundred. His tenure of 1084 was probably lapsing at that date. Probably also it had been under Glastonbury Abbey.

RICARDUS, non-geldant for one hide, was *Ricardus Interpres*. His tenures were in Road. They are made the subject of two entries in Domesday. He held one hide of the King, another of the Bishop of Coutances. It was the former, probably, for which he was surcharged, the Fegadri doubting his privilege as a tenant-in-capite. In due course, the Domesday Commissioners certify that he purchased the first-named hide, *per Licentiam Regis*.

HERBERT appears in Domesday as William de Owe's tenant at Laverton (10 hides).

VITALIS does not appear in Domesday with any tenement likely to have been in Frome Hundred. Elsewhere, that is in Carhampton Hundred, he held under Odo Fitz Gameline, and in Givela (Ycovil) Hundred under Roger de Corcelle.

PANCEVOLT of the Inquest was Bernard Pancevolt. His tenure was at Drukerton, under Turstin Fitz Rolf.

THE ELEMOSINA DE CENEMERESDUNA was a half-hide of land, appurtenant to Kilmersdon Church. It was in the King's hand at the date of the Inquest (March, 1084) by reason of the death of Peter, Bishop of Chester, the late Incumbent. The Fegadri, not knowing whom to tax for the tenement, reported it as a Tenure in Almoign and as non-geldant.

ROBERTUS, who appears in Domesday as Roger de Corcelle's tenant at Estalrewicca (Standerwick), was doubtless the Robert Fitz Herbert of the Inquest.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 25, 26) OF FROME HUNDRED.

UDEBERGA (Woodborough in Wellow).—The division between Osbern Gifard and his subordinates is ill-expressed in Domesday. His demesne is measured by *carrucage*, his tenants' portion by *hidage*. It is

clear that, in 1084, the Inquisitors exempted the whole of Woodborough as demesne. Osbern Gifard succeeded to estates of the Saxon Donnus both in Somerset and Wiltshire.

LITELTONA (Stoney Littleton in Wellow).—Collinson (iii. 327) ignores the Coutances' fee in *Littleton*, supplied by Domesday; but when he speaks elsewhere of a part of Littleton, held subsequent to Domesday, of the Honour of Gloucester, he is probably speaking of the Coutances' fee.

WELLOW.—No such place is named in the Somerset Domesday. Six hides situate in Woodborough and Stoney Littleton, and I hide called 'Wittochesmede,' are to be gathered from Domesday, and these were undoubtedly in Wellow parish. These 7 hides co-ordinate in Domesday with 1329 acres of exacter measurement. The whole of Wellow parish is 5292 acres. The difference (viz., 3963 acres) therefore represents the Manor of Wellow proper, at the date of Domesday, caput of one of the subdivisions of Frome Hundred. Of this apparent omission of Domesday we shall discourse elsewhere.

FERLEGA (Farley Hungerford) was first called Farley Montfort, says Collinson (iii. 351), because, on Roger de Corcelle's death, William Rufus gave it to Hugh de Montfort. This small Manor became eventually caput of the Honour of Farleigh Castle, to which some other Corcelle estates are found in ultimate subjection.—

Of course the present parish of Farleigh (904 acres) includes much more than the Domesday Manor. Farleigh having been originally a chapelry, its parish will have been arbitrarily assigned, and with small reference to the manorial boundary of the estate.

CAMERTON.—The Abbot of Glastonbury had held, and had lost, Camerton before the Conquest. King William, giving the estate to the Comte of Moretain, had disseized, not the Abbot, but Edmeratorius and his tenant Ailwin. The Abbot in turn recovered the estate for his Church, but only by giving, in exchange to the Comte, Tintinhull, a manor of 7½ hides in Givela (Yeovil) Hundred. "Roger," holding one of the 10 aides of Camerton under the Abbot in 1086, was probably Roger de Corcelle.

CREDELINCOTE (Carnicot) was long recognized as a "Fee of Morctain." It was one of those Fees which Lovel came to hold *in capite* of the Crown.

ECHEWICA (Wick, *al.* Eastwick, in Camerton).—It is unusual to find the Comte of Moretain succeeding to an estate of Alestan de Boscome. Alestan de Boscombe, one of King Edward's Thegns, had estates in Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Hertfordshire, Hants, Gloucestershire, Dorset, Wilts, and Somerset. In most of these he had been succeeded, in the first instance, by the elder Ralph de Limesey (deceased in 1084). In all but one or two cases Domesday finds William de Owe to have succeeded both Alestan de Boscombe and Ralph de Limesey, senior. For the identity of Echewica and Eastwick, see Collinson, vol. iii. p. 331.

FUSCOTA (Forscott).—Alditda, holding Forscott in January, 1066, was possibly the daughter of Earl Algar; and, if so, then the wife of Earl Harold.

INGELSCUMA (Englishcombe).—The Domesday details of tenure amount to a hide more than the ten hides announced as the gross contents of the manor. The error, if such, is counterbalanced by an inverse error under the next manor—Twerton.

TWERTONA (Tiverton, *al.* Twerton).—The four Thegns said by Domesday to have collectively, and *in paragio*, held the two manors of Twerton—held, it would seem, under Queen Edith. The two estates, it will be observed, were 10 hides. The smaller manor (2½ hides) was held by an individual Thegn. Who this Thegn was is explained by a Domesday postscript—"Hanc terram tenuit Alveredus Dapifer de Editâ Regina. Modo dicit Episcopus (Constantiensis) quod ipse eam tenet de Rege."—

Queen Edith's seigneuery over Twerton will have commenced before the Conquest, and have continued till her death in 1074. It was probably an appendage or annexation meet for her as Lady of the neighbouring Burgh of Bath. She sometime enfeoffed her steward, Alvered, in this part of Twerton. He remained her steward after the Conquest. At the Queen's death, or soon afterwards, King William gave all Twerton to the Bishop of Coutances. Alvered Dapifer vanished from the story, and the Bishop put Geoffrey Malruard as feoffee in Alvered's place. We shall recur to this incidental revelation of Domesday when we come to speak of Wellow and its præ-Domesday status.

HANTONA. NORTUNA.—Hinton and Norton having both been given in the 13th century to the Carthusians of Witham, the two parishes hardly represent the two Domesday Manors in severalty, though they nearly do so jointly. The present parishes together contain 4417 acres; the exact measures given in

Domesday make the Mauor of Hauton 1932 acres, and Norton 2680 acres; together 4612 acres. The Domesday Manors involved 2160 acres of wood. Part of this wood clearly lay in other parishes.

CORSTUNA (Corston).—A parish of 1190 acres, seems at first inadequate to a manor of 10 hides, but if we look at the exacter Domesday measures we find the manor was only 1086 acres. Here then was a case of what we have called "excessive hidation."

EVESTIA.—Domesday mentions the place between Corstuna (Corston) and Esewica (Ashwick); a corroboration of the inference from the *Inquisicio* that Evestia was in Frome Hundred (Old). That it was also in the Wellow portion of Old Frome Hundred is assumed in the Table.—

It is remarkable that, under Corstuna, Domesday makes Seuld to have been Abbot of Bath on the day of King Edward's death, and that under *Evestia* (the very next entry), Wluold is made to have been Abbot on the same day. It is a fact, though a very extraordinary one, that there were two contemporary Abbots of Bath at that epoch. The proof we have given elsewhere (*supra* pp. 57, 58).

CUMA (Combe Hawey).—The Domesday aspect of this Manor is not striking, otherwise than that it had once been Queen Edith's, and that its hidation (2 hides) when compared with a parallel acreage of 628 acres, was a privileged hidation. Agelric, the Anglo-Thegn who held Cume *in capite* in 1086, will have been very recently introduced; for the Inquisition of 1084 nowhere accredits Agelric with any Gheld exemption; yet in 1086 he held half of Cuma in demesne. Its increased value, from £1 to £4, within so short a period, is perhaps explained on the supposition that Agelric found it in a wasted state, and by the fact that all the five teams for which the Manor was adapted were at work thercon. Passing from Domesday to a præ-Domesday Index of Somerset Hundreds, we find that one of the said Hundreds was *Cumbe*. Nothing can be more likely than that a privileged manor of Queen Edith's, in Old Frome Hundred, and in the Wellow Division of that Hundred, should at one time have had the dignity of a Liberty or Franchise.

Collinson (iii. 334), as we think most erroneously, has identified Combe Hawey with the Bishop of Bayeux's Domesday Manor of Cume. The Bishop's Manor was in the Hundred of Meleborne. It is now represented in Temple Comb.

WELLOW HUNDRED. WELLOW MANOR. WELLOW PARISH.—The *Inquisicio* of A.D. 1084, under Frome Hundred, alludes indiscriminately to tenements which are now classed in the several Hundreds of Wellow, Kilmersdou, and Frome. Domesday also, in arranging the Bishop of Coutances' manors, adopts a sequence which shows that the Surveyors took no cognizance of any such ordered subdivision of Frome Hundred as we have attempted in our Table. Yet these subdivisions were known locally, both at the date of the *Inquisicio* and of Domesday, for an Index of Somerset Hundreds, contemporary with the *Inquisicio*, names three distinct Hundreds of "Welewe," of "Chiuemoredona," and of "Frome." (See Vol. ii, pp. 9-10).

We will speak first of Wellow Manor.—Here we have one of those difficulties, the investigation of which leads the student to observe a great deal, and haply to learn something, though he may fail at last to solve the enigma.

The Manor of Wellow is not named anywhere in Domesday. Collinson's discovery of Wellow in Telwe (*al. Telma, al. Telme*), was no discovery at all. Neither the Exchequer nor the Exon Codex meant anything but "Elm" in those forms of expression. (This prefix of the letter T to the true initial letter (E) of a word was merely a clerkly device to relieve the subsequent combination of consonants, a combination which was either offensive to the ear, or unpronounceable by the tongue, or incomprehensible to the mind, of a Norman Scribe. Thus De Moione's Manor of 'Edgeborough' became Tetesberga or 'Tegesheria' in Domesday; thus Ubley became 'Tumbeli'; and thus Elm became Telme.

Wellow, we repeat, is not named, nor represented by any formal name in Domesday. It is imperative that we should at least inquire how this happened. We will first state, or repeat, all that we know about Wellow, apropos to the question.—

As a Manor it was, before Domesday, known as Welewe, and was Caput of one subdivision of the Old Hundred of Frome. After Domesday, Wellow was again and more fully recognized as Caput of the same Subdivisional Hundred, but the subdivision had meanwhile been converted into a distinct Hundred, not in any way allied to Frome Hundred.

Wellow, both Manor and Hundred, was, after Domesday, annexed by the King (probably William Rufus) to the "Honour of Gloucester." As we have already argued, the formal suppression of Wellow Manor in Domesday, consists with a suppression of some 3,963 statute acres. The next point of enquiry, if Wellow

be not itself named in Domesday, is, whether this area of 3,963 acres can be found in that Record under some other name; or was Wellow (like Kelston in Bath Hundred) omitted by the Domesday Commissioners in error? The last is a possibility, but a very bare one, so bare that it were uncritical and idle to entertain it till we shall have examined all other possibilities of the case.

Was Wellow then that unnamed manor of Old Frome Hundred which in 1084 and 1086 was held *in capite* by the Norman Abbey of Montebourg? We think not. The anonymous manor was 5 hides, and measured 760 Domesday acres. In area, then, it can hardly have been a fifth of Wellow. Moreover there is nothing in the Domesday account of the Montebourg Manor to tally with the idea that it had been and was to be (like Wellow) Caput of a Hundred. Again, was Wellow, as a Manor, and as Caput of a sectional Hundred, buried by Domesday in its notice of the Royal and Dominical Manor of Frome? The Domesday measures of the King's Manor of Frome were 7,520 acres, of the Church-fee of Frome 1,175 acres, of Caivert (in Frome) 199 acres;—together 8,894 Domesday acres. The present parish of Frome is only 7,092 acres. The difference (circa 1,800 acres) may mean simply that the King's Manor extended beyond the bounds of the present parish; it cannot mean that the extension included any such Manor as Wellow, which (as we have calculated) would have contributed nearly 4,000 acres to the combination. Moreover, had the Lordship of Wellow Hundred been an inherent attribute of the King's Manor and Hundred of Frome; the grant thereof to the Honour of Gloucester, supposedly by William Rufus, would have been a dismemberment of an estate of Ancient Crown Demesne. Such a thing, so defined, is incredible at that period of history. When kings did begin to alienate the Manors of Crown Demesne, they parted with them piecemeal; they did not dissever them. One more enquiry remains.—Was Wellow, as a Manor and as Caput of a Hundred, buried by Domesday in the hidage and in the fiscal value, which the Record bespeaks for the late Queen Edith's Burgh of Bath? When we reflect that those twenty hides, assigned by Domesday to the Burgh of Bath, were, on independent grounds, supposed by us (*supra*, pp. 105-106) to have included a territory beyond the limits of Bath and Bath Hundred, as those limits present themselves to modern eyes;—when we reflect, too, that Queen Edith's Hundredal jurisdiction, annexed to her Burgh of Bath, was simply enormous; when we look at the Queen's sometime possession of Twerton and Combe (Hawey), both in Wellow Hundred;—when we know that, King William, being Lord of Wellow Hundred in A.D. 1084, the Gheld-Collectors of Frome Hundred, had no reason to prevent their assessing the two Hundreds together;—then, perhaps, we may agree that there is no necessity for our further enquiring, if and why Wellow, as a name, is omitted in Domesday. The name is not in Domesday; but the substance, the hidage of the manor and the Hundredal jurisdiction, possibly is. The manor and its area are possibly implied in the 20 hides of the Burgh of Bath; the Lordship of the Hundred was a jurisdiction possibly then vesting in the King, not as King, but as Queen Edith's successor in the Lordship of Bath. And thus it was no severance of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*, if William Rufus added the Manor and Hundred of Wellow to the Honour of Gloucester, no more than it was such a severance when the same King sold the Burgh of Bath to the Bishop of Wells.

There is one objection to our theory. When Rufus sold Bath to John of Tours, the King's certificate of the grant embodies these words:—“*Sciatis me dedisse, &c., Johanni Episcopo totam civitatem Bathoniæ, &c.; dedi inquam ei ita libere et honorifice cum omnibus appenditiis, quicquid ego ibi habui vel pater meus dum melius habuimus cum omnibus consuetudinibus extra, et infra, &c., cum monetâ cum Theloneo tam in campis quam in silvis tam in foro quam in pratis et in terris, &c.*” Henry I.'s confirmation of his brother's grant uses these words following—“*Ipsam urbem et omnia pertinentia ad firmam ejusdem civitatis dono et confirmo, &c., Johanni Episcopo, &c. Dono etiam hidagium quod exigebatur de viginti hidis ad eandem urbem pertinentibus et omnia placita et leges, justitias et omnes consuetudines omnino et adjutoria, et si quæ alia sunt quæ pater meus, vel frater, vel ego ipse habuimus in eâ.*”

Now, how was it, if our theory be correct, that Wellow and its Hundred-Court did not pass by these grants to the Bishop? The Certificate of Rufus is not dated; but there are good reasons for supposing it to have been written some years after his grant of Bath Abbey to the same Bishop, and the date of the latter proves to have been January 27, 1091. It is quite supposable, nay, it is even probable, that the King's augmentations of the Honour of Gloucester were previous to either of the grants to Bishop John of Tours, both of which, be it noted, were attested by Robert Fitz Hamon, then Lord of that same Honour of Gloucester.

We suggest, in short, that King William's grant of the *City* of Bath passed later than the year 1094, and that, at that date, Wellow and its Hundred were no longer appendages of the City of Bath, nor was it intended by the terms, general or specific, of William II.'s or Henry I.'s Charters, that anything should pass further than was on the face of those Charters, nor that the phraseology of the Charters would justify any research or claim of what had been, or might have been, appurtenances of Bath in the time of Queen Edith or of William the Conqueror.

WALTUNA (Walton in Kilmersdon).—For the proper identification of this manor, and Collinson's mistake in the matter, we refer to a note given under the Inquest of Frome Hundred (*supra*, p. 151).

LOCHINTONE.—So this name is written in the Exchequer Domesday. The Exon Codex, writing "Loduntuna," is in serious fault. The place is Luckington. It is in Kilmersdon parish.

COLEFORD is not in Domesday. It is a modern severance of Kilmersdon parish.

KILMERSDON.—The Manor is not in Domesday. The Church, called the Church of *Chinemesdone* in Domesday, has already been spoken of in a note on the Inquest of Frome Hundred (*supra*, p. 151).

All of Kilmersdon parish that is memorialized in Domesday, is Walton, Luckington, and Kilmersdon Church-fee. These amount to $8\frac{1}{2}$ hides. The parallel Domesday measures amount to 1328 acres. The present parish of Kilmersdon is 3460 acres. The parish of the last century included Coleford (1157 acres). The parish intact was therefore 4617 acres.

In our table we have given the whole acreage of Kilmersdon parish in parallelism with Domesday elements, which, as not embracing Kilmersdon Manor, are short by $(4617 - 1328 =)$ 3289 acres of the area proper to such comparisons. These 3289 acres must be taken for the present, then, to represent the Manor of Kilmersdon, which, like Wellow, was, at the date of Domesday, Caput of one of the subdivisions of Frome Hundred. Of the apparent omission by Domesday we will speak elsewhere. All we will add here is, that as the Church of Kilmersdon was *in manu Regis* at the date of Domesday, so, in all probability, was the manor.

ESWICA (Ashwick).—Here is a good instance of Villeins holding absolutely at a fixed rent: for their rent (3s. 6d.) was the whole value of the manor. It was at the low rate of 7s. per hide and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per Domesday acre.

The parochial area of Ashwick (1528 acres) has little to do with the extent (75 acres) of the Domesday Manor. Ashwick was originally but a Chapelry of Kilmersdon. The parochial area assigned to it will have been quite arbitrary.

Ashwick remained with Bath Abbey long after Domesday. (See Collinson, ii. 449).

§ The Charter whereby King Edward granted 'Æscwica' to 'Wulfold Abbot' for life found its way into Mr. Kemble's Codex (Vol. iv., p. 150, No. DCCCXI); but neither the Editor, nor, so far as we are aware, any other Author, has apprehended the relevance and importance of this document. But when we find that the Grantee was Wulfold, Abbot of Bath, and that the estate so granted was Ashwick, a whole throng of further relevances surround us.

This charter is dated A.D. 1061. Indiction xiv., Epact vi., Concurrent i. The two first elements of date are consistent; the two last have probably been vitiated by careless transcription.

The witnesses' names are the most striking feature in this Charter. We cannot forbear giving as many of them as serve to illustrate the Domesday of Somerset.—

GISO EPISCOPUS (Giso Bishop of Wells, consecrated at Rome, Sunday, April 15, 1061).

HEREMANNUS EPISCOPUS (Hermann Bishop of Sherborne, 1058-1075).

LEOFRICUS EPISCOPUS (Leofric Bishop of Exeter, sitting in 1061).

WILLELMUS EPISCOPUS (William Bishop of London, sitting in 1061).

ÆGELNOTHUS ABBAS (Ægelnoth, *al.* Æthelnoth Abbot of Glastonbury, succeeded in 1053).

ÆGELWIN ABBAS (probably Ægelwin, *al.* Æthelwig, Abbot of Evesham. He is called in Domesday Elwi and Alwin. He was a man of great diplomatic genius. His *æra* was from 1058 to 1077).

HAROLDUS DUX (Harold Earl of Wessex, which included Somerset and Dorset).

TOSTIG DUX (Earl Tostig. He held many estates in Wessex).

- ÆLFGAR DUX (Algar Earl of Mercia, hereby proved to have been living in 1161. His death has often been placed earlier. So far this charter is corrective of a false chronology. The inference from Freeman (vol. ii. p. 469), is that Earl Algar died in 1062.
- BRIHTRIC CONSILLARIUS (Brihtric Algarsson, Lord of the Honour of Gloucester;—had large estates in Devon and Dorset).
- ÆLFGAR CONSILLARIUS (one of the greater Thanes of the West;—the Algar, so often named in the Somerset Domesday as living in 1066;—the Ælfgear de Thorne, of 1068, styled “Ælfgar Princeps” in a Charter of King Edward, A.D. 1062).
- ÆGELUIN MINISTER (probably the Alwi Banneson spoken of in the Domesday Surveys of Somerset, Wilts, and Dorset, as living in 1066).
- EUERWACER MINISTER (of like position and æra with Alwi Banneson).
- ESEGAR MINISTER (Æsgar Lord of Worle, Somerset; and of Kalestoc, Cornwall, in 1066; attested the famous Waltham Charter of 1062, as “Esgar, Regiæ Procurator Aulæ”).
- ROTBERT MINISTER (Robert fitz Wymarch, Sheriff of Essex in 1061; had, in 1066, several estates in Somerset and Wilts).
- BONDI MINISTER (a frequent witness of King Edward’s Charters; had estates in Somerset, Dorset, Wilts, Berks, Oxfordshire, &c.; recognized as “Bundi Stallere” by King William in 1067-8).
- ÆILFERTH MINISTER (probably the Western Thane of 1066, who appears in Domesday as Aielvert, Agelferdus, Ailvert, Alward, Elward, and Olward. When addressed by King Edward as Sheriff of Dorset, his name was written Ælfred. In relation to his Dorset Shrievalty and estates, the Scribes of Domesday sometimes wrote his name as “Alured,” the Norman form of Ælfred. The Cornish Survey also speaks of “Alveredus Marescalcus” as an antecessor of the Comte of Moretain in that county).
- EADMER MINISTER (identical, doubtless, with the Edmar Atre, or Edmeratorus, of Domesday nomenclature).
- ÆGELSIE MINISTER (written variously in Domesday as Ælsi, Ails, Als, or Elsi.—His estates in Somerset, Dorset, and Devon were numerous. Many of them devolved after the Conquest on Walscin de Douai; others on the Bishop of Coutances, the Comte of Moretain, the Bishop of Wells, and Serlo de Burci). Ælsi, steward of Queen Edith in 1072, was perhaps the son-in-law of Ulward White; and, if so a younger man than the witness of this charter.
- ÆLFGET MINISTER.—(This Thane, if a land-holder in the South-Western Counties, probably died before the Conquest. Domesday, among the greater Thanes of 1066, instances none in Somerset or Dorset whose name could be taken as a form of Ælfget.)

ESTOCA (Radstock).—The Domesday acreage (1,092 acres) is represented mainly in the modern parish, of 1,005 acres.

STRATONA.—Stratton-on-the-Foss, and two estates called in Domesday Picota, measure together 8 hides, and, parallel therewith, 1,187 acres of Domesday registration. In the Table we take these estates to co-ordinate with the parishes of Stratton-on-the-Foss (1,148 acres), and Holcombe (780 acres), together 1,928 acres. Holcombe, as a manor, is not in Domesday. Its area is probably implied in Picota, rather than in Stratton. It came eventually to be held of the Honour of Gloucester.

PICOTA (Pitcott).—It would seem that Edmund Fitz Pagan had very recently acquired this manor (3½ hides). His exemption in 1084 has been already shewn to have been for his demesne at Walton. His demesne at Picota was 2½ hides. Not having been accredited with any exemption for the same in 1084, it may be that it had not then come into his possession. Or it may be that the Domesday entry of this estate was in the nature of an ‘increment’ or new ascertainment, supplementary of the Inquest of 1084, and adding (virtually) 3½ hides to the Inquisitional area of Frome Hundred.

HARDINGTONA (Hardington).—A hide of land which belonged to the Sheriff Baldwin’s Manor of Hemington is mentioned under the Bishop of Coutances’s Manor of Hardington, not as adding to the four hides of Hardington, but because it was locally situate in Hardington, and had pasture-rights in common with Har-

dington,—“et habet pascuam eomunem huic mansione” (scilz Hardingtonæ). Under Hemington the Exon Domesday says conversely, “De his xx et i hidis habet una hida communem pascuam in Hardintona, mansione episcopi Constantiensis a tempore Regis Edwardi.” The Exchequer Domesday says, under *Hardintone*,—“In hoc manerio est una hida pertinens ad Hamintone : Balduinus tenet, et habet commuenum pasturam huic Manerio” (scilz Hardintone). Under Hamitone, the same Record says, “De hac terrâ (xxi hides) una hida est in communi pasturâ in Hardintone, manerio Episcopi Constantiensis.”

This is all intelligible, though curious. It is less intelligible and more curious that Domesday gives no pasture at all among the constituents of Hardington, and only gives (half a league by half a league, or) 360 acres to Hemington.

WEREGRAVA (Wydergrave, in Hardington). Domesday notices this estate of the Bishop of Coutances, last but one of his Fief, and out of all topographical sequence. Such entries are not uncommon. They must be looked upon as postscriptive ; and, where both Domesdays give them thus out of sequence, it may be inferred that they were found, written postscriptively, on the Commissioners' original notes.

BABBINGTONA (Babington).—Its area of 5 hides is paralleled by Domesday measurements of 627 acres. The present parish (607 acres) was originally a Chapelry, taken out of the mother-parish of Kilmersdon later than the 12th century.

MILLESOTA (Middlecote).—This manor (5½ hides) was, in point of fact, a severance of the Abbot of Glastonbury's ancient Manor of Mells (originally 20 hides). The usurpant was the Bishop of Coutances.

The Domesday Scribes, not perceiving this, have entered all particulars of Millescote in duplicate as it were, once in the Bishop's Fief, once under Mulla, in the Abbot's Fief. In the Schedule of “*Terræ Occupatæ*” the mistake is renewed. The severance from Mulla was, of course, a “*Terra Occupata*,” but the Scribes, copying both the duplicate entries of the Survey, have created two severances and two manors where there was but one of each (Exon Domesday, pp. 483-484).

In three of the four entries about this estate the old value “*quando Episcopus receipt*” is given as £2 ; and the existing value (when Domesday was written) is given as £4. But in the fourth and last entry (Exon Domesday, p. 484) a uniform value of 25 shillings is bespoken for each period. This is a mere blunder, wholly unauthorised by anything in the more genuine text of the Survey.

Middlecote, in the time of Edward I., was held by the same Manor-Lords as Babington and the advowson of Babington Chapel. In Collinson's time Middlecote was depopulated, but its site was apparently known. (See Collinson, ii. 450).

WRITHLINGTON.—Brietuold, or Brihtuard, the Domesday Lord of Writhlington, is classed among the *Angli Taini* of Somerset. He was a priest, and in much favour with the Conqueror.

MULLA (Mells and Leigh-on-Mendip). This estate has long since been taken from Kilmersdon Hundred and formed into a distinct Liberty. This can be said only of the 14½ hides which remained to Mulla after the abstraction of Middlecote.

The 20 hides of Mulla and Middlecote together were paralleled by 2830 acres of Domesday registration. Collating with this the parochial areas of Mells (3611 acres), Leigh-on-Mendip (1425 acres), and Vobster (689 acres), we have a total of 5725 acres against 2830 Domesday acres. There are, probably, then, in the said parishes some (5725—2830=) 2895 acres, which, at the date of Domesday, were either unmet for registration, or appurtenant to the Royal Forest of Mendip.

KILMERSDON MANOR AND HUNDRED.—It is abundantly clear, amidst all our doubts, that the Manor and Hundred of Kilmersdon stood, at the dates of the Inquest and of Domesday, in precisely the same predicaments as the Manor and Hundred of Wellow.

Kilmersdon was (tem. William I.) Caput of a Hundred,—Caput of one of the subdivisions of Old Frome Hundred. Kilmersdon is not named in Domesday, nor is its hidage given, unless we conceive that hidage to have been buried in the twenty hides bespoken for the Burgh of Bath. The Church of Kilmersdon was *in manu Regis* at the date of Domesday ; the manor was therefore *in manu Regis* ; and, again, the Hundred was *in manu Regis*. And in regard to this precise evidence about Kilmersdon Church, our theory, about Kilmersdon and Wellow both, is by so much the better supported than it was in the separate case of Wellow.

Whether Domesday omits Kilmersdon Manor in error, or computes its hidage as involved in that of Bath, the exacter measures of the manor are equally ignored in that Record. In our Table (Vol. ii, p. 26, last column) we give the whole parochial acreage of Kilmersdon (3460 acres), and of its former member Coleford (1187 acres); but, against these 4647 acres, Domesday alleges nothing of contemporary measurement except some 1328 acres in Walton and Luckington. So far our design of balancing in all cases the acreages of the eleventh and nineteenth centuries is impeded. In short, we cannot muster Domesday measurements which are nowhere to be found.

The destination of Kilmersdon, both Manor and Hundred, was different to that of Wellow. In King John's time (1199-1216) the Manor and Hundred of Kilmersdon were held *in capite* of the Crown by John de Subligney (see Collinson ii, 445-6). This points to nothing but that at some earlier period the said Manor and Hundred, having been in the Crown, had been given to the said John de Subligney or to his lineal ancestor. We cannot, in short, trace Subligney's title so far back as the 11th century; nor do we know of his descent from any individual Norman of those who figured in Somerset at the date of Domesday.

CAYFORD is the only place in the present parish of Frome which was a member of the Old Hundred of Frome. All the rest of Frome parish was Extra-Hundredal at the date of Domesday.

RODA (Road).—Here the Bishop of Coutances's tenants divided between them the profits of two manorial mills. But the Domesday arithmetic is wrong, the parts given realizing in all $2\frac{1}{2}$ mills. Instead of the tenant, Roger, holding $\frac{3}{4}$ s of two mills (as in the Domesday text) he held one-third of one mill and one-fourth of another. The Domesday values, however, are rightly reckoned, and they accord with this amendment of the statement of shares. Explicitly, one mill was worth 15 shillings per annum, and the shares were—Sirewold's half, worth 7s. 6d.; Roger's third, worth 5s.; Rotbert's sixth, worth 2s. 6d. The other mill was worth 12 shillings per annum, and the shares were—Robert's half, worth 6s.; Roger's quarter, worth 3s.; and Moses' quarter, worth 3s.

Rainbald, the Priest, who had sold part of Road to Richard the Interpreter, had been Chancellor to King Edward. He was living at the date of Domesday, and holding large Church preferment under the Conqueror. He survived till the reign of Henry I., and took the chief part in the foundation of Cirencester Abbey. (See Key to Domesday;—Dorset, 116 n.)

WOLVERTON.—The Domesday Manor of RODA included Wolverton, without any distinction of name. The whole was 10 hides, paralleled by 1,231 Domesday acres. The parochial measurements are 1,664 acres, viz., Road, 928 acres; Wolverton, 736 acres.

MERSITONA (Marston Biggot).—The Domesday measures were 2,166 acres; the present parish is 2,207 acres.

BERCHELEE (Berkeley).—The Domesday measures, viz., 436 acres, consist well with a hidage of $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides. The present parish, of 1,927 acres, includes, of course, far more than the Domesday manor. Berkeley was only a Chapelry at its foundation.

TELMA, *al.* TELWE, potius TELME (Elm).—The Domesday manor contained (in correlation with its 5 hides) 524 acres. The modern parish is 893 acres. Elm was originally a Chapel. [Collinson (ii. 206) was much mistaken when he said that Elm was not in Domesday.]

CLOFORD (Cloford).—The Domesday Manor contained (correlatively with its 10 hides) 1,560 acres. The modern parish is 2,443 acres. Cloford also was originally a Chapel.

We reckon that some 1,425 acres, now in the parishes of Elm and Cloford, were not in the Old Hundred of Frome at the date of Domesday, but in the King's Manor of Frome. These two members of the King's Manor, though far apart, were eventually combined with other parcels of land, and the whole was called "Hill House Liberty." All were held by De Gorges, under direct grant from the Crown.

NUNNEY.—Much has to be said about this locality;—much in regard of its superficial Domesday aspect as *Nonin*; more in what may be learned about it by looking deeper into Domesday meanings.—

What Domesday (Exon Codex, p. 343) says about Nunney may be epitomized as follows. "Willelmus (de Moione) habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur Nonin quam tenuit Colo (*T. R. E.*) et reddidit geldum pro v hidis. Has possunt arare iii carrucæ. Hanc tenet Turgisus de Willelmo et habet inde iv hidas et i virgam et i carrucam in dominio; et Villani (habent) iii virgas et i carrucam. Ibi habet Turgisus iiiii Villanos et viii Bordarios et iiiii servos, &c., et dimidium Molinum qui reddit 30 denarios, et 100 agros

nemoris, et 20 agros prati, et 20 acres pascuæ; et valet 60 solidos, et quando Willelmus recepit 40 solidos."

Here then, corresponding with 5 hides, are 500 acres of land deemed worthy of Domesday note, viz, 360 acres of arable land (corresponding, as we held, with 3 plough-lands) + 100 acres of wood + 20 acres of meadow + 20 acres of pasture. The older value (£2) was, for such an estate, quite normal; the Domesday value (£3) was decidedly good. Wherever Turgisus held under William de Mohun improved values marked his tenure.

The existing parish of Nunney contains 2,421 statute acres. De Mohun's Manor of Nonin, whether we look at its hidage or its Domesday measures, will not, in this part of Somerset, have supplied more than half such a parish. Look at the adjoining parish of Cloford. Its present measure is little more than Nunney; it is 2,443 statute acres. But the Domesday hidage of Cloford was 10 hides; its exacter Domesday measures were 1,560 acres. Its older value of £7 had jumped to £10 when Domesday was written.

In such cases the usual resource for the student is to search Domesday for some other manor, likely to have been in Frome Hundred, equal to or greater than De Moione's manor, with a name reconcileable with Nunney, or with some existent or remembered hamlet in Nunney. Finding such an estate, the student will probably also have found the Domesday type of one half of the present parish of Nunney. We ourselves made this search, made it exhaustively; and it was vain. The required name and site were nowhere to be found. At the same period we were searching Domesday for Wellow and Kilmersdon, both in Old Frome Hundred. Our failure in that search has also been shown. But let the mind be once awakened by curiosity, and by a sense of difficulty, let it subside again into ever so long repose, or let it wrestle with other enigmas, and haply at last, some accidental touch, some ray of new light, may cause the old interest to re-awake, and may illuminate the old darkness.

Frome Hundred, the præ-Domesday Hundred, the Hundred of the Inquisicio, was full of difficulties. The said Inquisition (*supra*, pp. 149, 150) tells of an estate in Frome Hundred, in respect of which, or rather of his demesne therein, viz., 2½ hides, the Abbot of Montebourg was exempt from Gheld.

The Exon Domesday (pp. 180, 181) surveys this estate without giving its name. The text may be epitomized as follows.—

"Abbas Sanctæ Mariæ de Monteburgo habet unam Mansionem quam tenuit Spiritus Presbiter die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus. Et reddidit gildum pro v hidis. Has possunt arare iij carrucæ. Hanc dedit Nigellus Medicus per concessionem Regis Willelmi Abbatîæ de Monteburgo. Ibi habet Abbas ii hidas et dimidiam et ii carrucas in dominio et Villani habent aliam terram (2½ hides) et ii carrucas. Ibi habet Abbas v Villanos et xii Bordarios et ii Servos, &c., et dimidium molendinum qui reddit per annum 30 denarios, et dimidiam leugam nemoris in longitudine et tantundem in latitudine et xx agros pascuæ (read *prati* ex contextu) et xx agros pascuæ; et reddit per annum iiii libras et quando Nigellus recepit valebat tantundem."

For the curious story of the well and widely endowed Priest, Spiritus, or Spirtes, and how in some half dozen counties he was succeeded by the Physician Nigel, we refer elsewhere (*Domesday pluries*. *Antiq. Shropshire*, v. 208, 209).

In collating the manors of Old Frome Hundred we sought long to identify this Montebourg estate. The process, of course, was to find what possession the said Abbey afterwards had in the said Hundred. The search, if vain, was conclusive. We looked to the Records of Montebourg Abbey, rather meagre Records certainly; we looked to the confirmation of King Henry II. to that House; and we looked to Pope Nicholas's Taxation, taken A.D. 1291. It was clear that the Abbey, at the latter date, retained nothing which could by any ingenuity be made to represent its Domesday estate.

It was the Domesday "half mill rendering 30 pence per annum," which enabled us at length to find the Montebourg estate. There was no counter half mill in Frome Hundred except that of William de Moione, at Nunney. So, on this ground only, we ventured at first to suppose that this Montebourg estate was that other portion of Nunney which we had already judged to be necessary to complete a Domesday equivalent for the modern parish. Following the comparison thus set on foot, we saw that the two estates were probable moieties of an original manor of 10 hides. Each estate was geldable as 5 hides; each estate was adapted for 3 teams; each estate had 20 acres of meadow, and 20 acres of pasture.—

The differences of the two moieties were that the Montebourg Fee having 260 acres of wood more than

De Moione's, its Domesday measures were 760 acres as against 500. It had also one more team at work than De Moione's tenant had, and than was actually necessary. There were 19 labourers on the Abbot's estate, only 16 on De Moione's. These incidental advantages, chiefly that of the extra team, caused the Abbot's estate to be worth, in 1086, £1 more than De Moione's.

After thus identifying the Abbot of Montehourg's Domesday estate, it becomes a pardonable digression to see if we can trace the Abbot's interest in any previous or subsequent divisions of the parish.

"King Edred, brother of King Edmund" (says Collinson, ii. 217), "granted to the monks of Glastonbury part of, viz., 2 hides in, this vill."

Glastonbury Abbey had no such estate in Domesday. It had passed into other hands then. De Moione's Nunney has no feature in Domesday likely to have distinguished a confiscated estate of Glastonbury Abbey. The Abbot of Montehourg's share of Nunney may have been a Glastonbury estate antecedently to the seizin of Spirtes the priest.

In point of time, the next general Record of Church estates, after Domesday, is Pope Nicholas's Taxation (A.D. 1291). At that period neither the Abbot of Glastonbury, nor the Abbot of Montehourg, had any temporal estate in Nunney. The Prior of Longleat had. It produced 6 shillings per annum. At the same period the Church of Nunney in the Deanery of Frome was worth £10 6s. 8d., over and above a pension of £1 per annum, payable out of the same, to "Master Alexander de Montfort." We will not pretend to analyse this pension; we will only say of the Church that the advowson was then in the Lord of the Manor,—De Moione's Manor, we presume,—then held by Sir Nicholas de la Mere.

