



SOMERSET.

Boundaries of Districts —

Ditto of County when
noncoincident with District -----

Ditto of Blocks — ; of Civil Parishes



The Five-Hide-Unit in the Somerset Domesday.

BY THE REV. E. H. BATES, M.A.

AT the outset an explanation of the agglutinated expression, "Five-hide-unit," is necessary. Every reader of Domesday knows that in that mighty record four statements in particular are set down for each vill or holding,—the new owner and the value of the vill when he received it, and the late owner and the number of hides for which the vill paid Dane-geld in the reign of King Edward the Confessor.

It is with the last fact of the four that this essay is concerned. The statement about the geld is simple enough in itself. It was a species of land-tax instituted, likely enough, by Ethelred the Unready, to obtain money to buy off the Danes. Or, if this is assuming too much, then an older payment, so intimately connected by the English with the incursions of their enemies, as to retain their memory in its name as late as the days of Henry II, when the Danes were as much to be feared as the legions of Rome.

But what was the Hide, the unit of assessment on which the tax was levied? As the hide was undoubtedly an areal measure for some purposes, it was only natural to answer the question thus: Divide the acreage of the vill by the number of hides at which it was assessed, and the result will be the size of the hide. But as early as the days of Sir Edward Coke this formula was found unsatisfactory, because no six results were ever the same; and down to the time of Kemble, anti-

quaries wearied themselves in trying to solve the puzzle as to the number of acres in a hide.

At length Eyton in his preface to the *Key to the Domesday of Dorset*, 1878, referred to the hide as "a measure of qualities, conditions, and values," rather than a fixed area; and considered the hide, with its sub-divisions, the virgate and the ferndel, to be "names merely borrowed from the vocabulary of other systems of areal mensuration, or if from any single system involving these proportions, then from a system which was antiquated long before the Conquest." And he refers elsewhere to the "fallacy of the Domesday hide being an areal measure at all." Having cleared his mind of this fallacy, he unfortunately picked up another one—that the land for one plough, "terra ad unam carucam," was always 120 acres. So Eyton must be set down as one who believed in an exact and universal area in the Domesday measures, merely substituting the "carucate" for the hide.

Another view has now been set forth by Mr. J. H. Round, of which I endeavour to give a précis from the essay in *Feudal England*, 1895. In examining the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensiensis*, which he calls the true key to the Domesday system, Mr. Round was struck by the number of villis which were assessed at five hides apiece. This fact is more or less obscured in Domesday, because the villis are arranged not locally but personally, that is, in each county the villis are surveyed under the owner's name, so that villis held by two or more owners are widely separated. In the *Inquisitio* the total number of hides in each vill is given before the survey of the aliquot parts; and the hundreds of the county arranged in tabular form showed that, in Cambridgeshire at least, neighbouring manors possessed of diverse acreage and an ever varying number of plough lands, might be all rated at the same number of hides, which are nearly always five or a multiple. The Domesday of other counties having been worked over with the same results, Mr. Round deduced the following statement: that the assess-

ment in hides bore no ratio to area or to value in a vill ; that the assessment was not objective but subjective, that is, not fixed relatively to area or to value, but so far as possible arranged that each vill or part should have an assessment of five hides, a multiple, or a fraction of this figure.

So the theory of the principle on which the hidage was arranged must be reversed. Instead of starting from a vill carefully assessed in hides according to the actual size or value, and so increasing through the hundreds up to a grand total for the county, the exact opposite took place. So many hides being supposed by the Witenagemot to be in the county (the total being based on traditionary estimates), the county court divided the sum among the hundreds, these having already lost any connection with arithmetical ideas ; then the hundred court settled the assessment on each vill or part, again relying on traditionary figures.

At this point Mr. Round calls a halt, until "there can be for the whole hidated region of England a complete and trustworthy analysis of assessment."

Now Mr. Eyton's analysis of the Somerset Domesday¹ can be brought into action. By making use of the Exeter Domesday and the Geld Inquests bound up therein, he endeavoured to arrange the vills, whole and fragmentary, hitherto scattered under the owners' names, in the hundreds to which they belonged, and to identify them with modern places. Somehow or other he overlooked the coincidence of the hidage of so many vills being assessed in five-hide-units, although in more than one instance he was evidently struck by it.

Perhaps, after all, it has been for the best that Eyton confined his labours to identifications. Without his work much time must necessarily have been taken up in correcting the identifications of Collinson ;² and even that accomplished, the results would always have lain open to the suspicion of having

1. *Rev. R. W. Eyton*, "Domesday Studies in Somerset," 2 vols, 1880.

2. *Rev. J. Collinson*, "History of Somerset," 3 vols., 1791.

been subordinated to the needs of the theory. As it is, I have applied a theory adopted from independent study, to an analysis made without any reference to it ; for to use the catch-word of another controversy, Eyton “knew nothing” of the five-hide-unit theory, and the result is, I venture to think, a confirmation alike of theory and analysis.

In the following tables Eyton’s analysis has been arranged according to Mr. Round’s theory. For this purpose the county has been arranged in twelve districts, containing one or more hundreds apiece ; and each district has been sub-divided into blocks containing assessments of twenty hides, with a few double and triple instances. The reasons for producing two new sets of areas are these.

I very soon found that though a large number of villis either severally or re-unitedly contained five hides or a multiple, yet many did not fall under this rule. Then it gradually became clear that adjacent villis were combined to form units or multiples ; and after a good deal of calculating, it seemed that an aggregation of twenty hides, that is a quaternion of five-hide-units, practically brought all the villis under the law of five hides or a multiple.

The two rules I laid down for my guidance in the matter were : (1) that the several villis making up the block must be adjacent ; (2) that all the portions of a divided vill must be in the same block. To this second rule there is only one exception, Merriott in District X. The exceptions to the first rule, though more numerous, are nearly all due to the presence in the district of some one very large vill, whereby the smaller villis were cut off from the blocks to which they by arithmetic belonged. These exceptions will be discussed in the notes on each district.

The effort to arrange the whole county on the Procrustean rule of twenty-hide blocks, also led incidentally to the discovery of certain errors, either clerical or topographical, in Eyton, and of certain omissions in Domesday, in addition to the one

already pointed out. In every instance I have been able to produce, either from Domesday itself or from other good authority, evidence for each case, without which my claim would be rightly put out of court at once.

I do not at present feel able to decide whether there is sufficient evidence to show that those blocks were in reality a portion of the scheme of assessment ; or, to use an architectural similitude, if they are to be regarded as the framing in a half-timbered house, an integral part of the building ; or simply as a builder's scaffolding, to be removed as soon as the work is completed. In the latter case the vills will still remain in units and multiples.

With regard to the other new area, the district, the case is very different. In the process of building up the twenty-hide blocks, it was evident that to complete them it would be necessary to overleap the limits of single hundreds ; and again a survey of the whole county showed that the hundreds and free manors could be aggregated into districts containing 300 or 200 hides apiece. The rule employed was that the district should contain every vill locally situate within it, thus excluding vills detached from the main bulk of the hundred within the district, but including the vills belonging to other hundreds. To this rule there is only one real exception, Whitox-Meade, which locality, situate in District III is reckoned under District IV. In, I think, two instances, vills on the borders of their hundred and district have been transferred to the adjoining district.

Although Group would be perhaps a more natural term for these aggregations of hundreds, I have chosen the term District to emphasize my belief that the present hundreds are divisions of the larger area, and not that the larger area was formed by grouping the hundreds together. But the real importance of the districts will be discussed after they have been passed under review.

The map is based on the index map of the Ordnance Survey,

which gives the boundaries of the civil parishes after the changes of 1884. It is hardly necessary to remind readers that the modern civil or ecclesiastical parish may be composed of vills which temp. Domesday were absolutely distinct. But while I have often separated vills now grouped together, it has not always been possible to alter the boundaries of the parish (indicated by dotted lines); and so these must be looked on as only approximately correct.

In the Tables, the first column contains the Domesday vills under the modern names as identified by Eyton; the second column the different parts of divided vills; the third column the hidage of each vill. The hide was divided into four virgates, each virgate into four fertines or ferndels, and each fertine contained seven-and-half acres, of which 120 made up one hide.

DISTRICT I.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	4.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
N. Perrott		10 . .	Tintinhull		7 1 .
Haselbury		10 . .	Montacute		9 . .
		20 . .	Thorne ...	2 . .	
				1 1 .	3 1 .
2.					
Chisselboro'		5 . .			19 2 .
Norton ...		5 . .			
Stoke ...	5 3 .				
" ...	2 1 2				
Stoke ...	1 3 2	10 . .			
		20 . .	5.		
			Sock Dennis	3 2 .	5 . .
			" ...	1 2 .	7 . .
3.					2 . .
Chinnock ...	7 + 4 + 3	14 . .	Limington		6 . .
Odcombe ...		5 . .	Oakley ...		
Lufton ...		1 . .	Chilthorne	3 + 2 + 1	
		20 . .			20 . .

DISTRICT I—continued.

6.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	11.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Draicote ...				2	.	.	Adber ...	1	1	.			
Ashington				3	.	.	"	3	.			
Mudford ...	5	.	.				" ...	1	.	.			
" ...	4	2	.								3	.	.
" ...	3	.	.				Marston ...	5 + 2			7	.	.
				12	2	.	Rimpton ...				5	.	.
Stone ...				2	.	.	Whitcombe				5	.	.
				19	2	.							
											20	.	.
7.							12.						
Brympton				3	.	.	Poyntington				2	2	.
Houndstone				1	.	.	Charlton H.	10 + 5			15	.	.
Preston Pl.				2	.	.							
Coker ...				15	.	.					17	2	.
				21	.	.							
8.							13.						
Yeovil ...	6 + 2			8	.	.	Goathill ...				1	.	.
Lyde ...				2	.	.	Milborne P.				1	.	.
Barwick ...				2	3	.	Ilchester ...				3	.	.
Closworth				7	.	.	Henstridge	10 + 4			14	.	.
				19	3	.					19	.	.
9.							14.						
Hardington				10	.	.	Templecomb	8 + 5			13	.	.
Pendomer				5	.	.	Turnie	3	.
Sutton Bing.				5	.	.	Stowell ...				3	.	.
				20	.	.					16	3	.
10.							15.						
Trent ...				7	.	.	Horsington				11	.	.
Sandford Or.				6	.	.	Cheriton S.				6	.	.
Corton Den.				7	.	.	Cheriton N.				5	.	.
				20	.	.					22	.	.
							TOTAL ...				295	.	.

District I is made up of the Domesday Hundreds of Milborne, Givelea, and Liet, now Horethorne, Stone and Yeovil, Houndsborough Barwick and Coker, and Tintinhull hundreds.

In Milborne hundred, Eyton's identifications are taken as they stand, for reasons will be given in the notes on District II for believing that the duplicated entry of Charlton here and there is an error in Somerton hundred.

In the other part of the group several changes will be necessary. The first alteration is in the items making up the ten-hide vill of Stoke-under-Ham. Eyton has two parts, but a third Stoke he identified with Birchenstoke *i.e.* Bichenstoke in Chew hundred. As the three fragments together made exactly ten hides, I became suspicious of Eyton's view, and made a search for the evidence which should connect Bichenstoke with the family of Beauchamp, after whom it is supposed to have received part of its name; but answer came there none. In fact this is one of the cases where Eyton allowed himself to follow Collinson's lead, without the independent enquiry which would have shown his error. In the exhaustive article on the family of de Beauchamp, by Mr. J. Batten,¹ Bichenstoke is never alluded to as in their possession, except in this Domesday connexion, their holdings in the northern part of the county coming in with the marriage of John de Beauchamp with Cecilia de Vivonia, c. 1270. Bichen is not an uncommon prefix: Bichen-stock in Wilts, identified by Canon W. H. Jones with Beechingstoke; Bykennalre now Bicknoller in West Somerset; and divers places in the Devonshire Domesday. Bichenstoke belonged to the Barry family in the reign of Edward I.