Collinson tells of a second manor in Nunney, which was, as belonging to Glastonbury Abbey, called 'Nunney Glaston,' in distinction from De la Mere's manor, called 'Nunney Delamere.' Collinson does not give us any proof of the Abbot's seizin at any particular period. The "very ancient possession" of which he speaks may refer to the æra of King Edred. However, after the Dissolution, it does appear that lands in Nunney and Trudoxhill were granted by Queen Elizabeth, among a batch of estates late belonging to Glastonbury Abbey.—

Perhaps here we recover the lost clue. Perhaps this long obscured tenement of Glastonbury Abbey was that which, in the times of King Edward and King William, had been diverted into the successive hands of the Priest Spirtes, the Physician Nigel, and the Norman Abbot. If so, Glastonbury Abbey will, at some unascertainable period, have merely re-established a claim of the highest antiquity.

It is remarkable that Sudtone (now Fenny Sutton) and three other Wiltshire manors held by Nigel the Physician, at the date of Domesday, had, *T. R. E.*, been held by Spirtes the Priest; and that Sudtone in particular had been given before Domesday to the Abbey of St. Mary de Montehourg, which Abbey held it under Nigel in 1086.—

We have been unsuccessful in our effort to trace to any later date than Domesday, the interest thus acquired by Montehourg Abbey in Fenny Sutton.

LAVERTON.—The manor, of 10 hides, was represented by 1,332 acres of Domesday registration. Here was one of the older Churches of Frome Deanery. The modern parish is reduced to one of 1,034 acres.

REDDENA (Rodden).—The manor, a single hide, erst held by Edric, a favoured Saxon, was represented by 1,850 acres of Domesday registration, 1,440 acres of which were woodland. This woodland evidently lay elsewhere. The present parish of Rodden, originally a Chapelry, contains only 990 acres.

As at Rodden, so in two Wiltshire manors, Etchilhampton and Calston, Edric was succeeded by Ernulf de Hesding; and these Wiltshire manors were held in 1086 under Ernulf by the widow of Edric. The widow's name seems from the Gheld-Inquest of 1084 to have been Estrilda. Domesday gives many instances of the humanity of Ernulf de Hesding. Monastic Chartularies bear parallel testimony as to his piety. He was succeeded by three coheresses, from whom descended lineally the older Earls of Salisbury, and the Houses of Fitz Alan, and Chaworth.

WHATLEY and EGFORD.—These two manors, being conjunctively 6 hides, contained 1,216 acres of Domesday registration. The present parish of Whatley contains both manors, and the very appropriate acreage of 1,259 acres. The Church is one of the older foundations.

WITHAM.—The acreage here given for Turstin Fitz Rolf's two small estates is the modern acreage of all the parish of Witham Friary. But this parish had increased largely within a century of Domesday. Besides more scattered elements, it involved an estate of 2 hides, also called Witham, but which estate was in

the Domesday Hundred of Bruton. In the Table of Bruton Hundred we have included the estate and its Domesday measures; but, perforce, we include its modern acreage in the 5,497 acres which compose the parish of Witham Friary, and are in Frome Hundred.

Of WLFUNA, *al.* WLTUNA, *al.* URETUNA, added to Turstin Fitz Rolf's Manor of Witham, all trace is lost. When King Henry II. endowed the Carthusians with his lands at Witham, a place written Waletone is mentioned as adjoining.—

Domesday says of Turstin Fitz Rolf's manor—"Hæc Wlftuna est addita ad Honorem Adelwoldi quam tenet modo Turstinus." It is meant that, whereas Turstin Fitz Rolf had had a general grant of the lands of the Saxon Adelwold (usually written Alwold, and once styled 'Calvus', in Domesday), in this instance of Witham-cum-Wlftun, Ketel (usually written Chetel), was his *Antecessor*.

EASTRIP has become a parish at quite a recent date. It is formed of several parcels of land, formerly extra-parochial, and lying on the boundaries of Witham, Brewham, and Bruton. The parish of Eastrip exceeds the two Domesday manors by about 639 acres.

WANDESTREU (Wanstraw, East and West).—The two manors, being 9 hides, and measuring 1,938 acres of Domesday registration, are now aptly represented by a parish of 2,054 acres.

CRENEMELLA.—This estate, as held in A.D. 1066 and 1086 by Harding, under Glastonbury Abbey, cannot now be accurately defined. It probably consisted of both the parishes now distinguished as East and West Cranmere. The Abbatial Manor of 12 hides is paralleled by Domesday measures amounting to no more than 1,410 acres, whereas the two parishes, together, include 2,868 acres. Here then are (2,868 - 1,410 =) 1,458 acres, of which, as being utterly worthless, the Domesday Commissioners took no cognizance; or else the parishes include some portion of the King's Forest of Mendip, which portion was not of course in the Abbot's Manor. The low value of the Manor, as quoted in Domesday, £4 per annum for 12 hides, does not decide the question, for at any rate the case was one of excessive hidation.

In 1084, as we have already seen, the Abbot of Glastonbury and his tenant Harding, being ousted from Cranmere, the estate was in the King's hand. In 1086 the Abbot had recovered it. Subsequent evidences suggest that William Rufus deprived the Abbey of the whole Manor, and that Henry I. restored it under the name of East and West Cranmere, creating it at the same time a "Liberty," that is taking it away from any other Hundred or Franchise. When, in the time of King John, Savaric, Bishop of Bath and Wells, possessed himself of so many Glastonbury estates, Cranmere, without any distinction between East and West, is said to have passed to the See: and we hear no more of any Glastonbury interest in either place. But we hold that West Cranmere only passed by this transfer; for it was only West Cranmere that was consequentially annexed to the Bishop's Hundred of Wells Forum.

Meantime, East Cranmore, having perhaps been alienated in some other direction by Glastonbury Abbey, had no distinctive history or notice save that which is negatively supplied by the fact that it *did not* pass to the Bishop's Hundred of Wells. It had reverted or did then revert to its original and præ-Domesday Hundred of Frome.

Collinson, who has somewhat confused the few extant features of this case, shows that the Churches of both East and West Cranmere were originally Chapelries of Doultling, and that West Cranmere, having the mortuary rights of both Chapelries, was the greater, and, we may add, older foundation.

MIDDELTONA (now Podimore Milton), though 21 miles from Frome, seems to have been annexed to Old Frome Hundred before the Conquest, probably because the Abbot of Glastonbury had other estates in that Franchise. Its subsequent annexation to the post-Domesday Hundred of Whitley arose merely in that Hundred having been created as a general receptacle for Glastonbury manors of abnormal position.

FROME HUNDRED (Modern).—The existing Hundred of Frome is but a section,—a nominal third of the Old Hundred of Frome. The Old Hundred is taken in the Inquest of A.D. 1084, as containing the three sub-Hundreds of Wellow, Kilmersdon, and Frome.

The Caput of this last sub-Hundred was Frome-Selwood, a Manor of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronac*. Frome-Selwood is now interred in the Hundred of which it was, in the 11th century, the external Caput. It was probably for the Royal Manor and the Sectional Hundred of Frome, and for the Crown-pleas tried therein, that the Sheriff of Somerset paid the *Tercius Denarius*, in 1086. The amount was 5s. These *Tercii Denarii*, as far as they are recorded in the Somerset Domesday, arose only from purely Royal Franchises or from Franchises of the late Queen Edith. As Frome was a purely Royal Franchise, so Wellow and

162 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

Kilmersdon were Franchises, in all probability, of the deceased Queen. Their *tertii denarii* are therefore hurried in the large sum which the late Queen had paid to the Comes, in respect of her high jurisdiction centred at Bath.

When the Exon Domesday annexes an account of *Tercii Denarii* to the list of Comital Manors, it treats them properly as dues to the Comital Fief. When the Exchequer Domesday annexes the same account to the Fief of the late Queen Edith, it is a mistake, but perhaps an intelligible one. No *Tercii Denarii* were due to the Queen's Fief, but certain *Tercii Denarii* (not those specified) were due from her Fief to the Fief of the Comes.

OLD FROME HUNDRED.—In A.D. 1084 the Gheld Assessors found this Hundred to contain 298 hides. Its elements, culled from Domesday, seem to establish 8 hides, 3 virgates, and 2 gheld-acres more than the estimate of 1084. Were it worth while, the "Increments" might be plausibly accounted for and allocated.

We now give in a Tabular form the hidages and Domesday measures of all the manors of the triple Hundred, and annex to the same a column of modern acreages, viz., the acreages of the various parishes which, as a whole, and substantively, if not singly and exactly, co-ordinate with the Domesday Manors.

OLD FROME HUNDRED. WELLOW SECTION.

Domesday Manors.	Domesday Hidage. H. V. F.	Domesday Plough-lands.	Corresponding Arable Acreage.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Acreages.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.
Udeberga	1 0 0	2	240	..	8	..	243	Wellow	5292
Litteltona	1 2 0	2	240	20	20	..	280		
Added to Do.	1 2 0	2	240	20	20	..	280		
Liteltona	2 0 0	2	240	..	2	6	248	Farleigh Hungerford..	904
Ferlega	0 2 0	1	120	6	3	..	129		
Camelerton	10 0 0	10	1200	46	90	20	1356	Camerton	1748
Credelincota	3 2 0	3	360	..	10	..	370		
Echewica	0 1 0	1	120	120		
Heautwica	0 2 0 3/4	1	120	120	Foscott	580
Fuscota	5 0 0	4	480	20	19	6	525		
Ingliscoma	10 0 0	10	1200	100	12	..	1312	Englishcombe	1352
Twerton	7 2 0	10	1200	..	15	..	1215	Twerton	971
Twerton	2 2 0	2 3/4	300	..	3	7	310	Tellisford	757
{ Tablesforda	2 0 0	3	360	2	7	10	379		
{ Added	3 0 0	4	480	4	11 1/2	30	525	904	
{ Newetona	3 0 0	4	480	40	9	..	529	Newton St. Loe	1578
{ Added to Newetona	7 0 0	8	960	..	23	..	983		
Hantona	10 0 0	10	1200	720	12	..	1932	Charter House Hinton	2890
Nortona	10 0 0	10	1200	1440	20	20	2680	Norton St. Philip	1527
Corstuna	10 0 0	9	1080	..	6	..	1086	Corston	1190
Evestia	1 0 0	1	120	120	Obsolete
Duncretun	3 0 0	8	960	..	6	80	1046	Dunkerton	1233
Added to Duncretun	0 1 0	0	0		
Cuna	2 0 0	5	600	20	8	..	628	Combe Hawey	1011
	97 0 0 3/4	112 1/2	13,500	2441	308	172	16,421 16,421		21,533

OLD FROME HUNDRED. KILMERSDON SECTION.

{ Ec'lia Cbinemoresdone	0 2 0	..	0	0	{ Kilmersdon	3460
{ Waltuna	3 0 0	4	480	10	5	..	536		
{ Lochintone	5 0 0	5	600	180	12	40	792	{ Coleford	1187
Esewica	0 2 0	3 1/4	60	..	3	12	75	Ashwick	1525
Estocha	7 3 0	9	1080	1092	Radstock	1005
{ Stratona	3 0 0	3	360	60	20	40	480	{ Straton on the Foss	1148
{ Picotta	1 2 0	1	120	10	7	20	157		
{ Picota	3 2 0	4	480	50	8	12	550	{ Holcombe	780
{ Hardington	4 0 0	4	480	12	36	..	528	Hardington	831
{ Weregava	2 0 0	1	120	5	3	..	128		
Babington	5 0 0	4	480	120	12	15	627	Babington	607
Hamintona	21 0 0	20	2400	50	40	360	2822	Hemington	8406
Bochelanda	12 0 0	7	840	50	40	90	1000	Buckland Dinham	1359
Writelinctona	6 0 0	5	600	12	12	24	648	Writlington	772
Mulla	14 2 0	15	1800	240	15	12	2067	{ Mells	8611
Millescota	5 2 0	5	600	80	3	80	763	{ Leigh on Mendip	1425
								Vobster	689
	94 3 0	87 1/2	10,500	86 2	210	693	12,265 12,265		21,845

OLD FROME HUNDRED.—FROME SECTION.

Domesday Manors.	Domesday Hidage. H. V. F.	Domesday Plough-lands.	Corresponding Arable Acreage.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Acreages.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.
Kaivert	2 0 0	1	80	..	4	4	68	{ Cayford in	alibi.
Cavel	1 1 0	1 ½	120	..	6	5	131	{ Frome	
Loligtona	7 0 0	5	600	120	20	..	740	Lullington	687
Hordcerleia	5 0 0	4	480	120	24	..	624	{ Orchardleigh	715
Roda	9 0 0	9	1080	33	33	25	1171	{ Road	928
In Roda	1 0 0	1 ½	60	60	{ Wolverton	736
Bechentona	10 0 0	10	1200	100	12	8	1320	Beckington	1830
Mersitona	3 2 0	5	600	{ 1440	10	100	2166	Marston Biggot	2207
Berchelee	2 2 0	3	360	70	14	..	496	Berkley	1927
Telma	5 0 0	4	480	16	6	14	524	Elm	893
Estalrewicca	1 2 0	3	360	4	20	..	370	Standerwick	303
Claforda	10 0 0	9	1080	160	20	300	1560	Cloford	2443
Nonin	5 0 0	3	360	100	20	20	500	{ Nunney	2421
(Anonymous Manor)	5 0 0	3	360	360	12	20	760	{ Nunney, Part of	
Lauretona	10 0 0	10	1200	60	20	60	1332	Laverton	1034
Reddena	1 0 0	3	360	1440	6	30	1850	Rodden	990
{ Wateleia	5 0 0	5	600	14	6	50	670	Whatley	1259
{ Hecferdintona	1 0 0	4	480	60	0	0	546	372	Witham Friary
{ Witeham	1 0 0	2	240	0	2	0	240		
{ Wiftuna	1 0 0	1	120	0	0	0	122	190	Eastrip
{ Estropa	1 0 0	1	120	10	0	0	130		
{ Estropa	0 1 0	½	60	0	0	0	60	1038	{ Wanstrow East
{ Wandestren	4 0 0	4	480	60	12	0	552		
{ Wandestreu	5 0 0	5	600	720	36	30	1386	{ Wanstrow West	2054
Crenemella	12 0 0	10	1200	100	50	60	1410	{ East Cranmore	1054
Middeltona	6 0 0	6	720	0	50	100	870	{ West Cranmore	1814
								Podimore Milton	990
	115 0 0	111 ½	13,380	4987	395	826	19508		30611

RECAPITULATION.

Wellow Section	97 0 0 ¾	112 ½	13,500	2441	308	172	10,421		21,533
Kilmerdon Section	94 3 0	87 ¾	10,500	862	210	693	12,265		21,845
Frome Section	115 0 0	111 ½	13,380	4997	395	826	19,598		30,611
	306 3 0 ¾	311 ½	37,380	8300	913	1691	48,284		73,989

Here, experimentalizing on a large scale, we have the Somerset hide represented by 241 ½ statute acres of modern ascertainment. For as 306 ½ hides : 73,989 acres :: 1 hide : circa 241 ½ acres.

Again we have the same Somerset Hide represented by about 157 ½ acres of Domesday Registration. For as 306 ½ hides : 48,284 acres :: 1 hide : circa 157 ½ acres.

That is, at the date of Domesday, the average Hide of Old Frome Hundred included some (241 - 157 =) 94 acres, which were either waste and worthless, and so were not registered in Domesday, or else were in the King's Forest, and so not reckoned in Frome Hundred.

¶ The Domesday value of Old Frome Hundred was £266 8s. 4d. per annum. This was at the rate of about 17s. 4d. per hide, and of 1 3242 penny, and decimals of a penny, per Domesday acre ; also at the rate of about 17s. 1 ¼d. per plough-land.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR THE HUNDRED OF MONKTON (WEST) (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 75).

In Hundreto Monachetona sunt xv hidæ.

Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo	55 sol. et 6 den. pro ix hid. et i virga	9	1	0
Goffridus Constabularius et Edret debent Regi gildum	(xxxiii sol. et 6 d.) pro v hid. et iii virg.	5	3	0
		15	0	0

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF WEST MONKTON MANOR.

GEOFFREY CONSTABLE and EDRET were doubtless sub-tenants of Walcheline, Bishop of Winchester, who appears in Domesday as holding 7 ¾ hides in the Abbot of Glastonbury's Manor of Monacheton. It was not the wont of Domesday to name such sub-tenants. It may be, however, that these were surcharged by the Collectors of 1084 as officers or bailiffs, rather than tenants of the Bishop ; for Domesday declares the Bishop to be then holding in demesne 5 ¼ hides of this tenement. Even thus, the tenement was liable to gheld, for the Bishop held it, not *in capite* of the King, but of the Abbot. Geoffrey was probably Constable of Taunton Castle.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II, PP. 25-26) OF WEST MONKTON MANOR.

The 15 hides of Domesday were represented by 2,603 acres of contemporary measurement, viz., plough-land, 2,400 acres; wood, 24 acres; meadow, 39 acres; pasture, 140 acres. The modern parish of West Monkton is 3,079 acres. The difference of the two measurements (viz., 476 acres), was probably King's Forest, and accredited in Domesday, like North Petherton Forest, to the Royal Manors of North-Western Somerset.

The Domesday Value of West Monkton Manor (viz., £11 10s. per annum) was at the rate of 15s. 4d. per hide, and of 1.06 penny, and decimals of a penny, per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 11s. 6d. per plough-land, and of 13s. 9¼d. per team in employ.

The number of Villeins, Boors, and Serfs attached to West Monkton in A.D. 1086 was 56. This gives a single Labourer to every 6½ acres of Domesday registration; to every 43 acres of plough-land, and to every 35½ acres of land actually ploughed.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR THE HUNDRED OF GIVELA (YEOVIL). (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 71).

“In Hundreto Givelæ sunt xl et vii hidæ et dimid.” (157 hides, 2 virgates).

Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £30 7s. 6d. pro c hidis et i hid. et i virgâ		101	1	0
Et Barones Regis habent in dominio xxxi hidas.—				
De his habet Comes de Moretonio x et viii hid. et dim.	18	2	0	
Et Roger de Corcella iij hid. et i virgam	4	1	0	
Et Brismarus v hidas	5	0	0	
Et Garmundus ii hidas.....	2	0	0	
Et Ansgar Brito i hidam et i virgam	1	1	0	
	<u>31</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	31 0 0
Et non habet Rex Gildum de i hidâ quam tenet Sawardus Accipitrarius.....	1	0	0	
Nec de v hidis quas Monachi de Egresten tenent.....	5	0	0	
Nec de vi hidis quas tenent Britellus et Drogo et Alvered et Villani Comitû (de Moretonio) in Monte-Acuto	6	0	0	
Nec de iij hidis et i virgâ quas tenet Britellus ..	3	1	0	
Nec de iij virgis quas tenet Ansgar.....	3	0	0	
“Nec de ij hidis” [quas tenet Alvered Pinc]“erna” ..	2	0	0	
Nec de ij hidis de Achileio	2	0	0	
[Nec de i hidâ] “quam tenet Rogerus de Corcella” ..	1	0	0	
Nec de i hidâ quam tenet * * * *	1	0	0	
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Drogo	1	0	0	
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Roger Calvus	1	0	0	
“De hoc Hundreto restant de Gildo Regis £6 15s.” (the sum corresponding to) ...	<u>22</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	22 2 0
“Et de hoc Hundreto tenet Osbernus de Episcopo de Sancto Laudo ii hidas et iii virgas de quibus reddit Gildum in Hundreto Liet.”				2 3 0
				<u>157 2 0</u>

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF GIVELA (YEOVIL) HUNDRED.

Domesday gives to the Comte of Moretain the following demesnes, in manors which were probably in Givela Hundred.—

H. V. F.	
2 2 0	in Bisobestona, i. e. Montacute, now in Tintinhull Hundred.
1 0 0	in Givela, i. e. Yeovil, now in Stone Hundred.
4 0 0	in Tintinhull, i. e. Tintinhulle, now in Tintinhull Hundred.
4 2 0	in Cinioc, i. e. East Chinnock, now in Houndsborough, Barwick and Coker Hundred.
4 0 0	in Clouesworda, i. e. Cloworth, now in Houndsborough, Barwick and Coker Hundred.
<u>16 0 0</u>	

The total (only 16 hides) shows a diminution of $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides in the Comte's demesnes between 1084 and 1086. It was probably caused by intermediate feoffments in some manors.

ROGER DE CORCELLE'S demesne of $4\frac{1}{4}$ hides is fixed by Domesday as in Lymington, now in Stone Hundred.

BRISMAR was a Saxon Thane (*Anglus Tegnus*). His demesne of 5 hides was the exact half of his estate at Halberga (now Hazlebury Plucknett, in Houndsborough Hundred).

GARMUNDUS' 2 hides of demesne were part of Mudford (5 hides), an estate which he had held, as mortgagee, under Ulward Wyte. He held it *in capite* in Domesday, the mortgagor being defunct. Mudford is now in Stone Hundred.

ANSGER BRITO of the Inquest, was a notable tenant of the Comte of Moretain. He also appears in Domesday among the *Franci Tegni* who held *in capite* of the King. His estate at Prestetona was 2 hides. It would seem likely that the Inquest exempts him from $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides, held by him in demesne, while it surcharges him for the balance of such estate, viz., $\frac{3}{4}$ hide, not held in demesne. Prestetona seems to be the place now called Preston Plucknett. It is in Stone Hundred. Ansgar Brito of the Inquest is called in Domesday, Ausger de Montacute (E. D., 433). These names were inserted to distinguish their bearer from Ansgar Cocus, a King's Serjeant. Ansgar Brito was progenitor of the Barons of Odcombe.

SAWARD ACCIPITRARIUS of the Inquest is in this case called "Seward Hundrannus" by Domesday. The estate was 1 hide in Eattebera, half of which he held in demesne. Eattebera is probably part of Adber, in the parish of Trent. It is now, as Trent is, in Horethorn Hundred. At Domesday this part of Adber was in Givela Hundred. Saward's non-solvency was perhaps only a way of claiming his fee for acting on the occasion of the Inquest as a "Fegadrus," or "Hundred-man."

THE ABBOT OF ST. MARY OF GRESTEIN appears in Domesday as holding Nortona (5 hides) of the Comte of Moretain. It is Norton-sub-Hamdon in Houndsborough Barwick and Coker Hundred.

BISOBESTON stands in Domesday as a manor of 9 hides. It contained Castle Montacute ("ibi Castrum Montagut"). Domesday accounts for the occupation of only 8 hides. The tenants named as defaulters in the *Inquisicio*, held in Domesday only $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides, viz., Britell, 1 hide; Drogo, 1 hide; Alvered Pincerna $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides; villani, 1 hide. A new tenant, Duucan, holds 1 hide, and the Comte of Moretain $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides in demesne.

BRITELL'S insolvency on $3\frac{1}{4}$ hides was for so much of his Manor of Peredt (North Perriott). It was 10 hides, six whereof are recognized as his demesne in Domesday.

ANSGER'S insolvency on $\frac{3}{4}$ hide has been explained above.

ALVERED PINCERNA'S default on 2 hides was for so much of his estates of 19 hides in Chilthorne Dormer Chiselborough, West Chinnock, and Pendomer. The first of these is now in Stone Hundred; the three others in Houndsborough Barwick and Coker Hundred. Alvered was Butler to the Comte, and, holding all these estates under the Comte, was liable to pay gheld on his demesnes.

ACHILEIA (2 hides) had in Saxon times belonged to Aluin Banneson, whose normal successor, Alured de Hispania, got it at the Conquest. It was wrested from Alured by the King's Officers and added to the Royal Manor of Martock. The statement of its insolvency merely meant that when the Fegadri of 1084 reckoned *Achileia* as part of the $157\frac{1}{2}$ hides composing Givela Hundred, they were not responsible for the gheld thereon. The *Achileia* of the Inquest is now called Hurst.

ROGER DE CORCELLE'S default on one hide, was perhaps for so much of his Manor of Lymington as he had failed to prove exempt, and his Villeins had failed to pay gheld on.

DROGO (de Montacute's) insolvency was for a single virgate which he held in the Comte of Moretain's Demesne Manor of Tintihull (Exon D., p. 246).

ROGER CALVUS may be identical with Roger Boisell, who was Roger Arundel's tenant in Sutton (now Sutton Bingham). If not, Roger Calvus does not reappear in Domesday.

OSERN.—In Domesday the Bishop of Coutances has no Somerset tenant named Osbern. His Dorset tenant, so named, was probably Osbern Giffard. Neither had the Bishop any Somerset Manor which we can plausibly assign to Givela Hundred. It seems probable that the Bishop, between the years 1084 and 1086, conveyed his Manor in Givela Hundred to some other Feudalist. It is impossible to fix the manor in question, for Osbern's tenancy does not reappear in Domesday.

AS TO THE HUNDRED OF "LIET," in which Osbern is said to have accounted for his Gheld-due on $2\frac{3}{4}$ hides, there is mention of a Hundred of "Liet" in an Index of Hundreds of the same date as the *Inquisicio*, and

this word "Liet" is written over a cancelled word, *coch* (*sic*). In another old Index (Inq.-Gheld, pp. 57-58), the name of this Hundred is given as "Lieget." But among the Inquests of 1084, no such Inquest as that, of *Liet*, or *Lieget*, or *Cochra*, Hundred is preserved. Nor is the Inquest of such a Hundred involved and buried in any extant Inquest of any other Hundred, for none of the extant Inquests take any notice of Osbern's alleged transfer of Gheld from Givela Hundred.

The Inquest of Liet Hundred is therefore one of the lost Inquests, of which we have discoursed in due place (*supra*, pp. 89-90).

As a guess, or rather as an hypothesis, we should say that the Old Hundred of 'Liet' contained the Manor of East and West Coker, and also the Manor of Hardington (*postea* Hardington Mandeville). Both were Comital Manors, and are certainly not alluded to in any extant Inquest of A.D. 1084.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 25-26) OF GIVELA (YEOVIL) HUNDRED.

BISOBESTONA, *postea* MONTACUTE.—The former and older name of this manor suggests that it was at one time annexed to some Episcopate. At the Conquest it was held by the Abbot of Athelney. The Comte of Moretain, choosing it as a fit site for his Somerset Castle, got it from the Abbot, giving in exchange the Dorset Manor of Candel (now Purse Candel).—"Propter istam mansionem (Bisobestonam) dedit Comes unam mansionem quæ vocatur Candel Abbati de Alienniâ. (See Dorset Domesday, pp. 117, 118, 128 *n.*) Ere Domesday was written, the Comte's stronghold of Montacute was built. From that day to this the estate of Bishopston has been known only as the 'Chatellany, or Manor of Montacute.' The Domesday status of the manor is well worth observation. Among his tenants were three of his chief retainers, progenitors of as many Baronial Houses, two at least of which were afterwards known by the name of 'De Montacute.' Though the arable land of the manor was adapted for seven ox-teams, there were eight teams on the estate. No wood, no pasture, only 15 acres of meadow, are registered for the estate by Domesday: but among the live stock are 180 sheep, viz., one hundred on the Comte's demesnes, eighty on the tenement of his chief Butler, Alvered.

TINTEHELLA (Tintinhull).—This manor had been in Saxon times a possession of Glastonbury Abbey. The Comte of Moretain had obtained it by exchange, he giving Camerton (in Frome Hundred) to the Abbey (*supra*, pp. 150, 152). Tintinhull had been Caput of a Hundred, of one of the three Hundreds which, in A.D. 1084, went to compose the Hundred of Givela (or Yeovil). This probably was the Comte's inducement to acquire Tintinhull. The Exon Domesday (p. 476) says of Tintinhull—"Hæ prædictæ vii hidæ reddiderunt geldum pro v hidis." The immunity was of King Edward's time. Its abolition was in the nature of a 'Domesday Increment' on the hidage of the Hundred of Givela, as contrasted with the hidage of 1084. It often happened that when an Ecclesiastical Fee changed hands after the Conquest, its hidation, if privileged, was readjusted.

ESTOCHA (Stoke-under-Hamdon).—Out of the 5½ hides of this manor, one virgate had, *T. R. E.*, been exempt from Gheld. Collinson says that the five Saxons who had the manor in King Edward's time, held it under Glastonbury Abbey. This is probable enough, but it is not told in Domesday.

TINTINHULL HUNDRED.—This was one of the three Hundreds which, existing long before the Inquisition of A.D. 1084, were yet combined in that assessment to form the Hundred of Givela (or Yeovil). The old Indices of Hundreds (so often quoted above) say nothing about such a Hundred as Givela, but they enumerate the three Hundreds of Tintinhull, Stane, and Houndsborough. Givela Hundred, formed probably for behoof of the Comte of Moretain, was of short endurance. It was resolved (probably in time of King Henry I.) into its original elements. And thus it is, all but exactly, represented at the present day.

STANE HUNDRED, another of the constituents of "Givela Hundred," was (according to Collinson, iii. 203) sometime called the "Hundred of Stone and Yeovil." Again, the same author says that Yeovil was not "united with Stone Hundred till late years." He ought probably to have said *re-united*.

In one place Collinson says that Stone Hundred "*takes its name from a village in the neighbourhood of Yeovil, where the Hundred-Courts were formerly held.*" In another place he identifies Stone, "*which antiently gave name to the Hundred,*" with Stone, added to Serlo de Buri's Manor of Mudford, and again with "Stane," a Manor of the Comte of Moretain. Of the latter vill he adds that "*it is now a depopulated place between Mudford and Yeovil.*" This confusion led Collinson into further confusions of detail, which we cannot enlarge upon here.

Our notion is that it was a monolith which gave its oldest name, viz., "Ad Stana" to Stone Hundred, and that a vill afterwards built near the said monolith was therefore called Stone, and that this vill was in the parish of Mudford, and was the estate of 2 hides, which Domesday declares to have been added to Serlo de Burci's Manor of Mudford. (As to the Comte of Moretain's Manor of Stane, which had been wrested from Glastonbury Abbey, it is probably now represented by Stone in East Pennard, and in Whitstone Hundred).

LIMINGTON (Lymington).—The father of Roger de Corcella had preceded him in estate. His father holding some manor of five hides under the Abbot of Glastonbury, had surrendered his tenancy, receiving in exchange from the Abbot the Manor of Lymington (seven hides). Roger holds the latter *in capite* of the King, at the date of Domesday. The Abbot lost all the profits of both estates. "De his" (the five surrendered hides apparently) "perdit Æcclesia omne servitium" (Exon Domesday, p. 160). The affair is also entered on the Schedule of Terræ Occupatæ (E. D., p. 488), "Rogerus de Corcella habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur Limintona pro quâ dedit pater ejus in excambio v hidas quæ non poterant ab Æcclesiâ Glastingberiensis separari die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus."

We do not quite understand why the Abbot should lose all benefit of his exchange; but his house was visited with many deprivations after the expulsion of Abbot Turstin.

ACHELEIA (now Hurst).—The withdrawal of *Acheleia* from Alured de Hispania's Fief, and its annexation to the King's Manor of Martock, have been noticed above. It resulted ultimately in a decurtation of Givela Hundred, in their measure of which the Fegadri of 1084 had included *Acheleia*. The notice of this annexation to Martock is followed (Exon. D., p. 105) by a further and apparently similar transfer, in these words:—"Huic mansioni (*viz.*, Martock) sunt additæ aliæ duæ hidæ quas tenuerunt pariter duo Tegni tempore Regis Edwardi, sed tamen reddebant xl denarios in Martocha, et modo reddit (villa or terra) 40 solidos in Martocha Mansione Regis." This statement was, we presume, to show that at no time had the estate had the immunity of Tegnland. In our Table, we include it in Givela Hundred, because, like *Acheleia*, it was no actual part of the Manor of Martock, though, like *Acheleia*, it may have been adjacent thereto, and in the same parish. The estate has no secondary notice in Domesday such as *Acheleia* has (E. D., p. 352), but both estates are mentioned in the Schedule of "Terræ Occupatæ" (E. D., pp. 480, 481). This was merely the result of the duplicate entries of *Acheleia* in the Register (E. D., pp. 105, 352). The above two estates were in the technical language of Domesday, "Addita Martocha." There were other two estates which came under the category of "Abata de Martochâ." These were decurtations of the territory of the manor, but they were not therefore annexed to Givela Hundred. They remained in the Hundred of Martock, and will be found in our Table of that Hundred.

HOUNDSBOROUGH HUNDRED.—This was the third and last of the three ancient Hundreds which the Inquisicio of A.D. 1084 compounds into the one Hundred of *Givela*.

In the eighth century there was a vill of Houndsborough, or rather of Hunesberge, which Collinson, (ii. 323) says was then given to Glastonbury Abbey by Kenulph, King of the West Saxons. Its site was marked in Collinson's time by a spot called 'Houndsborough Cross,' probably the ancient tryst of the Hundred. As a vill, Houndsborough, under that name, no longer exists; and we ourselves are sceptical as to the existence at any time of a vill of Houndsborough, as distinct from the vill of Houndston. The vill which in King Kenulph's time was called Hunesberga is called in Domesday (so we believe) "Hundeston." Again in time of Henry I., when William Comte of Moretain founded the Priory of Montacute, he gave (or rather confirmed) thereto the Church and Manor of this vill under the name of Hunesberge. The real donor was Ansgar Brito, the Domesday Lord of Hundestona, who, as was usual, appears in the Comte's Charter only in the guise of a witness. Now again the vill is known as Houndstone. It is in the parish of Odecumbe.

CEOSSELBEROON (Chiselborough).—This manor, held by Alured Pincerna under the Comte of Moretain, became the Caput of the barony of Alured's descendants. They took the name of De Montacute. The male line expired in the 13th century. We have stated (Dorset, p. 128 *n.*) that John de Montacute was last in the male line of the Barons of Chiselborough. Collinson (ii. 330) gives William de Montacute as the last of the male line. The matter needs further investigation.

CHILTON CANTELO is not foreshadowed by any Domesday Manor of like name to Chilton. We conclude it to have been involved in some Domesday Manor of another name. Its history in the 13th century

(Collinson ii. 339) strongly suggests that it was then a member of the Honour of Montgomery. At that rate we should look for its Domesday type in some manor of William de Falaise, or of his father-in-law, Serlo de Burci. We conjecture that Chilton was one of the Mudifords of Domesday,—that one which, consisting of 3 hides, was held together, with its adjunct of Stana, by Rainaldus, under Serlo de Burci.

Of the Cantilupe Barons, as coheirs of the Honour of Montgomery, we have spoken elsewhere (*Antiq. Shropshire*, xi. 129). Our present conjecture places Chilton, perforce, in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Stane. While in possession of Cantilupe it was annexed to a new Hundred, that of Berwick or Barwick. Now again this temporary Hundred merges, not into the Hundred of Stone, but into the composite Hundred of Houndsborough Barwick and Coker.

BARWICK, *al.* BERWICK.—Neither is this manor typified in any Domesday Manor of cognate name. Its history in the 13th century has the same peculiarities as led us to look for Chilton in the Domesday Fiefs of Falaise or De Burci. Barwick was sometime held by the Courtenay Lords of the Honour of Montgomery, from whom it descended to Cantilupe as Courtenay's coheir. But we cannot find Barwick in either of the expected Domesday Fiefs; nay, as far as Domesday is its own interpreter, we are sure that Barwick was in neither Fief.

Our conjecture here is that Barwick was omitted in Domesday by mere error. The next question arising is this—Is there anything in the Inquest of Givela Hundred, taken A.D. 1084, to convict the greater and later Record of such an error? Certainly there is: the manor held by Osbern, under the Bishop of Coutances, and which paid its gheld in Liet Hundred, is not in Domesday. We have already concluded that it changed hands about that period, and that it may have appeared in Domesday under some other tenure. We adhere to the supposed change of possession—we abandon the conjecture about a Domesday reappearance. What if, the manor being Barwick, it was then passing from the Bishop of Coutances—say to Serlo de Burci or to William de Falaise—and if this unsettled state of matters was the very cause of non-registration in Domesday? We dismiss the question, having bestowed upon it all the attention due to a difficulty, and well aware that a very atom of fresh evidence on the post-Domesday history of Chilton Cantiloe and Barwick might disturb the weight and balance of present reasonings. Our Table (vol. ii., pp. 27, 28) assumes Barwick to have been in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Givela. It was, topographically, nearer to Yeovil than to Sutton (Bingham), and so, perhaps, rather in the Stane than in the Houndsborough department of Givela Hundred. Under Cantilupe's influence Barwick and Chilton, though wide apart, were formed into a Hundred or Liberty, called Barwick Hundred. Now again, both are fused into the composite Hundred of Houndsborough Barrow and Coker.

GIVELA HUNDRED.—As our Table (vol. ii., pp. 27, 28) implies, the præ-Domesday Hundred of Givela contained nothing (except 1 hide in Adber and 4 hides in Martoek) which is not now contained in the three Hundreds of Tintinhull, of Stone, of Houndsborough Barwick and Coker. On the other hand, two of the three last-named Hundreds contain some estates which Givela Hundred did not contain. In detail—

(1) Tintinhull Hundred contains Ilchester and Northover, which, at the date of Domesday, were *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*,—members of the royal manor of Meleborna (*postea* Melborne Port).

(2) Houndsborough, Barrow, and Coker Hundred contains, East and West Coker and Hardington, which seem to have been in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Liet, *alias* Coker. And, whereas Collinson says that, while Coker was a distinct Hundred, it also contained the Manors of Clossworth, Pendomer, and Sutton Bingham, we think it possible that one, but certainly not more than one of those three manors may have been in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Liet, and not in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Givela. It is true that such a concession would reduce the hidage of Givela Hundred to less than its complement, as advertized in the Inquest of 1084; but, according to our already-stated hypothesis, such a reduction may theoretically be replaced by adding to Givela Hundred a theoretical hidage of the Manor of Barwick.—In figures, 159h. 0v. 2f. (of the Table) — 5 hides (for, say, Sutton) + 3h. 1v. 2f. (for Barwick) = 157h. 2v. 0f. (of the Inquest).

Our work will hardly be complete with regard to Givela Hundred unless we add a Table of comparative measures, similar to those which have already been given for Frome and other Hundreds.—

TABLE OF THE COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF GIVELA (YEOVIL) HUNDRED.