"Achileia" is said to be Hurst in Martock, apparently because Domesday reckons it as part of that manor. But as it is well understood that a place might be said to be in such and such a manor, when, as a matter of geography, it was

1. *Proceedings*, Somerset Archæological and Natural History Society, 36, ii, 20.

several miles away ; instead of supposing a change of name, some existing place, manor, tithing, farm, or even less should be searched for to represent the Domesday vill. This seems to be Oakley in Chilthorne Domer, which is mentioned as a separate holding in a fine of 3 John ; three hides in Akeler and Ciltone, *see* also Kirby's *Quest*. I have also brought into this hundred one of the few places which Eyton left undeterminate, Eslide, a manor of Roger Arundel. It seems to be the same place as Lyde, a tithing in Yeovil parish. In Kirby's *Quest*, Robert fil. Pagani holds Lude in Stone hundred of the king, and it is on record that he succeeded to many of Arundel's manors.

One other identification must be touched upon. In the Gheld-Inquest there is a reference to an unnamed manor of two-and-threequarter hides held of the bishop of Sco. Laudo by Osbern, which is in Yeovil hundred, but pays its Gild in Liet hundred (now Coker). There is no entry in Domesday which can be identified with this manor. There are two parishes in this neighbourhood which are not given in Domesday, though in existence by 1200, Barwick and Chilton Cantelo. Barwick was part of Stone hundred in the reign of Henry III ; though soon after its owner was enabled to hold them as a separate hundred.¹ Barwick being on the frontier of Stone and Coker hundreds, seems to answer very well to the status of the Gheld Inquest Manor which was connected with both these hundreds ; and the silence of Domesday, though a very great, is not an insuperable bar, as at least one Somerset manor was omitted (*see* after Group IV) in the Survey. I have therefore resuscitated the anonymous manor as Barwick.

In Block 13, Ilchester seems an exception to the rule that the component vills should be adjacent. The regal possessions in Ilchester were reckoned as a member of Milborne ; and this attachment was probably the reason why the hidage of the two boroughs should be united.

1. *J. Batten*, Historical Notes on South Somerset, pp. 3, 29.

By means of these alterations, for all of which I have been able to bring forward some evidence, the greater part of the manors may be arranged according to the theory—five hides, multiples, or fractions. An occasional overplus in one block, *e.g.*, 7 is counterbalanced by deficiencies in adjacent ones 4 and 6. No. 8 is one virgate short. In blocks 12, 13, 14 there is a more serious deficiency, amounting to two-and-half hides in No. 12, one hide in No. 13, and one-and-quarter hides in No. 14, for I think that this block was only intended to be eighteen hides, to counterbalance the twenty-two hides in the adjacent block, No. 15. An explanation will be attempted afterwards, but at present it can only be noted that four hides and three quarters are wanted to make these three blocks conformable.

DISTRICT II.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	4.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Brewham ...		12 . .	Milt. Cleved.		10 . .
Stony-Stoke		3 . .	Upton Noble		3 . .
Redlynch ...		4 . .	Bruton ...	$1\frac{1}{4} + 1 + \frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{1}{5}F.$	2 3 $1\frac{1}{5}$
Discove ...		1 . .	Ansford ...		
		20 . .			20 3 $1\frac{1}{5}$
2.					
Yarnfield ...		2 . .	5.		
Kilmington .		5 . .	Pitcombe ...		5 . .
Penselwood .		3 . .	Shept. Mont.		5 . .
Cucklington		7 . .	Knowle ...	$1\frac{1}{2} + 1$	2 2 .
Stoke Trist'r		3 . .	Yarlington .		
		20 . .			19 2 .
3.			6.		
Charlton M.		5 . .	Maperton ...		5 . .
Wincanton .	$3\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$	4 . .	Blackford ...	4 + 1	5 . .
Bratton S. M		4 . .	Compton P.		6 . .
Holton ...		2 . .	Woolston {	$\begin{matrix} 3 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & . & . \end{matrix}$	4 1 2
Clapton ...	3 + 2	5 . .			
		20 . .			20 1 2

DISTRICT II—continued.

7.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	12.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Cadbury N.		12 . .		1 1 2	
Cadbury S.	$2\frac{1}{4} + \frac{3}{4}$	3 . .	Foddington	2 1 .	5 . .
Sutt. Montis		5 . .	Queen Camel	1 1 2	15 . .
		20 . .			20 . .
8.					
West. Bam.	$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 \\ . & 2 & . \end{pmatrix}$	4 3 .	13.		
Sparkford ...		5 1 .	Stert ...		2 . .
Barrow N. .		5 . .	Cary Fitzpn.		. 3 3
Barrow S. .		5 . .	Lytes Cary .		1 . 1
		20 . .	Milton Pod.		6 . .
			Charl. Ad. ?*		2 . .
			„ Mack.		3 . .
			„ addita		. 2 .
			Denesmodes		. 2 .
			Lydford E. .		4 . .
9.					
Castle Cary .		15 . .			20 . .
Alford ...		5 . .			
		20 . .			
			14.		
			Camel W' .		10 . .
			Yeovilton ...	8 + 2	10 . .
10.					
Lovington .		6 . .			20 . .
Wheathill ...		3 . .			
Lydford W.		9 . .			
Barton pt. ...		1 . .	15.		
Kein. in Bar.		1 . .	Long Sutton		10 . .
		20 . .	Somerton ...	$4 + 1 + \frac{1}{2}$	5 2 .
			Pitney ...	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$	1 . .
			Aller ...		2 . .
			Worth ?§ ...		1 2 .
11.					
Bart. S. Dav.	$3\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{1}{2}$	5 . .			20 . .
Kingweston .		5 . .			
Keint. Mand.		5 . .	TOTAL ...		300 2 $3\frac{1}{5}$
Babcary ...	$2\frac{1}{2} + 2\frac{1}{2}$	5 . .			
		20 . .	***Cari."		
			§ Oathe.		

District II is made up of the hundreds of Bruton (now Bruton, Catash, and Norton Ferrers), Somerton, and that part of Pitney which was liable to the Gheld. It contains three hundred hides and a fraction more. It also includes Milton Podymore, which temp. Domesday was in Frome hundred.

In Bruton hundred Eyton's identifications stand, with the exception of Milton Clevedon. I have already given reasons in the *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, v, p. 346, for removing the vill of Milton assigned by him here, to Milton in Winterstoke, and for placing here the Milton of Matthew de Moritania, rated at ten hides, which Eyton had omitted altogether. This alteration restores harmony in the blocks, and is based on historical evidence. In Somerton hundred Eyton introduced a vill of Charlton, identified as Charlton Adam, which he had duplicated in Milborne hundred as part of Charlton Horethorne. This item of five hides was wanted in the latter hundred to make the figures of Domesday agree with those of the Geld Inquest. For the instances where the Domesday total is less than the Geld Inquest figures are fewer and the difference trifling, compared with the instances in the other direction. As the Geld Inquest for Somerton hundred is missing, no assistance can be derived thence. The historical evidence is fairly decisive. The Charlton in dispute was held by Reginald de Valle-Torta under the Court of Moretaine, and was rated at five hides. The undisputed manor of Charlton (Horethorne) held by Robert Fitzgerald was rated at ten hides, so that the two parts of Charlton were one-third and two-thirds. Now it is confirmatory of this division that in 5 Stephen, 1139-40, Gerard de Campville gave two parts of the tithes of Charlton to Berdmonsey Abbey, and that his son Richard gave to Kenilworth Abbey the remaining third with the church, perhaps after the divided parts of the manor had been reunited under the same owner.

As it will be necessary to point out at intervals, the fact that by far the greatest part of the vills in Somerset fit into

twenty-hide blocks, tends to make it probable that in the very few instances to the contrary, the difficulty is rather due to the lapse of time and loss of evidence than to an actual disagreement. An examination of block 13 will show how perfectly the small villis and fragments combine together if this identification be allowed. An additional five hides here would upset the system, just as much as their absence would District I.

Then what is the Domesday prototype of Charlton Adam? The Charlton now left in the hundred, divided into two parts rated at three hides and a half, is identified by Eyton with West Charlton or Charlton Mackrell. Then there are three villis called Cari. One held by Roger Arundel, rated at three virgates three fert.,¹ is no doubt Cary Fitzpaine. Another Cari held by Humphrey the Chamberlain was rated at one-and-quarter hides, that is one quarter of five hides. As five hides composed one knight's fee, *vide* Pedes Finium, 3 John, No. 41, 5 John, No. 26, in *Somerset Records*, vol. vi, pp. 17, 21; this Cari may be assigned to Lytes Cary, set down in Kirby's *Quest* as held by William de Lit for the fourth part of one knight's fee. Then there is the third Cari, rated at two hides, also held by Humphrey the Chamberlain. This was identified by Eyton, but as we have seen superfluously, with a part of Lytes Cary. At the same time, Charlton Adam is apparently omitted in Domesday, unless it can be identified with this third Cari.

Mr. Batten, in *Historical Notes on South Somerset*, p. 125, discusses the title of de Mandeville to Charlton Adam, but as this was only acquired in the reign of Henry III, its earlier history was not necessary. In the Cartulary of Bruton Abbey (*S. R. S.*, viii,) are some early charters relating to Charlton Adam, which seem to supply the missing link between Cari and Charlton. During the episcopate of bishop Robert, 1142-1166, John Fitzhamon presented the church of Charlton Adam

1. Eyton, by a slip, enters it as three hides three virgates.

to the abbey, and the charter of confirmation by the bishop contains a clause that Roger, son of Odo, quitclaimed his right to the advowson, concerning which he had begun a suit. Well, in the Pipe Roll for 14 Hen. II, 1167-8, *i.e.* just after the latest possible date of the confirmation charter, Roger de Viliers paid a fine of forty shillings, "pro defectu," that is for not putting in an appearance or abandoning some suit already begun.¹ This is a coincidence of some value. But Roger de Viliers was the son-in-law and (in the person of his son) coheir of Helias de Orescuil, whom Eyton considered to be the representative of the Chamberlain (*Som. Domesday*, i, 66, 67). The weakest point in this chain of evidence is the presence of Roger claiming in his own right as early as 1167. In the first place the Orescuil property was not divided between the representatives of the female coheirs until 1210 (Rot. Pip. 12 John); and even supposing that Charlton Adam with apparently only a weak title had been the *dot* of Roger's wife, Alice de Orescuil, then her name would have been mentioned with his in the quitclaim clause. This last difficulty makes it probable that Roger was fighting for his own hand. His claim may have been based upon nothing better than an exercise of the good old rule and simple plan, which in the troubled reign of Stephen was a favourite means of conveyance, or he and Fitzhamon may have had a royal grant and fallen out in the division of the spoils. A seizure of the father's lands may seem a curious prelude to wooing the daughter, but such an introduction is not altogether unknown in modern times.

In block 1, Brewham will be found by itself. Eyton placed with it a certain "addita" of three virgates, and a portion of Witeham "abbata de Brewham." As these two portions make an integral part of block 1 in District III, wherein Witham is situated, I have transferred them thither, without prejudice as to their rightful hundred temp. Domesday.

In block 2, Yarnfield and Kilmington are separated from

1. Reeves, "History of the English Law," edit. Finlason, i, 411.

the other manors by an intervening piece of Wiltshire—Stourton; and a smaller portion, Gasper, which used to belong sometimes to one county and sometimes to the other, until a Local Government Order put a stop to such vagaries.

In block 4, Upton Noble is separated from Bruton by a part of Brewham. It will be found generally that these divided blocks occur on the borders either of other districts or of the county itself. The one-and-one-fifth fertine was an “ablata de” Bruton in Redlynch, and the half hide lay in Kilmington, though a part of the royal manor of Bruton. One must notice that these two pieces, with the two fertines in Woolston, make up the surplus over three hundred hides, and that if they are omitted, the contiguous blocks, 4, 5, 6, are twenty-and-quarter, nineteen-and-half, and twenty-and-quarter hides respectively, or an average of twenty hides. With this result should be compared, in District I, the three adjacent blocks, 4, 6, 7, containing nineteen-and-half, nineteen-and-half, twenty-one hides. The two items in Bruton may be accounted for as becoming liable to hidation at a later period, but the two fertines in Woolston are not so easily disposed of.

In block 10 I have included two pieces of Barton St. David, which are certainly not wanted with their namesake in block 11, and do just as certainly fit in where I have placed them. There is a geographical point where West Lydford meets a piece of Keinton, pushed up between itself and Barton St. David, and this may mark the position of the two hides.

In block 13, East Lydford is included, although it is separated from the block by Kenton Mandeville and Babcary. This seems to be its proper home, and it is curious that it still belongs to the hundred of Somerton, to which all the other constituent members of the block (with the exception of Milton Podymore) belong. Also it would be possible to pass from Lydford East to block 13, without trespassing into the parishes aforementioned, by keeping along the great Fosse road, which may have been looked upon as a bridge. The excess of

the total number of hides in this district is quite minute, and as I said above, may be partly accounted for by portions of exempt royal domains becoming the property of a subject and then hidated.

DISTRICT III.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	5.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Witham ...	1 + 2	3 . .	Road ...	9 + 1	10 . .
Brewham, in		. 3 .	Laverton ...		10 . .
"Ufetone" .		1 . .			
Eastrip ...	1 + $\frac{1}{4}$	1 1 .			20 . .
Wanstrow ...	5 + 4	9 . .			
Marston Big.		3 2 .			
Keyford 2 .	6.		
Egford ...		1 . .	Norton S. Ph		10 . .
			Hinton Char.		10 . .
		20 . .			20 . .
2.					
Cranmore ...		12 . .	7.		
Downhead .		3 . .	Englischo'be		10 . .
Whatley ...		5 . .	Twerton ...	7 $\frac{1}{2}$ + 2 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 . .
		20 . .			20 . .
3.			8.		
Cloford ...		10 . .	Newt. S. Loe	7 + 3	10 . .
Nunney ...	5 + 5	10 . .	Corston ...		10 . .
		20 . .			20 . .
4.			9.		
Rodden ...		1 . .	Combehay...		2 . .
Berkeley ...		2 2 .	Dunkerton .	3 + $\frac{1}{4}$	3 1 .
Standerwick		1 2 .	Carlingcott .		3 2 .
Beckington .		10 . .	Eachwick 1 .
Orch'rdleigh		5 . .	"Evestia" .		1 . .
			Camerton ...		10 . .
		20 . .			20 . .

DISTRICT III—*continued.*

10.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	14.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Ston. Lit'ton	2, 1½, 1½	5 . .	Mells		14 2 .
Forscote ...		5 . .	Millescote ...		5 2 .
Writhlingt'n		6 . .			
Walton ...		3 . .			20 . .
		19 . .			
11.			15.		
Hemington .		21 . .	Ashwick 2 .
			Stratton ...		3 . .
12.			Pitcot ...	3½ + 1½	5 . .
Buckld. Din.		12 . .	Kilmersdon .		. 2 .
Lullington .		7 . .	Radstock ...		7 3 .
		19 . .	Woodboro' .		1 . .
					17 3 .
13.					
Elm		5 . .			
Hardington .		4 . .			
Wydergrave		2 . .	TOTAL ...		297 3 .
Babington...		5 . .			
Luckington .		5 . .			
		21 . .			

District III, though as large as Nos. I and II, is peculiar in that it consists of only one Domesday hundred, that of Frome. This is now divided into the hundreds of Frome, Wellow, and Kilmersdon, besides certain liberties. Eyton's tables require but the smallest of corrections. Keyford (Kaivert) is not two hides, but two virgates. "Caivel" is identified by him with another part of Keyford, but this would not fit in with the theory of the five-hide-unit, and was in another way objectionable. I have identified it with Cholwell in Cameley (see District V, 6), which is more likely from the phonetics, and the vill fits in perfectly in its new home.

The second manor in Nunney is without a name in Domesday (Exeter and Exchequer). Eyton, by an examination of

internal evidence (i, 158, *seq.*), placed a manor of the abbey of Montebourg here. It contained five hides, and its presence brings block 3 up to the required total.

Two manors, Tellisford five hides, and Farleigh Hungerford half hide, are omitted in the table, as they would not combine with any of the neighbouring blocks. Now the Geld Inquest for 1084 gives 298 hides for the figures of Frome hundred; Eyton gives $306\frac{1}{4}$ hides, but when the entry relating to Kaivert has been corrected, and Caivel removed altogether, the amount is reduced to $303\frac{1}{2}$ hides, which differs from the Geld Inquest by five-and-half hides, the exact amount of the two manors mentioned above. A theory concerning this fact will be stated later on.

In block 1 are placed an "addita" to Brewham, three virgates, and one hide, then in Witham, but which is noted as having been an "ablata" from Brewham. Eastrip, which is now in Brewham, and therefore in Bruton hundred, was at this period in Frome hundred. I cannot pretend to account for this addition and subtraction, but when the items are added together here they make a very neat result. The Exchequer Domesday gives the larger estate in Witham as three hides, instead of two, the figure of the Exeter Codex. Here the theory supports the latter authority.

Block 2. Downhead was certainly not in the hundred temp. Domesday. See some notes in District VI.

Block 9. The site or modern equivalent of "Evestia" is unknown. Eyton notes that the Domesday list places it between Corston and Ashwick. A charter in the Bath Chartulary (*S. R. S.*, vii, 25) mentions that "Geofanstiga," *i.e.* "Evestia," is on the rivulet Camelar.

In block 10, the three first villas are situated on the right bank of the river Somer; Walton is in Kilmersdon parish, now reduced to a farm house, but apparently with Luckington (in block 13) making up the modern parish of Kilmersdon, unmentioned in Domesday, except as regards its church, which was endowed with one half hide. This block falling short of

the ideal number by one hide, is exactly balanced by the twenty-one hides of the huge vill of Hemington, which touches all the four villis.

Blocks 12 and 13 also balance each other, but in the case of 13 I must confess the rule of contiguity breaks down. This is partly caused by the proximity of the two large villis of Hemington and Mells. Elm is separated from Hardington by Buckland Dinham, while Mells intervenes between the latter and Babington with Luckington. The two blocks could be re-arranged into two contiguous combinations of thirty and ten hides apiece.

In block 15, Radstock seems to want two hides and a quarter to make it a vill of ten hides, to make block 15 up to twenty hides, and to round District III into 300 hides. Of this again.

DISTRICT IV.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	4.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Freshford .	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$	1 . .	Weston ...	15 + 5	20 . .
Woodwick .		2 2 .			
Firford ...		2 2 .			
Monk. Com.		9 . .			
		15 . .	5.		
			Kelston ...		5 . .
			Charlcombe .		4 . .
2.			Widcombe .		10 . .
Claverton .		5 . .	Whitoxmead		1 . .
Bathampton		5 . .			
Bathford ...		10 . .			20 . .
		20 . .			
			6.		
3.			Bath ...		20 . .
Batheaston .	3, 2, $1\frac{1}{2}$	6 2 .			
Bathwick ...	4, 2, 1	7 . .			
Tatwick ...	$1\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$	2 . .			
Woolley ...	1 + 1	2 . .	TOTAL ...		115 . .
Langridge...		2 2 .			
		20 . .			

District IV contains only 115 hides, being the patrimony of the religious establishment at Bath. An unusual wealth of charters enables the historian to trace their history back to the reign of Osric, king of the Hwicci, c. 676. He gave one hundred "manentes," which are adjacent to the city which is called "Hat Bathu," to the abbess Bertana and the nunnery (*Bath Cartulary*, S. R. S., vii, 7). By Domesday twenty hides had been added, being the assessment on Bath itself, but on the other hand five hides had disappeared from the district. By a process of exhaustion, these hides can be localised at either North Stoke or South Stoke. Either vill has an Anglo-Saxon charter of dotation, mentioning the number of hides as five. Kemble marks both these charters as spurious, still, one of them must represent a genuine gift. As the position of South Stoke fits in the best with the twenty-hide block theory, the blocks are arranged accordingly, to the exclusion of North Stoke, which under the circumstances may originally have been the smaller (five hide) portion of Weston. This curtailment of the assessment by five hides, with the similar diminutions in Districts I and III, will be noticed later on.

As regards Freshford, the Rev. T. W. Whale¹ would identify it with Vexford, in Stogumber, a situation more in accord with its position in Domesday. But this test cannot be insisted on, and all other evidence, both that collected by Eyton and the new test of the five-hide-unit, retain it here.

Block 1 is accordingly five hides short. Block 5 now presents a somewhat disintegrated appearance, which is yet not incompatible with original symmetry. Kelston is cut off from the district by Weston, a complete block in itself. This manor is omitted in Domesday, though clearly referred to in the Geld Inquest. As Eyton says "it is an omission of the Great Record, a thing not lightly to be suspected, but nevertheless a fact." But for this manifest default it would have been impossible to postulate the omission of Barwick (Dis-

1. *Proceedings Bath Field Club*, ix, no. 2, p. 136.

trict I). Then Kelston is joined in the same block with Charlcombe, Lyncombe, and Wittoxmead. The first two are now divided by Bath itself, and the last-mentioned vill is locally situate in Wellow parish in District III. The first difficulty may be got over by remembering that Bath was a royal possession, and therefore not included in the hidation scheme, until the time of Edith, wife of Edward the Confessor. There are no charters to explain when Wittoxmead was added to the original donation of king Osric. It is hardly likely to have formed part of his gift, as it lay in territory beyond his sway, and one can only suggest that when some later royal benefactor (for Wellow was regal property) gave the vill, the assessment of one hide placed on it was compensated by a corresponding relief on the Charlcombe assessment.

DISTRICT V.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	4.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Saltford ...		4 . .	Chew Magna		30 . .
Keynsham .		50 . .	Clutton ...		10 . .
Norton Malr.		5 . .			<hr/> 40 . .
		<hr/> 59 . .			
2.			5.		
Priston ...		6 . .	Farmboro' .	5 + 5	10 . .
Wilmington		3 . .	Timsbury ...	5, 3, 2	10 . .
Stant. Prior		3 . .			<hr/> 20 . .
Marksbury .		10 . .			
		<hr/> 22 . .			
3.			6.		
Comp. Dund.		10 . .	High Little.		5 . .
Chelwood ...	5 + 3	8 . .	Hallatrow ...		4 3 2
			Cameley ...		9 . 2
			Cholwell ...		1 1 .
		<hr/> 18 . .			<hr/> 20 1 .

DISTRICT V—*continued.*

7.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	10.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Farringd. G.				5	.	.	Harptree E.	5+5			10	.	.
Stone Easton	4½	1½	1¼	7	1	.	Harptree W.	5+5			10	.	.
Haia ...				2	.	.							
Chilcompton				5	.	.					20	.	.
				19	1	.							
8.							11.						
Emborough.				3	.	.	Comp. Mart.				5	.	.
Chewton ...	29	+	½	29	2	.	Ubley ...				5	.	.
Litton ...				8	2	.	Blagdon ...				10	.	.
				41	.	.					20	.	.
9.													
Hin. Blewett				7	.	.							
Moreton ...				5	.	.	TOTAL ...				300	.	.
Chewstoke .	3,	2,	1¾	8	2	.							
	¾,	½,	½	20	2	.							