Domesday Manors.	Domesday Hideage. H. v. F.	Domesday Plough-lands.	Corresponding Arable Acreages.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Acreages.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.
Bisbestona	9 0 0	7	840	..	15	..	855	Montacute	1485
Tintehella	7 1 0	10	1200	57	60	200	1517	Tintinhill	1828
Chingestona	8 0 0	8	960	180	41	..	1181	Kingstone	959
{ Estocha	5 3 0	2	960	3	25	20	1008	Stoke-sub-Hamdon	1330
{ Estochet	2 1 2	3	360	..	10	..	370	Lafton	292
Looutuna	1 0 0	1	120	..	10	Thorne Coffin	410
{ Torna	1 1 0	2	240	..	10	..	250
{ Torna	2 0 0	3	360	..	14	..	374
{ Soca, al. Soche	3 2 0	5	600	..	70	..	670
{ Soca, al. Soche	1 2 0	2	240	..	10	15	265
{ Givela	2 0 0	2	240	240
{ Julia	6 0 0	6	720	..	33	30	783
{ Citerna	1 0 0	1	120	120
{ Citerna	3 0 0	3	360	20	15	..	395
{ Citerna	2 0 0	3	360	..	30	..	390
{ Mundiforda	4 2 0	4	480	..	15	40	535
{ Modiforda	5 0 0	5	600	..	12	12	624
{ Stana	2 0 0	1½	180	180
Mudiford	3 0 0	3	360	360
{ Limigtona	7 0 0	8	900	..	60	240	1260
{ Draccota	2 0 0	3	360	31	26½	31	448½
Essentona	3 0 0	3	360	..	43	20	423
Brunetona	3 0 0	4	480	4	13	..	497
Prestetona	2 2 0	1	120	..	10	..	130
Eattebera	1 0 0	1½	180	10	6	..	196
Acheleia	2 0 0
(Anonymous)	2 0 0
Cinioc	7 0 0	7	840	..	60	20	920
Peredt	10 0 0	8	960	180	18	..	1158
Odecoma	5 0 0	5	600	10	20	12	612
Hundestona	1 0 0	1	120	..	3½	..	123
Ceselbergon	5 0 0	5	600	3	38	..	641
Cinioc	3 0 0	3	360	..	36	..	396
Cinioc	4 0 0	4	480	..	40	2	522
Nortona	5 0 0	5	600	20	25	..	645
Penna	5 0 0	5	600	210	10	40	860
Clouesarda	7 0 0	6	720	80	12	..	812
Halberga	10 0 0	8	960	60	13½	60	1093
Sutona	5 0 0	5	600	60	12	..	672
(Manor omitted)	(?) (?) (?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
	159 0 2	160	10,200	928	816½	742	21,686		30,661

Here we have a Hundred where 21,686 acres of Domesday Registration seem to compare with 30,661 acres of modern measurement. The deficiency of the Domesday estimate is 8975 acres. But when we count among the Domesday measures only 928 acres of wood-land, and only 742 acres of pasture-land, we are assured that Yeovil Hundred was pervaded by Forestal jurisdictions, registered, it may be, under the Royal Manors of Bruton or of Milborne, or, it may be, attached to yet more distant manors of the King or his Barons. Or it may be that the Comte of Moretain or William of Ewe had tracts of land in Yeovil Hundred, appropriated, indeed, to the Chace, but so worthless for any other purpose that the Domesday Surveyors registered only that which was of some better account.

Be that as it may, in Yeovil Hundred we have the Somerset Hide represented by 192½ statute acres and by 136½ acres of Domesday registration, each some proof that the hidated and measured lands were of good quality.

The Domesday value of Yeovil Hundred was £161 3s. 4d. per annum. This was at the rate of £1 0s. 9½d. per hide; and of 1.7834 penny, and decimals of a penny, per Domesday acre; also at the rate of £1 0s 1¾d. per plough-land.

These were good rates, but should be somewhat modified by the circumstance that about 6 per cent. of the gross revenue arose from the twenty and one Mills of the Hundred.

170 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR MILVERTON HUNDRED (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 67).

H. V. F.

In Hundreto Milvertouæ sunt xxiiij hid. et dim. (24 2 0).

	H.	V.	F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo £6 7s. 6d. pro xxi hidis et i virgâ	21	1	0
Robertus de Oburgivilla habet iii virgas quas tenet liberas de Rege	0	3	0
Pro ii hidis et dim. quas tenet Britellus non habet Rex gildum suum	2	2	0
	3	1	0
	24	2	0

ROBERT DE OTBORVILL was a King's Serjeant. He held Welesford (now Wellisford) *in capite* and in succession to two Saxon Thanes, Edric and Bruninc. His estate was originally 1 hide, but here, as elsewhere (*supra*, 68) he seems to have had some loss. In 1084 and 1086 his estate remains as 3 virgates, whilst Bretell, the Comte of Moretaine's Tenant at Ash-Brittle, had obtained the 4th virgate in Wellesford, and held it of the Comte.

¶ BRETELL'S TENURE of 2½ hides left in arrear in 1084, was his demesne in Aissa (Ash) a manor of 5½ hides which Bretel held of the Comte. It is in regard of him, its Domesday lord, that the place is now called Ash-Brittle.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II., PP. 27-28) OF MILVERTON HUNDRED.

MILVERTON.—This Manor of the late Queen Edith, though it was both Caput and part of Milverton Hundred, was evidently not considered to be intra-Hundredal nor geldable by the Gheld Assessors of 1084. Otherwise they would have recorded some exemption not only for the 2 fertines at which the manor had been nominally geldable in the time of King Edward, but also for the Church-fee of 1¼ virgates which was a tenure in almoign, and so had never been geldable.

The Text of Domesday suggests that the King had reduced the manor, at least, to the non-hidated form; that is, it was divided between himself and his Villeins, not according to their proportional shares in two fertines of nominal assessment, but according to their respective interests in the carruage or plough-lands of the estate.

That an estate, containing, at least, 2126 acres of Domesday mensuration, should, at any time, have stood geldable as 2 fertines, is, of course, only another instance of that excessively favourable bidation which was set upon this class of manors. When King Edward appointed this once Royal Manor as part of the dotation of his Queen Edith, he appointed that it should be geldable at the nominal figure of 2 fertines, that is, should any current gheld-rate be at 6 shillings per hide, Milverton would have been assessed, as exempt from, or solvent of, two sums, together amounting to nine-pence.

That the Domesday Manor of Milverton virtually included the manor now called LANGFORD BUDVILLE is suggested by the circumstances that we can find no other Domesday representative of the latter estate, and that the Præ-Domesday contents of Milverton Hundred tally in all ascertainable respects with the contents of the existing Hundred, one of whose nine parishes is Langford Budville.

PRESTON BOWYER.—(Collinson, iii. 15) says that "Preston Bowyer and Torrels Preston were at the Conquest parts of the Manor of Brumpton" (Brompton Regis is meant) "and are still part of the Hundred of Williton Freemanors." This is, perhaps, strictly true of Torrels Preston, which, if a member of Brompton Regis, would naturally pass into Williton Hundred, together with its Caput. But, surely, Preston Bowyer was at no time part of Brompton Regis. If it got at length into Williton Hundred, that will have been an accidental result of its having been for a time extra-hundredal, in virtue of the special franchises of Goldclyve Priory, to which House it was given by one of Alured de Hispania's descendants and heirs.

The name "Bowyer," says Collinson, is a corruption of "Bures." If so, the family of Bures will have held Preston previously to the grant to Goldclyve; and Hugo, the Domesday tenant, may have been Hugh de Bures. *Hugo* held altogether five manors under Alured de Hispania. Plainsfield was one of them. Richard fitz Ralph, who held Plainsfield in 1166 under Philip de Columbieres, was very probably descended from Hugo.

BADHELTONA (Bathealton).—When two or more thegns are said in Domesday to have held a manor *pariter*, or *in paragio*, it may transpire that they had held *equal portions*; but this is not implied by the words *pariter* or *in paragio*. In the present instance, as we see, one thegn, Aluric, had held three parts of Bathealton; Algar, the other thegn, only one part. The word *pariter* merely implies that the status, or degree, or quality of tenure, of the alleged co-tenants was equal. There were several classes of thegns. Aluric and Algar, we happen to know, were of the highest class. They were, as we should now express it, Peers. And that is all that Domesday intends by the word *pariter*. The Duke of Wellington now holds Strathfieldsaye by Grand Serjeantry: the Duke of Marlborough holds Blenheim by a like tenure. The two magnates are doubly peers then, as dukes and as grand serjeants: but no one infers that Blenheim and Strathfieldsaye are equal in point of value or extent.

MANEURDA should be Manueword or Manworth; but no such name, we are told, is traceable in Milverton Hundred. From its place in the Record (between Bathealton and Runninton), and from other characteristics, we are persuaded that Maneurda was in Milverton Hundred. It is but our guess that it was in Bathealton parish.

STAVEIA, *al.* **STAWEL**.—Our identification of this manor with Stawley is not according to Collinson, who makes Stawe to imply both Over and Nether Stowey. That theory is unquestionably wrong.

Orthography indeed would suggest that Alured de Hispania's Manor of Staweia would now be represented by Stowey (Nether Stowey in Williton Hundred); and that his double Manor of Estalweia or Stalweia finds as fit a counterpart in Stawley. And so Collinson conceived the question. The Gheld Inquest, however, proves that Estalweia, being a dominical manor of Alured de Hispania, was in Williton Hundred, and so must be the type of Nether Stowey, the Caput of his descendants' Barony. As to Staweia being Stawley and so in Milverton Hundred, the fact is but faintly indicated by the sequence of the Record. The negative proof is in such cases most to be relied on. If Staweia be not Stawley, where is Stawley in Domesday? If Stawley be not Staweia, what has become of the latter?

WELESFORDA.—Bretel, the Comte of Moretain's tenant, had appropriated one virgate of Robert de Auberville's tenement of Wellisford. Robert de Auberville was a King's Serjeant (*Serviens Regis*). His services were probably in connection with the King's Forcst. His Saxon antecessors were in one instance Foresters, in other instances Tovi, Sheriff of Somerset, before, and for some little time after, the Conquest.

Domesday gives evidence other than this spoliation of Wellisford, of De Auberville's title having been questioned or disturbed. What remained to his heirs seems to have escheated to the Crown in the time of Richard I. It was a Knight's-fee, says Collinson (iii. 19), and King Richard gave it to Wm. de Wrotham, his Forester for Somerset and Dorset.

TORNA.—Roger de Corcelle's Manor of Torna can hardly be represented by any other manor than that of Thorn St. Margaret. The sequence in which Domesday registers Torna is immaterial to the question, for Torna is the only Corcelle manor which can possibly have been in Milverton Hundred. Whereas the voracious territorialist who owned Torna procured himself a foothold in nearly every Somerset Hundred, there is less improbability that he got ingress into this of Milverton.

MILVERTON HUNDRED.—This Hundred is, so far as we know, precisely the same as it was in A.D. 1084, and at the date of Domesday.

Our Table however does not perfectly represent this identity, for it gives the whole parochial acreage of Milverton (5,475 acres) to this Hundred, whereas a part of that acreage (499 acres of Domesday measurement) is necessarily included in our Table of King's Brompton Hundred, in which Hundred, though in Milverton parish, Torrels Preston was.

In other words our Tables give the whole manorial measures of Torrels Preston as in King's Brompton Hundred, the whole parochial measures in Milverton Hundred. It is only by combining the two Hundreds into one Table that the true totals of correlative acreage could be placed in juxtaposition. Such a Tabular arrangement would produce more confusion than it would obviate.

The Domesday estimate gives to the presumed constituents of this Hundred 1½ hides more than were announced in the Inquest of 1084. We can say no more than that such a Domesday Increment is not without precedent.

The Domesday measurements of this Hundred are as follows:—(70 plough-lands =) 8400 acres + woodland 273 acres + meadow-land 79 acres + pasture 258 acres; in all 9010 acres, or (adding the Domesday

acreage of Torrels Preston, viz., 499 acres) 9509 acres. The measures of modern ascertainment realise 14,812 acres in the nine parishes of Milverton Hundred.

The average hide of Milverton Hundred was therefore represented by about 360½ acres of Domesday registration, and by about 561½ acres of actual territory. The difference between the Domesday measures (9509 acres) and the real measures (14,812 acres) leaves 5303 acres unaccounted of by the former.

We presume that this difference was forest, measured by Domesday into and with the great Forest areas attributed to the Royal Manors of Carhampton, Williton, and Cannington, and to other Liberties of North-western Somerset.

These, it will be remembered (See p. 131) exceeded the real areas of those Manors and Liberties by 16,466 acres. By taking Milverton Hundred into calculation the discrepancy is reduced to (16,466 — 5303 =) 11,163 acres: of which still remaining discrepancy we give full account elsewhere.

The value of Milverton Hundred had increased from £34 17s. 6d. (the value at the dates of Norman seizin) to £53 7s. 6d. (the value at the date of Domesday). The chief increase was in Milverton itself, whose value had more than doubled since it passed from the hands of Queen Edith to those of King William. The only estate which had decreased in value was Alured de Hispania's Manor of Staweia, which, by the way, seems to have been inadequately stocked.

¶ The aforesaid Domesday value, viz., £53 7s. 6d. per annum, was at the rate of about £2 0s. 6d. per hide, and of 1.3471 penny, and decimals of a penny, per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 15s. 3d. per plough-land.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR THE MANOR OF THURLBEAR (INQ.-GHELDI) P. 489.

In <i>Manerio</i> Torlebergæ sunt iii hida. Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo x et viii solidos }	3	0	0
(18s.), the full gheld on 3 hides	}		

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF THURLBEAR MANOR OR HUNDRED.

There is a duplicate Inquest on this Manor (See Inq.-Gheldi, p. 71). It perhaps explains the reason why the Manor came to be separately assessed. It runs as follows:—"In *Hundredo* Tierlebergæ sunt iii hida. De his habuit Rex de Gildo suo xviii solidos, et istos non reddiderunt Homines Comitibus nisi in Ultimo Gildo."

The Comte of Moretain's men, viz., Drogo and his villeins, had deferred their reckoning till the latest term of the Gheld-levy (viz., till Easter, A.D. 1084).

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II. PP. 27, 28) OF THURLBEAR MANOR.

The 3 hides of Domesday were represented by 1115 acres of contemporary measurement, viz., plough-land, 1080 acres; wood, 20 acres; meadow, 15 acres.

The case was one of privileged hidation. The present parish (949 acres) is less extensive than the Domesday Manor.

Here the Domesday Hide is represented by 316½ acres of parochial measurement, but, more intelligibly, by 371½ acres of Domesday registration.

The Domesday value of £6 per annum is at the rate of £2 per hide, and of one penny .2914 decimal parts of a penny per Domesday acre: also at the rate of 13s. 4d. per plough-land, and per team in employ.

The number of villeins and serfs abiding in Thurlbear, in A.D. 1086, was 26. This gives a single labourer to every 43 acres of Domesday measurement, and to every 41½ acres of land arable and land ploughed.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR THE MANOR OF THORN FALCON (INQ.-G., p. 489).

In *Manerio* Tornæ sunt vii hidæ.

Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo xxx solidos pro v hidis.....	5	0	0
Et de ii hidis retinuit Robertus Gildum Regis	2	0	0
	<hr/>	7	0

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF THORN MANOR.

THORN FALCON, though topographically in North Curry Hundred, was independently assessed in A.D. 1084. Indeed, the Hundred of North Curry consisted, at that time, of nothing save the Comital Manor of North

Curry, which, with its appurtenances of Stoke Gregory and West Hatch, was then in the hands of William de Moione, Sheriff of Somerset, as Custos for the King. And—whereas there is no extant Inquest of North Curry Hundred, and no appearance that any Inquest was taken in A.D. 1084,—on both grounds, or on either ground, it is probable that Thorn, which had its Inquest, was an independent Liberty.

On looking at the Indices of Somerset Hundreds, coeval with the Inquisicio of A.D. 1084, we find a Hundred of *Blacheterna*, or *Blachethorne*, mentioned. We cannot help taking Blackthorn as the ancient name of Torna (now Thorn Falcon). This idea further settles the Manor to have been an ancient Liberty, detached from any other Hundred. It also accounts for its being distinctively assessed in the Inquisicio of A.D. 1084.

From its place in the Record we judge the Inquest on Thorn Manor to have been a late and supplementary Inquest. The reason, probably, was that there was a dispute about its hidage and consequent gheld-liability. Domesday reproduces the Manor as one of 6 hides, which looks like a compromise between the demand of the Collectors of 1084 and the recusancy of the tenant, Robertus. It is further remarkable that the tenant of 1084, Robertus, is exchanged for Ansgar in Domesday.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II., PP. 27-28) OF THE MANOR OF THORN FALCON.

The 6 hides of Domesday were represented by 730 acres of contemporary measurement, viz., arable land, 720 acres; wood, 2 acres; meadow, 8 acres.

The present parish is 814 acres, and probably includes some wood or pasture which pertained at the date of Domesday to the King's Forest. Here the Domesday Hide, though parallel with about 136 acres of parochial measurement is better represented by $(730 \div 6) = 121\frac{2}{3}$ acres of Domesday registration. It was a case of excessive hidation.

The Domesday value, £3 per annum, is at the rate of 10 shillings per hide, and of nearly one penny per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 10 shillings per plough-land and of 15s. per team employed.

The number of Villeins, Boors, and Serfs, abiding at Thorn in A.D. 1086, was 12. This gives a single labourer to every 61 acres of Domesday measurement; to every 60 acres of arable land; and to every 40 acres of land actually ploughed.

It is recorded in the year 1166 how "Gilbert de Torna, if he could have his whole fee, would be owing the service of 2 Knights to Walter Brito." (Lib. Nig., i. 99).

Now Walter Brito (Baron of Odcumbe) was lineally descended from Ansgar Brito, alias Ansgar de Montacute, who held both Odcumbe and Thorn eighty years earlier of the Comte of Moretain. Gilbert de Torna was moreover in 1166 actual or presumptive or rightful Tenant of Thorn and other estates under Walter Brito. The idea of deprivation seemingly asserted in the above return of Walter Brito, is perhaps connected with the fact that in after times 'Thorn-Fagon,' as it had come to be called, was no longer in any connexion with the Barony of Odcumbe, but was held of the Honour of Dunster. In 14 Edward I. (1286) William de Thorn was certified to hold 2 small fees (that is Moretain fees) in Thorn Fagon of John de Mohun, Lord of Dunster (Collinson, ii. 182).—

It is probable that this tenure extended to more estates than Thorn Fagon, but it seems undeniable that these two fees of Moretain, wherever they were, were the same as Walter Brito had spoken of in his return of 1166. But how De Mohun had made a title to these Fees of Odcumbe, or indeed to any Moretain fees at all, we inquire in vain.

We have devoted unusual space to the investigation of all particulars which seem to touch on the early history and present representation of the Comte of Moretain's Manor of Thorne. A question, personal rather than local, and a further phænomenon have yet to be discussed.—

Among the Thegns of Somerset, Algar, who held Torna on the day of King Edward's death, was among the chiefest. This Algar was not dispossessed by the Conquest. In the summer of 1068 King William's charter restoring Banwell to Giso, Bishop of Wells, has among its witnesses no less than ten Saxons, all of them still holding considerable Fiefs in Somerset. Third in position comes Ælfgeard de Thorne, whose attestation, however, has been disguised by some Scribe who copied the King's charter into the *Liber Albus of Wells*, and wrote the witness's name as Ælfgearde Thorne. (For this charter we refer to Somerset Archæological Proceedings, vol. xxiii.) Now we will enquire further about the Somerset estates of Ælfgeard de Thorne, the 'Algar' of Domesday.—

At the time of his forfeiture or death (between 1068 and 1084) he was Lord of Scepton (*postea* Shipton Beauchamp), of Bera (*postea* Beer Crocombe), of Torna (*postea* Thorn Falcon), and of Peredt (North Periott). These estates, containing 27 hides in all, devolved to the Seignery of Robert Comte of Moretain. Algar was also Lord of Bischeurda (Bishopworth), of Weston (in Gordano), and part-Lord of Clotuna (Clapton in Gordano), all which devolved to the Seignery of the Bishop of Coutances. At Estoche lande (Stockland, Bristol), at Ailgi (*postea* Aylly), at Mancheva (Minehead), and at Aucoma (Alcomb in Dunster), Algar was succeeded by William de Moione, at Ottona (*postea* Wootton Courtenay), by William de Falaise, at Porlock, by Baldwin of Exeter, at Doneham (Dunhall?) by Walter de Douai, at Hatewara (?) and at Animera (Enmore) by Roger de Corelle. The latter Baron also succeeded Algar at Dondaina (Dundon), which Algar had held of Glastonbury Abbey.

In Devon, Cornwall, Wiltshire, and Dorset, Algar's manors were exceeding many, and had various destinations. We can learn no more of this wealthy Thane. It is quite a conjecture that Leveva, who seems to have been holding Scepton (Shipton) in 1084, was his widow, and that she vacated that tenure by death or otherwise before 1086, when the Comte of Moretain had taken Scepton into his own demesne.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI FOR LOCHESLEI HUNDRED (A.D. 1084), (INQ.-GHELDI, p. 74.)

In Hundreto Lochesleix sunt <u>xlvii hidæ.</u>		H.	V.	F.
Inde habet Rex de gildo suo £7 16s. pro xxvi hidis.....		26	0	0
Et Sctus Petrus de Româ et Abbas de Glastingesberia habent in dominio suo		11	0	0
De his habet Sanctus Petrus vi hidas.....	6	0	0	
Et Abbas (de Glastingesberia) v hidas	5	0	0	
	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	
Et non habuit Rex gildum suum.				
Pro iii hidis quas tenet Aluredus de Hispania de Abbate Glastingberiensis	3	0	0	
Nec pro iii hidis et iii virg. quas tenet Roger Witene de Honore predicti Abbatis ...	3	3	0	
Nec pro i virgâ quam tenet Ansethillus Parcarius	1	0		
De hoc Hundreto debentur Regi 42 solidi (<i>i. e.</i> , the gheld on 7 hides)	7	0	0	7 0 0
				<u>44 0 0</u>
Note.—So the Fegadri of Locksley Hundred only accounted for 44 of the 47 hides which they had announced as the contents of their Hundred. In other words, they omitted to mention in detail three further hides which, though absolutely in Locksley Hundred, had paid Gheld to the Fegadri of Huntspill Hundred.				3 0 0
				<u>47 0 0</u>

The Inquest of Huntspill Hundred says accordingly,—“In Hundreto Hunespillæ quod tenet Walscinus de Duaco est tantum una hida. De hac habet Rex vi solidos de gildo suo : et cum hoc Hundreto fuerunt recepti 18 solidi pro iii hidis quæ erant de Hundreto Locheslegæ” (Inq.-Gheldi, p. 70).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF LOCHESLEI HUNDRED.

THE ESTATE HELD BY ST. PETER'S OF ROME stands in Domesday as Peritoua, and as containing 6 hides, though its geldability *T. R. E.* had only been for 5 hides.

The favourable hidation of the Confessor's time did not in this, among many instances, influence the Assessors of 1084 in computing the area of a specific manor or of the Hundred which contained it.

The estate is now called Puriton. It has been withdrawn from Whitley Hundred, the ordinary representative of Locksley Hundred, and being added to Huntspill Hundred forms the modern and composite Hundred of “Huntspill and Puriton.”

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S demesne, said to be five hides in 1084, was in Sowi (now Middlezoy, Weston Zoyland, and Othery).

ALURED DE HISPANIA'S insolvency for 3 hides, was for 3 out of 5 hides in Woolavington, a member of Shapwick which Alured held of Glastonbury Abbey. Domesday actually specifies 3 hides as the proportion of Alured's demesne in *Hunlaventon*.

"ROGER WITENE" of the Inquest is the Roger de Corcella of Domesday. His surcharge on 3 hides, 3 virgates in 1084, is for so much of his demesnes, in estates held of the same Abbey, as he had neglected to account for. His tenures in this Hundred under the Abbey were 22 hides, of which he occupied in demesne 16 hides, $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates.

ANSCHETILLUS PARCARIUS was a tenant *in capite per serjantiam* in other quarters. In this case he is probably surcharged as an under-tenant of Roger de Corcella, in which, not unfrequent, relation Domesday calls him simply "Anschetillus." His sub-tenure in Locheslei Hundred was probably in that portion (5 hides) of Shapwick of which Domesday fails to give any detailed account.

THE THREE HIDES of Locheslei Hundred which paid gheld to Hunespill Hundred were probably Alured de Hispania's demesne in Woolavington, which Manor he held under Glastonbury Abbey.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 29-30) OF LOCHESLEI HUNDRED.

PERITON (now Puriton).—The Domesday Survey of this Manor indicates 6 hides as coordinate with 1,740 measured acres, and an annual value of £12. The hidation was therefore still privileged, though the privilege had somewhat abated by raising Queen Edith's 5 hides to the Papal 6 hides. Its ordinary hidation would have been at least 12 hides.

The present parish, measuring only 1,577 acres, is not so extensive as the Manor erst held by the Holy See. The Manor is said to have passed in time of King Henry I. to De Candos, Baron of Stowey, but there is no presumption that he was more than tenant thereof, holding of the Church of St. Peter at Rome.

SAPÆSWICA.—The Domesday Survey of Shapwick is incomplete. Of the thirty geldable hides which the Manor contained, Domesday only gives the tenancy and details of twenty-five. The omitted five hides were perhaps in Moorlinch proper (1,122 acres) and in Stawell (973 acres). If so, the subsequent survey of Stawell (Estawella) as containing $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides is redundant, and these $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides were only part of the 30 hides of Shapwick.

The half-hide, held by Garmundus in Shapwick, was no part of the aforesaid 30 geldable hides; it was merely a part of the Abbot's 20 ingeldable plough-lands. Though called a half-hide it was not geldable. There were in Somerset a few other instances where estates, though falling under a hidal denomination, were ingeldable by prescription.

The parochial acreage of Shapwick, Woolavington, Sutton Mallet, Eddington, Chilton-Polden, Cateott, Moorlinch, and Stawell, is found to be 14,755 acres. The lands recognized in Domesday as constituting those manors measured 7,847 acres. The difference, viz., 6,908 acres, was either King's Forest or utterly profitless waste. In this instance the hides and quasi-hides of Domesday are, on an average, coordinate with 246 acres of modern ascertainment.

SOWI.—Middlezoy was probably the Caput of the Glastonbury estate called *Sowi* in Domesday; and *Sowi* included not only Middlezoy (2,520 acres), but Weston-Zoyland (2,729 acres), and Othery (1,820 acres). These parochial measurements amount to 7,069 acres. The lands registered in Domesday as appurtenant to the 12 hides of Sowi measure (according to the system of computation avowed in this treatise) 2,442 acres, viz., arable land, 2,400 acres; wood, 12 acres; meadow, 30 acres. It may be reckoned then that some (7,069 - 2,442 =) 4,627 acres of this territory were not represented at all in Domesday. The ratio of the phenomenon is at once apparent. This was the very land of moors and swamps.

LOXLEY HUNDRED.—This is one of the præ-Domesday Hundreds which have been extinct for ages. At the dissolution of Loxley Hundred, its Manor of Puriton was added to Huntspill Hundred. All its other Manors were of the Glastonbury Fief, and went into the post-Domesday Hundred of Whitley. The total area of Lochslei Hundred, as given in our Table, is $50\frac{1}{2}$ hides against 47 hides, the asserted area of the Inquest of 1084. The Fegadri of 1084 had probably understated the Hundred by one hide; the gheld on such hide being their own fee or perquisite. The $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides of remaining difference possibly arose in the duplicate estimate of Stawell, which Domesday is above supposed to have admitted. However, these conjectural emendations of Domesday do not materially affect the statistics of the case. So let Loxley Hundred stand as $50\frac{1}{2}$ hides.—

Here we have the Domesday hide represented by 463 acres of modern ascertainment.

The acreage registered by Domesday for the same district is 12,029 acres, which gives rather more than 238 acres as the correlative of the hide. It all amounts to this, viz., that each hide of Domesday instance,

and every 238 acres of Domesday registration, co-ordinated with a further quota of about 225 acres of swampy wilderness, which had never been contemplated by any process of hidation, and which Domesday utterly ignored.

The Domesday value of Locheslei Hundred, viz., £72 per annum, was at the rate of £2 5s. 2d. per hide, and of 1.4364 penny, and decimals of a penny per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 15s. 3d. per plough-land, and of £1 1s. for each of 68½ teams in actual employ.

The number of Coliberti, Villani, Bordarii, and Servi abiding in Loxley Hundred at the date of Domesday was 203. This gives a single labourer to every 59¼ acres of Domesday registration,—to every 56 acres of plough-land,—and to every 40½ acres of land actually ploughed.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR MILBOURN HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, P. 72).

	H.	V.	F.
In Hundreto Meleborne sunt c et xv hidæ et 1 virga (<u>115¼ hidas</u>).			
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £18 18s. 4½d. pro lxiii hid. et i fertino	63	0	1
Et Barones Regis habent in dñio xxxiiii hid. et dim. et iii fert. (<u>Read 35 hidas 3 fertin</u>).			
De his habet Willelmus filii (filius) Guidonis viii hid. et i virg. et i fert.	8	1	1
Et Hunfridus Camerarius iii hid. i virg. iii fert.	3	1	3
Et Abbatissa S'ti Edwardi ii hid. et dim.	2	2	0
Et Monachi Sancti Severini iii hid. et dim.	3	2	0
Et Rotbertus filius Geraldii iiij hidas.	4	0	0
Et Ulwardus Wyta vii hid. et i virg. et i fert.	7	1	1
Et Comes de Moritonio ii hid. et iii virg.	2	3	0
Et Episcopus Walcelinus ii hid. et i virg. et dim.	2	1	2
Et Ecclesia Meleburnæ i hid. quæ nunquam reddit Gildum	1	0	0
	<u>35</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
	35	0	3
Et Fegadri retinuerunt sibi iii solidos de dimidiâ hidâ		0	2
Et non habet Rex geldum de x hidas quas tenent Villani Regis de Hasteriga	10	0	0
Nec de v hid. et iiij virg. quas tenet Sauson de Episcopo Baiocensi	5	3	0
Nec de dim. hidâ quam tenet Willelmus de Lestra	0	2	0
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Radulfus de Contivilla	0	1	0
	<u>16</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
	16	2	0
		115	1
		0	0

De hoc Hundreto sunt adhuc retro de Gildo Regis c sol. xxiii den. minus (but read c sol. xii denar. minus, i. e., £4 19s., for that is the true correspondent, at 6 shillings per hide, to 16½ hidas in arrear).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF MILBOURN HUNDRED.

WILLIAM FITZ WIDO had Horsington (11 hidas) and South Cheriton (6 hidas) in this Hundred. His demesne in Domesday is reduced to 4 hidas, i virg. 2½ fertins in Horsington. Meantime, therefore, he had enfeoffed Bernardus in South Cheriton, and the latter, holding in demesne 3 hidas 3¼ virgates, had become geldable for the same.

HUMPHREY CHAMBERLAIN'S demesne (3 hidas 1¼ virgates) is repeated in Domesday. His estate was Sanforda (6 hidas), now Sandford Orcas (a corruption of Sandford Orescuilz).

THE ABBESS OF SHAFTESBURY'S demesne was in Combe Abbas. It reappears as 2½ hidas in Domesday.

THE ABBOT OF ST. SEVERE was grantee and tenant of Hugh Earl of Chester, in 4 hidas of Henstridge. The Abbot's demesne, 3½ hidas, is again expressed in Domesday.

ROBERT FITZ GEROLD'S demesnes of 4 hidas reappears in Domesday as his demesne in a manor of 10 hidas, to which Domesday gives no name. Subsequent evidences show the said manor to have been Charlton Horethorne, sometimes called Charlton Camvill.

ULWARD WYTE'S demesnes reappear in Domesday as 3h. 2v. 1f. in Corfeton (Corton Denham), and

3. 3. 0. in Witecumb (Witcombe). But this survivor of the Saxon Thanes of the West was deceased before Domesday, if not at the date of the Inquest, and his lands, saving his widow's dower, were in manu Regis.

THE COMTE OF MORETAIN'S demesne of 2h. 3v. was in Merstona (Marston Magna). It is repeated in Domesday.

WALCHELINE, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, had Rimpton, in this Hundred. Domesday gives his demesne as the Inquest, viz., 2h. 1v. 2f. Rimpton has since passed into Taunton Hundred, which pertained almost wholly to the See of Winchester.

THE CHURCH-LAND OF MILBORNE appears as 1 hide in Domesday. The Incumbent, called "Reinbald, Presbyter," had been Chancellor to King Edward.

HENSTRIDGE, the whole of the King's Villanagium, viz., 10 hides, was ingeldant, *hæc vice*. The reason why his demesnes there were not specially exempted, was because they consisted of 8 plough-lands which had never paid gheld. "Habet Rex terram ad viii carucas quæ nunquam reddidit geldum," says Domesday. These plough-lands were, in fact, extra-Hundredal.

SAMSON held Come (now Temple Combe) under Odo, the imprisoned Bishop of Bayeux. Domesday gives Samson's demesne there as reduced to 5 hides.

WILLIAM DE L'ESTRE is probably he who, being called merely 'Willelmus' in Domesday, held Ponditona (Pointington) of the Comte of Moretain. Domesday gives his demesne as 1 hide, 1 fertine, 2 acres. He was geldable for the whole, but, as would appear, left half a hide in arrear in 1084.

RALPH DE CONTIVILL is named in Domesday as Walcheline de Douai's tenant at Ateberia (now Adber in Trent parish). His demesne there was 1 hide; his Villeinage, 1 virgate.

THE COLLECTORS (FEGADRI) had appropriated to themselves 3 shillings, being the gheld proper to half a hide under the existing assessment. It was, in fact, their fee for assessing the tax.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 29, 30) OF MELEBORNE HUNDRED.

MELEBORNE HUNDRED.—In this instance, and it is a rare one, the manors and hidages selected from Domesday are found to coincide precisely with the hidage of the Hundred, as advertised by the Inquisicio of A.D. 1084.

Since Domesday, and with the exception of its change of name, Milborne Hundred has undergone none but the most intelligible of alterations. Its name was written *Haretona* or *Hareturna* in Indices quite as old as the Inquest, so that the modern name of 'Horethorne' is rather a revival than a change.

Its Caput, Meleborne, anciently an estate of the *Vetus Dominicum Corona*, having passed to subjects, has long since been interred in the Hundred of Horethorne; but Ilchester, a distant member of Meleborne (Regis), has not followed Meleborne into Horethorne Hundred, but has gone, Church and all, into its adjoining Hundred of Tintinhull. To this we shall recur presently, and more fully.

RIMPTON, and the ratio of its transfer to Taunton Hundred, have already been spoken of.

ADBER IN TRENT.—There was a third portion of Adber in Trent, which was anomalously in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Givela (Yeovil). Trent being always in Horethorne Hundred, this section of Adber has now been drawn by 'parochial attraction' into Horethorne Hundred.

HESTERIGE.—Appended to the survey of Earl Harold's Manor is the following notice:—"In ista mansione tenuit quidam liber homo ix agros terræ et ii agros nemoris sed non potuit de mansione separari die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus, et valent 30 denarios per annum." This is merely a memorandum as to a former freehold, at Henstridge, obliterated at the date of Domesday, and absorbed in the King's Manor. They are statute acres that are spoken of, and the whole eleven were just short of an ordinary fertine by one acre. The value given, 30 pence, was probably calculated on the 9 acres of plough land, which would thus appear to have been worth about 3½d. per acre.

It is further said of this Manor—"Hæc (Mansio) reddit xxij libras de albo argento et quando W. Vicecomes recepit tantundem." The Sheriff of Somerset, William de Moione, of Dunster, was Custos of the King's Manor of Henstridge at the date of Domesday. The sum of £23, in white money, was equal to about £24 3s. of ordinary currency.

CHARLTON HORETHORN.—The Table gives Robert fitz Gerold as holding two-thirds of this Manor; for it is established by post-Domesday evidence that his anonymous estate of 10 hides can have been none other

than this. The rent of ten bacon-pigs and 100 cheeses, in lieu of £18, is instructive as regards market-values at the date of Domesday.

It is a much nicer point to establish that the Comte of Moretaine's estate of Ceorlatona, or Cerletone, constituted the other third of Charlton Horethorn. Both Domesdays mention the estate in a sequence which would, *per se*, place it either in Taunton or in Givela Hundred. But the Schedule of "Terre Occupatæ," placing it next to Mersitona (Marston Magna), corrects the fallacy suggested by the Domesday arrangement, and points to some estate in Milborne Hundred. And then we find that the Domesday measures of Fitz Gerold's estate are only 1390 acres, to which, if we add 830 acres (the Domesday measures of the Comte's estate), the total of 2220 acres is very proximate to the 2363 acres which now constitute the parish of Charlton Horethorn.

ILCHESTER CHURCH.—The triple entries in the Exon Domesday relating to this Church are instructive. First (Exon D., p. 159), it is noticed in the Schedule of Glastonbury estates:—"Mauricius Episcopus Lundoniensis tenet Æcclesiam Sancti Andree in Givelcestre et iii hidas terræ, de Rege, quas tenuit Brihtricius de Æcclesiâ Glæstinggeberiensi et non poterat ab Æcclesiâ (Glæstinggeberiensi) separari die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus. Hæc Æcclesia (de Givelcestre) valet per annum centum solidos, et quando Mauricius eam recepit valebat tantundem."

The abstraction of the estate from the Abbey necessitated a further entry (Exon D., p. 486) in the Schedule of "Terre Occupatæ," viz., "Mauritius Episcopus tenet Æcclesiam Sancti Andree in Givelcestra et iii hidas terræ de Rege quas tenuit Brihtricius de Æcclesiâ Glastingberiensi qui non poterat ab Æcclesiâ separari die quâ Rex E. f. v. et m. et valet per annum c. solidos et quando Mauritius recepit valebat tantundem."

The remaining entry (Exon D., p. 180) is in the Schedule of Tenants-in-Almoigne (*Terre quæ date sunt Sanctis in Elemosinâ in Sumersctâ*); but the Exchequer Domesday surveys the estate in a distinct Schedule entitled "Quod Mauricius Episcopus tenet." The said entry is, in either Codex, a full survey of the estate, with all particulars as to plough-lands, subtenants, team-power, and stock, usual to each survey. The only peculiarity is that the Exon Domesday treats of and speaks of the estate as a Manor (Mansio). The entry commences with these words:—

"Episcopus Mauritius habet i mansionem quæ vocatur Sanctus Andreas, quam tenuit Bristritius die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus."