District V contains the Hundreds of Keynsham, Chew, and the greater part of Chewton, omitting the isolated villis of Yatton and Kingston Seymour. In the notes on Districts I and III will be found my reasons for removing Birchenstoke from this hundred, and adding to it Cholwell. There is a discrepancy in the Domesday entry relating to Hinton Blewett. It is said to geld for eight hides, but the different items of holdings only amount to seven hides, which Eyton considers to be the correct amount. I have therefore entered it as a seven-hide vill, and this correction makes the total of the District exactly 300 hides. In the hundred of Chew, Eyton enters Hawkewella 1v. 1¼f., and identifies it with Norton Hawkfield. This is an extraordinary blunder, caused by following Collinson. Hawkfield is simply a corruption of Hautville, Latin, de Alta Villa, the family name of the holders

in the thirteenth century, just in the same way as the Malrewards gave their cognomen to the other portion of Norton; the vill having been divided at some date subsequent to 1066. Hawkewella will be found in Hawk-well; there are two places of this name in West Somerset, one in Dulverton, the other in Cutcombe (see notes on District XII). Eyton did not proceed further in the identification of Haia beyond the certainty that it was in Chewton hundred. I identify it with Hay Street in Stone Easton. The totals of the blocks look rather ragged at first sight, compared with the results in the earlier districts, as out of eleven, only four contain twenty hides exactly. But on the other hand it is very noticeable that the gaps balance; the deficit in block 1 corresponding to the overplus in block 8, while blocks 6, 7, 9, with a total of sixty hides, meet on the confines of Hinton Camely and Farrington. In block 7 Chilcompton is isolated from the other vills by Binegar, reckoned to be in Wells, and Midsomer Norton with its detached member of Downside. These places, as well as Paulton, are not mentioned in Domesday, and were included in other manors, apparently Wells and Chewton.

DISTRICT VI.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	4.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Batcombe		10 1 .	E. Pennard	19 + 1	20 . .
A 'member'		2 . .			
Westcombe		7 3 .			
		20 . .			
2.			5.		
Evercreech		20 . .	Ditchat ...		5 . .
			A 'member'		7 . .
			"		1 . .
3.			Lamyat ...		5 2 .
Doulting ...		14 . .	Alhampton		6 2 .
A 'member'		2 3 .	Hornblotton		5 2 .
Charlton ...		3 1 .	Baltonsboro'		5 . .
			Stone ...		5 . .
		20 . .			40 2 .

DISTRICT VI—*continued.*

6.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	7.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Pilton ...				2	.	.	Wells ...	50 + 2			52	.	.
Crocombe				3	.	.	Westbury ...				6	.	.
Pylle ...				5	.	.							
Wootton ...				5	.	.					58	.	.
S. Mallet ...				6	2	.							
							TOTAL ...				200	.	.
				21	2	.							

District VI contains the hundreds of Wells Forum and Whitstone, with the vill of Baltonsborough, now in Glaston Twelve Hides. It does not include Downhead, an isolated manor of Whitstone. At the date of the Survey, Wells Forum was included under the spacious heading, "Terra Episcopi Gisonis." Whitstone hundred was, in Eyton's words, "in a somewhat indefinite status." Domesday makes it to contain 120 hides with Downhead and Baltonsborough, whereas the Geld Inquest is only levied on 115 hides. As Downhead had in all probability a distinct inquest (now lost), there is only a difference of two hides between the two sets of figures, which is not so large a discrepancy as in many other hundreds. What is of more importance at present is that the total of 117 hides added to the seventy-eight of Wells Forum is only 195, five hides short of a symmetrical result.

An entry in Domesday will I think account for this shortcoming. At the end of the list of the Glastonbury estates are a series of entries relating to lands which at this time had passed into the hands of others. Among the land-grabbers was the earl of Moretain, who held Stane, valued at £9, Stoca and Stoca, worth forty shillings, and Dregcota, also worth forty shillings. Eyton identifies Stone with Stone in East Pennard; Stoca and Stoca with Stoke Lane; and Dregcota with Draycott in Shepton Mallett. In no case is the hidage of the vill given; the only means of identification, other than the owners' names, being their value.

Now an examination of the table will show that no increase of hidage is required in the case of Doultling and Shepton Mallett. At the same time it appears that Draycote in Limington Moretain's property was valued at forty shillings; also that an Estochet al. Stochet (late Beechenstoke) and Estochet (Stoke-under-Ham) are each worth forty shillings apiece. It does not seem too much to conclude that these statements are simply duplicate references to the same vill. With regard to Stone the conditions are reversed. The only other Stone in Domesday is the one in Stone Hundred, owned by Serlo de Burcy, and worth ten shillings. Other men and other value. The high value of the Stone of the Count of Moretain presupposes a fair hidage, and curiously enough, five hides in the adjacent vill of Ditchet are rated as high as £12. So, all things considered, it does not seem too great a demand on the liability to err of Domesday, to suppose that here again is a case of omission. It is the third and last time that Domesday will be required to confess to a slip. The first, that of Kelston, was established by Mr. Eyton; the second, that of Barwick, seems borne out by the testimony of his witness, the Geld Inquest; and for the third there is the indirect evidence of Domesday itself. The risk involved in entering the ownership of a vill, disputed by the highest secular and spiritual persons in the county, with king William as the final court of appeal in the background, may have caused such perturbation in the minds of the jurors, as to result in a temporary loss of memory in the case of Stone. The difficulty that then arises from the excess of the hidage in the Domesday entries over the figures of the Geld Inquest, will be met by removing Baltonsborough back into Glaston Twelve Hides. Eyton remarks that the "dominicum" of the abbot in Baltonsborough is necessary to complete the figures in the Geld Inquest; but if Stone had passed from the abbot to Moretain between 1084 and 1086, this objection would not apply, and the recent date of the transfer would account for the confused nature of the entries in 1086.

Another very interesting point occurs here. "The Domesday details of hidage amount to 120 hides for twenty-one items of estate (including Downhead), but when Domesday masses these items into groups, it supplies a total of only 118 hides."¹ Now reverse this true statement, and it means that when the large vill in Whitstone were broken up by subinfeudation, two hides were added to the original assessment; in Ditchat half a hide, in Pilton one hide and a half. The table shows that these additions destroy the symmetry of the block-system, but that at the same time they balanced a deficit in Wells. It seems very plain that the bishop had contrived to shuffle the liabilities attaching to two hides on to his neighbour and rival, the abbot of Glastonbury and his tenants.

DISTRICT VII.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	4.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Easton-in-G.		12 . .	Wraxall ...		20 . .
Portbury ...		8 . .	"addita" ...		1 . .
		20 . .			21 . .
2.			5.		
Portishead .		8 . .	Tickenham .	$8\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{3}{4}$	10 1 .
West.-in-G.	$7 + 3\frac{1}{4}$	10 1 .	Chelvey ...	$1 + \frac{1}{4}$	1 1 .
		18 1 .	Midgehill ...		1 . .
			Brockley ...		4 . .
			Claverham .		2 . .
			Kenn 2 .
3.					
Clapt.-in-G.		5 2 .			19 . .
Walt.-in-G.		3 2 .			
Clevedon ...		5 2 2			
Kingst. Sey.		5 2 .	6.		
		20 . 2	Yatton ...		20 . .

1. *Eyton*, i, 195.

DISTRICT VII—*continued.*

7.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	10.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Long Ashton				20	.	.	Winford ...	10	+	1	11	.	.
							Regilbury ...	2,	1 $\frac{1}{4}$,	$\frac{1}{2}$	3	3	.
							Butcombe ...				3	.	.
							Aldwick ...				2	.	.
8.							Haryat ...				1	2	.
Backwell ...				10	.	.	Shepbwurda				.	2	.
Barrow Gur.				10	.	.							
											21	3	.
				20	.	.							
9.							TOTAL ...				200	0	2
Wrington ...				20	.	.							

District VII contains the hundreds of Hareclive (but not Bedminster), Portbury, the isolated portion of Chewton, Kenn, now in Winterstoke hundred, and Havyat Green, now in Wrington, but placed by Eyton after Collinson in Burrington. These villis are all to the north of the river Yeo, which I have taken as the southern boundary of the district. I have also brought into block 10 "Shepbwurda al. Scepeworde," for which Eyton could find no modern equivalent. No more can I at present, but its presence here is desiderated for several reasons. With its figure, half hide, block 10 exactly balances block 2; and the district is brought up to a round figure, as the two fertines in Clevedon are a negligible quantity. Then there are a number of small holdings in this block, one of which, in Ridgehill, was already held by an Englishman. Finally Shepbwurda must be somewhere in the county.

Block 5 is broken up by the intervening mass of Wraxall, which apparently then included Nailsea, and forms block 4. These two blocks, however, mutually correct one another.

DISTRICT VIII.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	7.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Woodspring		9 1 .	Shipham ...		4 . .
Kewstoke ...		1 2 .	Cheddar ...	$2\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8}$	2 1 2
Worle ...		6 2 .	Draycot 1 .
Pantesheda .		. 2 .	Stoke Rod .		5 1 .
Milton ...	$1\frac{1}{2} + 1$	2 2 .	Weare ...		6 . .
			Badgworth .		2 . .
		20 1 .			19 3 2
2.					
Ashcombe .	$2\frac{3}{4} + 3\frac{1}{2}$	6 1 .	8.		
Uphill ...		6 2 .	Clewer 2 3
Hutton ...		5 . .	Alston Sutt.		4 2 .
Elborough .		3 . .	Chap. Aller.		11 . .
		20 3 .	Tarnock ...	$1 + 1$	2 . .
			Edingworth		2 . .
					20 . 3
3.					
Bleadon ...		15 . .	9.		
Loxton ...		5 . .	Brent ...		20 . .
		20 . .			
			10.		
4.			Wedmore ...		10 . .
Congresbury		20 . .	Bodeslega ...		1 . .
			Eachwick 1 $3\frac{1}{15}$
5.			Huish 2 .
Banwell ...		30 . .	Burnham ...		4 . .
Compt. Bish.	$5 + 4 + 1$	10 . .	Huntspill ...	$1 + \frac{3}{4}$	1 3 .
		40 . .	Alstone ...		1 . .
			Brean ...		2 . .
					20 2 $3\frac{1}{15}$
6.					
Winscombe .		15 . .			
Langford ...		5 . .			
		20 . .	TOTAL ...		221 3 $0\frac{1}{15}$

District VIII contains the hundreds of Winterstoke, Congresbury, and Cheddar (now all united under the first-named), Bempstone (less Cossington), and parts of Brent with Wrington, and Huntspill with Puriton. The total hidage amounts

to $221\frac{3}{4}$ hides, plus a fraction of a fertine, that is nearly two hides more than a round number. As this is the only district where the actual figures differ from the ideal by anything over a mere fraction, it is worth while to try and see if it can be explained. In the adjoining District IX, the total, if Eyton's figures be followed, comes to $200\frac{1}{2}$ hides. But Eyton (i, 175) points out in his notes on Locheslei hundred that probably the separate entry relating to Stawell two-and-half hides is redundant; and that the hidage of this vill, as of several others, had been already included in the thirty hides of Shapwick. If this be followed, then District IX will contain only 197 hides, 2 vir., 2 fer., the deficiency almost exactly balancing the overplus in District VIII, now under review.

The system of equalizing blocks, which has been noted several times already, appears to have been also applied to the districts on occasion.

From this surplusage it follows that the figures of the blocks will present a ragged appearance. Block 1 contains Milton, one-and-half hides, which Eyton considered to be Milton Clevedon (see note on District II); also "Pantesheda." The situation of this small vill had been left indeterminate by Eyton, with the remark that it would probably be found near Banwell. His extraordinary acumen in this department is amply confirmed by an entry in the twelfth volume of the Somerset Record Society, p. 67, *Pedes Finium*, 11 Ed. II, No. 28, "Ponteside juxta Bannewelle." I cannot, however, find any modern representative, unless it may be Puttingworth Farm, which is in an angle of the parish adjoining the other members of the block. Block 5 is made up of Banwell thirty hides; and separated from it by the curiously shaped parish of Winscombe, Compton Bishop, ten hides. Eyton put down three vills of Compton as indeterminate in regard to their identification, as they were all in the hands of lay owners temp. Domesday; and concluded that the present parish of Compton Bishop was then part of Banwell, as Churchill and

Puxton certainly were. But by this time one expects to find twenty-hide blocks; and as there are ten hides wanting to complete this block, and a parish of Compton handy, the three villis of Compton aggregating ten hides can be accommodated at once. Block 6 : Langford is now superseded as a parish-name by Burrington. Block 10 appears to cover an enormous area, but at this time it was easily navigated; Brean is isolated by the intervening mass of Brent, block 9.

DISTRICT IX.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	5.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Butleigh ...	7 $\frac{1}{2}$, 8, 2, $\frac{1}{2}$	18 . .	Stretcholt .	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$	1 . .
Lodreforda .		2 . .	Paulet 1 .
		<hr/>	Walpole 3 .
		20 . .	Puriton ...		6 . .
		<hr/>	Pegnes ...		1 1 .
			Crandon 2 .
2.			Sydenham .		. 1 .
Compton ...		5 . .	Cossington .		3 . .
Dundon ...		5 . .	Bawdrip ...		2 . .
Lega ...		4 . .	Horsey ...		2 . .
Ashcott ...	3 + 2	5 . .	Bradney ...		1 . .
		<hr/>	Bower ...	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}$. 3 .
		19 . .	Doneham 1 .
		<hr/>	Ham ...		1 . .
					<hr/>
3.					20 . .
Walton ...		14 2 .			<hr/>
Pedwell ...		3 . .			
Greinton ...		2 2 .			
		<hr/>			
		20 . .			
		<hr/>			
4.			6.		
Ham ...		17 . .	Huntworth .		1 . .
Sowi ...		12 . .	Pether. chur.		. 3 .
Shapwick ...		30 . .	Newton ...	1 $\frac{1}{4}$ 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ 3 $\frac{1}{4}$ 1 $\frac{1}{4}$	4 . .
		<hr/>	Lyng ...		1 . .
			Durstun ...		2 3 .
			Creech ...		10 2 .
		<hr/>			<hr/>
		59 . .			20 . .

DISTRICT IX—continued.

7.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	8—continued.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Edgeboro. .				2	.	.	Lexworthy .				.	3	.
Monkton ...				15	.	.	Goathurst ...				1	3	.
Broomfield .				3	.	.	Rexworthy .				.	1	.
							Bower	2	.
				20	.	.	Durleigh	2	3
							Wembdon .				2	.	.
8.							Chilton Trin.	$\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$			1	1	.
Michaelchur.				.	2	.	Bridgewater				5	.	.
Shurston ...	$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4}$.	3	.	Uluertoneton.				1	.	1
Melcombe	1	2	Cruce	1	.
Wolmersdon				.	3	2	Rima	2
Hadworthy .				1	.	.							
Hunstile	1	.					19	2	2
Halswell ...				1	.	.							
Blaxhold	1	.	TOTAL ...				197	2	2
Enmore ...				1	.	.							

District IX contains the hundreds of Ringoltdeswea and Locheslei (now united as Whitley), North Petherton, and Andersfield, together with the independent manors of Monkton, Creech St. Michael, and Ham. It also includes Cossington, which Eyton considered to be in Bempstone at this date. It was in Whitley 1242 A.D. (*S. R. S.*, xi, p. 256). I have omitted Pury Furneaux, containing four hides or thereabouts, and placed it for the nonce in District XII, block 1 (see notes on that block). The total in this District is 197h., 2v., 2f.; but the deficiency in the four blocks on the western side adjoining District XII is only 1 virg. 2 fert., which is almost exactly balanced by the overplus of 1 virg. $1\frac{3}{4}$ fert. in that district.

The deficit is therefore on the eastern side of the district. Now Ringoltdeswea hundred contains fifty-nine hides, one hide short; and curiously enough block 4, containing Ham seventeen, Sowi twelve, and Shapwick thirty, works out at fifty-nine hides, also one hide short; and this deficiency of

two hides practically balances the overplus of one-and-three-quarter hides in District VIII. This equation, however, depends on the omission of Stawell two-and-half hides. As I have already stated in the notes on District VIII, this entry is probably subsidiary to, and redundant of, the entry relating to the thirty hides of Shapwick. Its omission would reduce the total of Locheslei hundred from fifty hides and a half to forty-eight hides, as compared with forty-seven hides given in the Geld Inquest; but too much stress must not be laid on this apparently satisfactory result.

Blocks 2 and 3 are somewhat intermixed. It may be that Sedgmoor being a watery no-man's land at this time, the block containing Compton Dundon and Street could contain also Pedwell and Greinton, without encroaching on Walton. Block 4 simply contains the manors which it seems impossible otherwise to combine. The only point to be brought forward in its favour, perhaps, is that it exactly balances blocks 1-3. Block 5 contains a group of villis all situate, with the exception of Ham, on the right bank of the Parret, below Bridgwater.

As many of the villis are in the modern parish of Bridgwater, the map shows it as being in this block, although part with Chedzoy may have been reckoned in the five hides of Bridgwater. Eyton would identify Doneham with Dunball, but I think that Donwere is more probable, but in either case it is in this block. In block 8, Hattewara may be identified with Hadworthy in North Petherton; Hunstle is now a part of Goathurst. Idstock, another detached part of Chilton Trinity, will be found in District XII, under Cannington. Blaxhold, in Enmore, represents the Blachesalla of Domesday; and Rexworthy, in Durleigh, is Rachedeworde, identified by Eyton with Radway Fitzpayn, in Cannington. For these two identifications the reader is indebted to a note in *Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries*, ii, 134. Cruce, Rima, and Ulvertonetona are still to seek; the last is probably in Wembdon.

DISTRICT X.

1.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.	5.	H. V. F.	H. V. F.
Martock ...		38 . .	Chaffcombe .		5 1 .
in Martock .		2 . .	Cudworth ...		3 2 .
			Ckt.Malerbe		3 . .
		40 . .	Dowlish ...	4, 3, 2 $\frac{1}{4}$	9 1 .
					21 . .
2.			6.		
Comp. Durv.		3 . .	Street ...		1 2 .
„ ablata de M.		1 1 .	Whatley ...		1 . .
ablata de Barr.		. 2 .	Leigh ...		3 . .
Stratton ...		2 . .	Chard ...		8 . .
sacerdos in			Litelande ...		2 . .
S.P. ...		1 . .	Whitestant.		3 . .
Wigborough		2 . .	Knw. S. Gil.		2 . .
Shept. Beau.		6 . .			20 2 .
Lopen ...	2, 1, 1	4 . .			
		19 3 .	7.		
			Comb.S. Nic.		20 . .
3.			8.		
Seavington .	7, 3, 2	12 . .	Hint. S. Geo.		13 . .
Kingstone...		8 . .	Merriott, pt.		7 . .
		20 . .			20 . .
4.			9.		
Dinnington .		3 . .	Merriott, pt.		5 . .
Crickt.S.Th.		6 . .	Crewkerne c.		10 . .
Winsham ...		10 . .	Eastham ...		2 . .
		19 . .	Seaborough .	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ + 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 . .
			TOTAL ...		200 1 .

District X contains the hundreds of Martock, South Pether-ton, Crewkerne, and Kingsbury East, excepting, however, Kingsbury itself. It also includes Kingstone, politically in Tintinhull hundred, but locally here; two hides in Martock, placed by Eyton in Yeovil hundred, and Cricket Malerbe temp. Domesday and since in Abdick and Bulstone. One of the manors called Dowlish is no doubt the prototype of West Dowlish adjoining Cricket, and like it now in Abdick and Bulstone, but Eyton ranges them all in South Pether-ton. Still these two manors may have formed a small cantle transferred from District X to XI. The total number of hides is 200 plus one virgate, which counterbalances a deficiency of the same amount in the adjoining District I. Further, there are two small villis placed by Eyton in this district: "*altera terra ablata de Martock*," one hide and a half; and "*ablata de South Pether-ton*," half hide. At first sight, these portions evidently belong somewhere here, and they certainly counterbalance a deficiency of two hides in District XI, block 4. But this block contains the parish of Buckland St. Mary; and down to this century, Dommett tithing in this parish was reckoned part of South Pether-ton; and another tithing called West-combland was supposed to be in Martock! This double coincidence may well be allowed to correct the silence of Domesday, and to replace the "*ablata*" in their original block.

There is not much to add to this explanatory note. Notice how the adjoining blocks 4 and 5 correct each other's totals. In block 6 is included Whitestanton, which is isolated by the large manor of Combe St. Nicholas. Litelande is part of Chard. Blocks 8 and 9 make up the hundred of Crewkerne, and here occurs, so far as I can see, the only case of placing parts of the same vill in different blocks to make up twenty hides apiece. One part of Merriott combines with Hinton St. George, and the other part with the rest of the hundred.

1. *Collinson*, i, 20; iii, 2.

DISTRICT XI.

1.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	6.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Kingsbury				20	.	.	Isle Abbots.	5 + 1½			6	2	.
							Isle Brewers	6 + 2			8	.	.
							Bradon ...	2, 1, 1, 1			5	.	.
2.													
Drayton ...				15	2	2					19	2	.
in Drayton .				3	1	.							
La More ...				1	.	2							
							7.						
				20	.	.	Ilton ...	6 + 2			8	.	.
							Puckington .				3	.	.
							Whitelack.				10	.	.
3.													
Cur. Rivel c.				.	2	.					21	.	.
ablata de C.				.	1	.							
Earnshill ...	1 + ½			1	2	.							
Swell ...				3	.	.	8.						
Fivehead ...				1	2	.	Ilminster ...				20	.	.
Cathanger...				1	2	.							
Curry Mallet	3½ + 3½			7	.	.							
Hatch Beau.				5	.	.	9.						
							North Curry				20	.	.
				20	1	.							
4.							10.						
Staple Fitzp.				10	.	.	Taunton ...				58	3	.
Bickenhall .				5	.	.	Angersleigh				.	2	.
Buckl. S. M.	1½ + 1			2	2	.	Sampford ...				2	.	.
? Dommett .				.	2	.							
? Westcombl.				1	2	.					61	1	.
				19	2	.							
5.							11.						
Broadway ...				1	.	.	Thorne Falc.				6	.	.
Capland ...	1 + ½			1	2	.	Chedd. Fitz.	3½ + 2½			6	.	.
Ashill ...	5 + 2			7	.	.	Tetton ...				1	.	.
Beericrocom.				5	.	.	Norton Fitz.				5	.	.
Donyat ...				5	.	.	Ford	2	.
							Allerford	2	.
				19	2	.					19	.	.

DISTRICT XI—*continued.*

12.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	13— <i>contd.</i>	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Stoke S. My.				2	.	.	Hillfarrance.				3	.	.
Thurlbeer ...				3	.	.	Oake ...				3	2	.
Pitminster...				15	.	.	Heathfield...				3	2	.
							Halse ...				4	.	.
				20	.	.					20	.	.
13.													
Heale ...				1	.	.	TOTAL ...				300	.	.
Bradford ...				5	.	.							

District XI contains the hundreds of Abdick and Bulestone, North Curry, and Taunton Dean, with the manors of Thurlbeer and Thorne Falcon, now part of North Curry. An isolated part of Taunton Dean is, however, included in District XII. Eyton also includes in Taunton Dean a part of Sampford Arundel in Milverton hundred, being led thereto by the fact that part of Sampford is locally situate in Pitminster (Coll., iii, 25). But it is rather doubtful if in such a case the part would be called Sampford also, as it is in Domesday. Three of the villis belonging to the earl of Chester in the county, are placed with a query by Eyton in Taunton Dean, and their hidage fits in so well as to confirm his suggestion. But in only one other instance is even a single hide belonging to one district found in another; and in this case, Whittox Meade, the circumstances are unusual (see notes on District IV). There is, however, no trace of a Sampford in the hundred; so one is thrown back on the idea that the name of the place has been changed. The name of the earl of Chester's tenant, Maubank, is often found in the early records of the county, but seems to be connected rather with Williton Freemanors. The case will be noticed again. Blocks 1-9 present no unusual features, as the two distinct villis in Buckland St. Mary have been treated of in the last District X. With regard to blocks 10-13, containing $120\frac{1}{4}$ hides, the presence of the huge

DISTRICT XII—continued.