There was good ground for such a treatment of the estate; for, though the *Borough* of Ilchester belonged to the King as an outlying appurtenance of his Manor of Meleburne, the Church of St. Andrew had the greater part of the suburban lands, and indeed had the Manor, so far as there was any Manor. A further difference between the two estates (the *Borough* and the Manor) was that the *Borough*, as a member of an extra-hundredal and ingeldable estate, was in no Hundred whatever; but the Manor, being hidated, fell within the Hundred of Meleborne. In process of time, when Milhern Port, being severed from the Crown, was annexed to the Hundred (call it Meleburne or Horethorne) of which it had been *Caput*, Ilchester (the *Burgh*) did not follow Milborn Port into Horethorne Hundred, nor yet did Ilchester (the Manor or Church-fee) remain in Horethorne Hundred. Both were annexed, as topography would suggest, and as has been before explained, to Tintinhull Hundred.

MILBORNE (*alias* HORTHORNE) HUNDRED.—Supplementary of the above notes on this Hundred, we subjoin a Table of comparative measures, similar to those which have already been given for Frome, Givela, and other præ-Domesday Hundreds.

If, in addition to the hidages quoted in this Table, we reckon the eight ingeldable plough-lands of Hens-tridge as so many hides, we shall have in Meleburne Hundred 123½ hides. The Somerset Hide is therefore here represented by about 174 acres of modern ascertainment, and by 165 acres of Domesday registration.

About 1095 acres, or nearly 9 acres per hide, will have been Royal Forest, not accounted of as intra-hundredal, but as *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*.

The Domesday value of Meleburne Hundred was £132 9s. per annum. This was at the rate of nearly £1 1s. 6d. per hide; and of 1.5627 penny, and decimals of a penny, per Domesday acre; also at the rate of about £1 0s. 10d. per plough-land.

PORTBURY HUNDRED.

179

COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF MELEBURNE, NOW HORETHORNE HUNDRED.

Domesday Manors.	Domesday Hidage. H. V. F.	Domesday Plough-lands.	Corresponding arable acreage.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Acreages.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.	
Ecclesia de Melburne . . .	1 0 0	1	120				120	Milborne Church . . .	alibi.	
In Meleburn . . .	1 0 0	1	120				131	In Milborne . . .	alibi.	
{ Horstenetona . . .	11 0 0	10	1200	420	100	60	1750	} 4105	Horsington . . .	3501
{ Cherintona . . .	6 0 0	6	720	1330	125	150	2325			
Sandforda . . .	6 0 0	6	720	40	8	20	788	Sandford Orcas . . .	1091	
{ Comba . . .	5 0 0	5	600	60	80	20	760	} 1920	Temple Combe . . .	1842
{ Coma . . .	8 0 0	8	960	60	40	40	1100			
{ Turnietta . . .	0 3 0	3	60				60	} 1302	Corton Denham . . .	1320
{ Corfetona . . .	7 0 0	7	840	20	6		866			
{ Witcumba . . .	5 0 0	4	480	40	6		526	} 4930	Henstridge . . .	4252
{ Hestrige, t'ra ad 8 car. . .	10 0 0	24	2880	720	160	720	4480			
{ Hengesterich . . .	4 0 0	3	360	30	0	30	450	} 2220	Charlton Horethorne . . .	2363
{ (Anonymous) . . .	10 0 0	10	1200	60	30	100	1300			
{ Ceorlatona . . .	5 0 0	6	720	20	50	40	830	} 934	Marston Magna . . .	1068
{ Merstona . . .	5 0 0	5	600	30	40		670			
{ Merstona . . .	2 0 0	2	240		24		264	} 946	Trent . . .	1590
{ Trenta . . .	7 0 0	5	600	30	80	60	720			
Etesberia . . .	0 3 0	3	360	10	6		76	} 150	Pointington . . .	1020
Ateberia . . .	1 1 0	1	120	20	10		150			
Pontitona . . .	2 2 0	3	360		1	20	380	Geathill . . .	300	
Gatelma . . .	1 0 0	2	240	25	15		230	Rimpton . . .	999	
Rintona . . .	5 0 0	5	600	40	10		650	} 648	North Cheriton . . .	1088
{ Ciretona . . .	3 0 0	3	360	12	10	10	392			
{ Ciretuna . . .	2 0 0	2	240	10	6		256	} 507	Stowell . . .	903
{ Estanwella . . .	3 0 0	4	480	6	16	5	390			
Ecclesia de Givelecestra . . .	3 0 0	3	360	30			390	Ichester Church . . .	alibi.	
* T'ra ad 8 carr. ingeld.	115 1 0	127	15,240	3013	813	1275	20,341		21,436	

INQUISICIO-GHELDI FOR PORTBURY HUNDRED (A.D. 1084) ((INQ.-GHELDI, PP. 67-68).

In Hundreto Porberie sunt iiii, xx hidæ et vi et dim. hida (86½ hidas).	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo x et ix lib., vi den. minus (£18 19s. 6d.) pro		63 1 0
Et Barones Regis habent in dominicatu suo 13 hidas, 2 virgas, 3 fert.		
De his habet Episcopus Constantiensis viii hid. et iii virg. in dominio	8 3 0	
Et Willelmus de Ou v hidas i fertin. minus	4 3 3	
	<u>13 2 3</u>	13 2 3
Et non habet Rex Gildum suum pro i hidæ quam tenet Osbernus de Episcopo } Constantiensi	1 0 0	
Nec pro ij hidis quas tenet Ori de Episcopo Constantiensi	2 0 0	
Nec pro i hid. et i virg. quas tenet Engelerus de Arnulfo de Hesdinc	1 1 0	
Nec pro v. hidis et i virgæ et i fertino de quibus cognoscitur (Cognoscuntur) Fegadri } se recepisse denarios	5 1 1	
	<u>9 2 1</u>	9 2 1
		86 2 0
De hoc Hundreto sunt adhuc retro £2 17s. 4½d. quæ debentur Regi de Gildo suo. (And the arrear is at the rate of 6 shillings per hide on the defaulting hidage, viz., on 0 hidas, 2¼ virgates.		

NOTES ON THE GHELD-INQUEST OF PORTBURY HUNDRED.

THE BISHOP OF COUTANCES' demesnes are reproduced in Domesday as 7½ hides in Wraxall and 1¼ hides in Portbury, together equal to 8¾ hidas.

WILLIAM DE OU'S demesne are in Domesday 4 hid., 3 virg., 3 fertins in Tickenham.

"OSBERN" as a Tenant of the Bishop of Coutances, vanishes from Domesday. In 1084 he held under

the Bishop both in Givela (Yeovil) Hundred, and in Portbury Hundred (Inq.-Gheldi, pp. 68-71). Who succeeded to Osbern's specific tenancy in Portbury Hundred it is impossible to determine. It was either William de Monceaux, or Roger Fitz Ralph, or Herluin, or Ascelinus; unless, indeed, some Manor of the Bishop of Coutances' Fee and of Portbury Hundred were omitted in the Domesday Survey.

There can be no suspicion of the death or forfeiture of Osbern between the dates of the Inquest and of Domesday, for, at the latter period, Osbern held estates under the same Bishop both in Devon and Dorset. He was probably no other than Osbern Giffard.

Ori's tenancy under the same Bishop also vanishes from Domesday, unless Ori were the unnamed knight (*unus miles*) who divided with his Villeins and Boors the occupancy of $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides in Wraxhall, under the Bishop. But to us the suspicion again recurs that some part of the Bishop of Coutances' Fee in Portbury Hundred was omitted in the Somerset Domesday. We refer to a like suspicion in the case of one of the Bishop's Manors in Givela Hundred (*supra*, p. 168).

"HENGELERUS" appears in Domesday as holding part ($1\frac{3}{4}$ hides) of Tickenham under Arnulf de Hesding (E. D., 417). Appositely enough he has $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides thereof in demesne. His default in 1084 was for just that quantity.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II, PP. 29-30) OF PORTBURY HUNDRED.

WOROCOSALA (Wraxhall).—For this Manor of the Bishop of Coutances', geldable as 20 hides, Domesday bespeaks details which amount to $20\frac{1}{2}$ hides.

Our Table represents Wraxhall as embodying manorially the three parishes of Wraxhall, Nailsea, and Flax Bourton; and it is probable that some part or rather most part of the two latter parishes went to form the Manor of Wraxhall, just as the churches or chapels of both were, whenever founded, only affiliations of the Church of Wraxhall. Little seems to be known of the early history of Nailsea or Bourton save that the latter acquired its distinctive name of Flax Bourton by falling into the possession of Flaxley Abbey.

The three parishes of Wraxhall, Nailsea, and Flax Bourton enclose a territory of 7165 acres, which, compared with the 21 hides of Domesday, gives the unusual proportion of 341 acres per hide. On this, and on another ground, we should say that these three parishes enclose something more than the Domesday Survey declares. The manor, in its given areas of plough-land, wood, meadow, and pasture, measured only 5220 acres of Domesday recognition, that is in the very usual proportion of 241 acres per hide. Here then are ($7165 - 5220 =$) 1945 acres, not registered in Domesday. There was a vast marsh adjoining to Nailsea. Its remains are still known as Nailsea Moor. This was the kind of area, we will not say territory, which the Domesday Surveyors omitted to register.

PORBERIA (PORTBURY).—The civil parish of Portbury includes Ham Green (say 100 acres), and so measures about 3819 statute acres. Here the large proportion of parochial acreage to the Domesday hide is chiefly the result of "favourable hidation;" and the Domesday measures, being 3250 acres, still give a high representation (*viz.*, 406 acres) to each Domesday hide. What we hold in this case (if we are to account for any remaining anomaly) is, not that Portbury contained any land unmeet for Domesday registration, but that the present parish of Portbury contains some ($3819 - 3250 =$) 569 acres, which were not in the Domesday Manor. And whereas Portbury Church was one of the older churches of the district, it was *a priori* probable that its parish would extend into other manors.

Now, what, if among the many Tythings of Portbury parish, one (we do not suggest which) was at the date of Domesday an independent manor. And what if that manor, containing, say $2\frac{3}{4}$ hides, and about 569 acres, were omitted by error in Domesday? We will recur to that question.

TICHEHAM (Tickenham).—Here we have a case of "excessive hidation," for 1627 acres give but 160 acres per hide to $10\frac{1}{4}$ hides. But the parish and the two Domesday Manors nearly coincide, the exacter Domesday measures of the manors being 1676 acres against the 1627 acres of the parish. The Seigneurie over William de Ewe's Manor, following a usual destination, came to be vested in the "Honour of Strigoil." The Seigneurie over Hesding's Manor did not remain with any of his co-heirs, but seems ultimately to have been annexed to the Honour of Gloucester.

WALTON IN GORDANO.—The parish is 515 acres in excess of the territory registered in Domesday. This was the only Somerset Manor of Ralph de Mortimer. His antecessor Gunni, the Dane, is elsewhere called Johannes Dacus and Johannes Danus. His manors, aptly for one of his race, were all on the coast.

CLEVEDON.—The Domesday manorial measures are 1029 acres in excess of the present parish. To the manor were attached 3240 acres of pasture, of which there were only 7420 acres in the whole Hundred.

PORTESHEVE (Portishead).—The present parish contains 653 acres more than the manor, as measured in Domesday.

EASTON IN GORDANO.—The civil parish including Pill (say 100 acres) contains 1696 acres, which is 450 acres more than the Domesday Manor. Twelve hides co-ordinating with 1246 Domesday acres gives hardly 104 acres per hide. Such hidation may well be called excessive. This was the only manor in Portbury Hundred which had receded in annual value since the seizure of its Domesday occupant, Roger Fitz Ralph.

Collinson's remarks seem to imply that the Church of St. George at Easton was originally the Mother Church of a large district, and that the term "In Gordano," suffixed to so many neighbouring localities, merely purported that they were once in this vast parish of St. George. If this were so, it is easy to suppose that, on the sub-division of the said parish into many parishes, manorial boundaries were disregarded. This may be in some degree a solution of the question as to how it could have happened that the parishes of Portbury Hundred were so seldom conterminous with the cognominate manors.

However, the question is far older and probably much larger than investigation will suffice to solve. Of the four parishes, yeleft "In Gordano," Clapton was the only one which, at the end of the 13th century, had the dignity and appearance of a Mother Church, and Clapton Church is dedicated not to St. George but to another warrior-saint—St. Michael. At the same period Easton, Walton, and Weston had no status even as chapelries; and if the first of the said three churches has since been dedicated to St. George, the two last claimed the tutelage of St. Paul.

WESTON.—The two Domesday manors of Weston contained together 10½ hides. This hidage co-ordinates with 2612 acres of Domesday Registration, giving the very intelligible proportion of 252 acres per hide. The present parish of Weston in Gordano is only 693 acres.

The smaller manor of Weston, that held by William de Monceaux of the Bishop of Coutances, is registered in Domesday as having among its appurtenances six quarantines of moorland (*vi quadragia morarum*). The quantity was only 60 statute acres, and was registered probably as having some quality of pasture. The bulk of such moors is seldom registered in Domesday. In this case the said bulk lay between Weston and Clapton. It is now called Clapton Moor. In this smaller manor of Weston the Domesday total is given as 3¼ hides. The details of tenancy supply ($2\frac{2}{3} + \frac{2}{3} =$) 3½ hides.

CLOTUNA (CLAPTON IN GORDANO).—The Domesday Manor is 5½ hides, co-ordinating with 1260 acres of exacter measurement, which gives the rational proportion of 229 acres per hide. The modern parish contains only 1066 acres; that is, it involves 194 acres less than the Domesday Manor.

Against the 5½ hides attributed in gross to Clotuna, Domesday gives details of tenancy amounting only to ($3\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{1}{4} =$) 5¼ hides. Thus the two inaccuracies, that given under Weston and this under Clapton, are compensatory of each other.

PORTBURY HUNDRED.—Of the twelve Domesday estates which we assume to have been in this Hundred, eight owned the Seigneurie of Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances. Portbury itself was Caput of the Hundred, and the Bishop was presumably Lord of the Hundred.

The Inquisitional Hidage of Portbury Hundred was given A.D. 1084 as 86½ hides. We have been able to collect from Domesday only 84½ hides of the required area. It is possible that some manor of about 2¾ hides was omitted by error in Domesday; the manor, to wit, which, in 1084, was held by Oshern under the Bishop of Coutances.

After what has been said above as to the non-representation of the old manorial divisions of this Hundred by present parochial boundaries, it will be satisfactory to shew how nearly the parishes in gross equalize in measure the Domesday manors in gross.—

The exacter measures of the latter amount to 21,370 acres; the actual measure of the parishes to 22,311 acres.

Here, then, is a difference of 941 acres, part of which may possibly represent the estate supposed to have been omitted in Domesday, and the whole of which may, in another view, represent such portions of the moors about Nailsea and Clapton as were unregistered in Domesday.

182 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

The modern Hundred of Portbury contains only one manor, Abbots Leigh (2,228 acres), which the præ-Domesday Hundred did not contain.

At the date of Domesday Leigh was partly in Bedminster Hundred, but mainly in the Royal Manor of Bedminster. When given to the Abbey of St. Augustine, at Bristol, Leigh became exempt from all subjection to Hundred or Liberty. After the Dissolution, Abbots Leigh, contrary to its true antecedents, was interned, for convenience sake, in Portbury Hundred.

¶ Supplementary of the above notes, and prefatory of some further remarks on the phenomena of this Hundred, we offer a Table of its comparative measures. We exclude from the said Table all conjectural matter, such as that which would arise from our idea that some manor of this Hundred was omitted in Domesday.

COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF PORTBURY HUNDRED.

Domesday Manors.	Domesday Hidge. H. V. F.	Domesday Plough-lands	Corresponding Arable Acreage.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Domesday Acreage in Gross.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.
Worocosala	20 0 0	26	3120	150	150	1680	5100 } 5220	{ Wraxhall	3773
Added thereto	1 0 0	1	120	120 }	{ Nailsea	2771
								{ Flax Burton	621
									7165
Porberia	8 0 0	18	2160	600	150	340	3250 3520	{ Portbury	3019
								{ Ham Green	
Ticheham	8 2 0	9	1080	110	30	60	1280 } 1676	Tickenham	1627
Ticheham	1 3 0	3	360	30	6	..	396 }		
Walton	3 2 0	4	480	50	20	100	650 } 650	Walton in Gordano ..	1165
Clivedona	5 2 2	6	720	10	46	3240	4016 } 4016	Clevedon	2987
Portesheve	8 0 0	8	960	360	20	100	1440 } 1440	Portishead	2093
								{ Easton in Gordano }	
Estona	12 0 0	9	1080	30	36	100	1246 } 1246	{ Easton in Gordano }	1696
								{ Pill	
Westona	7 0 0	6	720	210	33	960 }	1923 } 2612	Weston in Gordano ..	693
Westona	3 1 0	3	360	12	17	300 }	639 }		
Clotuna	5 2 0	5	600	70	50	540 }	1260 } 1260	Clapton in Gordano ..	1066
	84 0 2	98	11,760	1632	558	7420	21,370		22,311

Each of 84½ hides is represented by 265 acres of modern ascertainment, and by 254 acres of Domesday registration, both marks of a poor district.

The Domesday value of Portbury Hundred, viz., £70 10s. per annum, was at the rate of 16s. 9d. per hide, and of .7915 decimals of a penny, per Domesday acre, also at the rate of 14s. 4½d. per plough-land.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI FOR RINGOLDESWEA HUNDRED (A.D. 1084), (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 75.)

In Hundreto Ringoldeswea sunt lix hidæ (59 hides).	H. V. F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £8 8s. 9d. pro 28 hidis et dimidiâ virgâ	28 0 2
Abbas de Glastingesberia habet in dominio suo xvii hidas	17 0 0
Non habuit Rex Gildum suum pro vii hidis et i virga et dimidia quas tenet Roger de Corcella de Abbate de Glastingesberia	7 1 2
Nec pro ij hidis quas tenet Hunfridus Camerarius	2 0 0
Nec pro iiij hidis et dimidiâ quas tenent Villani Abbatis	4 2 0
	<u>13 3 2</u> 13 3 2
	59 0 0

De hoc Hundreto debentur Regi £4 3s. 3d. ;—and £4 3s. 3d., at 6s. per hide, is the exact gheld apposite to 13 hides, 3 virgates and 2 ferdines.

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF RINGOLDESWEA HUNDRED.

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S exempt demesnes reappear in Domesday, viz., as 10 hides in Walton 5 hides in Boducheleia (now Butleigh), and 2 hides in Lega (now called "Street"): altogether 17 hides.

ROGER DE CORCELLE'S insolvent land is put by the Inquest at 7 hides, 1½ virgates. That was the then

extent of his demesnes in estates held under Glastonbury Abbey. In Domesday his demesnes had increased to 8 hides, $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates. This was probably by his recent assumption of 1 hide of the *Villanagium* of this or that estate.

HUMPHREY CHAMBERLAIN'S estate of 2 hides was at Lodreford, sometime a member of the Abbot of Glastonbury's Manor of Butleigh. The Fegadri reported him as insolvent; not knowing, perhaps, that he, in 1084, now held, not of the Abbot, but of the King. Such a position made him non-liable.

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S insolvent Villeins were surely those of Walton. The *Villanagium* of Walton remained exactly $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides at the date of Domesday.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 29, 30). RINGOLDSWEA HUNDRED.

AISECOTA (Ashcott).—The clerk who transcribed this part (pp. 151, 152) of the Exon Domesday has left it scarcely intelligible that Roger de Corcelle's share of Ashcott was only a part of the great abbatial estate of 10 hides, whose Caput was Walton. The primary misarrangement, which thus separated the two parts of Ashcott, was perhaps in the original notes of the Domesday Commissioners; if so, the clerk who transcribed the Exchequer Domesday saw the misarrangement, and knew what was the real purport of the original. His transcript, though much more compressed, makes the case perfectly clear. Both Domesdays concur in specifying the number of plough-lands (three, and two and a half) proper to Roger de Corcelle's Manor of Ashcott and Girard Fosarius' Manor of Greinton. Such details are foreign to the usual method of Domesday, when dealing with the constituents of a great manor like Walton, and in this case they are redundant. Forty plough-lands were the complement proper to the 30 hides which are bespoken for Walton and all its appurtenances. But if we also accept the detailed plough-lands assigned by Domesday to Ashcott and to Greinton, the gross arable proportion becomes $45\frac{1}{2}$ plough-lands.

LEGA.—Collinson identifies this Manor with 'Legh upon Mendip.' The latter however is not named in Domesday, being then a mere member of the Abbot of Glastonbury's Manor of Mells; and both Mells and Leigh-upon-Mendip were in Frome Hundred.

Collinson, conversely, denies that Street is named in Domesday, which is verbally true. It is called *Lega*; and even in Collinson's time Street contained three hamlets which were known as Middle, Upper, and Lower Leigh.

STREET was of course a Roman name. It is more remarkable than explicable how often Roman names, now restored to topographical nomenclature, were veiled or suppressed in the pages of Domesday. On the other hand, a Vill called *Scetre* in the Dorset Survey, was probably of Roman origin. Though Domesday preserved the name, it is now obsolete. The site of *Scetre* is a mere problem.

BODUCHELEIA (Butleigh).—The Exon Domesday, telling (p. 160) of various deprivations suffered by the Church of Glastonbury, says:—"Comes de Moritonio habet duo quadragia nemusculi in longitudine et unum quadragium in latitudine de mansione quæ vocatur Bodecaleia, quod (*sic*) fuit de Æcclesiâ Glastingaberiensi die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus." It is difficult to see how 20 acres of dwarf wood in Butleigh should have been an object to the Comte of Moretain. His nearest estate was at Chinton (now Kinton Mandeville), and he also had made appropriation of a part of the Abbot's estate of Ditchat, but his tenants, and not he, were in possession of these and all other lands of his fee that were in this vicinity.

LODREFORDA.—This sometime member of Butleigh cannot now be traced. Humphrey Chamberlain, who held it under the King, not under the Abbot, was seated at Bahcary, some 4 miles away from Butleigh. Both Domesdays give the then existing value of Lodreforda to be 20 shillings. In the Schedule of "Terræ Occupatæ," however (E. D., p. 486), the past and present values are each 30 shillings.

VALUES ON SEIZIN, and in A.D. 1086. The annual value of the whole Hundred of Ringoldswea, at the time when the several Domesday occupants took possession, was £37 15s. At the date of Domesday it had risen to £61 10s. This improvement in the yield of Glastonbury estates was mainly due to the exiled Abbot Turstin, of whom it is recorded (Exon Domesday, p. 161), that, while the Somerset estates of the House had been in his hand, they had improved in annual profits by £128.

The following are the comparative measures of this Hundred:—

It contained, according to the Inquest of A.D. 1084, 59 hides. From Domesday we select, with every confidence, specific manors which again shew the Hundred to have contained 59 hides. Corresponding with these 59 hides, Domesday gives positive measures amounting, in all, to 10,120 acres, that is, for 76

plough-lands (of 120 acres each), we reckon arable land, 9,120 acres ; and we count from Domesday figures—wood-land, 511 acres ; meadow-land, 239 acres ; pasture-land, 250 acres.

The six parishes which correspond collectively with the above Domesday Hidage measure 15,572 acres, shewing precisely that (15,572 - 10,120 =) 5,452 acres, or more than one-third of the Hundred, was either Royal Forest or Baronial Chase, or else was omitted altogether from Domesday reckoning, as being utterly waste and profitless. In this case the Domesday hide is represented by 264 acres of modern ascertainment, and by 171½ acres of Domesday registration.

The Domesday value of Ringoldswea Hundred, viz., £61 10s. per annum, was at the rate of £1 0s. 10½d. per hide ; and of 2.1699 pence and decimals of a penny per Domesday acre ; also at the rate of £1 4s. 1d. per plough-land, and of £1 6s. 5d. for each of 69½ teams actually employed.

The number of Coliherti, Villani, Bordarii, and Servi, abiding in Ringoldswea Hundred in A.D. 1086, was 177. This gives a single labourer to every 58 acres of Domesday registration, to every 52 acres of plough-land, and to every 47 acres of land actually ploughed.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR NORTH PETHERTON HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, P. 73).

“ In Hundreto Nort-Pedret sunt xxxviii hidæ et iii virg. et dim. fert.” (38 hid. 3 virgates 1½ acres).

Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £9 10s. 8½d. pro 31 hidis 3 virg. et dim. fert. 31 3 0½

H. V. F.

Et Barones Regis habent in suo dominicatu v hid. et dim. et dim. virg. (5. 2. 2.).

De his habet Walscinus de Duaco ii hidas	2	0	0		
Et Johannes Hostiarius virgam et dim.	0	1	2		
Et Ansgerus Focarius v virgas	1	1	0		
Et Rothertus de Otburgi-villa hidam et dimidiam	1	2	0		
Et Ecclesia de eadem Mansione (meaning North Petherton) dim. hid.	0	2	0		
	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	5	2
Et non habet Rex Gildum de dim. hidæ et dim. virg. quas tenet Johannes	0	2	2		
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Ansgerus de Waltero	0	1	0		
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Rothertus filius Guillelmi	0	1	0		
Nec de hominibus Rotberti de Otburgivilla, de dim. virgâ quam tenent	0	0	2		
Nec de dim. virgâ quam tenet Walterus de Hispania	0	0	2		
	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	1	1
				3	3
				0	½

“ De hoc Hundreto debentur Regi viii sol et iii den. de gildo suo ” (and note that gs. 3d. in money is, at shillings per hide, the exact assessment of 1 hide, 1 virgate, 2 fertines).

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF NORTH PETHERTON HUNDRED.

The original expression of receipts is “ ix Libr. et x sol. et viii den. et i fertinum pro xxxi hidis et iii virgis et dimidio fertino.” Here, then, we have the fertinum, or *fourth-ing*, expressing in one sentence the fourth of a penny, and the fourth of a virgate. The money, at 6s. per hide, is the exact correlative of the territory. Instead of saying half a fertine of land, it is sometimes convenient to say 1½ acres,—gheld-acres of course. In 1084 the gheld on a hide being 6 shillings, the gheld on a virgate was 1s. 6d., on a fertine was 4½d., on a gheld-acre was 1½d.

WALTER DE DOUAR's exempt demesne is shewn in Domesday to have been two hides out of the five hides which constituted his manor of ‘ Brugia,’ now Bridgewater, a corruption of *Brug-Walteri*.

JOHN USHER is exempted by the Inquest for 1½ virgates of demesne, but charged on 2½ virgates. This suggests an estate of one hide at least ; and, if his estate were more than one hide, then it follows that the gheld on such excess was duly paid.

Domesday (Exon, p. 441) writes this estate as *Peghenes*. In all it was 1½ hides ; of this, John Usher holds 2 virgates in demesne ; the Parish Priest holds (under him) 2 virgates ; his Villeins hold half a virgate ; and half a virgate is left unaccounted of. John Usher has also 1 virgate in Hunstill, of which he holds half in demesne (see note on Hunstil, *infra*). Peghenes, subsequently falling into the hands of De Horsey, Lord of Horsey in this vicinity, was called Horsey Pegnes (Collinson, iii. 86). It is now, parochially,

in Bridgewater, but tradition points to it as the original site of the Mother Church of Chilton St. Trinity. This satisfactorily tallies with the Domesday mention of a Parish Priest in Peghenes.

ANSGER FOCARIUS (Fouver) is exempt for 1 hide 1 virgate of demesne. Domesday gives his collective estates, traceable to this Hundred, as only 1 hide, viz., 1 virgate in Cildetona (Chilton St. Trinity), 2 virgates in Micheleserca (St. Michael Church), and 1 virgate in Siwoldestona (Sheerston). It is obvious that some change took place between 1084 and 1086, but whether of tenure or assessment we cannot say. It may have been that, in the interval, Ansgar lost a virgate of estate, or it may have been that the Inquisitional 5 virgates were found to be really 4 virgates. His demesne in 1086 is only $3\frac{3}{4}$ virgates. His demesne in Andersfield Hundred is found similarly reduced.

ROBERT DE AUBERVILLE.—His exemption for demesne in 1084 is on $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides in this Hundred. His tenants were in arrear on 2 fertiues. Total, 1 hide, 2 virgates, 2 fertines.

Domesday gives *Melecoma*, Robert de Auberville's only estate, traceable to this Hundred, as geldable for $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates. Here, then, was a change still more puzzling than that in the case of Ansgar Focarius.

But, next after Robert de Auberville's estate of Melecome, Domesday surveys Newentona, an estate of $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides, which, if we mistake not, was in North Petherton Hundred, but which Domesday gives to Anshetill Parcarius.—

Now, as it is clear that Anshetill Parker had had nothing in this Hundred in 1084, so it seems obvious that between 1084 and 1086 he had supplanted Robert de Auberville in Newentona.

The two estates, Melecome and Newentona, are gheld-measured in Domesday as ($1\frac{1}{2}$ virg. + $1\frac{1}{4}$ hides =) 1 hide, 2 virgates, 2 fertiues, exactly the complement of Robert de Auberville's tenements in 1084.

Domesday has other evidences of unsettled title in the case of the King's Serjeantries, and specially of that held by D'Auberville.

NORTH PETHERTON CHURCH was, in A.D. 1084, held by Peter Bishop of Chester. Its glebe was 3 virgates. He seems to have held 2 virgates (exempt) in demesne, and 1 virgate (solvent) in villeinage. The Bishop died in 1084-5. His nephew, Ralph, seized the returns of this estate, and was deprived by the King, who, in 1086, appears as having "in hand" the whole 3 virgates.

WALTER, under whom Ansgar holds one virgate, was doubtless Walter, *alias* Walscinus, de Douai. No Ansgar appears in Domesday with any tenure under that Baron.

ROBERT FITZ WILLIAM reappears in Domesday either as *Robert Herecome*, or, simply, as *Robertus*. In 1086 Robert Herecom held one estate, 'Robertus' held two estates, in this Hundred under Roger de Corcelle. 'Robertus' also held one estate under John Usher. The first estate, that held by Robert Herecom, was in Siredeston (Sheerston). His demesne there was one virgate.

WALTER DE HISPANIA is put down as a Debtor in regard of two fertines. His tenancy was in Ulmereston (now Wolmersdon), under his brother, Alured of Spain.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 31, 32) OF NORTH PETHERTON HUNDRED.

NORTH PETHERTON CHURCH AND PARISH.—The last column of the Table presents no parallel acreage to 9 hides $2\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, which were in the Hundred of North Petherton, but not in any parish of North Petherton Hundred. The parish of North Petherton, as a whole, was rather associated with the Royal Manor than with the Hundred. Its whole acreage is therefore given in the Table of the *Vetus Dominium Coronæ*. (See Vol. ii., pp. 1 and 2).

ULMERESTONA (Ulmersdon).—Of one of the addita to Ulmersdon, the Exon Domesday (p. 349) says:—"*Ista virga fuit de Petret mansione Regis cā die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivis et mortuus;*" and adds, correctively, "*Hanc virgam præstuerat (præstiterat) Præpositus Regis Alwi in die Regis Edwardi.*" The same Record (p. 472), in the Schedule of "Terræ Occupatæ," says:—"*Aluredus de Hispania habet unam Mansionem que vocatur Ulmerestona. Huic addita est virga terræ. Virga autem erat de dominicā mansione Regis que vocatur Pedret die quā Rex Edwardi,*" &c.; and, correctively, "*et fuit accommodata cuidam Tegno, et valet per annum v solidos.*" The simple story is this, then. A virgate of land, part of King Edward's Manor of North Petherton, had been entrusted to a certain Thegn by Alwi Banneson, then acting as King Edward's Provost at the said Royal Manor. Alured de Hispania, having from the Conqueror a general reversion of Alwi Banneson's estates, appropriated this virgate as though it had been Alwi's property, not a trust. Alured de Hispania further annexed the virgate to Wolmersdon, an estate in North

Petherton parish, which had been Alwi's by a sound title, and so had properly descended to Alured. This irregularity it was which caused the affair to be reported in the Domesday Schedule of "Terræ Occupatæ."

NEWENTONA (Newton in North Petherton Parish).—Five small estates, named Newton or Niweton in Domesday, collectively measure four hides. It is difficult to identify these five estates from Collinson's data, still more to trace them. One of them he calls North Newton, and says that it is now in Williton Hundred. Another, since called Newton Comitis, was of course the estate held by Comte Enstace in Domesday.

TEGESBERIA, being Edgborough, is an instance of the Norman Scribe's propensity to prefix T. The reason why it (Tegesberia), stands alone, as it were, and is followed by no other manor of North Petherton Hundred, is simply that De Moione's Schedule commences with North Petherton Hundred, and that he had only one manor therein.

In the more general list of Terræ Occupatæ (Exon D., 472), "Tegesberia" stands between two North Petherton manors, viz., Alured de Hispania's Burh (West Bower), and Walter de Douai's Bur (East Bower). Probably Rad. Dacus (Dennis), who, in 1165 (L. N. 92), held $\frac{1}{2}$ f. under Moione, held Edgborough. Osbert Dacus, who held the manor *tem.* Henry II., and William Dacus, son of Osbern, who held it *tem.* Richard I., were tenants of Moione, we suppose, though Collinson (iii. 74) does not say that Moione was interested here.

BUR, *al.* BUHR (West Bower in Bridgewater).—It is singular that Alured de Hispania should have had no exemption in 1084 for the virgate in Bur, which Domesday says he had in demesne. Possibly he had taken the estate *in hand* since the Inquest. Domesday seems to record an objection to Alured's addition of one virgate to Bur. In King Edward's time, Alured's antecessor, Samarus, had held this virgate as a member of the Royal Manor of North Petherton—*tenuit Samarus in firmâ Regis, in mansione quæ vocatur Petret* (E. D., pp. 349, 472).

BUR, *prius in Melecome* (East Bower in Bridgewater).—There seems to have been an objection to Walter de Donai's title. Domesday says of Bur:—*Hæc mansio pertinuit ad mansionem Roberti de Othorvillâ quæ vocatur Melecoma ea die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vicus et mortuus.* Consistently with this, Saricius, registered as Walter de Donai's antecessor in Bur, is also registered as D'Auberville's antecessor in Melecome (E. D., 329, 442). We have already spoken of Robert de Auberville and the disturbances of his tenure.

HAUME, *al.*, HAME (Ham, in Bridgewater).—Here the Abbot of Athelney has half a hide in demesne at Domesday; and at—

GREMEDONA (Crandon in Bawdrip), Aldret, a King's thegn, has the whole estate (2 virgates) in demesne. Yet to neither of these tenants *in capite* had any exemption been accorded in the Inquest of 1084. If Aldret had acquired his estate since 1084, the Abbot had held his before the Conquest. However, there are other instances where the Abbot of Athelney's demesnes were ignored in the *Inquisicio*.

HUSTILLA (Hunstill in Chilton Trinity).—John Usher's estate here was only 1 virgate, and Domesday says in effect that, in K. Edward's time, three-fourths of the estate had belonged to the Royal Manor of Somerton.—*De hæc virgâ pertinebat dimidia virgâ et unum ferdinum ad mansionem Regis quæ vocatur Sumertona die qua rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus et valet per annum (the whole virgate) 5 solidos* (E. D., 443, 480).

The curiosity is not that King William should have bestowed on one of his serjeants an outlying member of his Manor of Somerton, but that Somerton should have had so distant an appauge.

ULVEREONTONA (obsolete).—Collinson makes this place to be represented by "Wolverton"; but there is no Wolverton where *Ulveroneton* was. Its site is unmistakable from the sequence of Domesday, which names it after one, and before another, Peri, and among a series of Corcelle Manors, all of which, so far as we can identify them, were clearly in North Petherton Hundred.

HATEWARA and RIMA are in the same series. We can identify neither, but we venture to say that they probably were in North Petherton Hundred.

CRUCA.—We infer the site of this Manor of Walter de Douai merely from the sequence of Domesday. The Record introduces it between *Wallepille* (Walpole) and *Bur* (East Bower), both in N. Petherton Hundred. The perambulation of North Petherton Forest (*tem.* Edw. I.) mentions a Manor of *Crich*, then held by the Prior of Montacute.

DONEHAM.—Collinson interprets this name by one equally strange, to us at least, viz., *Downend*. The site of "*Doneham*" remains an open, though a curious question,—

The Exon Domesday surveys 'Doneham,' marginally, in juxtaposition with Estragella, the first-named of Walter de Douai's Somerset Fief, and which we are sure is represented by Stretchhill, in the parish of Pawlett and Hundred of North Petherton.

The Exchequer Domesday introduces DONEHAM into the text-column, and names it in the following sequence, viz., *Stragelle* (Stretchhill in Pawlett), *Stragella* (part of Stretchhill), *Wallepille* (Walpole in Pawlett). DONEHAM (*de quâ queritur*), *Cruce* (obsolete), and *Bure* (East Bower in Bridgewater).—

On all hands, then, we may safely assume Doneham to have been in North Petherton Hundred. The marginal entry of the Exon Domesday is as follows:—"Walterus" (Walscain de Duaco) "habet unam virgam quæ vocatur Doneham quam tenuit Algarus die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus, et est de *ila*" (qy. Ilâ) "terrâ quam Rex (Willelmus) dedit ei" (*scilz*: Waltero) "inter duas aquas et valet per annum xii nummos." (Exon D., p. 328).

The Exchequer Domesday (Collinson, i. 26) is transcribed as follows:—"Walterius tenet unam virgatum terræ quæ vocatur Doneham. Algar tenuit T. R. E. Hæc est de illâ (*sic*) terrâ quam Rex dedit ei inter 2 aquas. Valet xii denarios."—

Collinson somewhere interprets the 'duæ aquæ' of Domesday to be the rivers Axe and Parret. We forget in what connection he says this, and, indeed, where he says it; he, too, seems to have forgotten all about Doneham and his identification thereof with Downend.—

To find a manor, of small extent and of obsolete name, between the Axe and the Parret, leaves a wide field open to the imagination; any definite apprehension of the spot must remain unsatisfied.

In a narrower field than that selected by Collinson, viz., in the mid-stream of the Parret itself, we find Dunball Island. We do not suggest that Doneham and Dunball are two forms of the same word, but half of each word may well have arisen from the same etymological source.—

Dunball Island occupies a site particularly consonant with that which Domesday arrangement suggests for Doneham. Dunball Isle is a real island now. It lies, as we have said, in the Parret, and between Bridgewater and Pawlett,—just the vicinity in which we suppose Doneham to have been. Dunball Isle, Collinson (iii. 75) says, was artificially produced, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, by certain persons cutting a trench, of 40 yards' width, across a previous isthmus. Whether Dunball, at the date of Domesday, were an island or a peninsula, and whether we prefer the reading, 'De Ilâ terrâ,' or 'De illâ terrâ,' matters little. Domesday uses the word 'Ila' for many spots which were not strictly surrounded with water. Here we dismiss the subject.

COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF NORTH PETHERTON HUNDRED.

The Inquisitional Hidage (A.D. 1084) was 38 hides, 3 virgates, and $\frac{1}{2}$ one fertine. Domesday seems to supply in the component estates, 39 hides, 3 virgates, $2\frac{1}{2}$ fertines. The more positive measures of Domesday for the same estates realize 13,454 acres, viz., of arable land (reckoning 120 acres to each of $102\frac{3}{4}$ ploughlands), 12,330 acres; of wood-land, 423 acres; of meadow-land, 333 acres; of pasture-land, 328 acres; of moor-land, 40 acres.

The seven parishes, whose Churches are within the limits of the Domesday Hundred of North Petherton, measure by modern ascertainment 13,628 acres.

But this apparent approximation between old and new measurements is delusive. The two things measured are not the same. About one fourth of the hidage given in the Table (viz., $9\frac{3}{4}$ hides) was in the Hundred, but the parish in which this hidage lay, viz., North Petherton parish, was not in the Hundred. So these hides are measured as hides into the tabulated Hundred, but their correlative modern acreage is measured elsewhere. Of this presently.—What the Table does show is this, viz., that 39 hides, 3 virgates, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ fertines of Domesday are paralleled by 13,454 acres of exacter Domesday measures. And this gives the Domesday hide of North Petherton Hundred to coordinate with a fraction more than 337 acres of Domesday registration.

The larger and more complete comparison with modern acreage and with the modern Hundred should be on other data, viz.—

Seven parishes common to both the Old and New Hundred of North Petherton }	13,628 acres.
measure collectively, as in the Table—	

Three parishes of Ancient Domesne, which constituted the King's Manor of North Petherton and which were partly in the old Hundred and are altogether in the New Hundred, viz., North Petherton itself (10,174 acres), Chedzoy (1,655 acres), and Thurloxton (551 acres) measure collectively	12,380 acres.
And 13,628 acres + 12,380 acres gives as a total of modern acreage	26,008 acres
Against this total we place the—	
Domesday acreage of the Hundred of North Petherton	13,454 acres
Domesday acreage of the Royal Manor of North Petherton, with all its understood appurtenances (See Vol ii., pp. 1 and 2)	3,940 acres
Total of Domesday computation	17,394 acres

So that (26,008 - 17,394 =) 8,614 acres of modern ascertainment, stand unexpressed in the positive Domesday measures which we have collected above. Probably a part of this balance of 8,614 acres, having been marsh or moor, was not expressed any where in Domesday. But the bulk of it, we venture to think, went to satisfy that extraordinary excess over real area which Domesday attributes to the extreme North-Western districts. The whole of such excess it will be remembered (*supra*, p. 131) was 16,466 acres.

In other words Domesday attributed to the Manors of Carhampton, Cannington, Williton, Cutcomb, Minehead, &c., the woods and pasturage which lay topographically in other Hundreds, in North Petherton for one. Therein was the Royal Forest of North Petherton. We should expect naturally to find its area represented among the Domesday attributes of the Royal Manor of North Petherton. Instead of that, Domesday does not give a single acre of wood, and only two leagues or 240 acres of pasture, to the said Manor.

THE DOMESDAY VALUE of North Petherton Hundred at the date of the Conquest is not fully given. Allowing something for omissions of the Record we gather it to have been about £59 per annum. In the year 1086 it is fully recorded. It was £67 7s. per annum. This was at the rate of £1 16s. 9d. per hide, and of 1.2021 penny and decimals of a penny per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 13s. 1¼d. per plough-land.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI FOR SOUTH PETHERTON HUNDRED (A.D. 1084), (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 73).

In Hundreto Sutperetonæ sunt lxvi hidæ et dimidia (66 hides, 2 virgates).	H. V. F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £12 9s. pro xl et i hidis et dimidia.....	41 2 0
Rex et Barones sui habent in dominio <u>xi hidas.</u>	
De his habet Rex ii hidas	2 0 0
Et Clericus de villâ Sutperetonæ, 1 hid.	1 0 0
Et Siwardus iiij hidas et iii virgas.....	4 3 0
Et Johannes Hostiarius hid. et dim. et i fert.....	1 2 1
Et Hardingus hid. et dim. it iij fert.	1 2 3
	11 0 0
	11 0 0
Et non habet Rex Gildum de vi hidis quas tenet Leveva	6 0 0
Nec de i hidâ quam tenent villani Abbatis de Adelingia	1 0 0
Nec de ii hidis quas tenet Turstanus ..	2 0 0
Nec de i hidâ quam tenet Stephanus de Willelmo de Ou ..	1 0 0
Nec de dimid. hidâ quam tenet Willelmus de Dalmereiq	0 2 0
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Willelmus de <i>Monticut</i>	0 1 0
Nec de dim. hidâ quam tenet Rogerus de Luxovio.....	0 2 0
Nec de i hid. et i virgâ quas tenet Radulfus Rufus.....	1 1 0
Nec de dimid. hidâ quam tenet Odo de Fornelt	0 2 0
Nec de ii hidis quas tenet Rotbertus filius Gilberti de Willelmo de Moione	2 0 0
	15 0 0
	14 0 0
	66 2 0

There is one hide too much stated somewhere in the foregoing list of arrears ; and though the list amounts to 15 hides, only 14 hides should be reckoned in the composition of the whole Hundred. The Collectors themselves acknowledge their error, inasmuch as they add to their statement these words, viz. : " De hoc Hundreto debentur Regi de Gildo suo iij lib. et iij sol." Now £4 4s. is the gheld, not on 15 hides, but on 14 hides.

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF SOUTH PETHERTON HUNDRED.

THE KING'S exempt demesne was two hides in Over-Stratton, which having been held by Marleswayn, *T. R. E.*, the King had, on Marleswayn's forfeiture, annexed to the Royal and Ingeldable Manor of South Petherton.

THE CLERK OF SOUTH PETHERTON, called in Domesday " Aluiet Sacerdos, Elemosynarius Regis," was exempt of gheld for the hide of land which was the Fee of his Church.

SIWARDUS, ANGLUS TEGNUS," *al.* Siwardus Accipitrarius" appears in Domesday as holding 2½ hides of demesne in Seuenametona (Seavington S. Michael), and 2 hides of demesne in Dunintona (now Dinnington), both in this Hundred.

JOHN USHER reappears in Domesday as holding iu demesne 1 hide, 2 virgates, and 1 fertin in Winchineria (Wigborough in S. Petherton).

HARDING FITZ ELNOD, Anglus Tegaus, reappears in Domesday with 1 hide, 2 virgates, and 3 fertins of demesne in Lopen.

LEVEVA'S insolvent manor was Sceptona (now Shipton Beauchamp). Before the Conquest and perhaps for some time after that epoch, Shipton had been held by Algar.—

On Algar's death, Leveva, perhaps his widow, succeeded to Shipton. She is said to be holding 6 hides (the known contents of Shipton) in 1084 ; but probably she was then surrendering her tenure by death or otherwise. In Domesday (1086) the Comte of Moretain holds the manor. Neither Leveva nor any other Tenant-in-fee holds it under the Comte. On the contrary, he holds it himself, most part in demesne, some part in Villeinage. It is only by ascertaining this immediate change that we can account for the Comte not having had any demesne whatever in this Hundred in 1084.

TURSTAN'S default was in respect of some part of his tenure under the Comte of Moretain in Cruca (Cricket St. Thomas).

ATHELNEY ABBEY appears in Domesday with two hides in Seavington (Abbas) one of which was held in Villeinage, and was liable to gheld. The reason why the Abbot's demesne, also 1 hide, was not exempted, does not appear, neither in this nor in other cases where he was similarly passed over. (See above, p. 100).

WILLIAM DE OU'S Tenant, Stephen, had vanished before Domesday. At that date William de Ou held Watelega (It is Whatley in Winsham parish) in demesne.

WILLIAM DE ALMEREIO was Roger de Corcelle's Tenant of 2 hides in Chenolla (Kuowle St. Giles) and Illega (annexed to Knowle St. Giles, but now obsolete). William de Almercio seems, in 1084, to have been in arrear on one-fourth of his tenure.

WILLIAM DE MONTACUTE here represents, probably by a mere error, William de Moncellis, the Bishop of Coutances' Tenant at Dovelis (now Dowlish Wake). The virgate, as to which he was in arrear, was probably subject of a question whether his estates at Dowlish were 9 hides, or 9 hides and 1 virgate. Domesday says the latter.

" ROGER," here called " DE LUXOVIO," is perhaps the Baron usually called Roger de Corcelle, and sometimes called Roger Witen. If so, his outstanding charge for gheld will have been in respect of 2 virgates which Domesday says had been taken out of the King's Manor of Barentona (Barrington).

But perhaps " Roger," tenant of William de Moione in 1½ hides at Estrat (Street) was Roger de Lisieux. Even at that rate, it is by no means certain that De Moione's tenant Roger de Lisieux was not Roger de Corcelle. The latter, though a Baron himself, was undertenant to many Barons.

RALPH RUFUS appears in Domesday as the Bishop of Coutances' tenant of 5 hides, 1 virgate, in Caffceoma (Chaffcombe).

" ODO," here called " DE FORNELR," was Roger Arundel's tenant of 3½ hides in Cudeworda (now Cudworth).

" ROTBERTUS," here called " FITZ GILBERT," appears in Domesday as William de Moione's Tenant of 3 hides in Lega, which the sequence of the Record inclines us to think was Leigh in Winsham.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II. PP. 31-32) OF SOUTH PETHERTON HUNDRED.

CRUCA (now Cricket St. Thomas).—Domesday says of 'Cruca,' "Hæc mansio reddebat per consuetudinem in Sut-Petret, 'mansione' Regis, vi oves cum agnis suis et unusquisque liber homo (reddebat) i blomam ferri, *T. R. E.*; sed postquam Turstinus accepit terram de Comite non fuit reddita hæc consuetudo in 'manerio' Regis."

Collinson has erroneously applied the Domesday notice of Cruca (Cricket St. Thomas) to Crewkerne.

SEUENEHAMTON (now Seavington St. Mary).—The Schedule of "Terræ Occupatæ" (Exon. Domes., 476) says, "De hæc mansione sunt ablati xxv agri moræ et prati et x agri nemusculi, et sunt additi in Sut-Petret mansione Regis." The moor-land being measured with the meadow-land, or, indeed, being measured at all, indicates some special value of a particular marsh.

STANTUNA (White Stanton).—This Manor is isolated from the rest of South Petherton Hundred, and lies westward, on the borders of Devon. There are several features in Domesday indicative of a wild and exceptional status, such as the absence of meadow-land, a considerable area of wood-land, and 50 acres of pasture, consisting well with a stock of 13 she-goats. The hidation was favourable, inasmuch as each hide implies 423 acres of Domesday measure. Nevertheless, the land (1270 acres) implied by the Domesday measure was short of the present parochial area (1937 acres) by 667 acres, which we take to have been either King's Forest or else waste, not contemplated in the Domesday estimate.

WHATLEY. LEIGH. STREET.—These three villis, all in Winsham parish, were not like Winsham itself, in the Bishop's Hundred, at the date of Domesday, simply because they did not belong to the Bishop. The acreage attributed to them in the last column is the result of calculation rather than ascertainment. It leaves 1880 statute acres as the quota due to Winsham proper (See Table, Vol. ii. p. 24).

STREET is written *Strate* in the Exchequer Domesday, *Estrat* in the Exon Codex. This propensity of the Norman scribes to add an initial E to English and Latin words beginning with double consonants is worth notice. Escalade, Escuage, Escutcheon, Esperance, Esquire, Estate, are all words which took their forms from the Norman die. Our Anglican propensity is the reverse. We abide by Scale, Scutage, Scutcheon, De-sperate, Squire, and State; nay, we rob words, properly commencing with E, of that prefix. Thus the Greek *Episcopus* becomes with us Bishop, the Norman *Etouteville* becomes in England Stuteville; the Latin *Extraneus* and the Norman *Etrange* becomes with us Stranger; and the *Easterling* becomes Sterling.

We have elsewhere remarked that the Exon Domesday savours more of Norman clerkship than does the Exchequer Codex. In the Exon Domesday we have, for instance, such names as *Espachestona*, *Estalrewica*, *Estalweia*, *Estana*, *Estantona*, *Estanwella*, *Estapla*, *Estaweia*, *Estaweit*, *Estoca*, *Estochelanda*, *Estochet*, *Estragella*, *Estrat*, and *Esturt*, in all of which the initial E having been superadded by a Norman scribe, must be removed before we can identify the names with English-spelt localities. But the Exchequer Codex prefixes the Norman E to none of the above names, except the last. It spells *Sturt* as *Esturt*; and, under Somerset at least, it encumbers no other name with this specific Norman disguise.

SUT-PETRET HUNDRED.—The Hidage, collected in the Table from Domesday, is 68½ hides, or 2 hides more than that prescribed by the Inquest of A.D. 1084. This is no more than an ordinary "Domesday Increment."

The Old Hundred purports to be represented in the Table. The modern Hundred is mainly conterminous; but it has lost parts of the parish of Winsham, which have followed Winsham itself into the Hundred of Kingsbury East, by parochial attraction, as we term it. The Modern Hundred further includes the Royal Manor of South Petherton, which, though *Caput* of the Old Hundred, was external thereto. It also includes Barrington and Chillington, members of the Manor of South Petherton at the date of Domesday, and so, not in the Old Hundred.

The existing Hundred of South Petherton represents 68½ hides given in the Table + 23 quasi-hides of South Petherton and its appurtenant villis; in all 96½ hides. It further represents (10,681 + 4510 =) 15,191, acres of Domesday registration, co-ordinating with the said hidage and quasi-hidage.

The measurement by modern parishes is 10,906 statute acres (given in the Table) + 5788 acres (the joint contents of the three parishes of South Petherton, Barrington, and Chillington;—in all 16,694 statute acres.

Here, then, the Hide or Quasi-Hide of Domesday was co-ordinate with $\left(\frac{15191}{96\frac{1}{2}} =\right)$ 156¼ Domesday acres, and with $\left(\frac{16694}{96\frac{1}{2}} =\right)$ 173 acres of modern ascertainment.

The difference between the modern and the Domesday acreage is (16,694 – 15,191 =) 1503 acres. That

difference represents some part, perhaps, of the Royal Forest of Neroch, but, also, perhaps, some other land which being absolutely waste and profitless was nowhere registered in Domesday.

Subjoined is a Table of the contents and comparative measures of the Old Hundred alone.

Domesday Estates.	Domesday Hideage. H. V. F.	Domesday Plough-lands.	Corresponding Arable Acreage.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Acreages.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.
Six items of estate in } South Petherton and } Barrington	9 0 0	5½	660	..	16	..	676	{ In South Petherton } { and Barrington .. }	alibi.
Lopen (3 items)	4 0 0	4	480	..	40	..	520	Lopen	480
Sceptona	6 0 0	4	480	..	15	..	495	Shipton Beauchamp ..	836
Cruea	6 0 0	5	600	140	1½	..	741½	Cricket S. Thomas ..	875
Seuenameton	3 0 0	3	360	..	8	..	368	Seavington S. Michael	280
Dunnintona	3 0 0	3	360	60	8	60	488	Dinnington	514
{ Seuenhamtun	7 0 0	7	840	..	40	..	880	Seavington S. Mary ..	988
{ Seouenameton	2 0 0	2	240	..	6	..	246		
Stantuna	3 0 0	8	960	260	..	50	1270	White Stanton	1937
Chenolla (2 items)	2 0 0	4	480	80	560	Knowle S. Giles	532
Dovells (3 items)	9 1 0	7½	900	260	43	140	1343	Dowlish Wake	1282
Caffecoma (2 items)	5 1 0	5	600	640	1240	Chaffcombe	969
Cudworda	3 2 0	4	480	..	4	160	644	Cudworth	1074
In Winsham (3 items) ..	5 2 0	7	840	260	9½	100	1209½	Winsham, Part of ...	1130
	68 2 0	69	8280	1700	191	510	10,681		10,906

Here the Domesday Hide co-ordinates with $(10,681 \div 68\frac{1}{2} =)$ about 156 Domesday acres; but a comparison between the same hide and modern acreage cannot be drawn here, simply because 9 hides of Domesday are unrepresented in the column of modern acreages.

¶ The Domesday value of South Petherton Hundred, viz., £53 14s. per annum, was at the rate of 15s. 8½d. per hide; and of 1½d. per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 15s. 6¾d. per plough-land.

THE INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR THE HUNDREDS OF TAUNTON AND PITMINSTER (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 67).
In Hundreto Tantonæ et in Hundreto Pipeminstre 120 hidæ et iii virgæ et i fertinus.

	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £30 3s. pro c hid. et dimid.		100 2 0
Et Barones Regis habent in suo Domicatu xx hid. et dimid. et i fertinum		20 2 1
		121 0 1
De his (20h. 2v. 1f.) habet Episcopus Walchelinus	11 1 3	
Et Wills (de Moione) Vicecomes ..	2 2 0	
Et Roger Arundell	3 0 3	
Et Johannes Hostiarius	1 1 2	
Et Presbyteri de Tantona	2 1 0	
	20 3 0	

NOTES ON THE ABOVE INQUEST.

ARITHMETIC.—Here the arithmetic is careless. The *Fegadri* announced the contents of the Hundred to be 120 hides, 3 virgates, 1 fertine. They then proved by their details that it was 121h. 0v. 1f., i. e., one virgate more. They further proved that one of the details stated broadly as 20h. 2v. 1f. contained 20h. 3v. 0f., or 3 fertines more. The mistakes probably passed notice, as nearly balancing each other; for though the *Fegadri* exempted 3 fertines too much of the Barons' demesnes, they accounted for gheld on 1 virgate (or 4 fertines) more than their primary estimate would warrant. The money difference was the gheld of a fertine, viz, 4½d., and it was against the collectors. The Inquest concludes as follows.—“Præter supradictas hidas habet adhuc Episcopus Walchelinus in Tontona xx carucatas terræ que nunquam reddiderunt Gildum.” The estate was not only ingeldable, but extra-Hundredal. In no other case did the Somerset *Fegadri* allude to any such estate. It was no business of theirs. The word *Carucata* is here used

in its truest sense, viz., as a quantity of non-hidated land, containing at least one plough-land and, therewith, the usual accessories of a single plough-land.

The Domesday description of these 20 carucates includes full details (Exon D., 161-2)—“Exceptis his predictis hidis habet ibi Episcopus terram ad xx carucas quæ nunquam reddit gildum . . . Ibi habet Episcopus . . . i leugam nemoris in longitudine et aliam (leugam) in latitudine et xl agros prati et ii leugas pascuæ in longitudine et i (leugam) in latitudine.” Thus, to make the 20 plough-lands into true carucates, it required (1,440 + 40 + 2,880 =) 4,360 acres of other land.

At the time of the Inquest, the Bishop of Winchester had apparently in his demesne 11h. 1v. 3f. of geldable and hidated land in Pitminster and in Taunton. In 1086 he only retained in demesne 5 hides of hidated land in Pitminster. He had therefore, in the interval, discharged 6h. 1v. 3f. from his demesnes at Taunton, granting them either in fee or in villeinage to persons who thereupon became geldable for the same.

WILLIAM DE MOIONE appears in the Inquest with 2 hides 2 virgates of demesne. In Domesday he has 2 hides 1 virgate 2 fertines only.

ROGER ARUNDELL, exempted by the Inquest for 3 hides 3 fertines of demesne, stands exempt in Domesday (3 + 1 + 0) 4 hides of demesne.

JOHN USHER's exemption for 1 hide 1 virgate 2 fertines of demesne is repeated precisely in Domesday. It was for land in Taunton, which having been held of Archbishop Stigand *T. R. E.*, was now held of the King *sine medio*, which fact also exempted it from gheld.

THE PRIESTS OF TAUNTON, exempted for demesnes of 2½ hides in 1084, are probably Aluric and Edmer, two brothers, whose demesnes appear in Domesday as 2½ hides. They held of the Bishop, not of the King. Their exemption was probably prescriptive and by way of almoign.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 33, 34) OF TAUNTON AND PITMINSTER HUNDREDS.

The relative proportions of Tainland and Villeinage, viz., 17h. 2v. 2f. + 37 hides, hespoken by Domesday for the hidage of Taunton, are together equal to the 54h. 2v. 2f. asserted as the gross hidation of the manor. But to make all the details concur, we must suppose Leveva's two hides to be reckoned in the *Villanagium* of 37 hides. It was probably part of the 6h. 1v. 3f. of land which had been taken from Bishop Walcheline's demesne between 1084 and 1086; and Leveva perhaps represented a Thane who, *T. R. E.*, had enjoyed the estate, to which the Bishop now restored her.

GOFFRID, elsewhere called 'Goffrid Constable,' holds 4½ hides of Tainland under the Bishop. His occurrence in this position favours the idea that, before Domesday, Bishop Walcheline had rebuilt Taunton Castle.

THE WHOLE of what is called 'TANTON' (we will explain the term presently) in Domesday, contained, *inter alia*, (20 + 80 =) 100 plough-lands. (The teams actually in employ were 109). Reckoning the plough-land of Somerset to contain, like that of Dorset, about 120 statute acres, it is easy to approximate to the total of statute acres implied or named in the Domesday Survey of Taunton.

Thus, 100 Terræ ad unum carucam	= 12,000 statute acres	} 16,659
The Episcopal woods, meadows, and pastures were.....	= 4,360 do.	
The Tenants had, of woods, meadow, and pasture	299 do.	

But, be it observed, that this word, *Taunton*, and these *measurements* apply to an area which now contains more than 15 parishes, the actual acreage of the said parishes being 22,925 acres.

Adopting the same kind of Domesday mensuration to the Episcopal Manor of Pitminster, we find it to have contained (20 plough-lands =) 2400 acres of arable land, 400 acres of wood, 6 acres of meadow, and 400 acres of pasture; in all, 3206 acres. But the present parish of Pitminster contains 5120 acres.

Throughout all Somerset the Domesday Manor, taken individually, seldom co-ordinates with the modern parish. But if we take the whole of a Hundred, or the whole of a great Fief in a given Hundred—massing the Domesday manors on the one hand, and the modern parishes on the other,—we obtain, not indeed an equality of areas, but the true proportion of the whole territory to that part of it which was occupied, or cultivated, or afforested eight centuries ago.

We have already stated that, under the name of the superior manor, Taunton, Domesday cloaks a number of subjective manors, of which there is no mention in the Record. The parochial areas of Pitminster and Taunton, and of all the localities suppressed, or rather involved in those two Domesday denominations, are here annexed.—

TAUNTON, PITMINSTER, AND THE VILLS IMPLIED IN THE DOMESDAY SURVEY OF TAUNTON.

Parishes.	Distances from Taunton.	Acreage.	Parishes.	Distances from Taunton.	Acreage.
Taunton and Wilton ...	} 3 parishes together }	3,455	Brought forward	}	21,178
Pitminster		5,120	12 parishes ...		2 miles S.W.
Kingston	13½ miles N.	3,477	Cothelstone	7 " N.W.	906
Combe Flory	6½ " N.W.	1,369	Bishop's Hull	1½ " W.	1,341
Nynehead Flory	7 " S.	1,448	Otterford and Bishop's Wood	} 6 to 11 miles S.	2,387
Withiel Flory	16 " N.W.	2,485	Bishop's Lydeard, —(a part in Taunton Hundred)		
Corfe	3½ " S.	1,127			
Orchard Portman	2 " S.	635			
Ruishton	2½ " E.	1,003			
Staplegrave	1½ " N.W.	1,059			
		21,178			28,045

It would seem that all or nearly all other manors of Taunton Hundred, though not held of the Bishop's Fee, yet owed various suits and customs to the Episcopal Hundred or Manor. Subjoined is a list of these manors with the various spellings,—

(I.) Of the Exon Domesday, both when spoken of as Suitors to Taunton, and as Members of Baronial Fiefs otherwise independent. (II.) Of the Exchequer Domesday in the like relations.

Exon Domesday.		Exchequer Domesday.		Modern name or situation.
P. 162, sub Tantaona.	Alibi in Exon Domesday.	Fo. 87, b. 1.	Alibi in Exchequer Domesday.	
Talanda	Talam (p. 405)	Talanda	Talham (fo. 94. a. 2)	Tolland.
Acca	Acha (p. 405)	Acha	Ache (fo. 94. a. 2)	Oake.
Holeforda	Holefort (p. 405)	Holeforde	Holeford(fo. 94. a. 2)	Holford, now in Whitley Hundred.
.....	Holeforda(p. 406)	Holeforde(f. 94 a. 2)	Holford in Lydeard St. Lawrence?
Ubedena	Opededra (p. 414)	Ubedene	Opededre (94. b. 2)	Cheddton Fitz Pain or Over Cheddton
Succedena	Cedra (p. 414)	Succedene	Cedre (94. b. 2)	Do., part of, called Nether Cheddton.
Maidenobraoca	Maidenobroche	Maidenbrook in Cheddton Fitz Pain.
Jafort	Alford (p. 253)	Laford	Eford (92. b. 1)	{ Ford (Collinson, iii. 230) in Norton Fitz Warren.
Lediart	Lidiard	{ Lydeard Punchardon in Bishop's Lydeard.
Lega	Lega	Angersleigh.
Billa (<i>sic</i>)	Hilla (p. 352)	Hilla	Hill Farrance.
Bela (<i>sic</i>)	Hela (p. 253)	Hela	Heal in Bradford parish.
Denichehede	Nichehede	Nynehead Flory.
Bagueberga	Bageberga(342-3)	Baweberga	Bageberge (96. a. 2)	West Bagborough.
Scobinalre	Alra (p. 264)	Scobindare	Alre	{ Obsolete, or query Allerford in Hill Farrance?
Stoca	Estoca (p. 343)	Stocha	Stoche (96. a. 2)	Stoke St. Mary.
Nortona	Nortona (p. 253)	Nortone	Nortone (92. b. 1)	Norton Fitz Warren.
Bradeforda	Bradeford(p. 253)	Bradeforde	Bradeforde (92. a. 2)	Bradford.
Halsa	Halsa (p. 412)	Halsa	Halse (94. b. 1)	Halse.
Hafella	Herfelt (p. 343)	Hafella	Herfeld (96. a. 2)	Heathfield.
Hilla (<i>rectius</i>)	Hilla (p. 352)	Hilla	Hille (97. b. 1)	Hill Farrance.
Hela (<i>rectius</i>)	Hela (p. 253)	Hela	Hele (92. b. 1)	Heal in Bradford parish.

LYDEARD PUNCHARDON was, parochially, in Bishop's Lydeard; and the bulk of Bishop's Lydeard was, manorially, in the Bishop of Wells's Hundred, and is now in the Hundred of Kingsbury West. But there

were parts of Bishop's Lydeard which were not manorially under the Bishop of Wells's Seignury or Fee. Some of these parts were members of the Manor of Taunton, and were held under the Bishop of Winchester, and were withal in Taunton Hundred, where they still remain (See Collinson, ii. 493). And nearly the same of Lydeard Punchardon: it was, and is in the parish of Bishop's Lydeard, but William de Moione was its fendal lord; it was in the Hundred of Taunton, and owed certain services to the Bishop of Winchester's Manor of Taunton.

HOLFORD is situated, topographically, in Cannington Hundred, but, as owing services to the Bishop of Winchester's Manor of Taunton, it was reckoned, in the eleventh century, to pertain to Taunton Hundred. In process of time these anomalies were swept away; but Holford was not, therefore, annexed to Cannington Hundred, but to Whitley Hundred.

Now Whitley was a post-Domesday and very scattered Hundred. It was, in fact, an assemblage of Somerset estates, which were found in some such anomalous status as Holford.

HALSE was in Taunton Hundred, in the eleventh century, both topographically and as owing suit and service to Taunton Manor. On being given to the Knights Hospitallers it became, in virtue of the privileges of that order, extra-Hundredal and a Liberty in itself. Why, on the confiscation of the Hospitallers' estates, Halse should have been annexed to the Hundred of Williton, we cannot divine. (See Collinson, iii. 527).

It is remarkable that the Exeter Domesday—noticing Halse after a manor (Timbracumb), which was in Carhampton Hundred, and before a manor (Hiwys), which was in Williton Hundred—adds in the margin, opposite Halse, “Hæc terra est de Tantone Hundred.” The note is coeval, and shows that the scribe was aware that he had taken Halse away from its fitter juxtaposition with Opedra and Cedra, Roger Arundel's other Manors in Taunton Hundred. The clerk who transcribed the Exchequer Domesday makes a still greater misarrangement in placing Halse at the head of all Roger Arundel's Manors, and in placing Hiwys next. But the Exchequer clerk added no note indicative of any sense of the error. Here is one illustration of our theory that the Exon scribes had more local knowledge than their brethren of the Exchequer; and, if so (see Preface, p. 5), that the Exon Domesday was written in the country before the Commissioners' Notes were despatched to the Exchequer.

HELE.—The grant of $4\frac{1}{2}$ hides in Taunton and its suburbs, made by King William to the Comte of Moretain, Alured of Spain, and John Usher, were in the Fee of the late Archbishop Stigand. They were, therefore, in qualification, or perhaps in non-anticipation, of the King's more general grant of Taunton and its appurtenances to the Bishop of Winchester. Heal comes under the same category. It was given to the Comte of Moretain though it had been a member of Archbishop Stigand's Manor of Taunton. Domesday says of Hele, “Hæc terra T. R. E. non poterat separari a Tantone, manerio Walchelini Episcopi.”

TEDINTONE.—Collinson, in his Domesday Index, interprets *Tedintone* as ‘Tatton’; but, in the place proper to Tatton, says nothing about such an estate. Probably he knew nothing; for Earl Hugh's Manors in the South-west of England seldom have any post-Domesday history. The way by which Earl Hugh probably came by these manors in succession to Eadnoth the Stallere (slain in 1068), and Earl Hugh's feoffment of William Malbank, in most of his South-western acquisitions, are matters already discussed (*supra* p. 58).

SANFORDA.—Sampford Arundel was in Milverton Hundred, but as a parish, a great part of Sampford came close upon Trull, in Taunton Hundred (see Collinson). This latter part we conceive to have been Earl Hugh's Manor of ‘Sanforda.’ The whole parish of Sampford Arundel contains 1144 statute acres. Such an area is in great excess of Roger Arundel's manor, of $1\frac{2}{3}$ hides, in Milverton Hundred; but the parochial area is no more than normal if it be taken to have included Earl Hugh's Manor of two hides in Taunton Hundred.

ALRE, also a Manor of Earl Hugh, was perhaps identical with *Scobinalre*, a manor which Domesday (Exon. Codex, p. 162) names among those otherwise independent manors which owed certain suits and services to Bishop Walcheline's Manor of Taunton. Still, the site of Alre, *alias* Scobinalre, must remain conjectural. There is a locality now known as “Allerford.” It is in the parish of Hill-Farrance. If not itself identical with Alre or Scobinalre, its name possibly indicates the whereabouts of Earl Hugh's estate.

TAUNTON AND PITMINSTER HUNDREDS.—According to the Inquest of A.D. 1084 these joint Hundreds contained 120 hides, $3\frac{1}{4}$ virgates. Domesday, if we rightly collect the constituents of the said Hundreds,

makes them to contain 122 hides, 3½ virgates, and also 20 ingeldable plough-lands, computatively excluded from the previous Inquest.

The exacter measures of Domesday for the same territory realize 33,814 statute acres, viz.

For Taunton with its 16 involved manors or parishes or parts of parishes.....	16,659 acres
For Pitminster (as before stated, <i>supra</i> , p. 192).....	3,206 acres
For other manors of Taunton Hundred, specifically measured in Domesday, 102½ } plough-lands (reckoned equal to) 12,300 acres ; wood-land, 445 acres ; meadow-land, } 228 acres ; pasture-land, 976 acres ; in all	18,949 acres
Gross Domesday acreage of Taunton and Pitminster Hundreds so far as it was } registered in the Survey	33,814 acres

The manors and estates which composed the two Domesday Hundreds of Taunton and Pitminster being measured parochially, are found by modern ascertainment to contain 42,486 statute acres.

The difference between the two measurements, that of the 11th and that of the 19th centuries, is (42,486 - 33,814 =) 8,672 acres.

Now it is improbable that the King's Forest interfered materially, or at all, in a Franchise where the very 'Pleas of the Crown' belonged to the Bishop of Winchester as Lord of the Hundred.

We opine, then, that in this district or province the Domesday Surveyors found some 8,672 acres of moor or waste of which they took no notice, and so excluded the same from the Domesday Register.

¶ In this case the 20 ingeldable plough-lands of Domesday, being taken to represent so many hides, we have each of 142½ hides represented by about 297½ acres of modern ascertainment, and by about 236½ acres of Domesday registration.

¶ The Domesday value of the Hundreds of Taunton and Pitminster, viz., £296 14s. 7d. per annum was at the rate of £2 1s. 6d. per hide, and of 2.106 pence and decimals of a penny per Domesday acre ; also at the rate of £1 10s. per plough-land.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) OF WHITSTONE HUNDRED (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 67).

In Hundreto Witestane sunt c et xv hidæ (<u>115</u> hides).		H.	V.	F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £15 pro l hidis		50	0	0
Et Abbas (Glastingberiensis) habet in dominio suo xl hidas		40	0	0
Et Rex non habet gildum de i hid. et iii virgis quas Serlo de Burgeio (<i>sic</i>) habet ...	1 3 0			
Nec de iiii hid. iii virg et dim. quas Roger de Corcella (habet) ...	4 3 2			
Nec de v hidis et virgâ et dimid. quas tenent Villani Abbatis	5 1 2			
	<u>12 0 0</u>	12	0	0
De istis debentur Regi de Gildo suo £3 12s. (that is 6s. per hide on the lands in } default). }				
Et de vii hidis quas tenet Drogo de Abbate Glastingeberiensis non reddit Gildum } in hoc Hundreto		7	0	0
Et Nigellus Medicus non reddit Gildum in hoc Hundreto de v hidis.....		5	0	0
Et Aluricus et Ewardus non reddunt Gildum de i hida in hoc Hundreto		1	0	0
		<u>115</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF WITESTANE HUNDRED.

Domesday, whether we rightly or wrongly collect the elements of this Hundred, is contradictory of itself as to the hidage. Its details of hidage amount to 120 hides for twenty-one items of estate, but when Domesday masses these twenty-one items into groups, it supplies a total of only 118 hides. And that sum is still three hides in excess of the previous computation of the Inquest.

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S demesnes in East Pennard, Baltonsborough, Doulling, Batcomb, and Ditcheat, instead of being 40 hides, as in the Inquest, are 41 hides in Domesday.

THE WHOLE HUNDRED OF WHITSTONE seems to have been in a somewhat indefinite status, both at the time of the Inquest (1084) and at the date of Domesday (1086). The 'Fegadri' of 1084 were evidently not

aware of the full contents of the Hundred ; and though the Domesday Commissioners added three hides to the estimate of the Fegadri, they gave indications of a suspicion that some of the estates surveyed, contained still more than the totals of hidage which they were content to set down ; they named one estate (in Ditcheat) of which they knew no more than the hidage and the value ; they named three estates, apparently in Draycott, in Stone, and in Stoke-Lane, of which they knew only the value, but not the hidage. All these four estates had recently come into the possession of the Comte of Moretain by deprivation of the Abbot of Glastonbury ;—we say recently, because the Comte's possession thereof was not sufficiently verified to cause them to be enrolled in that Schedule of Domesday which gives full particulars of the better recognised manors of his Fief.

We have alluded elsewhere (Dorset Domesday, pp. 21, 22) to the dislocations and dismemberments which befel the Glastonbury estates, either during the time of Abbot Turstin, or on his relegation to Normandy in 1083. Nevertheless, during his Abbacy, the generality of the Abbatial estates are proved by the Somerset Domesday to have increased enormously in value. The King had them in hand both at the date of the Inquest and of Domesday ; yet it is very remarkable that neither Record alludes in terms to the existing relegation of Abbot Turstin, nor to the stewardship of King William's Escheators.

SERLO DE BURC's default would seem from Domesday to be in respect of $1\frac{3}{4}$ hides which he held in demesne at Pylle, under the Abbot of Glastonbury.

ROGER DE CORCELLE appears in Domesday as holding $17\frac{1}{2}$ hides in the Abbot of Glastonbury's manors, supposed to have constituted this Hundred. His default was probably in regard to his demesnes in Doultling and Batcombe.

THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S Villeins appear in Domesday as holding some $12\frac{1}{4}$ geldable hides in this Hundred. The Defaulters in 1084 would seem to have been the Villeins of Baltonsborough, Doultling, Batcombe, and Ditcheat.

THE ESTATE which in 1084 was held by Drogo (de Montacute) under Glastonbury Abbey was 7 hides in the Abbot's great manor of Ditcheat. It is supposable that the Comte of Moretain was at this time mediate between Drogo and the Abbey. This and other parts of Ditcheat were, soon afterwards, confiscated by the Crown. Hence, in Domesday, the Comte of Moretain holds 7 hides (the same, doubtless) of the King ; and Drogo is not mentioned. (E. D., 158, 483.)

NIGEL MEDICUS.—The five hides held in 1084 by Nigel were in Lamyatt, then a member of Ditcheat. Domesday makes Nigel to hold this estate of the King, shewing its recent confiscation. Domesday makes Nigel's occupation to be $5\frac{1}{2}$ hides,—by error, probably,—for such an estimate causes the details of the whole estate of Ditcheat to exceed its given area (30 hides) by half a hide.

ALFRIC and EVERARD, sometime joint tenants of Glastonbury Abbey, in a hide in Ditcheat, hold it under the King in Domesday, and probably two years earlier. Their default was, like that of Nigel Medicus, perhaps only a claim on all sides to exemption as tenants *in capite*, or as tenants of Royal Almoign.

No extant Inquest speaks of payment in any other Hundred of the Gheld pretermitted in this. Now it is clear that Drogo's tenement, as well as part of Nigel's, will have been liable to a quota of gheld ; and in the ordinary course they should appear in some other Hundred, either as paying such a quota or as substantiating their objections. The absence of such memoranda is another indication that the Somerset Gheld-Inquests are not all extant. (*Vide supra*, pp. 89, 90.)

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 33-34) OF WHITSTONE HUNDRED.

PILTONA (Pilton).—The portion of land allowed to the Monk, Alnod, in the Abbot's non-hidated and ingeldable demesne, though it was called "a hide," remained ingeldable, and was not calculable as a hide of the Hundred. The case was unusual ; and Domesday shows its exceptional character by adding that it was *per concessum Regis*.

Domesday gives the total contents of Pilton-cum-Membris as 20 geldable hides, but enumerates details amounting to $21\frac{1}{2}$ hides. Besides this, it omits the hidage of Draycott, and says nothing about Stoney Stretton and Bagbury, which, though in the parish of Evercreech, were doubtless members of Pilton. The Domesday measures of all this area amount to $7348\frac{1}{2}$ acres, while the acreage of the parishes, which yet did not contain quite all these manorial elements, is no less than 13,328 acres. The inference is the

usual one, viz., that neither hidation nor Domesday measurements contemplated the settled occupation or valuation of large areas of the territory of Somersetshire.

BALTONSBOROUGH is now in the Hundred of Glastonbury Twelve-Hides. That it was originally in Whitstone Hundred is suggested by the fact that without its annexation to the latter Hundred we can neither make out the complement of the Hundred (115 hides) nor of the Abbot of Glastonbury's demesnes (40 hides), prescribed by the Inquest of 1084. The sequence of Domesday manors, which (as in the Table) names Baltunesberga next after Pennarministra, and next before Doltin, points to the same conclusion, that Baltonsborough was then in Whitstone Hundred.

DICESCOT (Ditcheat-cum-Membris).—Domesday gives the gross hidage as 30 hides. The details, also supplied in that Record, amount to 30½ hides.

DUNEHEFDE (Downhead).—We have added Downhead to the Table of the Domesday Hundred of Witestane, chiefly because it is now in Whitstone Hundred. The addition is on another ground objectionable, for it increases the Domesday area of Witestane Hundred by three hides over the area (115 hides), pronounced in the Inquest of A.D. 1084;—and three hides were the precise contents of Downhead.

Our suggestions are that at the date of the Inquisicio and of Domesday, Downhead was a distinct Liberty, perhaps a tenure in pure Almoign, or that, if it was subjected to any Inquest, that Inquest is lost. Its isolated position, its unqualified tenure by Arnisius, probably a Monk, consist with either idea; but the mention of 'Dunehefde,' in one of the old Indices of Somerset Hundreds, strongly favours the notion of its having been a distinct Liberty. The arrangement of the Table, then, is rather suggested by convenience than by any conviction that Downhead was in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Whitstone.

OAKHILL is a modern ecclesiastical district, embodying part of the older parishes of Shepton Mallet and Stoke Lane. So far its area is rightly assigned in the Table to Whitstone Hundred. But another part of the district was taken from the parish of Ashwick, now in Kilmersdon Hundred. Strictly speaking, then, some part of Oakhill, it is immaterial how much, belonged rather to the Domesday Hundred of Frome.

WHITSTONE HUNDRED.—Besides the abstraction of Stoney Stretton and Bagbury (two ancient members of Pilton) and of Baltonsborough, from Whitstone Hundred and beyond, the addition of a part of Oakhill (the part which was in Ashwick parish and Frome Hundred at Domesday) to Whitstone Hundred, there have been no other material changes in its area since Domesday.—Blackford, a Glastonbury Manor, in Bruton Hundred at the date of Domesday, was at one time annexed to Whitstone Hundred and caused the latter to be called for a time the Hundred of Whitstone and Blackford. Later still, Blackford was annexed to Whitley Hundred, and Whitstone lost its dual designation.

Upton-Noble in Bruton Hundred was, parochially, an affiliation of Batcombe (Collinson, i. 227). But this at no time affected the distinction between the two manors and their respective Hundreds. When its parish was first assigned to Upton-Noble, the said parish would seem to have been commensurate with the Manor.

West Bradley was formerly a Chapelry of East Pennard, which last was a Manor of Whitstone Hundred, but there is no evidence that the Manor of West Bradley was ever in Whitstone Hundred. It is now, and probably was always, in the Hundred of Glastonbury Twelve-Hides.

WHITSTONE HUNDRED was, like Whitstone Hill, so named from a monolith which formerly stood on the said Hill, and which was the Trysting-place of the Hundred. This trysting-place was "near Cannard's Grave, and about a mile southward from Shepton Mallet," says Collinson (iii, 459). The Hundred Courts are now removed to the town of Shepton itself.

Until the Dissolution the successive Abbots of Glastonbury were Lords of Whitstone Hundred, they paying forty shillings per annum to the Crown, in acknowledgment of the Franchise.

COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF WHITSTONE HUNDRED.

The measurements applicable to the several Manors of Whitstone Hundred are not all given in Domesday. This was because of the insufficient survey of the Comte de Moretain's occupancies of Dregcota, of Stanc, of "Stoca et Stoca." The measures which are given may be summed as follows.—Reckoning the plough-land, or *Terra ad unam carrucam*, to contain 120 acres—139 of such plough-lands measure 16,680 acres; the wood-land (*silva* of the Exchequer, *nemus* of the Exon Domesday) was 3,882 acres; the meadow-land (*pratun* in both Records) was 397½ acres; the pasture-land (*pastura* or *pascua* in the several Records) was 468 acres. Total 21,427 acres.

In comparison with a Domesday hidage and quasi-hidage of (118 + 20 =) 138 hides, and with Domesday exact measures of 21,427 acres, we have modern estimates of the nearly co-ordinate parishes amounting to 36,074 acres.

This gives about 181½ acres of Domesday measure to the Præ-Domesday Hide, and about 261 acres of modern measure to the same hide.

If our theory as to the acreage of the plough-land be definitively adopted, it will further follow that Domesday, in measuring the manors of Whitstone Hundred, omitted all notice of some 14,647 acres (that is, more than a third of the actual and geometrical area).

That some part of the territory thus ignored was Royal Forest we cannot say. If it were, it is buried in the Domesday measures of some manor or other of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*.—

But as to the bulk of the ignored territory, we repeat once more our settled conviction that the Domesday Survey of Somerset often omits to measure or to notice in any way, vast areas of unsettled, unoccupied, and utterly worthless waste. In Whitstone Hundred we are in a land of moors and marshes, alternating with rocks and barren downs. East Sedgemoor, Godney Moor, and large portions of the Mendip range bounded, or intruded upon, the lands of Domesday registration.

The Domesday value of Witestane Hundred, viz., £140 per annum was at the rate of £1 0s. 3¼d. per hide or quasi-hide ; and of 1.5681 penny and decimals of a penny per acre of Domesday Registration ; also at the rate of £1 0s. 1¾d. per plough-land, and of £1 6s. 0½d. for each of 107½ teams actually employed.

The number of Villani, Bordarii, Cotarii, and Servi abiding in Witestane Hundred, A.D. 1086 was 410. This gives a single labourer to every 52½ acres of Domesday Registration ; to every 41 acres of arable land ; and to every 31½ acres of land actually ploughed.

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR WILLITON HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, PP. 71, 72).

In Hundreto Willetonæ sunt iiii.xx hid. et xii et dim. hida (<u>92 hides, 2 virgates</u>).		H. V. F.
Inde habet Rex de Gildo suo £16 11s. 6d. pro		55 1 0
Et Rex et Barones sui habent in suo dominio <u>23 hidas, 3 virg. 3 fert.</u>		
De his habet Rex in Dominio i hidam et i virgatum	1 1 0	
Et Abbas de Muceleneia i hidam	1 0 0	
Et Dodo de Cori dimid. hidam	0 2 0	
Et Wills (de Moione) Vicecomes xii hid. et dim. et iii fertines.....	12 2 3	
Et et Ricerus de Stochas ii hid. quas tenet de elemosinâ Ecclesie.....	2 0 0	
Et Roger de Corcella iiij hidas et dimid.	4 2 0	
Et Alured de Hispania ii hidas	2 0 0	
	<u>23 3 3</u>	23 3 3
Et non habet Rex Gildum de vi hid. i. virg. i. fert. quas tenent Villani de Netelcoma } et de Unnesforda et de Delvertona.....	6 1 1	
Nec de iii hidis quas tenet Ansgar Cocus de Comite Roberto	3 0 0	
Nec de i hidâ de Imela et Oda et Waitstou	1 0 0	
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Rotbertus filius Rotselini.....	0 1 0	
Nec de i virgâ quam tenet Rannulfus de Strangestona	0 1 0	
Nec de i virgâ de Letfort	0 1 0	
Nec de i virgâ de Pirtochesworda quam tenet Dodeman et Ricardus	0 1 0	
	<u>11 1 1</u>	11 1 1
De hoc Hundreto sunt adhuc retro de Gildo Regis £3 7s. 10½d. (which, at 6 shillings per hide, is the exact charge on 11 hides 1 virg. 1 fertin).		
Et de ii hidis quas tenet Malgerus de Kartrai habet Rex Gildum suum, sed in alio } Hundreto persolvit		2 0 0
		<u>92 2 0</u>

INQUISICIO GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR WINESFORT HUNDRED (INQ. GHELDI, P. 72).

In Winesfort Hundret sunt ii hidæ et i fertinum.

De hoc habet Rex dimidiam hidam in dominio	0	2	0
Et de i hidâ et dimidiâ (hidâ) et i fertino nou habet Rex gildum ..	1	2	1
	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>

De hoc Hundreto debentur Regi 9s. 4½d. (which, at 6s. per hide, is exactly the Gheld due to 1 hide, 2 virgates, and 1 fertine).

NOTES ON THE ABOVE INQUESTS OF WILLITON AND WINSFORD HUNDREDS.

THE KING'S concern in Williton Hundred arose in his holding by Escheat the four Comital Manors of Dulverton, Nettlecombe, Winsford, and Capton. However, it was only a part of Winsford which was, at the date of the Inquests, interred in Williton Hundred. The King's demesne in Winsford, and part of the Villeinage, as yet remained a distinct Franchise, and was assessed in a distinct Inquest. The two Inquests, thus arising, may be considered as one.

The Inquests speak of 1¾ hides in the two Hundreds as being in the King's demesne, and of (6h. 1v. 1f. + 1h. 2v. 1f. =) 7 hid. 3 virg. 2 fert. (of villanage, evidently) being in arrear. The Inquests, therefore, survey (1h. 3v. 0f. + 7h. 3v. 2f. =) 9h. 2v. 2f. of the King's territory. H. V. F.

Domesday, on the other hand, specifies Royal demesnes, in the above four manors, amounting to 2 1 2 It specifies 4 items of Villeinage in the same (1h. 2v. + 1h. 2v. 2f. + 3h. + 2 virg.) amounting to 6 2 2 And it gives, as additamenta of Dulverton and Winsford (1. 3. 3½. + 0. 2. 0. =) 2 1 3½

Total 11 1 3½

The increase of the King's demesnes by 2½ virgates means, or may mean, nothing more than that the King's Officers had taken so much away from the villeinage of the said manors.

The seeming net increase of the whole territory by 1 hide, 3 virgates, 1½ fertines, may be a mere 'Domesday Increment,' or may mean that the Gheld, proper to so much land, had been duly paid in A.D. 1084.

THE ABBOT OF MUCHELNEY'S estate was Chipstable (2½ hides). Domesday gives him only a half-hide of demesne therein.

DODO DE CORI is named in Domesday among the English Thaners. He is called simply Dodo. His estate was at Stowe (now Nether Stowey), and was 3 virgates, only one of which he seems to retain in demesne. Domesday expressly says that this estate was "in Hundreto de Wellintuna." Williton is meant; but instances of Domesday mentioning any Hundred of the South-Western circuit are rare.

WILLIAM DE MOIGNE'S Dominical Manors in this Hundred are most easily gathered from Domesday, though, of the five, we can only assign to three their modern representatives. His demesnes, in 1084, stand at 12 hides, 2¾ virgates; also, in 1086, at 12 hides, 2¾ virgates.

WHETHER THE OBLITERATION preceding the name of RICHER DE STOKES conceals the name of a colleague or co-partner is not determinable by the verb (in a singular number) which follows. Such an error occurs below in this very Inquest. Richer de Stokes was a Norman, an almoner of the King. He appears in Domesday as Richer de Andeli, and as holding the Church of St. Mary of Warverdinestoc, with its 2 hides of land. Hence we learn that he got his English name from his benefice being in one of the Stokes. How the Church of Waverdine-Stoke is now represented is an ulterior question.

ROGER DE CORCELLA'S demesnes in this Hundred stand at 4½ hides. In Domesday he appears with several estates in this quarter, but in only one, Cliva (now Kilve), does he retain any specific demesne. The said demesne was 2 hides, 3 fertines. The change was due to the recent feoffments of his tenants, Alric, or Norman, or William.

ALURED DE HISPANIA'S 2 hides of demesne seem to reoccur in Domesday as in his Manor of Estalweia; which we take to be Nether Stowey.

THE VILLANAGIUM specifically given by Domesday to Dulverton, Winsford, and Nettlecombe is only 6 hides, 2 fertines. It is possible that the Fegadri of 1084 had found a larger villeinage in those three manors than continued in 1086. It is possible that their calculations embraced a part at least of the Villeinage of Capton.

ANSGER COCUS.—His only estate in this Hundred was Lulestoc (Lilstock). It was 5 hides. In Domesday he holds it, not of the Comte of Moretain, but of the King. That Ansgar who appears so often in Domesday as tenant of the Comte of Moretain, was Ansgar de Montacute. Whether Ansgar Cocus was distinct or identical, there is no suspicion of inaccuracy in the Inquest, for had Ansgar Cocus been a tenant *in capite* in 1084, his default on 3 hides would be inexplicable, as would also his non-appearance among the exemptions for this Hundred. Domesday gives him $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides as held in demesne, but is incoherent about the other part of his estate. It is clear that between 1084 and 1086 Ansgar Cocus changed his Suzerain at Lulstock. His neglect to pay Danegeld may have been a symptom of the change.

IMELA, Odo, and WAISTOU were three vills, probably in St. Decuman's parish, occupied by Villeins only who paid their rents to the King's Manor of Williton. Their non-payment of gheld in 1084 was probably due to non-liability. Domesday puts their collective tenements at $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides,—an undoubted and clear case of the 'increment' which the Commissioners set upon the estates of certain Hundreds, and which results in the Domesday estimate of such Hundreds appearing so often to exceed the estimate propounded by the Gheld-Collectors of 1084.

ROBERT FITZ ROSCELINE was Ralph Paganell's tenant of an estate written in Domesday as Wiahalla. It was only 1 virgate, and held by Robert entirely in demesne. His default in 1084 was accordingly for the whole estate.

RANNULF DE STRANGESTON'S default on one virgate was probably for some item of estate held under Alured de Hispania in 1084, but which did not remain with Rannulf in 1086. Domesday gives him as Alured's tenant at Strington in 1086, but Strington was in Cannington Hundred.

LETFORT appears in Domesday (p. 473, Exon D.) as 'Ledforda,' a virgate of land annexed to the King's Manor of Williton. Its insolvency in 1084 means non-liability.

THE NON-SOLVENT VIRGATE IN PIRTOCHESWORDA was of the same character. It was a virgate taken out of William de Moione's Manor of *Elwoda* (now Elworthy), and annexed to the King's Manor of Williton (Exon D., 340). Though Dodeman and Richard are said to hold this virgate in the Inquest of 1084, Domesday exhibits Dodeman only, and him as Moione's tenant in the bulk of his Manor of Elworthy.

FOR MALOER DE CARTRAI'S complex Gheld account we refer elsewhere (*Supra*, p. 113). His estate in Williton Hundred was Brushford (2 hides) held under the Comte of Moretain.

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF WINSFORD HUNDRED.

This Inquest may be looked upon as merely supplementary to that of Williton Hundred. It does not assess the whole of Winsford, which was, with its *aditamentum*, four hides. We take it to be adjustive of some omissions which had been made in the Inquest of Williton Hundred. It almost follows that the Censors (Fegadri) of Williton Hundred, estimating its contents as $92\frac{1}{2}$ hides, omitted $2\frac{1}{16}$ hides of the contents of Winsford. Our Table of the two Hundreds should therefore aim at realizing from Domesday an area of $94\frac{9}{16}$ hides. We shall find Domesday increments yet more than would satisfy such a calculation (See Vol. ii, p. 35).

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 35-36) OF WILLITON AND WINSFORD HUNDREDS.

DULVERTON.—NETTLECOMBE.—WINSFORD.—CAPTON.—The hidation of these Comital Manors was privileged. They were all in the custody of William de Moione, then Sheriff of Somerset. Their farms were payable in 'White Money,' which would add about 5 per cent. to the values recorded in the Table, or £1 14s. 9½d. to the gross values of the Hundred.

DULVERTON.—Under this Manor, Domesday says—"De hâc mansione sunt ablata xxiv oves quas reddebat Brigeport, mansio Comitum de Moritonio, die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus per consuetudinem, sed postquam Malgerus recepit terram de Comite non fuit reddita hæc consuetudo."

NETTLECOMBE was held *T. R. E.* by "Godwin son of Harold,"—of *Earl* Harold obviously, seeing that it was a Comital Manor. Earl Harold's son, Godwin, probably legitimate and of age in 1066, is not new to history. Harold's own age, as ascertained by Mr. Freeman, quite consists with his having a son, of full age in 1066. In the valuation of this Manor both Domesdays omit the Pounds. The Table supplies the omission with all moral probability.

WINSFORD and CONGRESBURY are the only two Comital Manors of Somerset which are treated as distinct Hundreds by any extant Inquests of 1084. It seems doubtful whether such Inquests were imperative.

If they were, then Inquests of King's Brompton, Old Cleeve, Creech St. Michael, and North Curry were taken, and are lost.

Of the half-hide held by three Thegns *T. R. E.* and since added to Winsford, the Exon Domesday says, "Hæc reddit in firmâ Regis (de Winesforda) xx solidos, et quando Willelmus de Moione recepit tantuudem." And of the Thegns it says "Isti Tanni debebant ire in servitium Præpositi hujus manerii per consuetudinem absque omni firmâ *donante*." The change of tenure was precisely that by which 'Thegmland' became 'Reeveland.'

In the Schedule of "Terre Occupatæ" (Exon D., p. 479) the name Winsford is erroneously written. The Record says "Rex habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur *Winescuma* quam tenuit Tostinus Comes. Huic addita est dimidia hida terræ quam tenuerunt iii Tanni pariter die qua Rex E. fuit vivus et mortuus: et reddit per annum xx solidos in firmâ Regis."

CARMA (Quarum in Winsford).—Godebold, a Serviens Regis, an Arbalister in fact, had a number of estates in Devon, but only this one in Somerset. Being a *tenant in capite per Serjantiam* it is strange that his demesne in Quarum should have had no exemption in the Inquest of 1084.

ECCLESIA SANCTÆ MARIE IN WARVERDINESTOC.—Stogumber proper, called Waverdines-Stoke in Domesday, seems to have consisted entirely of this Church-estate of two hides. The tutelage of St. Mary is still bespoken for the Church of Stogumber. It is called in Pope Nicholas' Taxation the Church of "Stokgummer." As to the name Waverdine-stoc, a place called Wardeston in time of Edward III., though not identical, seems to have preserved a cognate etymology.

COLEFORD.—Collinson (iii. 546) omits de Corcelle's, and notices only De Moione's, share of Coleford.

HEWIS (Lud Huish).—Collinson (iii. 541) notices Lud Huish as distinct from Hewis (Begarn Huish), but does not give the Domesday type of the former.

ESTALWEIA (Nether Stowey).—Caput of the Barony of Alured de Hispania's descendants. Collinson (iii. 550) traces the origin of this important Manor in Ralph de Pomeroy's Manor of *Estaweia*, which we take to have been a small manor of the same district.

The Mother Church of this district was at Over Stowey in Cannington Hundred. When Nether Stowey became a parish of itself, a great portion of its old manorial constituents remained in the parish of the Mother Church, and so continue at this day.

Domesday says of Alured de Hispania's second Manor of Estalweia, "Hæc est addita terris Alwi quas Alveredus tenet." It means that whereas Alwi Banneson was elsewhere the antecessor of Alured of Spain, here his antecessors were two other Thegns named Oswald and Alfred.

WAIECOMA (Weacombe in West Quantoxhead).—Here is a case of a *Bordarius* holding land at a fixed rent: viz., one virgate at an annual rent of 7s. 6d. Three other virgates in the same Manor realized rents of 8s. 4d. each. These virgates seem to have each contained 45 acres of arable land. The rent of the first virgate was therefore 2d. per acre.

CHILVETUN (Kilton).—The Knight-tenant is written in the Exon Domesday (p. 339) as *Radulfusus*. We presume Radulf Rufus to have been intended. He held largely under the Bishop of Coutances. In the Schedule of *Terre Occupatæ* the name *Chilvetuna* is changed to *Duictona*;—by mere error probably.

CLIVA (Kilve).—Collinson (iii. 532) makes Corcelle's two Manors of Selve, *al. Selua*, to be typical of Kilve. We prefer Cliva; and take both Selves to have been parts of Silver (*postea* Monksilver).

PERLESTONA.—probably near Kilve, but the name is lost. It originated with Perlo, a Thegu of the Confessor's time. Very seldom did a Saxon of so late a date give name to any locality. More seldom still did a name, so given, abide.

ELWRDA (Elworthy).—An estate of privileged hidation. One of William de Moione's four virgates had been wrested to the Royal Manor of Williton.

MILDETUNA, SINDERCOMA (Mill Town and Syndercombe).—These places though now in Clatworthy parish, were at the date of Domesday in Williton Hundred, when also Clatworthy was in Sheriff's Brompton Hundred (*Vide supra*, p. 111). Sheriff's Brompton having since been annexed to the Hundred of Williton and Free Manors, all the previous anomaly has vanished.

CROWECOMA (Crowcombe).—This place, said by Domesday to have been held *T. R. E.* by *Sanctus Suitunus Wintoniæ*, had been given to the Cathedral Church of St. Swythyn by Gytha, wife of Earl Godwin, in expiation of sundry sacrileges committed by her husband. The Comte of Moretain seized it at the

Conquest. His tenant, called 'Robert Constable' in Domesday, was ancestor of Beauchamp of Hatch. Collinson is in great error as to this estate.

WIDEPOLLA (Withypool).—Of Robert de Otburville's tenancy here, Domesday says.—"De istâ (terrâ) solebat Rotbertus reddere xx solidos de firmâ Præposito Regis de Winesforda, et modo est deraciocinata ad Teglandam."—A lawsuit had recently determined Withypool to be *Tegland*, that is, Robert de Auberville was to pay no more rent, but to hold *in capite per serjantiam*. His Saxon antecessors at Withypool, viz., Dodo, Almar, and Godric, had evidently been Royal Foresters, and their land had been *Tegland* as opposed to *Reeveland*, or land on which a rent was payable to some Reeve or Officer of the Crown. There are many similar appearances in Domesday of recent question and settlement of De Auberville's estates and position; we say *recent* because in this as in other cases no exemption, such as that to which a tenant by Serjeantry was entitled, had been recorded in D'Auberville's favour in the Inquests of 1084.

AN ANONYMOUS MANOR, following *Widepolla* in the Table, is thus described in Domesday.—"Rodbertus de Odburvilla habuit i virgam terræ quam tenuit Dodo pariter die quâ Rex E. fuit vivus et mortuus. Hæc addita fuit mansioni Regis quæ vocatur Dolvertona. Modo iterum dijudicata est esse Teglanda et valet per annum 10 solidos." Both Dodo and Robert de Auberville were in their day King's Foresters. D'Auberville had not lost his estate, he had rescued it by suit-at-law from all liability as a member of *Dulverton*. It had been *Tegland* under Dodo; now it was analogously part of a Serjeantry, that is held by service other than rent. The specific estate was perhaps in *Hawkridge*, a vill not formed so early as Domesday, and which (See Collinson, iii. 529) was afterwards held in Serjeantry.

ESSATUNA (Exton).—Three virgates of land annexed (A.D. 1086) to this Manor of the Bishop of Coutances, had before the Conquest belonged to Godwin, Haroldsson's Manor of *Nettlecombe*, now (A.D. 1086) a Royal Escheat (Exton and *Nettlecombe* are ten miles apart).

WIAHALLA, *al.* NEUHALL.—Newhall is a hamlet in *Holford* parish (Collinson iii. 457). We may presume that 'parochial attraction' has now drawn Newhall from the Hundred of Williton to that of Whitley.

HIWYS (Huish Champflower).—Roger Arundel probably obtained this valuable and privileged estate within the two years preceding the Domesday Survey. There had been no exemption recorded in his favour on the Inquest of Williton Hundred in A.D. 1084. Privileged hidation marks many estates of his Saxon antecessor, *Alric*. This *Alric* is perhaps he who, in other relations, is called *Aluric Cild*.

ASWEI (Ashway in *Hawkridge*).—Among the live stock, Domesday enumerates *xxi porcos et xxvi inter oves et capras, i. e.*, "twelve swine, and what with sheep and she-goats, twenty-six head."

WILLITONE AND WINESFORD HUNDREDS.—The Inquisitional hidage of these two Hundreds in A.D. 1084, was (92½ hides + 2¼ hides =) 94 hides, 2 virgates, 1 fertine. The hidage apparently furnished by Domesday particulars for the same two Hundreds is collectively 97 hides, 1 virgate, 3½ fertines. The excess of the latter (viz., 2 hides, 3 virgates, 2½ fertines) is so reasonable a 'Domesday Increment' as to require no further remark.

Parochial acreages amounting to 60,408 acres, are the nearest counterpart which the nature of the case allows us to tabulate as against the above Domesday hidage.

In this case then the Domesday hide is represented by about 620 acres of modern ascertainment.

Included in the above manorial hidage, though not in the above parochial acreage, are certain parts of *Bicknoller*, 1390 acres; *Exmoor*, 20,765 acres; *Hawkridge*, 3,725 acres; *Upton*, 3,779 acres. But a part also of these parishes and acreages undoubtedly belonged to the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ* of Domesday, and was extra-Hundredal. The whole parochial acreages are at all events tabulated with the Royal Manor of Williton. (See Table ii, pp. 1 and 2).

In the present Hundred of Williton and Free-Manors, though not in the Domesday Hundred of Williton, are *Brompton-Regis*, 8810 acres; *Old Cleeve*, 4793 acres; *St. Decumans* (including Williton itself), 3,758 acres. These places, too, were extra-Hundredal at the date of Domesday, and were in the hands of the King, either as *Comes*, or *Jure Coronæ*.

Included in the modern Hundred of Williton and Free-Manors, but not in the Old Hundred of Williton, neither in the above hidage nor parochial acreage, were *Brompton Ralph* and *Clatworthy*, which at the date of Domesday formed the independent Hundred of Sheriff's *Brompton*;—and *Halse*, which was in the Domesday Hundred of *Taunton*. The removal of *Halse* to the Hundred of Williton and Free Manors has been already discussed. (*Supra*, p. 194).

It has been necessary to state all these particulars about the Old Hundred of Williton. In order that there might be no misapprehension about the very remarkable Domesday phenomenon which yet remains to be dealt with. Parallel with the 97 hides, 1 virgate, $3\frac{1}{2}$ fertines, instanced in the Table and extracted from Domesday, there is, also in Domesday, a registered acreage of arable land, wood-land, meadow, and pasture, amounting to 69,084 acres. This gives the astonishing proportion of nearly 710 measured acres to each Domesday hide ; moreover, the exact acreage of the Hundred exceeds the instanced parochial acreage by $(69,084 - 60,408 =)$ 8676 acres. This, however, can be explained without departing from our principles of Domesday mensuration and comparison. Take Earl Tostig's Manor of Winsford, for instance. It is geldable as $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides. It contained 18,568 acres of registered land (viz., 7200 acres of arable land, 40 acres of wood, 8 acres of meadow, and 11,320 acres of pasture). But the modern parish, which we are obliged to enter on our Table against all this acreage and against three other manors containing $1\frac{3}{4}$ hides, or 1634 acres of Domesday registration,—the modern parish, thus set against $(18,568 + 1634)$ 20,202 Domesday acres, measures only 8656 acres.—

The solution is that the pasture (11,320 acres) which Domesday attributed to the *Manor* of Winsford lay mostly in the districts which are now parochialized under the names of Exmoor and Hawkridge, whose whole acreage, merely for the sake of convenience, we have tabularly assigned to the *Vetus Dominicum Corona*. (See Table, Vol. ii, pp. 1 and 2). This instance showing how the comparative measures of a single manor affect the measures of a whole Hundred, does not affect calculations on a still broader scale ; nor does it even touch the larger conclusion that the Manors and Hundreds of North Western Somerset are made by Domesday technicality to include Forests and Chaces which actually and topographically lay in other districts.

Another and more easily verified feature about the Domesday Hundred of Williton was its extremely favourable hidation. Each hide of the Hundred was on an average co-ordinate with some 416 acres of arable land, to say nothing of meadows, nor of woods and pastures, not here reckoned of.

The Domesday value of Williton Hundred, viz., £151 4s. 8d. per annum, was at the rate of £1 11s. 0½d. per hide ; and at the rate (of course insignificant) of .5253 decimals of a penny per Domesday acre ; also at the rate of 8s. 11½d. per plough-land, and of 14s. 5d. for each of 209½ teams actually employed.

The number of Villeins, Boors, and Serfs abiding in Williton Hundred, A.D. 1086, was 665. This gives a single labourer to each 104 acres of Domesday registration ; to each 62 acres of plough-land ; and to each 39 acres of land actually ploughed.

Williton Hundred was, in point of area, far the largest of any in Somerset ; more than a third of its plough-land was not in cultivation at the date of Domesday. Next to the Hundreds of Cutcomb and Minehead, it had the scantiest population of any Hundred, not excepting even that of Carhampton.

INQUISICIO-GHELDI (A.D. 1084) FOR WINTERSTOKE HUNDRED (INQ.-GHELDI, P. 69).

(This Inquest is amended and restored by its own constructive evidence.)

"In Hundreto Winest . . . vi.xx hid. virgæ."			
(In Hundreto Winestocæ sunt vi. xx et ix. hidæ et dimidia virg. (129 hid. 2 fertin.)			H. V. F.
Inde habet Rex de gildo suo xiii (read <i>xxiii</i>) libras et iii sol. et lx (read <i>i</i>) denar. }			77 0 3
et i obolum pro lxx.vii hid. (supply <i>et iii fertinis</i>) }			
. (supply <i>Et Bar</i>)ones Regis habent inde in dominio suo xl (supply <i>hidas</i>)			
et i virgam. (40h. 1v. 0f.)		H. V. F.	
(<i>De his habet</i> , supplied) "Walchelinus Episcopus x hidas in dominio"	10	0	0
"Et Giso Episcopus vi" (supply <i>hidas</i>)	6	0	0
(Supply <i>Et Abbas Glastingber</i>) "iensus iiij hidas et iii virgas"	4	3	0
"Et Comes Eustachius iii hidas et i fertinum"	3	0	1
"Et Serlo de Burceo v hidas et virgam et dimidiam"	5	1	2
"Et Willelmus de Falesia vii hidas et dimid. et iii fertinos"	7	2	3
"Et Walscinus de Duaco iii hidas et virgam et dimidiam"	3	1	2
	40	1	0
"Non habet Rex Gildum pro iiij hidas quas tenet Radulfus Tortemanus de Gisone	}	4	0
Episcopo"			
"Nec de mansione quæ vocatur Harp(<i>ctreu</i> supplied) quam tenet Robertus filius	}	5	0
Walteri pro v hidas			
(<i>Nec pro dimidiâ</i> supplied) "hidâ quam tenet Osbernus de Gilberto fil. Tuoldi"			2
"Nec pro dimid. hidâ quam tenet Aluuard de Anscetillo Parcario"			2
"Nec pro dimidiâ hida quam tenet Aselinus de Episcopo de S'to. (<i>Lauda</i> supplied)			2
"Nec pro i virgâ et iii fert. quas tenet Willelmus de Falesia"			1
"Nec pro i fertino de terrâ Serlonis de Burceo"			1
"Nec pro dimidiâ hidâ et iii fertinis de quibus Fegadri reddere non potuerunt	}	2	3
rationem"			
	11	2	3
			129 0 2

"De hoc Hundreto sunt adhuc retro de Gildo Regis lxx solidi et iii oboli (£3 10s. 1½d.) et quos deberet (read *debebat*) Rex habuisse et isti sunt vadiati in misericordiâ Regis."

(N.B. The sum of £3 10s. 1½d, at 6 shillings per hide, is the exact assessment on 11 hides 2¾ virgates, which were in default or arrear.)

Security had to be given that these arrears should be accounted for to the King's satisfaction.

NOTES ON THE INQUEST OF WINTERSTOKE HUNDRED.

- BISHOP WALCHELINE'S demesne of 10 hides was so much of his Manor of Bleadon.
- BISHOP GISO'S 6 hides of demesne were so much of his Manor of Banwell.
- THE ABBOT OF GLASTONBURY'S demesne (4¾ hides) are repeated *literatim*, in Domesday, as his demesne in his Manor of Winscombe (in all containing 15 hides).
- COMTE EUSTACE'S demesne of 3¼ hides reappears in Domesday as a demesne of 4 hides in Lochestona (now Loxton).
- SERLO DE BURCI'S demesne (5 hides 1½ virgates) appears in Domesday as a demesne of 7½ hides in Blagdon.
- WILLIAM DE FALAISE'S demesne of 7 hides 2¾ virgates is reduced in Domesday to a demesne of 7 hides 1 virgate in Worsprinca (now Woodspring in Kewstoke parish).
- WALTER DE DOUAI'S demesne of 3 hides, 1 virgate, 2 fertins are precisely reproduced in Domesday as so much demesne in his Manor of Worle.
- RALPH TORMEAIN'S arrear was 4 out of 5½ hides which he held under Bishop Giso in Banwell.
- ROBERT FITZ WALTER'S default was in respect of the whole of his Manor in East Harptree, held under the Comte de Moretain.

OSBERN's default was in respect of 2 virgates out of six which he held in Chiwestoc (Kewstoke) under Gilbert fitz Turolf (Exon Domes., p. 415).

ALWARD's default was in respect of two virgates out of four which he held in Mideltona (Milton near Kewstoke) under Anschetil Parker (Exon Domes., 443).

ASCELINE's tenures in this Hundred under the Bishop of St. Lo (Coutances) were so various that it is impossible to detect the particular half-hide which was left in arrear of gheld.

WILLIAM DE FALAISE.—The arrear on $1\frac{3}{4}$ virgates charged against William de Falaise was on the exact difference between 7h. 2v. 3f. (his alleged demesne in 1084) and 7 hides, 1 virgate (his demesne recognized in Domesday). So much land, therefore ($1\frac{3}{4}$ virgates), is, in different shapes, quoted twice over in the Inquisicio, and went by so much to add a fictitious area to the Hundred. In other words, the Fegadri, having allowed 7h. 2v. 3f. of demesne to stand as exempt in the upper portion of their account, should not, in the lower portion, have surcharged a part of that demesne as liable. This, and some similar mistake as to a single virgate, probably caused the deficiency of gheld on $2\frac{3}{4}$ virgates, for which they were unable to account. They had, in fact, made estimate of the Hundred as containing 129 hides, 3 fertins. It probably contained only 128 hides, 1 virgate, and 3 fertins.

SERLO DE BURC's default of gheld on 1 fertin was probably on so much of his *villanagium* in Blagdon. He was, perhaps, taking portions of his Villeinage into hand; but had operated too late on this specific portion to entitle it to exemption. The Fegadri looked upon it as still villeinage, and assessable; but, as there was no Villein in occupation, they must needs surcharge the owner.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 37-38) OF WINTERSTOKE HUNDRED.

BLEDONA.—*Est de victu monachorum*, says Domesday; that is the Bishop held Bleadon, not as a possession of his See, but on behalf of the Monks of his Cathedral Monastery at Winchester.

The acreage of Bleadon parish is 2795 acres. This gives $186\frac{1}{2}$ acres as representing the Domesday hide. The measures of Domesday which we call exact, make the Manor to contain 2827 acres.

WINSCOMA.—The total of 15 hides given as the hidage of Winscombe includes one virgate, which is not mentioned in the Domesday details. The details include and specify as one of the said 15 hides, a hide held by the Bishop of Coutances under the King, and by Herlewin under the Bishop. This hide is surveyed in duplicate, in the Bishop of Coutances' and in the Abbot of Glastonbury's Schedules (Exon Domesday, 129-130; 479 and 148). In the Bishop's Schedule it is called Wintret. Therefore Winterhead, which is now in Shipham parish, was *T. R. E.* a member, manorially, of Winscombe.

BANUELLA.—The Banuella of Domesday included Banwell (4829 acres), Puxton (613 acres), Churchill (2497 acres), and Compton Bishop (2535 acres; in all 10,474 acres. The Domesday measures amounted to only 5320 acres. This has been explained on former pages (*supra*, pp. 32, 33, 125).

KEWSTOKE AND WOODSPRING.—The six Domesday estates which pass under the names of Worsprinca (3 estates), Chiwestoc (1 estate), and Mideltona or Mildetuna (2 estates), are nearly represented in the modern parishes of Kewstoke (2428 acres), and Locking (1016 acres). A hidage of $13\frac{1}{4}$ hides given for the 6 estates, when compared with an acreage of 3444 acres for the two parishes, gives a proportion of 260 acres to the hide. The exact measures of Domesday realize only 3086 acres for the six estates. Locking is not verbally mentioned in Domesday, but that it belonged to this group of estates is proved by its subsequent history.

BLACCHEDONA (Blagdon) was the Caput of Serlo de Burci's Barony. Blagdon and Uphill with other of his estates went to his descendants the Barons Fitz Martin.

ASHCOMBE, now a Township of Weston-super-Mare, is the sole Domesday representative of both places. The first item of estate ($2\frac{3}{4}$ hides) is made the subject of duplicate entries in the Domesday Text, and again of duplicate entries in the Schedule of Terræ Occupatæ.

CHENT, now Kenn, was evidently a postscriptive entry on the Bishop of Coutances' Domesday Schedule. It had, perhaps recently, and in almost a desert state, been allotted to the Bishop. Its hidage (half a hide) had at this rate, not been reckoned in the estimate of 1084.