3.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	5.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Terra Olta .	.	1	.				Quantock E.	7	.	.			
Wdieta	3	.				„ W.	3	2	.	10	2	.
Holcombe	1	.										
Merridge ..	.	2	.				Perlestone .	.	2	.			
Tuxwell	1	.				Weacombe .	1	.	.			
„	.	.	2				Torweston .	1	2	.			
Plainsfield...	1	.	.				Woolston .	.	2	.	3	2	.
Marsh Mill .	1	.	.										
Radlet	3	3				Bicknoller .	.	2	.			
				5	0	1	Newton .	4	2	.	5	.	.
Stowey ...	3	.	.										
„	2	.	.										
„	.	3	.								19	.	.
„	.	1	.										
Fiddington .	4	.	.				Total of blocks 1—	5			99	3	0 $\frac{2}{5}$
				10	.	.							
Newhall	1	.										
Holford ...	1	.	.										
„	.	2	.										
„	.	.	2				6.						
Stringston .	1	.	.				Bps. Lydiard				9	3	.
„	.	1	2				Bagborough	3 + 1			4	.	.
„	.	.	2				Ash Priors .				3	1	.
Dyc. & Alfox.	2	.	.				Lyd. S. Laur.	2 + 2			4	.	.
				5	1	2							
											21	.	.
				20	1	3							
							7.						
4.							Crowcombe .	4	.	.			
Lilstock ...	5	.	.				Cantoca .	.	1	.			
				5	.	.	Halsway .	.	3	.	5	.	.
Kilton ...	10	2	.										
				10	2	.	Willet	2	.			
Kilve ...	2	2	.				Elworthy ...	1	.	.			
Hill ...	2	0	.				Coleford	1	3			
				4	2	.	„	.	.	3			
							Hartrow ...	1	.	.			
							Stogumber .	2	.	.	5	0	2
				20	.	.	Monksilver .	2	2	.			
							Ayley .	.	2	.			

DISTRICT XII—continued.

7—contd.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	9—contd.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Ulvertona	2	.				Bratton	3	.			
Capton ...	1	.	.				Woot. Court.	3	.	.			
				4	2	0	Eppsa	2	.			
Sampf. Brett	2	.	.				Sordemanneford	.	1	.			
Watchet ...											5	.	.
1, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$	1	3	.				Timberscom.	1	2	1			
Ledford	2	.				Allarcott	2			
Imela & Oda	.	2	.				Donescombe	.	.	1			
Imela	2	.	5	1	.	Luxborough	2	.	.			
							Langham ...	1	.	.			
				19	3	2	Bickham	1	.			
											5	.	.
8.													
Bromp. Ral.	3	2	.								20	.	.
Clatworthy .	1	2	.										
				5	.	.							
Nettlecombe	2	3	.				10.						
Ludhuish	3	.				Selworthy .	1	.	.			
Beggarnhuis	1	2	.				Holnicote	2	2			
				5	.	.	"	.	2	2			
							Luccombe...	3	.	.			
Old Cleeve .	4	1	.								5	1	0
Goldsoncott.	.	2	.				Porlock ...	3	.	.			
Leigh	2	.				Culbone ...	1	1	.			
				5	1	.	Oare ...	1	.	.			
											5	1	0
Withycombe	3	.	.				Allerford ...	1	.	.			
Rodhuish	1	.				Bossington .	1	.	.			
Treborough .	.	2	.				Horner ...	1	.	.			
Browne ...	1	.	.				Dover	1	.			
				4	3	.	Wilmersham	1	1	.			
							Stoke Pero .	.	.	2			
				20	.	.					4	2	2
9.							Cutcombe ...	3	.	.			
Carhampton.	1	2	.				Oaktrow	2			
Dunster ..	.	2	.				Estaweit	1	.			
Alcombe ...	1	.	.				Combe ...	1	.	.			
Stanton, $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{1}{4}$	1	.	.				Combe ..	.	1	.			
Avena	2	.								4	2	2
Bradeuda	2	.										
				5	.	.							
				5	.	.					19	3	.
Minehead ...													
Mena	2	.				TOTAL 6-10				100	2	2

DISTRICT XII—continued.

11.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.	13.	H.	V.	F.	H.	V.	F.
Exford	1				Tolland ...				2	.	.
"	1½				Wiveliscom.				15	.	.
"	2				Manworthy .				1	.	.
"	1				Bathealton .				2	.	.
"	1										
Bagley	2								20	.	.
Almsworthy .	.	1	.										
Estana	2										
Cibearda ...	1	.	.				14.						
Withypoole .	.	2	.				Pres. Bowyer	2	3	.			
Ashway	2	1				Torel's Pres.	1	.	.			
Hawkridge .	.	1	.				Milverton	1	1			
Brushford ...	2	.	.				"	.	.	2			
				5	0	3½					4	0	3
Winsford ...	3	2	.				Poleshill ...	1	.	.			
"	.	2	.				Wellisford...	1	.	.			
Lege ...	1	.	.				Greenham...	1	.	.			
				5	0	0	Kittistord ...	2	.	.			
Exton ...	3	.	1								5	.	.
Quarme $\frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{2}$	1	1	.				Appley ...	1	.	.			
Broford	1	.				"	.	3	.			
"	.	.	1				Stawley ...	3	.	.			
				4	2	2					4	3	.
Dulverton...	1	3	3½				Ashbrittle .				5	2	.
"	2	2	.										
Holland	1	.								19	1	3
Pixton	1	.										
Hawkwell	1	1¼										
				5	1	0¾	15.						
				20	0	2¼	Runnington.	2	.	.			
							Tho. S. Marg	1	3	.			
							Samp. Arun.	1	.	3			
12.											4	3	3
Brom. Regis				10	.	.	Wellington .				15	.	.
Middleton...	.	3	3										
Syndercomb.	1	.	.								19	3	3
Huish Cham.	2	3	.										
Chipstable .	2	2	.										
Raddington .	2	.	.										
Skilgate ...	1	1	.										
				10	1	3	TOTAL 11-15				99	3	3¼
				20	1	3	TOTAL OF						
							DISTRICT .				300	1	1½

District XII, containing 300 hides, takes in an enormous area, stretching from the mouth of the Parret to Exmoor Forest. Within these bounds are the hundreds of Cannington, with one vill of North Petherton; Milverton, Williton Freemanors, and Carhampton. Sheriffs Brompton, Cutcombe and Minehead, Brompton Regis, and Cleeve were separate hundreds at this period, now absorbed in the two last-named. There are also parts of Kingsbury West and Taunton Dean. The holdings are very small, this being the only district in which the subdivision of the fertine is used to any extent. In addition to this element of uncertainty in arranging the blocks, there is the further difficulty that a considerable number of small vills are unidentified by Eyton, beyond being assigned to a particular hundred.

From these two causes some of the results must be looked upon as tentative and perhaps provisional. Without unduly pressing details, the blocks do appear to have certain geographical limits which help towards their delimitations. Of the first five blocks, containing 99h. 3v. 0 $\frac{2}{3}$ f., four of them are situate between the Parret and the summit of the Quantocks, the fifth covering the north-west shoulder of that range. The next five blocks, 100h. 2v. 2f., occupy the northern section of the district from Quantock to Devon; and the last five, 99h. 3v. 3 $\frac{1}{4}$ f., the southern section, the boundary line running for part of the way along the ridge of the Brendon hills.

In the table I have arranged the small holdings in groups of five hides each, within the blocks, to bring out as far as possible the features of the five-hide-unit arrangement.

Block 1. Pury Furneaux temp. Domesday was in Wembdon, and therefore in North Petherton hundred. Pilloc, this is one of a group of six vills belonging to Roger de Corcelle, placed by Eyton (ii, 19) in Carhampton hundred, but with a suggestion that they might be in Cannington or North Petherton. He could not identify them then, but the proof positive

that one of them (Dodisham) is in Cannington, and that there is a Blackmore (Blackamora) in Cannington, enables me to transfer the other four to the same parts, and to point out that this fresh evidence is really a witness to Eyton's extraordinary skill in identification of Domesday manors. Dodisham in Cannington is mentioned in the Inq. P.M. of Walter Michel of Gournay Street, who died 20 Oct., 1487, seised of tenements in Dodisham, Pegenesse, and Petherham; and also in the will of Richard Michell, proved 1563-4, "Dudisham in Cannington."¹ Blackmore is an old farmhouse in the same parish (*Proc.*, xliii, i, 38, and illustration). "Suinduna" may be Swang Farm. Idstock (Ichetocha), though described by Collinson as a part of Chilton Trinity in North Petherton hundred, is set down in the Proportion Roll, 1742, as forming with Beere in Cannington a separate tithing in Cannington hundred.

Block 2. Honibere is in Domesday "Hederneberia," left unidentified by Eyton; see account by Rev. W. H. P. Greswell, "Alien Priory of Stoke Courcy," *Proc.* xliii, ii, 66.

Block 3. "Wdieta" is one of the six returned villis of Roger de Corcelle; both terra Olta and Holcome belonged to him. The four sections of Stowey are reckoned by Eyton to belong exclusively to Nether Stowey. He thought that Over Stowey was then a part of Stockland Bristol. But this I venture to think was only the result of trying to make every hide contain so many acres of land, a belief from which Eyton could never shake himself free. Now it is very true that the hides of Stockland Bristol contained very few acres (eighty-seven), but they were not the smallest in Somerset; Weston-in-Gordano having only seventy-two acres to every hide, and four other villis in the county have less than 100 acres to each hide.

The Rev. W. H. P. Greswell makes the very probable suggestion that the portion of Stowey containing three vir-

1. *Brown, F.*, "Somerset Wills," vi, 3.

gates, which Dodo, an English Thane, held temp. Domesday, is really Dodington. The place does not appear in any of the early lists of villis, *e.g.*, Kirby, Nomina Villarum, Lay Subsidy, etc.; it is mentioned in an Assize Roll of Henry III; in 1335 the chapel of Dodington is described as being in the parish of Nether Stowey;¹ the list of rectors and patrons in Weaver begins only in 1473; so Dodington certainly appears as a rather late creation of a separate parish.

In block 5, I have entered Bicknoller as the modern equivalent of "Alra," left indeterminate by Eyton. Collinson derives the name from two British words signifying a "little treasury." This is indeed a little treasure of pre-scientific etymology, but not to be taken seriously at the present time. I cannot pretend to improve on it, but can only suggest that as there is ground for supposing that the first part of Bickenstoke in Chew hundred is a post-Domesday addition to the original name Stoke (see note on that place), that such may also have happened here to distinguish Alra from other villis of the same name. Bicknoller is Bykenalre, 1327, Bykennalre, 1284, Kirby's *Quest.* There are several places with this prænomen in the Devonshire Domesday. Newton, not identified by Eyton, is in the modern parish of Bicknoller, together with Woolston. Torweston, though in Sampford Brett, is on the same side of the stream as the other places in this block. Perlestona is Pardlestone farm in Kilve.

Block 7. Aili or Ailgi is placed by Eyton in Carhampton Hundred. He does not notice Collinson's statement that it is the modern Vellow (iii, 546). "Cotford land in Aylly," does seem a link with Catford in Stogumber. On the other hand, that this manor and land of Aylley were held of Elizabeth Lady Audley, points to Aley in Over Stowey as the locality, for this was the territory of that family (Collinson, iii, 552). Ulvertona has not yet been identified, but is placed by Eyton in Williton hundred.

1. Reg. Radulphi de Salopia, p. 239.

Block 9. Bradeuda may be Broadwood in Carhampton, behind Dunster park; and Mena may be East and West Myne near Bratton, in Minehead. Eppsa, Donescombe, and Sordmaniford^{*} are still unidentified. The last-named was given by William de Mohun and Reginald his son, *i.e.* before 1213, to Cleeve abbey. Shortmanisford is mentioned with Durborough (block 2) in a fine of 40 Hen. III, no. 168.