COMTUNA.—Walter de Douai's double Manor is understood by Collinson to have been the estate which, afterwards devolving on the See of Wells, was therefore called Compton Bishop. And truly De Douai or his descendants did make large benefactions in other quarters to the See of Wells.

206 THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—THE HUNDREDS OF SOMERSET.

It should be noted that the Domesday measures of Walter de Douai's double manor amount to 762 acres, whereas the present parish of—

COMPTON BISHOP comprises 2535 acres. This possibly may mean no more than that the Manor, being Episcopal, had a parish annexed to it out of one or more circumjacent manors.

It is in deference to authorities most entitled to respect that we make Compton an original member of Banwell. By so doing we fail to find an antitype to Comte Eustace's Manor of Contitone (see Table of unidentified Manors, Vol ii, pp., 41-42).

WINTERSTOKE HUNDRED.—If our collection of the Domesday materials of the Old Hundred be correct, we see that the Domesday hidage (128½ hides), falls short of that of the previous Inquest (129½ hides) by 2½ virgates. We have probably given some small manor of this Hundred to another Hundred.

The modern Hundred of Winterstoke includes 27 parishes. Eighteen of these parishes represent manors which, in 1084-6, seem to have constituted the Old Hundred of Winterstoke. Of the parishes added to the Hundred, one parish, Rodney Stoke, represents a Manor of Old Cheddar Hundred; three parishes, viz. Axbridge, Charterhouse-on-Mendip, and Cheddar represent Crown estates not appurtenant to any Domesday Hundred; two parishes, viz. Congresbury and Wick St. Lawrence, formed a distinct præ-Domesday Hundred; one parish, Badgeworth, was in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Bimastan (*vide* vol. ii, pp. 13-14); one parish, Yatton, was in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Chewton; and one parish, Rowberrow, was probably in the præ-Domesday Hundred of Sudbrent (which will be described in the sequel).

TABLE OF THE COMPARATIVE MEASURES OF (OLD) WINTERSTOKE HUNDRED.

Domesday Manors.	Domesday Hidage. H. v. F.	Domesday Plough-lands.	Corresponding Arable Acreage.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Acreages.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.
Bledona.....	15 0 0	17	2040	0 1	50 16	720 0	2827	Bledon	2795
Banuella	30 0 0	40	4800	300	100	120	5320	{ Banwell	4829
								{ Churchill	616
								{ Puxton	2497
								{ Compton Bishop	2535
								{ 10,474 acres in all	4140
Winescoma	15 0 0	30	3600	2880	60	120	6660	Winscombe	4140
{ Worspicoa	6 1 0	12	1440	10	10	10			
{ Added thereto	3 0 0	3	960	0	0	0			
{ Chivwestoc	1 2 0	2	240	10	20	20		{ Kewstoke	2428
{ Midelftona	1 0 0	1	120	2	6	20		{ Locking	1016
{ Sipeham	4 0 0	6	720	10	3	200	933	Shipham	766
{ Lachestona	5 0 0	7	840	6	50	60	956	Loxton	1203
{ Blachedona	10 0 0	10	1200	200	10	120	1530	Blagdon	3457
Opopilla.....	6 2 0	10	1200	0	70	100	1370	{ Uphill	1077
								{ Christon	571
Worla	6 2 0	15	1800	0	50	260	2110	Worle	1810
{ Hassecomba	2 3 0	3	360	10	31	0			
{ Aisecoma	3 2 0	5	600	3	40	100	1144	Weston-super-Mare	1590
{ Hoctona	5 0 0	5	600	15	30	200			
{ Illebera	3 0 0	4	480	0	20	40	1385	Hutton.....	1877
{ Harpedreu	5 0 0	5	600	100	40	400			
{ Harpetreu	5 0 0	5	600	60	40	400	2240	East Harptree	2770
Chent.....	0 2 0	Kenn	1013
Pantsheda	0 2 0	..	60	60	1013
								alibi.
	129 0 0	185½	22,260	3607	616	2898	29,381		37,001

The modern parochial acreage (37,001 acres), less the acreage (29,381 acres) registered in Domesday, leaves 7620 acres not registered in that Record. Such an acreage of moorland or marsh, utterly valueless, is quite consistent with the state of the district eight centuries since.

The Domesday Hide of Winterstoke Hundred is represented by about 287 acres of modern ascertainment and, most plausibly, by 227½ acres of Domesday recognition.

The Domesday value of Winterstoke Hundred, viz., £113 5s. per annum, was at the rate of 17s. 6½d. per hide; and of .925 decimals of a penny per Domesday acre; also at the rate of 12s. 2½d. per plough-land.

The evidences indicate a poor country and a favourable hidation.

NON-INQUISITIONAL HUNDREDS, LIBERTIES, AND MANORS OF SOMERSET.

We now proceed with notices of those ten Hundreds, Liberties, or Manors, which are not touched by any extant Inquest of A.D. 1084.

A Table of each such Franchise will be found in Vol. II, pp. 37-38, 39-40, 41-42. The evidences which supply or suggest the older name, and the contents, of each Hundred or Liberty, will be given in the notes here following.—

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 37-38) OF SOMERTON HUNDRED.

The Caput of this Hundred was the Royal Manor of Somerton, a manor of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*, ingeldable and never hidated. The Manor of Somerton belongs therefore to another section of our enquiry (*vide* Vol ii, pp. 1-2). It could not with any consistency be placed on a Table of the Hundred of which it was the Caput, though all its accessories and decurtations, at whatever time we can find them to have been hidated, properly belonged at that time to the Hundred.

No Gheld-Inquest of Somerton Hundred is preserved, but the Hundred is named as such in contemporary Indices. The said Inquest is one which, having been necessarily made, has been obviously lost.

MANSIONES ADDITE SOMERTONÆ.—These were three Teglands, probably adjacent to the Royal Manor. Whereas, before the Conquest, some Saxon king had granted them *in thenagio*, so now the Conqueror, adding them to Somerton, had abolished the tenure-in-thenage, committing one estate to Villeins, granting another to Ogisius, a Norman, and continuing a third Thane, Saunus, in possession of the smaller estate—no longer to be held *in thenagio*, but as a fee-farm tenure in the Manor of Somerton.

DENESMODEVELLA.—This name seems to be undiscoverable in any modern locality. The place, being an old and perhaps distant member of the Manor of Somerton, had been given by King William to Alured of Spain, it may be in compensation of an estate in Martock, which had been taken from the said Alured (*vide supra* p. 91).

ADDITA CERLETONÆ.—The Exchequer Domesday takes no notice of this item of estate. The text of the Exon Domesday is similarly silent about it. But in the Schedule of *Terræ occupata* there is the following entry: “Ad mansionem Rogeri, Arundelli quæ vocatur Ceorlatona fuit addita dimidia hida terræ quam tenuit I. Tannus pariter die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus. Hanc tenuit Warmundus de Rogero et adhuc invocat eum ad garantiam sed Rogerus inde omnino deficit ab illo die quo Rex Willelmus hunc Warmundum de ipsâ terrâ resaisire fecit.” The reason why the Domesday Commissioners did not admit this estate into the text of their Survey is obvious. They did not know, they had no power of deciding, whether Warmundus held it lawfully, or who was his lawful Seigneur. We learn of a case in after times, and another county, where a tenant *in capite* unreasonably refusing livery to a sub-tenant, the latter appealed to the Crown, obtained livery and seizin, and became thenceforth a tenant *in capite sine medio*. In other terms, the mesne-Lordship escheated to the Crown.

CARI (Lytes Cary).—Humphrey Chamberlain's two estates in Cari are said “to be joined with the Honour of Bristric”; that is, when the Conqueror bestowed the estates of Brictric Algarsson (constituting, in other terms, the Honour of Gloucester) on Queen Matilda, he added thereto a Seigneurie over numberless small Thegns. This is known to have been the case in many instances, both in Dorset and Somerset. Another probable phase of the story is, that many Thegns (Ordric and Lovinc, for instance) having power to choose their own Suzerain, had either accepted the Advowry of Brictric before the Conquest, or of Queen Matilda after the Conquest. Humphrey Chamberlain, in turn, had been a favourite officer of the late Queen, who had given him estates and Lordships in many counties, and therewith a mediate ascendancy over such Thegns or Tenants as might happen to be in possession of the respective lands. That Humphrey got rid of his Thegn-tenants before Domesday is probable, but not proven. There are cases where smaller Thegns of the Saxon era, having ‘attorned’ to a Norman ‘Avoue,’ reappear in Domesday as his tenants in Villeinage.

SOMERTON HUNDRED.—Corresponding with the 58 hides, 3¼ virgates, which the Table concludes to have been the hidage of Somerton Hundred, we have Domesday exact measures amounting to (9745 + 490 =) 10,235 acres; of which 9360 acres were arable land; 176 acres were wood-land; 259 acres were meadow; and 440 acres were pasture.

HUNDREDS AND LIBERTIES ABSENT FROM THE INQUEST OF A.D. 1084.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II, PP. 37-38) OF PITNEY HUNDRED.

Pitney Hundred is perhaps only a post-Domesday severance from the præ-Domesday Hundred of Somerton.

The Inquests or Inquest of A.D. 1084, whether they assessed two or only one district, are lost. The coeval Indices of Somerset Hundreds, though they mention a Hundred of Somerton, say nothing of any Hundred of Pitney. The inference is that the former, at that time, included the latter.

Another reason for assuming such ancient combination is that the modern acreage of Somerton Hundred is greatly in excess of the Domesday areas of its manors, while, in Pitney Hundred, the excess is the other way. In short, with respect to this matter, we must combine the two Hundreds before we can realize a consistent and intelligible whole.

A third reason for the same presumption is that Langport, which has been annexed to Pitney Hundred, was at the date of Domesday, a member of the King's Manor of Somerton. On being detached from the Royal Manor, Langport would more naturally have fallen into Somerton Hundred than into Pitney Hundred; but if, as we suppose, the two Hundreds were indistinct at the time, the anomaly vanishes.

A fourth reason for supposing the original unity of the above two Hundreds would seem to date their severance as later than the 13th Century, for then the Manors of Pitney and Pitney-Wearne were held to be parcel of the King's Manor of Somerton, and Somerton was, ere then, interned in its cognominate Hundred.

DRAITUNA (Part of Drayton).—This great Manor of 20 hides was in two several Hundreds at the date of Domesday. A part of it (1½ hides), called *La More*, having been given to Roger de Corcelle, had been withdrawn from the Abbot of Muchelney's jurisdiction, and was in Bulstone Hundred. Another part (3¼ hides), also in Bulstone Hundred, was nevertheless in the Abbot of Muchelney's fee. And this is that part of Drayton parish which remains in Bulstone Hundred to this day. This part, with its presumed proportions of plough-land, wood, meadow, pasture, and annual value, is distinctly entered in the Table bearing on the subject (Vol. II., pp. 11, 12). The bulk of Drayton (*viz.*, 15½ hides) was in the Hundred of Pitney (or, perhaps Somerton) at the date of Domesday, and is duly included and described in the Table (Vol. II., pp. 37, 38), which we are now annotating.

The Domesday measures proper to this estate of Muchelney Abbey seem to be more than 7200 acres. The indication is that the Abbot had rights of wood, and pasture, and probably of chase, over a large area external to the parish of Drayton.

PETENEIA. WARNE (Two Pitneys and Pitney-Wearne).—The Exon Domesday is incomplete and unsatisfactory as to these three entries. The Table is compiled from more accurate particulars, supplied by the Exchequer Codex.

Wulward White, tenant *in capite*, of the two Pitney estates from 1866 to 1084, was deceased at the date (1085-6) of Domesday, and his estates were then *in manu Regis*.

WARNA (Pitney Warne).—This small estate was perhaps part of some compensation, made shortly before Domesday to Robert de Auberville for his losses elsewhere. Possibly it was one of Wulward White's newly escheated estates. Its non-geldability, *T. R. E.*, and its recently-wasted condition, thus become more intelligible.—That the land of the once-favoured Saxon should, at his death, be exposed to depredation, is not more unlikely than that King William should seize it and give it to a Norman.

THE MODERN HUNDRED OF PITNEY, besides the elements set forth in the Table (Vol. ii, pp. 37-38), has been made to include the whole of the home estate of Muchelney Abbey, with its adjuncts of Thorney and Middeney,—estates which so far from having been in any Domesday Hundred, were constituted an Extra-Hundredal, non-hidated, and ingeldable Liberty. Of that Liberty we shall have more to say in another chapter.

Here we venture to suggest that Pitney Hundred, at whatever time it was created, was improvised to consolidate, as far as might be, various estates of Muchelney Abbey, and that this arrangement, though it took something from the older Hundred of Somerton, was not allowed to interfere with the boundaries of Bulstone Hundred.

The following Table, combining and also distinguishing the various measures of each section of a whole district, will strengthen the oft-repeated axiom, that the Domesday Surveyors of Somerset did not register the whole territory under the correlative Manorial designations :—

Domesday Manors.	Domesday Hidage. H. v. F.	Domesday Plough-lands.	Corresponding Arable Acreage.	Domesday Wood Acres.	Domesday Meadow Acres.	Domesday Pasture Acres.	Gross Domesday Acreages.	Modern Parishes.	Parochial Acreages.		
Somerton. Vetus Dominium Coronæ	Quasi hides. 50 0 0	50	6000	144	100	720	6964	Somerton Parish	6925		
In Somerton.—Estates, not in the Crown, but in the Hundred	Hides. 6 0 0	4	480	0	0	10	490			Kingdon Do.	2064
Nine Villis, including 15 Manors, or parts of Manors, all in Somerton Hundred	52 3 1	74	8880	176	259	430	9745			Langport Do.	171
	108 3 1	128	15,360	320	359	1100	17,199	{ 7 Parishes of Somerton Hundred (as in Table, Vol. ii, p. 38)	15,512		
(Three Villis, including 4 Manors, or parts of Manors, in the Hundred of Pitney,— Less the measures proportionate to 3½ hides of Drayton, which were in Bulstone Hundred)	20 0 0	17	2040	4323	56	2880	9299	{ 2 Parishes of Pitney Hundred (as in Table, Vol. ii, p. 38)	{ 3665		
	3 1 0	3	360	720	9	706	1795				{ 361
	17 1 0	14	1660	3603	47	2174	7504				3340
Muchelney Abbey (a Liberty)	Quasi hides. 4 0 0	4	480	12	25	100	617	{ Muchelney Parish, — in Pitney Hundred	1566		
Three Totals combined ..	130 3 1	151½	18,180	3941	432	3540	26,093	Thirteen Parishes	29,542		

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 39, 40) OF THE PRÆ-DOMESDAY HUNDRED OF LIET, *alias* LIEGET, *alias* COCHRA.

This, like Brompton, North Curry, and other Liberties presently to be reviewed, was one of the Comital Hundreds of Somerset. An Inquest, taken thereof in A.D. 1084, is lost; but, that such an Inquest was taken, is proved by the extant Inquest of Givela (Yeovil) Hundred, which says that a certain item of Gheld, properly payable to the Collectors of Givela Hundred, had been accounted of in "Liet Hundred." Moreover, the contemporary Indices of Somerset Hundreds make mention of a Hundred variously written 'Liet,' or 'Lieget,' and the former name is written over, and in substitution of, a Hundred of *Cochr* (being, we presume, a cancellation of some form of the word Coker, which was an alternative name of Liet Hundred.)

Liet Hundred seems to have contained only two Manors, and those Comital. One was the Manor of Coker, then combining East and West-Coker. The other was the Manor of Hardington, since known as Hardington Mandeville. The Domesday status of each Manor is set forth in the Table.

Both Manors were in custody of William de Moione, who, as Sheriff of the county, was also Custos of the King's Escheats. Cochra, which at the date of Domesday was geldable as 15 hides, and Hardington, which was geldable as 10 hides, had paid gheld respectively, as 7 hides and 5 hides in the time of K. Edward. Similar abridgments of the Franchises of Comital estates have been previously instanced and discussed.

Had the Inquest of Liet Hundred been preserved, it would probably have shown King William as exempt from the gheld of eleven hides in the said Hundred, and his Villeins, or other Tenants, as paying or owing the gheld of 14 hides.

HUNDREDS AND LIBERTIES ABSENT FROM THE INQUEST OF A.D. 1084.

LIBERTY OF BRUNETONA—KING'S BROMPTON.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL II, PP. 39-40) OF THE LIBERTY OF BRUNETONA REGIS (KING'S BROMPTON).

There is no assessment of this Liberty or Huudred among the Gheld Inquests of 1084. Neither is it assessed or contemplated in the extant Inquest of Williton Hundred to which it is now annexed. It was the progressive annexation of this and several other similar Franchises to Williton Hundred which caused the latter to be eventually styled the Hundred of Williton and Free Manors. (Collinson's idea (Vol. iii, p. 485) on this change of name, seems to us unsatisfactory).

BRUNETONA (Brompton Regis).—Gueda, or Guida, the præ-Conquestual possessor of this Manor, was the Countess Gytha, the widow of Earl Godwin, and the mother of Earl Harold. Among its ancient privileges disused before Domesday, was the receipt of the Tercius Denarius of Milverton—"De hâc mansione ablatus est tercius denarius de Milvertonâ qui per consuetudinem reddebatur in eâ, die qua Rex Edwardvs fuit vivus et mortuus."

Milverton was a quasi Royal Manor and the Caput of a Hundred, and at the time specified (A.D. 1066) it was part of the dotation of Edith, Queen of King Edward. All Royal Manors may be supposed to have paid the Tertius denarius arising from the Crown-pleas of their respective jurisdictions to some Comital Manor. At the date of Domesday, King William was seized both of the Royal and of most of the Comital Manors of Somerset. It was so in these cases of Milverton and of King's Brompton. The seemingly unimportant transfer of the third-penny which was discontinued in this instance, was discontinued, as we shall see, in others. When Domesday (pp. 94-95) declares the Manor of Brunetona to be 10 hides, the very text of the Survey shows that of these 10 hides, one was held by the local priest, another by Hugh de Valletort under the Comte of Moretain. The last was an *ablatum* of Brompton. It lay in Preston, a distant vill, situate topographically in the Parish and Manor of Milverton aforesaid.

But Domesday (pp. 252, 474) reveals to us another old member of Brompton, a third hide, also in Preston and held, in 1086, by Robert fitz Ivo, under the Comte of Moretain. It is possible that this hide also had been originally one of the 10 hides of Brompton; but that its abstraction having been at a more remote period, the Surveyors, reporting the status of the Capital Manor, failed to detect the exact particulars, and in another part of their Record reported this third hide in such a way as to lead to the inference that the Capital Manor had been primarily one of eleven rather than of ten hides. And this mistake, if such it was, becomes more supposable from the circumstance that they reported Earl Harold to have been the ancient Lord of this member of Brompton; whereas if a member of Brompton, it cannot have passed to Harold's hands from the hands of his mother, Gytha, for she survived him.

The Manor of Brompton was, perhaps, at the early period of Earl Godwin's possession, styled 'Brompton Comititis,' to distinguish it from that other Brompton which was afterwards known as 'Brompton Vicecomititis,' and is now called Brompton Ralph.

'Brompton Comititis' of course became 'Brompton Regis' when it escheated from the Comital family of Godwin to King William.

BROMPTON REGIS contained, at the date of Domesday, some 15,903 acres of the exacter measures of that Record—viz., 7200 acres (corresponding to 60 plough-gangs) of arable land; 4320 acres of wood; 63 acres of meadow, and 4320 acres of pasture.

The area of Robert fitz Ivo's estate,—whether exceptional to, or included in the said computation, we care not to decide,—was 499 acres.

Against the above manorial area of 15,903 acres, we have for Brompton Regis a parochial area of only 8810 acres.

The excess of the Manor, with its appendages, over the Parish without any appendages, was thus 7093 acres.

Most part of this excess lay probably in the forests and pastures of Milverton Hundred. The rest contributed to that far greater excess which we have already shewn to have obtained in the North Western Hundreds of Somerset in respect of Domesday technicalities when compared with ascertainable realities.

LIBERTIES OF CLEEVE AND CREECH.—HUNDRED OF NORTH-CURRY. 211

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II. pp. 39, 40) OF THE LIBERTY OF CLIVA (OLD CLEEVE).

This was one of the Comital Manors which, at the date of Domesday, were an Escheat in King William's hands, together with the Earldom of Wessex, which included Somerset.

Before the Conquest, and while Harold was yet Earl, this Manor was entitled to the *Tercius Denarius* of Crown Pleas in the several Royal Manors and jurisdictions of Carhampton, Cannington, Williton, and North Petherton. "Huic Mansioni jacuit Tercius Denarius," &c. The use of the word *jacuit* implies a reference to the past only; and the Domesday value of the money (£23 of White money, or about £24 3s. of ordinary currency) is an independent proof that these Tercii Denarii were no longer exacted. William de Moione, then Sheriff of Somerset, had custody of the Manor on behalf of the Crown. "Reddit xxiiij libras de albo argenta et quando Willelmus de Moione recepit eam, reddebat tantundem."

The Manor of Old Cleeve was not the subject of any extant Inquest of A.D. 1084, neither was it then included in that Hundred of Williton to which it has since been annexed.¹

The hidage and Domesday measures of the Manor of Old Cleeve, as well as its modern acreage as a parish, are included in the general calculation as to the Hundreds, Manors, and Parishes of North-western Somerset (*vide supra* pp. 130, 131).

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 37, 38) OF CRICE (CREECH ST. MICHAEL).

Creech St. Michael was, at the date of Domesday, the Caput of Andersfield Hundred, but it was not, therefore, a part of the said Hundred. Some Capita of Somerset Hundreds were interned in their respective Hundreds; some, not being so interned, were distinct Liberties.

Creech St. Michael was one of those Comital Manors of Somerset which came at the Conquest into the King's hand by escheat of the House of Earl Godwin, whose daughter, Gunnilda, had been its latest possessor.

Soon after Domesday, Creech St. Michael was given to the Comte of Moretain. Hence the erroneous identification (Collinson, i., p. 75) of the same Comte's Domesday Manor of 'Cruche' with part of Creech St. Michael. 'Cruche', held under the Comte by Turstiu in 1086, was probably Cricket St. Thomas in South Petherton Hundred.

Of Gunnilda, daughter of Earl Godwin, we have already discoursed (*supra*, p. 81); also of the custody of the King's Escheats, and of the revennes derived therefrom at the date of Domesday (*supra* p. 84).

Creech St. Michael and its manorial territory have also been surveyed in combination with its subject Hundred of Andersfield (*supra* p. 100). But the Inquest of Andersfield Hundred, duly taken in A.D. 1084, certainly excludes Creech St. Michael. Whether any distinct Inquest of the Manor was taken or foregone may be a question. None such is extant.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 39, 40) OF NORTH-CURRY HUNDRED AND MANOR.

North-Curry, at the date of Domesday, was an Escheat as part of Harold's Earldom. Whether the Hundred involved the Manor, or the Manor involved the Hundred, is a question of mere words. If, in A.D. 1084, any Inquest was taken of either, or both, none such is extant.

Domesday gives the details of the Manor and Church of Nort-Chori as epitomized in the Table. The Manor was held by William de Moione, then sheriff, and held on behalf of the Crown.

The Domesday Manor must be understood as involving Stoke Gregory (3790 parochial acres), and West Hatch (1681 acres). (See Collinson, ii. 180.)

The modern Hundred of North-Curry aptly represents the old Liberty in that it contains all these. It further contains the Manors of Thurlbear and Thorn-Falcon, which, in A.D. 1084 were independent Manors or Franchises, and were duly assessed in two several Inquests of that date. (*Vide supra*, pp. 172, 173.)

The 20 hides of North-Curry seem to co-ordinate with the following Domesday measures, viz., arable-land, 4800 acres; wood-land, 62 acres; meadow, 78 acres; pasture, 2885 acres; vineyards, 7 acres;—in all 7,832 acres. The acreage of the corresponding parishes appears to be 11,027 acres, viz., North-Curry, 5556 acres; Stoke Gregory, 3790 acres; and West Hatch, 1681 acres.

¹ By this, and other like annexations, the Hundred of Williton became the Hundred of Williton-and-Free-Manors.

HUNDREDS AND LIBERTIES ABSENT FROM THE INQUEST OF 1084.

SOUTH-BRENT HUNDRED.—MARTOCK HUNDRED.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 39-40) OF SUDBRENT HUNDRED.

There is no Gheld-Inquest of A.D. 1084 extant for this Hundred. Its name, "Sudbrent Hundred," is borrowed from one of the old Indices, apparently contemporary with that Record. The Hundred seems to have consisted of three manors, one of which was, at that date, in the Crown, by escheat of Godwin, son of Earl Harold, another belonged to Glastonbury Abbey, a third to the Bishop of Coutances.

The King's escheated manor, consisting of Langford, Burrington, and Berrow, was given to Glastonbury Abbey by William Rufus, the grant being nominally of Burrington and Berrow; but Langford, thus ignored in terms, had unquestionably stood as the Caput of all three estates at the date, and on the pages of Domesday. The reason of this various description of a complex manor was of an ecclesiastical character; for, though Langford was the Manorial Caput, it was, parochially, only a hamlet of Burrington. At Burrington, probably, was the mother Church not only of Langford and Berrow, but also of Rowberrow.

The addition of Rowberrow (as in the Table) to the contents of Sudbrent Hundred is largely presumptive. Like Berrow, Rowberrow has no Domesday mention. Being perhaps unoccupied and unfounded at the date of Domesday, its territory may have been an annex of the Royal Manor of Langford, or may have been included in the Bishop of Coutances's estate, called "Attigetia."

Rowberrow passed eventually to the Abbey of St. Augustine at Bristol, at what date or by whose gift we do not enquire. Such grants usually obliterated all trace of previous Hundredal affinities. The annexation of Rowberrow, after the Dissolution, to Winterstoke Hundred, was a mere arbitrament of the moment, suggested by no precedent,—the result rather of that same ignorance of precedents which now besets ourselves.

SUDBRENT HUNDRED, as defined in the Table, embodied $26\frac{1}{2}$ hides. The exacter measures of the same territory, as supplied by Domesday, amount to 5119 acres, viz., arable land, 4920 acres; wood-land, 56 acres; meadow, 43 acres; and pasture, 100 acres.

The existing parishes, which seem to represent the cognate territory, measure, collectively, 13,558 acres. So we have $(13,558 - 5119 =)$ 8439 acres, to represent those moors and marshes of the district which the Domesday Surveyors altogether ignored.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II. PP. 39-40) OF MARTOCK MANOR AND HUNDRED.

MARTOCK was one of Queen Edith's Dower-estates. No Gheld-Inquest is preserved, certifying its assessment in A.D. 1084, but it is registered in coeval Indices as one of the Hundreds of Somerset. (See Vol. ii., p. 9).

Domesday, valuing the manor as annually worth £70 *numero*, adds "et centum solidos plus, si Walcelinus Episcopus fuerit testatus." As we have said before, the Bishop of Winchester's concern in the question was probably official other than personal.

Since King William's seizin of Martock (A.D. 1074), two estates, of 2 hides each, had been added to the manor. Probably they were both in process of abstraction from Givela (Yeovil) Hundred, at the time of the Inquest of A.D. 1084. One of them, written "Achelai," had been given to Alured de Hispania in the first instance, but was afterwards (1074-1084) taken from him. "Achelai" is at this day represented by Hurst, a member, both manorial and parochial, of Martock.

The other *additum* to Martock has no Domesday name. It has been spoken of in our Notes on Givela Hundred (*supra*, p. 167).

Martock, the Royal Manor, was given, after Domesday, to Comte Eustace of Boulogne. It then involved Coat, Bower-Henton, Hurst (aforesaid), Newton, part of Stapleton, Witcomb, and Ash (see Collinson, iii, 4). In identifying Ash (afterwards called Ash-Bulleyn from the Comte of Boulogne's possession thereof) with Aisse, a Manor of the Comte of Moretain, the Somerset Historian contradicts himself (see Collinson, iii, 6).

As will be seen by the Table (Vol. ii, pp. 39-40), two estates had been taken from the King's Manor of Martock before Domesday, and given in fee to subjects. They had been taken from the manor, we understand; they still remained in the Hundred. One of them is called—

CONTONA.—We cannot find any Compton near to Martock; but Domesday, making it an *ablatum* of Martock, does not absolutely conclude anything about the situation of this Compton. What Domesday says or implies is, that Contona no longer contributed anything to the King's Ferm of Martock, having been given to Ansgar Cocus. It is just supposable that Contona, having become the site of a chapel may have, lost its Domesday name and been called Stapleton. If so, then a supposed part of Stapleton, not passing to Comte Eustace, may have been the estate of Ansgar Cocus. Now Ansgar Cocus was a King's Serjeant, and half of Stapleton is found to have been afterwards held in Serjeantry of the Crown (Collinson, iii. 7). There is a further possibility that *Contona*, wherever it was, was also the site of an independent manor of Comte Eustace, written in Domesday as *Contitona*. However, such a supposition, if adopted, would not necessarily place Comte Eustace's Manor in Martock Hundred. We prefer to class it (as will appear in the sequel), among the "non-identified Manors of the Somerset Domesday."

SECOND ABLATUM OF MARTOCK.—It is almost a guess that this ablatum of $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides from Martock, is represented in Longload. The acreage which has in latter times been assigned to Longload, as an ecclesiastical district, does not affect the question. Such an acreage (1390 acres) is far too large to represent the $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides of "Aluric Parvus" of Hampshire.¹

All that is suggested or intended by the Table (Vol. ii, pp., 39-40) is, that the three Domesday estates which we have arranged under Martock Hundred are wholly represented in more or less of those 10,566 acres which constitute the three ecclesiastical districts of Martock, Ash, and Longload.

MARTOCK HUNDRED.—In parallelism with the $40\frac{2}{3}$ hides which our Table bespeaks for the præ-Domesday Hundred, Domesday registers exact measures amounting to 6770 acres, viz., arable land (enough to employ 42 teams, that is) 5040 acres; wood-land, 240 acres; meadow, 50 acres; and pasture, 1440 acres.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 41-42) OF THE MANOR, LIBERTY, AND HUNDRED OF GLASTONBURY
TWELVE-HIDES.

The Table above referred to is constructed so as to embody all possible particulars—both those which Domesday reveals and those which it only suggests—touching this extraordinary Franchise. Whatever is curious or abnormal in the Domesday text, as quoted in the Table, has been already examined on former pages. It remains to observe of—

NYLAND (*alias* ANDRESEY), BATCOMBE, and GREEN OAR, that we account them to have been outlying members of Glastonbury itself, and that such is the ratio of their non-appearance in Domesday. Their subsequent extra-parochial status is in favour of the same presumption.

THE HUNDRED OF GLASTONBURY-TWELVE-HIDES. — It was Glastonbury alone which constituted the traditional 'Twelve Hides' wherefrom the Hundred took half its name. The material Hundred, at the date of Domesday, comprised $15\frac{2}{3}$ hides, none of which seem to have been geldable.

Correlatively with these $15\frac{2}{3}$ hides Domesday gives exacter measures, amounting to 4439 statute acres, viz., arable-land, 3840 acres; wood-land, 327 acres; meadow, 68 acres; pasture, 200 acres; and vineyards (say) 4 acres.

To match with these 4439 acres of Domesday registration, we have an area of 20,016 statute acres ascertained by modern parochial measurement.

So then (20,016 - 4439 =) 15,577 acres may stand as the proximate measure of wide-spread marshes and moor-lands, of many a barren upland, to none of which did the Domesday Surveyors devote a line or a thought.

The list of Somerset Moors, given on a former page (*supra* p. 39), and our frequent mention of the hill-ranges of Polden and Mendip, will supply ample illustration of the circumstance that Glastonbury, its Hundred and its adjuncts, counted, in Domesday, as less than one-third of a now-ascertained superficies.

¹ This Aluric appears twice, if not oftener, among King William's Thanes, holding lands in Hampshire. In one instance, Domesday writes his name expressly as "Aluric Petit," in another as "Aluric Parvus."

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 41-42) OF THE NON-IDENTIFIED MANORS OF THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.

It seems better to devote a distinct Table and a separate section of remark to that residue of subjects to which, while we ourselves regard them with extreme doubt, we would wish to draw the attention of future enquirers.—

Domesday tells of four Somerset estates, which were, undoubtedly, intra-hundredal; but to which Hundred or Hundreds of those already reviewed, these estates belonged, there is great uncertainty.

What else is known about these estates we proceed to state.—

CONTITONA, *alias* CONTITONE.—Last of Comte Eustace's Somerset Manors, and apparently as a post-scriptive entry, Domesday gives the following (we transcribe from the Exon Codex):—

“Comes habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur Coutitona quam tenuit Wlnodus die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus et reddidit Gildum pro v hidis. Has possunt arare v Carrucæ. Modo tenet hanc Mathildis de Comite Eustachio. De his habet Mathildis iii hidas in dominio et ii carrucas et Villani aliam terram et iii carrucas. Ibi habet Mathildis v villanos et x bordarios et iiii servos et ii vaccas et cxl oves et i Molinum (qui reddit per annum v solidos, et iiii denarios) et v agros prati et iiii quadragia pascuæ in longitudine et ii (quadragia) in latitudine; et reddit (mansio) per annum centum solidos et quando Comes Mansionem recepit valebat iiii libras.” (Exon Domesday, p. 263.)

Collinson, in his Domesday Index, identifies Contitone with ‘Compton’—a very safe assumption; but when, in his text (Vol. ii., 121) Collinson converts Comte Eustace's Manor of Contitone into the Manor which is now called Compton-Dando, we resign such guidance. The Domesday antecedent of Compton-Dando was unquestionably the Bishop of Coutances' Manor of *Contuna*.

One of the tythings of the present parish of Pilton is called the tything of “East and West Compton.” But this and other tythings of Pilton parish were apparently involved in Pilton itself at the date of Domesday. Pilton was a Manor of the Abbot of Glastonbury. It had several members; but they were all more distant from the Capital Manor than were the aforesaid tythings. So the tythings, being suppressed in Domesday, the members of Pilton are declared, and, of course, Compton (East and West) is not among them. Neither have we seen any later mention of “East and West Compton” suggestive that it was at any time manorially distinct from, or a manorial off-shoot of Pilton. *Always inherent, indistinctively inherent*, seems to have been the manorial relation of East and West Compton to Pilton.

Again, to suppose Comte Eustace's Manor of Contitone to have been identical with East and West Compton, would be to suppose the former to have been in Winterstoke Hundred; but the præ-Domesday Hundred of Winterstoke (see above, p. 206) will bear no such conceptional addition as a manor of five hides.

¶ A more plausible, but far from conclusive theory as to the whereabouts of Comte Eustace's Manor arises in this way following:—

The Exon Domesday (pp. 105, 480) speaks of a locality called *Contona*, or *Cumtona*. It was an estate of 1½ hides. In King Edward's time it had been an appurtenance of Queen Edith's Manor of Martock. Now (1086) it was an ablatum from Martock. Ansgar Cocus held it of the King, probably by serjeantry.

No such ancient appendage of Martock is now traceable;—none, at least, now bearing such a name as Compton.

Comte Eustace's estate may have been in the same quarter. If so, it possibly remains at this day in the parish and Hundred of Martock, though under some other name than Compton. There are no less than seven places in Martock parish, some two or more of which may possibly represent some two Domesday Comptons. The seven are Ash, Longload, Milton, Stapleton, Witcombe, Coat, and Bower-Henton. An eighth, viz., Hurst, we know to represent an estate which was called in Domesday *Achileia*.

Again, it is absolutely certain that Comte Eustace's Manor of Contitone was in some Hundred or other, and it is all but clear that it was in no Hundred surveyed by the extant Inquests of 1084. Now the Inquest of Martock Hundred is one of the lost Inquests. Lastly, it came to pass that, soon after Domesday, the Manor of Martock itself was given by the Crown to Comte Eustace. If Compton, his previous estate, were Compton-juxta-Martock, we see at once the ratio and appropriateness of the later grant; but we prove no identity.

¶ In such cases as the above, the difficulty always arises in the want of positive evidence. Negative evidence becomes so much the more valuable. There is a place in the parish of South Petherton, now

called Compton Durville. This was a Domesday Manor no doubt, but it was not Comte Eustace's Manor. Collinson does not identify it with any Domesday type. The sequence of Domesday tells us that the antecedent of Compton Durvill was *Comtuna*, a manor held, in 1086, by Malger de Cartrai, in the Fief of Robert Comte of Moretaip.

¶ Compton, part of Compton-Dundon, was held by Roger de Corcelle at Domesday—held under Glastonbury Abbey (see Table, Vol. ii., pp. 29-30). It cannot have been Comte Eustace's Compton.

¶ Compton, in Midsomer Norton, is a vill noticed by Collinson (ii. 151). Surely, like Midsomer Norton itself, this Compton was a mere adjunct of the King's Manor of Chewton.

¶ Compton Paunceford was Turstin fitz Rolf's at the date of Domesday (see Table, vol. ii., pp. 15-16, and Collinson, ii., 76).

¶ Compton Martin was Serlo de Burci's at the same date (see Table, Vol. ii., pp. 21-22, and Collinson, ii., p. 131).

¶ Chil-Compton, called in Domesday 'Contona,' was a Manor of the Bishop of Salisbury (see Table, Vol. ii. pp. 21, 22). Collinson has appropriated the Domesday notice of Compton (Dando) to the Bishop of Salisbury's Manor of 'Contona.' Accordingly, Collinson failed to find the true Domesday antecedent of Chilcompton. All we wish to show here is, that Chilcompton was not Comte Eustace's Manor of Contitona.

¶ Though we may not say that we have, either positively or negatively, identified Comte Eustace's Manor of Compton, we may be permitted to speculate on its Domesday peculiarities. In two Somerset Manors the Comte's antecessor had been Lewinus—possibly Earl Leofwine, son of Godwin. The Comte's antecessor at Contitone had been Wlnod—possibly Wulfnoth, another son of Earl Godwin (confer Freeman iv. 75 2).

Mathildis, Comte Eustace's tenant at Contitone, provokes curiosity. Was she his sister, or other kinswoman? It was the name which he gave to his daughter, born long after Domesday, to Mathildis, the eventual heiress of Boulogne, the Queen of Stephen of Blois.

To conclude with the Domesday complexion of Contitone. It was clearly in the richer part of Somerset. Its hidage—each hide correlative with 137 Domesday acres—its kine, though there were but two of them, tell the same story.

THERE IS YET ANOTHER MANOR, a double Manor, called Comtuna, or Contune, in Domesday, concerning whose doubtful identity we next proceed to speak:—

COMTUNA, *alias* CONTUNE.—After Walter de Douai's Manor of Brien (Brean in Bempstone Hundred), and before his Manor of Harpetreu (West Harptree, in Chewton Hundred) the Exon Domesday surveys his Manor of Compton. "Walterus habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur Comtuna quam tenuit Elwacer et reddidit geldum pro iiii hidis. Has possunt arare iii carrucae. Hanc tenet Radulfus de Waltero et habet iii hidas et dimidiam et dimidiam virgam et ii carrucas et habet unum Villanum qui habet virgam et dimidiam et dimidiam carrucam: et habet ibi Radulfus iiii Bordarios et vii Cotarios et ii animalia et ii porcos et cxx oves et lxx capras et unum molendinum qui reddit vi denarios et iii quadragia nemoris in longitudine et ii (quadragia) in latitudine et xii agros prati et x quadragia pascuæ in longitudine et ii (quadragia) in latitudine; et valet per annum 50 solidos, et tantum quando receipt."

"Huic Mansioni addita est una mansio quæ vocatur Comtuna quam tenuit Ailricus pariter die quâ Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus et reddidit gildum pro unâ hida. Hanc potest arare, una carruca. Hanc tenet Radulfus de Waltero et habet iii virgas uno fertino minus; et Villani habent unam virgam et unum, fertinum et dimidiam carrucam. Ibi habet Radulfus unum Villanum et ii Bordarios et iiii agros nemusculi et ii agros prati et iiii agros pascuæ; et valet per annum x solidos et tantundum quando receipt." (Exon Domesday, p. 333).

In the Schedule of Terræ Occupatæ is the entry usual to such compound manors as the above.

"Walscinus Duaco (*sic*) habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur Cumtona, quam tenuit Euerwacre. Huic addita est alia mansio quæ vocatur Cumtona quam tenuit Ailricus pariter die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus, et reddidit gildum pro unâ hidâ. Hanc tenet Radulfus de Waltero (*sic*); et valet per annum x solidos et quando Walterus accepit valebat tantundum (Exon Domesday, p. 486).

Here, again, we have a Compton of five hides. Collinson (iii, 582) identifies it with Compton-Bishop; and indeed the sequence of Domesday does not controvert such a proposition. However, this will be

adding five hides to Winterstoke Hundred, which will not bear the addition. Moreover, a communication from a learned Somerset Antiquary clearly proves to us that Compton Bishop had no distinct mention in Domesday; for that, both before and after Domesday, it was buried in Bishop Giso's great Manor Banwell.

The alternative supposition of our Somerset commentator is, that Douai's Compton may be represented by Compton Martin, or by Ubley. Certainly, both Compton Martin and Ubley were in Chewton Hundred, and so either of them, followed by Douai's Manor of West Harptree, would fall into the best of Domesday sequences. Moreover, Compton Martin, under its Domesday name of Comtona, and as being a Manor of five hides, and as having been held *T. R. E.* by Euroaco, and as held in 1086 by Serlo de Burci, looks strikingly like a moiety of some vast Compton, the other moiety of which was Walter de Douai's. But this vision, however symmetrical, is delusive. The Domesday representative of Ubley was *Tumbeli*, and it had no association whatever with any Compton; and Compton Martin will not suffice to represent more than Serlo de Burci's Compton, combined with Serlo de Burci's Manor of Morthona, another five hides now represented by Moreton in Compton-Martin parish.

In other points, save equal hidage and identical tenure *T. R. E.*, De Burci's Compton, and De Douai's Compton want features of analogy. De Burci's Manor was worth £5 15s. per annum at the date of Domesday; De Douai's was worth only £3. De Burci's Manor had fluctuated in value since his seizin; De Douai's was stationary in that respect. De Burci's Estate had seven teams at work thereon; De Douai's had but three. De Burci's five hides included 1850 acres of Domesday measurement, whereof 600 were arable, and 990 were wood-land; De Douai's five hides included but 762 acres of Domesday measurement, whereof 480 were arable, and 60 were wood-land. In short, Walter de Douai's Manor of Compton was neither identical nor conterminous with Serlo de Burci's Compton; it was in a much poorer district than Chewton Hundred.

¶ It will only be adding further negatives as to the whereabouts of Walter de Douai's Compton to say that it was not in the same region as Comte Eustace's Manor, nor yet is there any probability that it was in any Hundred assessed by the extant Inquests of A.D. 1084.

Here we stop. We ourselves have no idea where it was.

ESLIDA, *alias* ESLIDE.—At the end of the Schedule of Roger Arundel's estates, and following the survey of his Manor of Penna (now Pen-Selwood, in Norton Ferris Hundred, formerly in Bruton Hundred), the Exon Domesday gives the following:—

“Rogerus habet unam mansionem quæ vocatur Eslida quam tenuerunt ii Tanni Godwinus et Siricus pariter die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus et reddidit gildum pro ii hidis (et unus Tannus habuit unam hidam et aliam). Has possunt arare ii carruce. Hanc (mansionem), tenet Ascelinus de Rogero. Inde habet Ascelinus i hidam et iii virgas, et dimidiam, et ii carrucas in dominio et Villani dimidiam virgam. Ibi habet Ascelinus, i Bordarium, iiii servos et iiii porcos et liij oves et ii agros nemusculi et iiij agros patri. Et valet per annum xl solidos et quando ipse recepit valebat tantundem.”

Collinson in his Domesday Index (Vol. i, p. 41), identified “Eslide” with Gurney-Slade; but in his text (Vol. iii, p. 412) he refrained from repeating the idea, shewing, if anything, that Gurney-Slade was a part of Binegar, and so, from old time, a possession of the Church of Wells, and in the Hundred of Wells-Forum.

It appears, however, that Gurney Slade was a part of Binegar only parochially, and not even that altogether, for a part of Gurney Slade is in the parish of Ashwick. Now Ashwick was manorially a possession of Bath Abbey, and it was in the Kilmersdon division of Old Frome Hundred. Again, it appears that the parochial boundaries of Ashwick were improvised at a period much later than Domesday, at which date Ashwick was merely a part of the more ancient parish of Kilmersdon.

Notwithstanding all these complicities the undoubted fact remains that Gurney-Slade has been of old parochially divided; and the presumption is that, where a distinct locality like Gurney-Slade has so been divided parochially, it was itself originally a manorial integer.

We have no evidence to show that Gurney-Slade was, as a manor, ever in the possession of the See of Wells or the Abbey of Bath. It is more supposable that, if an independent manor, it was in Kilmersdon Hundred than in Wells Hundred.

The question still remains as to “Eslida” being represented by Gurney Slade. Roger Arundel had other manors in Old Frome Hundred, viz., Beckington, Marston (Biggott, and Berkley. Domesday ranges them in sequence, but his manor of Penna (in Bruton Hundred) separates the group from Eslida.

However, if Roger Arundel's tenant at Eslida, viz., Ascelinus, were the same with Ascelinus who held so largely under the Bishop of Coutances, and if Ascelinus, the Coutances tenant, was progenitor of a house of Gurnay (as Collinson says that he was), then, indeed, it was better than a guess for Collinson to suggest that the Eslida of Domesday passed into Gurnay Slade. But about the descent of De Gurnay from Ascelinus we hesitate. The Domesday ancestor of Gurnay was named 'Nigel.'

Another guess is that Eslida may possibly be represented by Long-Load, one of those localities in Martock of which we have made recent mention. This guess is backed by the merely negative circumstance that Eslida, not appearing to have been in any Hundred of which there is an extant Inquest of 1084, may have been in Martock Hundred, of which the Inquest is lost.

Neither in Gurnay-Slade nor in Long-Load can we trace any seignery of Roger Arundel's descendants, nor yet any tenancy of any supposable representative of Ascelinus in the Barony of Roger Arundel's heirs. We dismiss the case of Eslida and its present representation as one wanting adequate evidence.

SHEPBURDA, *alias* SCEPEWORDE.—If the sequence of Domesday suggests anything as to the situation of an estate of an Anglo-Thane who had but two, then this estate (it may be worth while to say) is placed between two estates which were respectively in the Hundreds of Bruton and Frome.

The Exon Domesday surveys it as follows :—

Aluric habet unam mansionem quæ ('vocatur' omitted) Shepburda, quam tenuit Britricus (he was Aluric's father) die qua Rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus, et reddidit gildum pro dimidiâ hidâ. Hanc potest arare dimidia carruca. Hanc tenet Rahirius de Alurico et habet ibi x oves; et valet (mansio) v solidos (Exon Domesd., p. 456).

Collinson, in his Domesday Index, translates Scepeworde as Shipway.

We cannot find Shipway, nor did Collinson find it in his detailed history. *Scepeworde* should rather resolve itself into 'Shipworth' or 'Skipworth,' than into 'Shipway.'

The Domesday estate has an impoverished but not an irreclaimable aspect.

On the borders of Exmoor Forest there was (see Collinson, iii, p. 58), a place written *Schepecumbeheved* (Sheep-comb-head) in the time of Edward I. The name, though it cannot have represented "Scepeworde," may have belonged to the same vicinage; and nothing can be more possible than that a Shepherd's station such as Rahir's, should have been in Carhampton Hundred.

Aluric Fitz Brictric's other Somerset estate was West Lydford. It was in Bruton Hundred, it was of considerable extent and proportionate value. In this manor Aluric had his demesnes. He had enfeoffed no tenant. The contrast with Scepeworde tells us nothing but that the latter was not in Bruton Hundred.

THE FOUR NON-IDENTIFIED MANORS of Somerset contained $12\frac{1}{2}$ hides and $11\frac{1}{2}$ plough-lands. Their exacter Domesday measurements indicate 1753 statute acres, whereof 1380 acres were arable, 23 acres were meadow, 66 acres were wood-land, and 284 acres were pasture.

The fact of each hide including, on an average, only $140\frac{1}{4}$ acres would, *per se*, suggest that these manors were in the better parts of the county.

CHAPTER V.

THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.—NON-HIDATED LIBERTIES.

ESTATE OF THE CHURCH OF ST. JOHN, AT FROME.

WE now pass from the Hundredal and hidated system of Manors to that small residue of Somerset estate which, like the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*, was Extra-Hundredal, but which, unlike the *Vetus Dominicum*, was measured by the carrucate.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., PP. 41, 42) OF THE ESTATE PERTAINING TO THE CHURCH OF ST. JOHN AT FROME.

The Exchequer Domesday, after reviewing Frome as a Manor of "Ancient Demesne of the Crown," adds as follows :—

"De hoc Manerio tenet *Æcclesia Sancti Johannis de Froma* 8 Carucatas terræ, et similiter tenuit tempore Regis Edwardi. Reinbald ibi est Presbyter."

The Exon Domesday uses language of similar import in its notice of Frome—viz., "*De hâc Mansione habet Æcclesia Sancti Johannis de Froma viii Carucatas terræ, quas tenebat ipsa Æcclesia de Rege Edwardo in elemosynâ, eâ die quâ ipse fuit vivus et mortuus. Modo tenet hanc Rainbaldus et tenuit tempore (Regis) Edwardi.*"

In their Schedules of 'Tenures in Almoign,' both Domesdays give detailed account of the Church-Fee of Frome. The Exon Domesday (p. 180) speaks most at length, saying, "*Ecclesia Sancti Johannis de Froma habet viii Carrucatas terræ. Ibi habet Rainbaldus, qui eam tenet, ii carrucas et dimidiam in dominio et Villani sui habent vi carrucas. Ibi habet Rainbaldus viii Villanos et xii Bordarios et iv Servos et i Roncinum et iii animalia et xxx porcos et cxxviii oves et I Molendinum qui reddit per annum v solidos, et vi quadragia nemoris in longitudine, et ii (quadragia) in latitudine et xxxv agros prati. Et reddit per annum vi libras.*"

This is one out of two only instances wherein the Somerset Domesday makes use of the word "Carrucate." The mere use of the word implies non-geldability, a Franchise which equally attached to the King's Manor of Frome, though in the latter case the said Franchise is implied by other language—viz. : "*Nescitur quot hidæ sunt in eâ quia nunquam reddidit Gildum.*"

It is further remarkable that the measures of the King's Manor are not expressed by the term "Carrucates," but in terms of the Plough-gang. "*Terram hujus mansionis possunt arare 50 Carucæ,*" says the *Exchequer Record*.

The Carrucate, as we have often said, was, on the South-Western circuit, little else than an ungeldable hide. Like the hide, it was of variable dimensions. Like the hide, its ordinary contents were a single plough-land with more or less of complemented territory. The Carrucate of Frome Church-fee would seem to have implied something more than a single plough-land, for eight Carrucates seem to have contained eight and a-half plough-lands. The whole estate contained, we should say, about 1175 acres—viz., 1020 acres of arable land, 120 acres of wood-land and 35 acres of meadow. This gives 146½ acres to the Carrucate of Frome Church. And, in the richer districts of Somerset, the Domesday Hide is often found to co-ordinate with as narrow dimensions.

ABBATIAL LIBERTY OF MUCHELNEY.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II. PP. 41, 42) OF THE DOMESDAY LIBERTY OF MUCHELNEY, NOW FORMING PART OF PITNEY HUNDRED.

MUCHELNEY, THORLEY, and MIDDLENEY, three islands, as Domesday calls them, formed the site and Abbatial estate of the Monastery of Muchelney. The Exon Domesday, adverting to this strange combination, uses words somewhat ill-arranged.

“ In Abbatia ad Micheleneiam et Mideleneiam (et) Torleiam ; in his tribus insulis sunt iii (*sic*) carrucate de terra que nunquam reddiderunt gildum. Ibi habet Sanctus Petrus iiii carrucas. De his habet Sanctus ii carrucas et unum agripennum vinee in dominio et alias ii (carrucas) habent Villani. Ibi habet Sanctus iii Villanos et xviii Bordarios et iiii servos et ii Piscarias (que reddunt per annum vi millia anguillarum) et i Roncinum et vi porcos et xxx capras et xii agros nemoris et xxv agros prati, et centum agros pascue. Et valet inter totum per annum lx solidos et quando Abbas obiit¹ valebat tantundem (Exon Domesday, p. 174).

The above entry is not only verbally obscure, but it is placed low down in the Schedule of Muchelney estates, as though the Exon Rubricator were ignorant that he was describing the Caput of an Abbacy.

The Exchequer Domesday not only places the entry in question in its true position, at the head of the Muchelney Schedule, but uses language more intelligible as a whole, and more correct as to the item of *Carrucate* :—

Ecclesia Sancti Petri de Micelene habet iiii carucas terre, que nunquam geldaverunt, in his insulis Michelene, Midelene et Torleie. Ibi sunt in dominio ii Caruce et una arpent vinee. Ibi iiii servi et iii Villani et xviii Bordarii cum ii carucis. Ibi ii Piscarie reddentes vi millia anguillarum et xxv acra prati et xii acra silve et centum acra pastura. Valuit et valet iii libras.

This estate, or rather these estates, we have tabulated with full particulars (See Vol. ii, pp. 41-42).

At the date of the Gheld-Inquest (A.D. 1084), these estates formed an independent Liberty, a member of no Hundred whatever. No Inquest thereof can properly be said to be missing or to have been lost, inasmuch as none was ever taken. The annexation of the Liberty of Muchelney with its Domesday members intact, to Pitney Hundred, took place after the Dissolution.

¶ Of the use of the word “Carrucata” in the Somerset Domesday the above is the last of only two instances. The Carrucate we repeat, the Carrucate of South Western England, was, in intention, an ingeldable hide. Like the hide it might contain more than one plough-land, for it was an expansive denomination. Like the hide, as in the above instance, the single carrucate was usually co-ordinate with a single plough-land ; and, like the hide, the carrucate usually involved other elements besides its single plough-land.

In the present instance each carrucate implies one plough-land (or 120 acres) and about 34½ acres of wood, meadow and pasture-land ;—in all 154½ acres of Domesday measurement. And some such a complement is in the Somerset Domesday often found to have constituted a Hide.

¶ While the Domesday measures of Muchelney, Thorney, and Middeney, combined, only amount to 617 acres, the modern parochial measurement, of Muchelney and Thorney only, is 1566 acres. It is another proof that extensive moorlands and marshes were totally ignored in Domesday mensuration.

Domesday, describing the three estates as “islands,” and telling of their Piscarie and eel-products, gives a picture of the region which it does not measure.

¹ Liward, Abbot of Muchelney in 1066, or an unrecorded successor of Liward, seems to have died shortly before Domesday.

CHAPTER VI.

APPENDIX OF OBSERVATIONS AND STATISTICS.

After devoting Five Chapters to the work of systematizing the Domesday Survey of Somerset, we find that an arrear of matter, both incidental and reflective, has accumulated on our hands, which, so far as it belongs to no definite place in the aforesaid Five Chapters, is better reserved for an Appendix, so far as it is statistical or synoptical, may well have a like destination.

We will deal with such details without attempting a symmetrical arrangement of heterogeneous subjects.—

OMISSIONS OF THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY.

Omissions have often been charged against the Great Survey in cases where the deficit has subsequently appeared to have been rather in the competency of the critic than in the text of the Record. Domesday omissions should neither be alleged lightly nor dogmatically. Nevertheless such laches were possible and, more than that, actual. We have said something already to justify such an assertion. We trust that, in enlarging on the subject now, we shall say nothing unnecessarily or presumptuously.

¶ The Somerset Manor of Kelston, or Kelweston, was omitted, by Domesday, in error, an error half revealed to us by the Gheld Roll of A.D. 1084. Nevertheless, we are so sure about the name of the Manor, about its hidage, and about its existing acreage, so proximately sure about its Domesday acreage, that we have ventured to include all four points in our Tables and calculations.

¶ Two other Manors, Wellow and Kilmersdon, are not specifically named in Domesday. If their hidage is included in Domesday it is among the 20 hides which were attributed to the Burgh of Bath. The correlative Domesday acreage of these two Manors, as well as that of the Burgh of Bath, is certainly omitted in the Survey; and we have not ventured to speculate upon it or to define it, so far as to include it in any Table. But the modern acreages of both Wellow and Kilmersdon are included in our Tables, for we could not distinguish these acreages from the acreages of all those lesser manors which are massed in the parishes of Wellow and Kilmersdon.

In this instance, then, that omission of Domesday, which cannot be supplied, is of the areal quantities which were correlative, at the date of Domesday, with the "20 hides of Bath," and of the areal quantities which should have represented the two Manors of Wellow and Kilmersdon, whether included in the said "20 Hides" or not.

So far then, those 871,110 acres of exacter Domesday measure, represented in the Table (Vol ii, pp. 5-6) are not the full and appropriate antecedent of these 1,049,080 acres of modern ascertainment, which are given in the same Table.

¶ The names of two Manors, now called Barwick and Chilton-Cantiloe are certainly omitted in Domesday. Consequently their hidages and Domesday acreages are nowhere specifically entered on the Record.

It is possible that Chilton may, as to its essence, lie buried in some Domesday Manor of another name:— we have conjectured Mudford (*supra*, p. 168). We will say no more on a subject possibly leading to nothing but further conjecture.

As to Barwick the case is different. The Gheld-Inquest of Givela Hundred gives note of some Manor

¹ Collinson abounds in the non-discovery of identities, and, therewith, in erroneous statements of Domesday omission.

In our Dorset Treatise (pp. 113, 114) we presumed a 'Domesday omission,' because an estate in Badbury Hundred, alluded to in the Gheld-Inquest of 1084, could not be found in the Dorset Domesday. This estate proves to have been Gussage St. Michael. It was omitted in the Dorset Domesday, but it was in Domesday nevertheless. It was surveyed under Earl Alberic's lands in Wiltshire.

Here, by the way, is another phase or symptom strengthening our conviction that the Domesday Commissioners who visited Dorset and Wiltshire were identical.

which does not reappear in Domesday, and it is probable that this Manor was Barwick. If so, not having any data for assigning a hidage or a Domesday acreage to Barwick, it is only represented in our Tables by its modern parochial acreage. Again, as in the case of Bath Burgh, Wellow and Kilmersdon, the true and full acreage, ordinarily a part of the Domesday statements, is wanting in our calculations, and mars the arithmetical integrity of the comparison between the extent of land surveyable in the eleventh century and the extent substantiated by modern science. Added to this, in the case of Barwick, the hidage of the eleventh century is wanting, and cannot be supplied by conjecture.

¶ There is some probability that a Manor of Portbury Hundred was omitted in Domesday. If so, it is, perhaps, now typified by one or other of the Tythings of Portbury parish (*Vide supra*, pp. 180, 181).

¶ Again, there is another case of possible Domesday omission;—the case of Dodington. The name we cannot find in Domesday, but the hidage and exacter measures may be incorporated, for aught we know, in those of some other Domesday Manor. We, not knowing what Manor this may have been, nor in what Hundred it may have lain, have neglected to enter the parochial acreage (543 acres) of Dodington under any Domesday Hundred whatever.

¶ After all, and putting at the outside the statistical disarrangements created, or supposed to be created, by, at most, six Domesday omissions, the result of any conjectural supplement to the letter of Domesday would be almost fractional in the general estimate which we have embodied in, and founded upon, the Synoptical Table (Vol. ii., pp. 7, 8).

POST-DOMESDAY HUNDRED OF WHITLEY.

This subject, if extraneous, is also curious.—Alone of the Somerset Hundreds, that of Whitley can certainly and simply be characterized as of post-Domesday formation.

It was clearly improvised with the object of grouping under one Franchise a plurality of estates which owned the Seignury of the Abbot of Glastonbury. Hence the Abbots of Glastonbury, till the Dissolution, were always Lords of Whitley Hundred.

Whitley Hundred was constituted as follows.—It took, from the dissolved Hundred of Loxley, the Manors of Chitton-Polden, Catcott, Eddington, Middlezoy, Moor-linch, Othery, Shapwick, Stawell, Sutton-Mallett, Weston-Zoyland and Woolavington;—in all 11 manors.

It took from the dissolved Hundred of Ringoldsway the Manors of Ashcott, Butleigh, Compton and Dundon (both in Compton-Dundon), Greinton, Street, and Walton;—in all 7 Manors.

It absorbed the previously-independent Liberties or Hundreds of High-Ham and West Monkton.

It took from the old Hundred of Bruton the Manors of Blackford, Holton, and Wheathill. It took Holford from the old Hundred of Taunton, Podemore-Milton from the Old Hundred of Frome, and Cossington from the old Hundred of Bempstone.

Such arrangements, being jurisdictional and in some sort expedient, were in defiance of topographical considerations. Hence the twenty-six Manors which still constitute the Hundred of Whitley are, many of them, detached from any apparent centre. (See Vol. ii., p. 10, for a Tabular representation of the same particulars.)

THE SOMERSET DOMESDAY, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO FIEFS.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (VOL. II., P. 43) BEING A SCHEDULE OF SOMERSET FIEFS.

The object of the said Table is chiefly to show how the gross hidage and quasi-hidage, established by the Synoptical Table (Vol. ii., pp. 7, 8), was apportioned on the several Fiefs of Somerset, so that the total hidage and quasi-hidage of the Fiefs correspond to a fraction with the total hidages and quasi-hidages of Hundreds and Franchises.

The last items in Columns 2 and 4 of the Table, now under notice, require explanation. The 'Addita' of Manors have been already tabulated under their appropriate Hundreds and Franchises; but a few are not correspondently allotted to their respective owners in the Table of Fiefs. For instance, the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ* is represented in the Table thereof (Vol. ii., pp. 1, 2) as constituted of 417 Plough-lands or Quasi-hides. But it contained more—viz. in the shape of 'addita,' some ten hides which are dispersed in different Tables of hidated Hundreds. And so these ten hides are not in the

present Table added to the King's tenure *Jure Corona*, but go to constitute a part of those 30 hides 2½ virgates which are entered in mass at the foot of column 4, simply as not having been combined with any of the forty-seven Fiefs numbered in the upper part of the said Table.

With regard to columns 6 and 7 of the Table, it should be stated that Domesday seldom gives the specific population of an 'additum.' Of the above ten hides it only specifies the population of 4½ hides. The said population is 22 males. The annual value of all the ten hides is, however, registered in Domesday, and amounts to £14 7s.

There were 'addita' also to certain Comital Manors. Some of these are not reckoned in the previous entry of the King's tenure *Jure Comitatus*. We put the excluded items at 6 hides 1 virgate 3¼ fertines, with a Domesday stated population of 34 males and an annual value of £9 1s. 2d.

In the late Queen Edith's Liberty of Chewton, though not in her manor, was Chewton Church, whose land (2 virgates) was held by the Abbot of Jumieges. We have reckoned these 2 virgates in our Table of Chewton Hundred. We must equally reckon them here as constituting a kind of Fief. The population of the estate was 20 males; its annual value £2 3s. 4d.

Of the 'Ablata' of Royal and other Manors it is impossible to say with precision which are tacitly merged by Domesday in the Fiefs of those who obtained the said 'ablata,' and which are not. There are cases also where the 'ablatum' worked no evident or declared diminution in the extent and accessories of the manor from which it was 'ablated.'¹ Therefore, were we to reckon a decurated manor as still integral, and were we further to reckon the extent of the 'ablatum' into this item of miscellaneous Fiefs, we should be reckoning so much land twice over. In such a case it is hardly well to aim at an exactness which is not bequeathed to us by Domesday. We prefer to strike a rough balance and to reckon as 'ablata,' not included in any of the 47 enumerated Fiefs of the Table, just that proportion of territory which, being added to the Fiefs will make the whole of the Fiefs correspond with the whole of the Land-measures, viz., with 3,438⁹/₁₂ hides or quasi-hides ascertained in the Table (Vol. ii. p. 7).

This addition will be of 13 hides, 2 virgates, 1½ fertines.¹ The population is only specified in one 'ablatum' out of many, and is there 4 males. The annual value of all such 'ablata' is about £6 17s. 11d.

¶ So far we have shown, as fully as was practicable, how the same Domesday hidage, already apportioned on a multitude of districts (by Table, Vol. ii., pp. 7 and 8), may be also apportioned on a multitude of Fiefs (by Table, Vol. ii., p. 43). It remains to say that there were several small parcels of estate, to which, as being in some stage of severance, the Somerset Domesday makes but slight allusion. Individually, of these severances, it is doubtful whether in respect of population and value, they were included in the manors which were losing them, or in those which were gaining them. That they were included in one or other, we may be sure. On that account, and because Domesday gives them no distinct population or value, we cannot introduce them in a Table like that under notice.

Another supplementary matter is in regard to annual values.—In our Table of the Comital Fief (Vol. ii., p. 4) we give, at the foot, as items of Comital revenue £268 14s. 1d., white money, and £8 15s. ordinary currency. The first item being converted into terms of the second (by the addition of about 5 per cent.) resolves itself into £282 2s. 8d. And thus (£282 2s. 8d. + £8 15s. =) £290 17s. 8d. becomes the representative of the said two items of Comital Revenue.

But it will be seen that, in the Table (Vol. ii., p. 43) now under notice, we introduce the annual value of the Comital Fief as £307 17s. 8d.; that is, we add £17 to the estimate of the previous Table. This we proceed to explain.—

There were persons living in and under the Comital Fief who were in receipt of £17 per annum more than that which, at the precise date of Domesday, reached the King. These £17, therefore, though they were part of the gross value of the Comital Fief, and so of the King's estates, were no part of the King's income at the moment.—

¹ An instance of this is the Manor of Knowle (now in the parish of Shepton Mallet), Domesday gives it as 1½ hides, held *in capite* of the King by Drogo de Montacute, as a Franco-Thegn. The Record then speaks of one hide 'ablated' from the original Saxon Manor, and held by Turstin fitz Rolf; but it does not enter this 'ablatum' in Turstin fitz Rolf's schedule of estates, neither does it give its population or stock, but only its value, viz., £1 per annum.

This item of one hide is therefore reckoned in our Table among the 'Ablata' of 13 hides, 2 virgates, 1½ fertines spoken of above.

Similarly, as to all the remaining entries in this column. They indicate the annual values of whole Fiefs or Tenements. In respect of income, they indicate, not merely the annual income of the superior Lords (named in column 2), but the annual income of each superior Lord and his Free Tenants, combined.

¶ The fifth column of the Table (Vol. ii., p. 43) now under notice affects to number the Free-Tenants in each Fief of Somerset. It is impossible to do this with absolute certainty, for such Tenants as William de Monceaux or Nigel de Gornai, or Drogo de Montacute, were probably, but not demonstrably, identical with 'Willielmus,' or 'Nigellus,' or 'Drogo,' each mentioned in a plurality of other entries in the same Fief. In such cases we can only estimate probabilities, and count names accordingly.

In the case of the Free-Tenants of Glastonbury, numbered as 56 in the same column, we have gone further, and counted tenements rather than tenants. Thus in point of fact we have counted such a tenant as Roger de Corcelle ten times over. Something of the same kind results in 37 tenants in the Fief of the Bishop of Wells.—

Altogether, we are free to confess that the total of Free-Tenants numbered in this column exceeds the number of Free-Tenants actually named in Domesday.

But, on the other hand, a plurality of tenures like Roger de Corcelle's, involved also a plurality of sub-tenures; and the names of sub-tenants, though Free, rarely appear in the Somerset Domesday. We have no other means of approximating to the numbers of the sub-tenants than this of presuming some plurality of sub-tenures where one immediate tenant was a tenant in plurality.

¶ The second, fifth, and sixth columns of the Table (Vol. ii. p. 43) when combined, show or suggest how the adult male population of Somerset, deducible or supposable from Domesday, was in number about 13,670.

In other words,—among the tenants in chief, instanced in column 2, the number of permanent residents was perhaps 60. Of Knights, Free-Tenants, and Sub-Tenants, the number of residents, adumbrated in column 5, and consisting with Domesday data and Domesday reticences, was about 303. The Burgesses, Coliberti, and Gabulatores,—the tenants in Villeinage and all other adults, less than free and annexed to the land, are enumerated from Domesday data and appear in column 6 to have been about 13,307 in number. Arithmetically, $60 + 303 + 13,307 = 13,670$.

But, besides this complement of 13,670, there will have been several classes of adult male population in every County which were necessarily omitted in Domesday. These classes are suggestively instanced in our Dorset Volume (page 151, note 3). They were supposed to have amounted to 488 in that County. Let us put them at about 630 in Somerset.

The total adult male population inhabiting Somerset in A.D. 1086 will thus seem to have been about $(13,670 + 630 =) 14,300$. Now if we take the hidage and quasi-hidage of Dorset (2,650 hides) and the hidage and quasi-hidage of Somerset (3,488 hides); and if we have found the relative population of Dorset to have been 9,000 at the time of Domesday, we might expect to find a relative population in Somerset of 11,846. Instead of that, we find, as above, 14,300; and this is an illustration in full of what we have often instanced and suggested in detail, that Somerset, so far as its registered hidage can be taken as an index of its area, was a more populous County than Dorset.

Again, the existing parochial acreage of what constituted the Dorset of Domesday has been ascertained (Dorset Volume pp. 144, 145) to be 632,909 acres; and the existing parochial acreage of what constituted the Somerset of Domesday has been ascertained (Vol. ii. p. 7) to be 1,049,080 acres. So, if we have in A.D. 1086 a population for Dorset of 9,000, we might expect to find a proportionate population of 14,918 for Somerset. But we find only a population of 14,300.

So then Somerset,—settled, occupied, and hidated Somerset,—was in the eleventh century a more populous land than Dorset; but 'Lacustrine Somerset,' or Somerset, reckoned as including its vast areas of swamp and wilderness, was on the whole less populous, per square mile, than Dorset.

¶ At the Census of 1871 the males of all ages counted in Somerset were 228,027. Supposing that 128,027 of these were infants or youths under age, the remaining 100,000 adult males are more than sevenfold of the Domesday population; in other words, the Census of 1871 presents $7\frac{1}{7}$ adult males to the unit of the eleventh century. In Dorset the same Census presented 5 adult males to the unit of the eleventh century. So then, in Somerset, the population has increased in the proportion of 3 : 2 when compared with its increase in Dorset.

THE ANNUAL REVENUES AND VALUES, from all sources and of all descriptions, instanced in the Somerset Domesday, amount, according to the 7th column of the Table (Vol. ii, p. 43) of Fiefs, to £4168 0s. 3d., but, according to another Table (Vol. ii, p. 7, of Hundreds and Liberties), to £4161 4s. 7d. The reason of the discrepancy we hardly care to ascertain. It is, perhaps, in some small errors of computation, such as that in the latter Table, certain *blanche fermes* have not been expanded into ordinary currency.

We will take the said revenues and values at the higher figure, viz., £4168 0s. 3d per annum.

This gives £1 3s. 10d. as the value proportioned to each Domesday Hide;—1.1481 penny and decimals of a penny, as the value proportioned to each acre of Domesday specification;—and .9630 decimal parts of a penny as the proportion to each acre of modern ascertainment.

The contrast between these Domesday values and modern rents is probably greater in Somerset than in Dorset, inasmuch as any one, conversant with the modern statistics of Somerset, will probably put the existing rent-value of the whole County at a higher average than £1 1s. per acre (See Dorset Volume, p. 152).

THE FARM-LABOURER OF SOMERSET AT THE TIME OF DOMESDAY.

Co-ordinating with the single agricultural labourer of every district there was a certain quantity of land—of mixed land;—of the arable portions of such mixed land, and of such parts of the said arable land as were actually under tillage. These co-ordinates varied to an extent greater, perhaps, in Somerset than in any other county of the Survey.

We select certain Fiefs and districts, well calculated to show the degrees and the extremes of such variation.

FIEF, HUNDRED, OR MANOR IN WHICH THE ACREAGE CO-ORDINATING WITH A SINGLE AGRICULTURAL LABOURER, IS PROPOSED TO BE SHOWN.

	Acres per Labourer.		
	Gross.	Arable.	Ploughed.
All estates of the Vetus Dominicum Coronæ (twelve in number)	143	66	50
Hundred of Cutcomb and Minehead	142	29	25
Hundred of Williton	104	62	39
Hundred of Carhampton	102	53½	35
Hundred of Congresbury	89	56	52
Episcopal Hundred	85	63	52
Manors of the Earldom	77½	50	34
4 Manors of the late Queen Edith	75½	58	47
Hundred of Chew	69½	44½	35
Hundred of Chewton	63	44	40
Manor of Thorne (now Thorn Falcon)	61	60	40
Hundred of Loxley (now part of Whitley Hundred)	59¼	56	40½
Hundred of Ringoldsway (now part of Whitley Hundred)	58	52	47
Hundred of Whitstone	52¼	41	31½
Hundred of Huntspill	49	41	41
Manor of West Monkton	46½	43	35½
Manor of Thurlbear	43	41½	41½
Hundred of Crewkerne	43	37	30
Manor of Ham	37	36	30

With regard to the application of manual labour to the soil the extreme rates per acre, whether high or low, shown in the above Table to have obtained at the æra of Domesday, seem practically to obtain now. The mesne rates of the same two periods are, perhaps, nearly identical. If population has increased in the interval of eight centuries, so have the breadths of cultivation. If more science and more capital have been brought to bear on agriculture, this has not been so much by increasing the relative numbers of agrarian operatives as by the use of machinery.

DOMESDAY DISTRIBUTION OF SOMERSET LANDS.

The Table (Vol. ii, p. 43) may be used to establish yet further statistical results. Supposing the whole Domesday territory of Somerset (being upwards of 3480 hides or quasi-hides) were divided into 348 parts. Then, there will have belonged—

To the King, in demesne, or by lapse, or escheat	more than 75 such parts ;
and so more than one-fifth of the whole County.	
To the Abbot of Glastonbury	more than $44\frac{1}{2}$ such parts ;
or nearly one-eighth of the whole county.	
To Geoffrey de Moubrai, Bishop of Coutances.....	more than $36\frac{1}{2}$ such parts ;
or more than one-tenth of the county.	
To Robert, Comte of Moretain	nearly $34\frac{1}{2}$ such parts ;
or nearly one-tenth of the whole County.	
To the Bishop of Wells	more than 28 such parts.
To the Bishop and Monks of Winchester	nearly $12\frac{3}{4}$ such parts.
To the Abbeyes of Bath, Muchelney, and Athelney, and to other Religious Bodies and Personages	nearly 22 such parts.
To Walter de Dowai	nearly $10\frac{3}{4}$ such parts.
To Roger de Corcelle	nearly $10\frac{1}{4}$ such parts.
To William de Moione, Sheriff of Somerset	nearly 8 such parts.
To Roger Arundel	nearly $7\frac{1}{4}$ such parts.
To William de Owe.....	nearly $5\frac{3}{4}$ such parts.
To Turstin Fitz Rolf	nearly $5\frac{1}{2}$ such parts.
To Serlo de Burci	nearly $5\frac{1}{4}$ such parts.
To Alured de Hispania	nearly 4 such parts.
To Odo, Bishop of Baieux ; Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury ; Eustace, Comte of Boulogne ; Ida, Comtesse of Boulogne ; Hugh, Earl of Chester ; Baldwin de Exeter ; Edward de Salisbury ; Robert Fitz Gerold, and fourteen other Barons	nearly $22\frac{3}{4}$ such parts.
To Godebold (Archibalistarius) ; Robert de Auberville and seven other King's- Sergeants	more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ such parts.
To the Franco-Thanes, ten in number.....	more than $2\frac{3}{4}$ such parts.
To the Anglo-Thanes, eighteen in number	more than $6\frac{3}{4}$ such parts.
To diverse persons, holding the 'addita' and 'ablata' of large Manors	more than 3 such parts.
	Total..... <u>348</u>

Dividing the same 348 parts after another fashion, we find—

In the Crown	75 such parts.
In the Church and Religious Institutions	107 such parts.
In Lay-Fiefs, including the Military Fiefs of the Bishops of Bayeux, Coutances, and Salisbury	<u>166 such parts.</u>
	<u>348</u>

Hence it will be seen that the Church which, with its vassals and dependents, enjoyed more than a third of Dorset, enjoyed less than a third of Somerset ;—less by exactly nine parts out of three hundred and forty-eight.

Howbeit, Bishop Giso's Fief in Somerset was larger than Bishop Osmund's Fief in Dorset, and the Abbot of Glastonbury had, in Dorset and Somerset, a greater territory than was held by the Abbeyes of Shaftesbury, Cerne, Milton, Abbotsbury, and Athelney, combined.

LONDON : BOWDEN, HUDSON AND CO., PRINTERS,
23, RED LION STREET, HOLBORN.