Block 10. Estaweit and the two Combes are not identified, the last necessarily so in a land which is all Combes: but Estaweit may be Stowey in Cutcombe (old Stowey and Stowey farm). If these identifications be admitted, the symmetry of the four parts of this block is peculiar, the two parts nearest the sea being equal, and the two upland parts also being alike in a curious fraction.

Block 11. Estana and Cibeurda, not hitherto identified, may be Stone and Chibbet in Exford. Eyton suggested this locality for Estana (ii, 20). Lega he placed in Carhampton hundred, but Leigh in Winsford would be adjacent to other holdings of de Moione. In the parish of Dulverton, on the borders of Devonshire, is Hawkwell, which I think is the Hawkwella of Domesday, placed by Eyton in Norton Hawkefield in District V. There is also a Hawkwell in Cutcombe, but the one in Dulverton seems to have been the more important. In Domesday it belonged to two English thanes, so we get no help from that. Taunton Priory presented to the rectory of Havekewell in 1324 and 1327,¹ but not later; and as Dulverton rectory also belonged to them, the two rectories may have been amalgamated. Among the taxpayers in Dulverton manor, 1 Edw. III, is Richard de Hanckwelle, viiid.

Block 13. "Maneurda," not identified by Eyton further than being placed in this neighbourhood, is clearly Manworthy, as Maneworth is a separate vill in Kirby's *Quest*.

In these twelve Districts will be found the whole of Somerset

1. Reg. Bishop Drokenesford, S. R. S., i, 229, 267.

liable to the geld, with certain exceptions. The non-geldable portions are *ex necessitate* excluded. They may be divided into two classes, (1) the domains royal or ecclesiastical which have never been assessed in hides; (2) a very few places of which it is recorded that though the hidage is known yet the geld was never levied. The second class are a small vill in Milborne Port, and another in Wearne near Langport.

The hidated portions which do not appear in the Districts are Bedminster hundred, six-and-half hides; and in Frome hundred, Tellisford, five hides, and Farleigh (Hungerford), half hide; total, twelve hides. These places cannot be fitted into any block of the Districts where they are situated, and their addition upsets the round figures to which the totals of the districts closely approximate. Now, after bringing into play every scrap of evidence available, in three Districts there were gaps, of which at the time nothing could be made. In District I, four-and-threequarter hides in blocks 12 and 14; in District III, two-and-quarter hides in block 15; in District IV, five hides in block 1; total twelve hides. I believe myself that this coincidence represents an effort to keep the sum total of the hidage in the county at the same figure, in spite of the appearance of fresh areas liable to the geld. Bedminster hundred may originally have been an exempt royal domain, of which certain portions having been granted out to subjects, forthwith became liable to geld. It is not so easy to account for the appearance of Tellisford and Farleigh. The Geld-Inquest for the hundred of Frome gives 298 hides, and Eyton's table of the hundred recovered from Domesday contains $303\frac{1}{2}$ hides, that is an increase of five-and-half hides. So it really looks as if in the interval between 1084 and 1086 these two vills had been added to the hundred, perhaps even to the county, and if anybody asks where from, one can only suggest Wiltshire. This must remain unsettled until the Wilts Domesday has been re-arranged in tables. Replacing the missing hides in the three Districts, the analysis presents these remarkable figures :

		H.	V.	F.			H.	V.	F.
District	I .	299	3	0	District	VII .	200	0	2
	„ II .	300	2	3 $\frac{1}{5}$		„ VIII .	221	3	0 $\frac{1}{15}$
	„ III .	300	0	0		„ IX .	197	2	2
	„ IV .	120	0	0		„ X .	200	1	0
	„ V .	300	0	0		„ XI .	300	0	0
	„ VI .	200	0	0		„ XII .	300	1	1 $\frac{3}{20}$
							2940	2	0 $\frac{11}{12}$

It is impossible to look at the total of each District, and avoid the conclusion, that whoever was responsible for fixing the figures, desired to have in Somerset a number of areas containing even hundreds, with, in two instances, an extra twenty hide block thrown in.

Perhaps at this point one ought to stop, having before one's mind Professor Maitland's warning,¹ that "microscopic labour is apt to engender theories which break down the moment they are carried outside the district in which they had their origin ;" but as only a calculating machine could have gone through the work without producing something in the shape of a theory, I now proceed to offer some suggestions concerning these results, and further to try to hitch them on to any pegs in Anglo-Saxon history which seem able to give them a hold.

First of all it must be settled when the figures were last arranged. For the benefit of those who have not Eyton's analysis at hand, I must state that the totals of the hidage in each hundred in the Geld Inquests of 1084, and the totals of the hundreds as arranged by Eyton from Domesday, seldom agree exactly. Of the 2940 hides, 208 hides are in hundreds whose Inquests have been lost, 434 hides are in hundreds where the figures of either return agree, and the remaining 2298 hides are in hundreds where the figures vary. As a rule the Domesday figures are the higher, and the excess greater, than in the instances where the contrary results are found.

1. "Domesday and Beyond," p. 407. Cambridge, 1897.

The difference in some of the hundreds is quite a negligible quantity. In other cases the differences in adjoining hundreds counterbalance each other. The Domesday figures of Hareclive show an excess of two-and-quarter hides, the Domesday figures of Portbury show a decrease of two-and-quarter hides and two fertines. Bulestone has an excess of one virgate, Abdick a decrease of the same amount. Williton Freemanors has an excess of 3h. 0v. 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ f., Carhampton has a deficiency of 2h. 2v. 1f. The increase in the Domesday figures of Frome of five-and-half hides I have above considered to be due to an importation into the hundred. The large increase in Bruton hundred I have elsewhere¹ attributed to the inclusion of Queens Camel, which was in the Geld Inquest of 1084 treated for the nonce as "terra Regis," and so placed under a separate heading not now to be found. The excess of six-and-quarter hides in Givelea (Yeovil) hundred, is perhaps due to some entanglement with Coker hundred, of which the Geld has been lost (see notes on District I). There is only one case which seems for the present to be beyond explanation. Chewton has an excess of eight hides, Winterstoke 11h. 1v. 2f., Congresbury one hide, and Cheddar two fertines: a total of twenty-and-half hides; while Chew has a deficiency of one-and-half hides. These hundreds are very much intermixed, and the net result is an excess of nineteen hides. Ten hides of this total has been caused by the introduction of Compton (ten hides), which, though Eyton left unidentified, I consider to be Compton Bishop (see notes on District VIII). Eyton was puzzled by the great difference in the figures of Chewton hundred, and attributed the rise to an excess of zeal on the part of the Domesday Commissioners. I venture to offer a different explanation. Yatton (twenty hides), placed by Eyton in Chewton hundred, was undoubtedly at a period antecedent to Domesday, and also afterwards as late as the reign of Henry III, a separate hundred. May it not be that it was

1. "Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries," v, 346.

also at this date, 1084-6, separate ; though, its Inquest having been lost, as was often the case with the smaller areas, it has been included in one of the hundreds among which it was situate. If this could be supposed probable, the totals of the Domesday figures and those of the Geld Inquests, plus one for Yatton, would balance. If it was rated on nineteen hides instead of twenty, its full hidage, its case would be exactly similar to Congresbury, an adjacent manor rated at twenty hides, but paying geld on nineteen hides. The removal of Yatton from Chew hundred would result in a deficiency of twelve hides, as against an excess of eleven hides in Winterstoke. This could easily be got over if we can accept Eyton's suggestion that at this period, as he indeed shows over and over again, several manors were not in the hundreds where we afterwards find them. But which manor of Winterstoke hundred was at this period in Chewton I cannot settle.

This confession of ignorance does not affect the result that the Domesday figures differ from the Geld Inquest returns. Now as it is from the Domesday figures that the tables have been constructed, and the symmetrical results arrived at, which would have been impossible with the earlier figures of the Geld Inquest of 1084, it would seem to follow that this elaborate system was introduced in 1086, and not till then.

Eyton certainly believed that the Domesday figures were more modern than the Geld Inquest figures, but here I must differ from him. The very wording of the mighty return shows that the Domesday Commissioners were conducting an enquiry after an older state of things and hidage than that which was prevailing in their day. The assessment is always set down as that prevailing in the time of king Edward, that is before the Geld Inquests of 1084 ; and so I think that where there is a return made of a vill that T.R.E. it paid on a certain number of hides, but that there are really a larger number of hides there, the returns refer, not to a re-valuation made then and there, but to the older assessment which had

been alleviated T.R.E. This conclusion of course makes a decrease of hidage from king Edward's days to 1084, and such a shrinkage is taught by the history of the times. From the first reference to the number of hides in the Tribal List of 700, down to the latest collection of Danegeld, temp. Henry II, there is apparent a continuous decline in the number of hides liable to the levy. The disappearance of hides, a marked feature of Edward's reign, was evidently checked under William's rule, for not the lighter rate of the last of the Saxons, but the earlier figures, are required to make the Inquest totals, yet a certain leakage there was. The rate of decline varies in different counties; in Somerset it is very small, in Wilts very large.

And may it not have been one of the objects of the Domesday Survey to stop this leakage? The royal commissioners, with the "stark" Conqueror in the background as the final court of appeal, might well compel the jurors to return the very uttermost fertine in their district, which custom may have allowed the native hundredors to pass over. The very smallness of the difference, fifteen hundreds showing an increase of twenty-eight hides in Domesday over Geld Inquest totals; and six showing a decrease of eight hides, or a net difference of twenty hides in a total of 2298 hides (the figures of Givelea and Yatton, Bruton, and Frome are not included) shows how carefully the tax was collected, and perhaps the jealousy of the Conqueror, lest aught should escape the treasury: and we know in the words of the chronicler, that he was given to avarice and greedily loved gain.

So taking the evidence of Domesday itself, it seems probable that the figures of the hidage are older than the Conquest.

Eyton held in his Introductory Essay on the Dorset Domesday, that the assessment was made in the reign of Ethelred the Unready, of evil memory: being led thereto by the historical fact that the Danegeld was first paid in his reign.¹ In his own

1. "Chronicle," A.D. 991.

words, "When, in the days of king Ethelred (979-1016) the country was surveyed and subdivided for the purposes of equal taxation, the hide was accepted as the basis of assessment. Then, too, we may be sure, the hidage of most counties, and of Dorset among the rest, was scrutinized and readjusted; then the lands were not measured indeed, still less re-measured, but were so divided and parcelled as to bring one hide into fair comparison with another. And here again the hide virtually, though not designedly, assumed still more the seeming of an areal measure."

That statement seems to be self-contradictory. There is no equal size in the hide after his reign, nor equal value either.¹ There is no historical evidence that Ethelred, or his wise men either, did or could have made a re-survey of the country. That the number of hides in any vill was not necessarily altered at this date, has been well brought out by the Rev. C. S. Taylor, vicar of Banwell,² who has utilized the evidence of Anglo-Saxon charters to show that when the subject of a charter can be identified with a Domesday vill, the chances are that though the charter may be hundreds of years older than Ethelred, the vill will have the same number of hides.

Now there are still in existence three ancient lists of hides in England, which are known as the County Hidage, c. 1000; the Burghal Hidage temp. Edward the Elder, c. 920; and the Tribal Hidage, c. 700, according to the different headings under which the hides are given. The first one, unfortunately, does not include Somerset. But the Chronicle gives, among the many futile plans of Ethelred the Unready's wise men, a fiscal device, which seems to bear out my arrangement of the hundreds in great districts containing 200 to 300 hides apiece. The entry is under the year 1008 A.D. "As the text of the majority of our authorities stands, every 300 and ten hides were

1. See "Appendix."

2. Pre-Domesday Hide of Gloucestershire; *Transactions of Bristol and Glouc. Arch. Soc.*, vol. xvii.

required to build and equip a ship of war. One text reads, from three hundred a ship and from ten a skiff," *i.e.* a smaller vessel. There is an absence of subject to the figures, but if we might read in "hides," as in most texts, the first part of this primeval levy of ship money fits in with the figures of the larger districts.¹

As to the districts containing 200, and in one case 220 hides, it is noticeable that they are, with one exception, grouped together in the middle of the county. If it be allowed that Bath Forum, District IV, was at this period in the county, then IV, V, VI would make a total of 620 hides, an assessment of two big ships and two little ones; and Districts VII, VIII, IX would yield an equally symmetrical result. District X is, however, unconformable, unless it may have been combined with other districts in the neighbouring county of Dorset. As far as a small effort to group the hundreds in the western part of Dorset went, it produced two districts of 200 hides apiece.

It is of course quite likely that in a time of such universal distress and danger, provincial boundaries may have been disregarded in favour of the efforts aforesaid, efforts which seemed as hopeless as those of a "hag-rod" dreamer to get rid of his nightmare. But this suggestion must await a fresh analysis of the Dorset Domesday. The city of Bath we know had no assessment of hidage in the gift of king Osric.

As regards the extra twenty hides in District VIII, they may also emphasize the fact that at the date of the original assessment either Yatton (twenty hides), or Congresbury (twenty hides), had, like Bath, an immunity. But the figures of the second authority to be quoted make this twenty hides of longer standing in the Geld-rate of Somerset. The document called the Burghal Hidage gives a list of Burghs in southern

1. *Ramsay*, "Foundations of England," i, 360, and n. "For the assessment of one ship on three hundreds, Mr. C. Plummer has called my attention to the disputed charter of Eadgar, *Cod. Dip.*, vi, p. 240, where three hundreds appear to be given as a normal 'scyp-fylled,' or 'scyp-soene.'" And *Freeman*, "Norm. Conq.," i, 647, n. 11.

and south-western England, and after each name the number of hides which were supposed to belong to it. Professor Maitland (p. 502) considers that its age, at the latest, is that of Edward the Elder, 901–925, one hundred years earlier than our last halting place ; and that it is a system of military defence ; fortified strongholds (no need to say against what enemy) to be supported by the surrounding country. Of Burghs in Somerset we have : To Watchet (Weced), 513 ; to Axbridge (Axanbrige), 400 ; to Lyng (Lenge), 100 ; to Langport, 600 ; to Bath, 3200 ; total, 4813 hides. Now as in Domesday Somerset only contained 2940 hides, and Bath 120 hides was part of Mercia at this date, 2820 hides must either denote a marvellous shrinkage, or the presence of a disturbing element in the earlier total. This element is, I think, to be found in the figures relating to Bath. Professor Maitland (p. 456) thinks that these figures included the hidage of Gloucestershire. The totals of the hidage of that county vary in the old lists ; if one may take the total of 2000, as given in one list, there are left 1200 hides supporting Bath, which are to be looked for in Somerset, and the total for the county burghs is 2813 hides, marvellously near the 2820 hides of Domesday.

Districts VII and VIII, with 420 hides, may have been allotted to the support of Axbridge 400 hides. Districts I, II, III, V, containing 1200, stretch upwards to Bath, requiring that number. Langport 600 may have been supported by Districts VI, IX, X, 600 hides, though it actually is situated in District II ; and District IX contains Lenge. Districts XI and XII, 600 hides, may fairly well support Watchet 513 and Leng 100=613 hides.

But the districts and the burghs do not sort well together, though the totals agree ; and I think that we must appeal to the still earlier document for the conditions under which the districts were formed and in actual service.

This document is called the Tribal hidage list, because the hides are arranged, not under counties as in the latest list, nor

under the fortified burghs, but under the names of Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and tribes. It is generally considered by authorities to have been drawn up about 700 A.D.

Now the totals of the hides of each tribe are given in round numbers, of which the lowest unit is 300 hides, rising by multiples to 600, 900, and 1200, after which number the figures rise by thousands to an incredible point. One of the smallest units of 300 hides is allotted to a place called Gifla, which is the same as Gifle, the Anglo-Saxon form of Yeovil. The late Mr. Kerslake had already spotted this identification of Gyfla, and made use of his discovery to argue that this district of Gifle, with its 300 hides, was a primitive "scir" or shire, a portion cut off from the British territory by the English victory at Pen, in 658, when Kenwalk drove the Britons to the Parret. But I have already been able to reunite the hundreds of Givela (Yeovil), Coker, and Milborne into one district (No. I) containing 300 hides, extending from Pen to the Parret, of which district Yeovil is the centre. If it be conceded that the scene of the battle was not Penselwood, in Norton Ferris hundred, but Poyntington, in Milborne hundred, then we should have in one well-defined district the site of the battle, the whole of the area won by the conquerors, the chief town or burgh of the district; and last, and perhaps for our present purposes most important of all, the number of hides at which the new community was assessed in the fiscal arrangements of the West Saxons' kingdom.

Further than this point the figures and theories cannot be carried. As they stand I submit them to the criticism of all who are interested in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race.

It may seem incredible that an assessment made c. 700 A.D., should last down to 1066. But the writer of this paper is in this year of grace paying firstfruits on an assessment made in

1. Wessex is entered in this list, so Gifle, as Professor Maitland has pointed out to me, must be a reiteration; but the totals of the larger areas are so outrageous, that the two sets of figures cannot be treated on the same basis.

1538, and land tax according to figures settled in the reign of William III. So the English may well have continued to pay taxes on the old figures, until the arrival of the feudal system with William I. It does seem that the double entries of values in Domesday point to some indication on the Conqueror's part to introduce a new assessment. His troubles and death within two years would throw back the whole scheme of reform, for tho Conqueror's bow was not the only part af his equipment which no other man possessed, so the reform was deferred until the reign of Henry II, when the Danegeld finally gave place to other systems of taxation.

It may be objected that having brought out the five-hide-unit I have made nothing of it. But the unit is so connected with questions relating to tenure of land and military service, not only in England, but also on the Continent, that a discussion in a local survey would be out of place.

APPENDIX.

To make it still clearer that neither the hide nor the team-land, "terra ad carucam," was a fixed area, I have arranged District I in tabular form, showing for each civil parish the number of hides (and carucates) of team lands, the value when each holder received his share of the spoil, and the modern acreage. Also in two other columns the number of acres in each hide and its value.

Mr. Round's researches have definitely decided in the negative the ancient problem as to whether the hide was ever intended to have a fixed area. Mr. Eyton's view that the team-land was precisely 120 acres must needs be answered in the same way. In Professor Maitland's own words (*Domesday and Beyond*, p. 431), "For Mr. Eyton the team-land was pre-

cisely 120 of our statute acres. The proof offered of this lies in a comparison of the figures given by Domesday, with the superficial contents of modern parishes. What seems to us to have been proved is that, if we start with the proposed equation, we shall rarely be brought into violent collision with ascertained facts, and that, when such a collision seems imminent, it can almost always be prevented by the intervention of some plausible hypothesis about shifted boundaries or neglected wastes. More than this has not been done. Always at the end of his toil the candid investigator admits that when he has added up all the figures that Domesday gives for arable, meadow, wood, and pasture, the land of the county is by no means exhausted. Then the residue must be set down as "unsurveyed" or "unregistered," and guesses made as to its whereabouts. Then, further, this method involves theories about lineal and superficial measurements which are, in our eyes, precarious."

DISTRICT I.

	Hides.	Team-lands.	Value.			Acreage.	Acres to one hide.	Value of one hide.		
			£	s.	d.	Acres.	Acres.	£	s.	d.
Sutton Bingham.	5	5	5	.	.	556	111	1	.	.
Corton Denham .	7	7	7	.	.	} 1392	116	.	18	4
Whitcombe ...	5	4	4	.	.					
Norton-sub-Ham.	5	5	5	.	.	632	126	1	.	.
Thorne Coffin ...	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	5	2	10	.	413	127	.	15	4
Perrott, North .	10	8	7	.	.	1280	128	.	14	.
Sock Dennis ...	5	7	4	.	.	688	138	.	16	.
Stoke-undr.-Ham	10	13	12	.	.	1380	138	1	4	.
Templecombe ...	13	13	16	.	.	} 1910	138	1	4	3
Turnie	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$.	14	.					
Brympton ...	3	4	2	.	.	} 576	144	.	12	6
Houndston ...	1	1	.	10	.					
Closworth ...	7	6	7	.	.	1082	155	1	.	.
Charl. Horethorn.	15	16	24	.	.	2380	158	1	12	.
Chisselborough .	5	5	3	.	.	797	159	.	12	.

DISTRICT I—continued.

	Hides.	Team-lands.	Value.			Acreage.	Acres to one hide.	Value of one hide.		
			£	s.	d.	Acres.	Acres.	£	s.	d.
Trent... ..	7	5	8	.	.	} 1618	161	1	.	6
Adber	3	3	2	5	.					
Chinnoek, West .	4	4	3	.	.	} 1160	166	1	.	.
„ Mid .	3	3	4	.	.					
Montacute... ..	9	7	9	3	.	1516	168	1	.	4
Cheriton, North .	5	5	4	.	.	857	172	.	16	.
Chilthorn. Domer	6	7	5	.	.	} 1397	175	.	18	9
Oakley	2	—	2	10	.					
Ashington... ..	3	3	2	.	.	529	176	.	13	4
Horsington ...	11	10	8	15	.	} 3130	184	.	16	2
S. Cheriton ...	6	6	5	.	.					
Sandford Orcas .	6	6	8	.	.	1104	184	1	3	4
Limington... ..	7	8	7	.	.	} 1684	187	.	17	9
Draicote	2	3	1	.	.					
Henstridge ...	14	} 19	28	.	.	4255	193	1	5	5
(carucates)	8									
Chinnoek, E. ...	7	7	12	.	.	1360	194	1	14	3
Marston Magna .	7	7	12	.	.	1392	198	1	14	3
Mudford	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	12	10	.	.	} 2897	200	.	13	5
Stone... ..	2	1 $\frac{1}{2}$.	10	.					
Rimpton	5	5	6	.	.	999	200	1	4	.
Hasel. Plucknett	10	8	8	.	.	2083	208	.	16	.
Odcombe	5	5	5	.	.	1119	223	1	.	.
Pendomer	5	5	2	.	.	1114	223	.	8	.
Coker	15	15	19	1	.	3604	240	1	5	4
Hardington ...	10	10	12	14	.	2667	268	1	5	4
Tintinhull... ..	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	10	10	.	.	2083	287	1	7	7
Lufton	1	1	.	12	.	297	297	.	12	.
Goathill	1	2	1	.	.	298	298	1	.	.
Stowell	3	4	2	.	.	903	301	.	13	4
Preston	2	1	.	15	.	769	384	.	7	6
Poyntington ...	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	3	1	10	.	1020	408	1	.	.
Yeovil	8	8	9	10	.	} 4219	421	1	3	.
Lyde	2	2	2	.	.					
TOTAL ...	296 $\frac{1}{4}$	295	311	19	0	57,160	Avr. 193	1	1	0

Yeovil had a little "imperium in imperio" in its midst, "twenty-two tenants holding in paragio," but it is not likely that their united territory was so large as to require a great deduction of acres, and a consequent diminution in the size of the hide. Henstridge had, in addition to its hides, eight carucates, which Mr. Eyton considered to be the expression for hides no longer liable to the geld. On the other side, I have not included Barwick, of which nothing more is known than its hidage; nor the figures relating to Ilchester and Milborne Port, as they can only refer to small portions of the royal domains. The team lands for Oakley are wanting. If its hidage be subtracted, the number of hides and team lands in the district will be the same to a fraction.

I also give the averages contained in the last two columns of the table for all the districts, with the warning that the figures are to be taken "subject to a final audit."

		Acres in one hide.	Value of one hide.					Acres in one hide.	Value of one hide.		
District	I	193	1	1	0	District	VII	282	0	18	1
„	II	253	1	0	5	„	VIII	418	1	3	9
„	III	233	0	16	4	„	IX	250	0	18	8
„	IV	164	1	6	10	„	X	202	1	0	5
„	V	248	1	0	10	„	XI	272	1	6	3
„	VI	294	0	16	5	„	XII	762	1	11	8
								—	—	—	—
For the County								310	1	1	4
								—	—	—	—