

HIDATION ON THE GLASTONBURY ESTATES A STUDY IN TAX EVASION

BY STEPHEN C. MORLAND

The estates of Glastonbury Abbey have a long and continuous history. Many of the manors granted to the abbey by Saxon kings and nobles were still its property at the Norman conquest, and with few exceptions these formed the abbey estate at the dissolution. Of those recorded in Domesday Book, many were also surveyed during the 12th and 13th centuries.

Early grants of land refer to households ('mansae', 'manencia', 'mansiones', 'cassati', etc.), or to hides, terms used interchangeably, implying the homestead of a family or the land it tilled. Such a household possessed a team of eight oxen to draw a plough; later records indicate that a team was expected to plough an acre a day on forty days before Christmas, for autumn corn, and on 40 days after Christmas, for spring corn. In a three-field village with one field fallow, a team could therefore work 120 acres. (Logically, in a two-field village, which was more usual in Somerset, a team could cultivate 160 acres). Hence we have the equation in origin of the household, the hide, the team land and 120 (or possibly 160) acres. This is beautifully neat and satisfactory. What is surprising is that it sometimes seems to have existed in fact.

With the Danish wars the hide was used as the unit for levying Danegeld. The agricultural hide was something real. An actual team ploughed actual acres (however inaccurately measured). In a village the number of teams and the land they cultivated might increase or decrease; instead of a single household providing a team, holdings were divided and sub-divided; but the basis of reality remained. The hide in its fiscal aspect, the unit for levying geld, was an idea that sometimes lost this connection with reality. The productivity of the land, the methods of cultivation, and therefore the ability of the people to pay geld, varied from area to area. Kings might wish to increase their income, or, at other times, to secure their spiritual welfare by favouring the church. The fiscal hide was subject to pressures, in particular the pressure of the powerful to reduce their share of geld liability. In Domesday Book the hide is almost always a fiscal unit; in the later surveys, often an agricultural unit.

In this paper I have examined the hidation of Glastonbury Abbey manors, with particular reference to the extent to which that great landlord had succeeded, by the XI century, in lightening the burden of taxation on its immense estate.

The records on which I have relied are, firstly, the series of charters granting land to Glastonbury abbey and to individual abbots, some of which are included in the Great Chartulary (SRS 59, 63, 64), others in the 'Landbook' now lost¹; (references are to Professor Finberg's invaluable 'Early Charters of Wessex'); secondly, Domesday Book and the Geld Accounts; thirdly, later surveys of various manors, in particular those ordered by Abbots Henry of Sully, 1189, Michael of Amesbury 1235-52, and Roger Ford, 1252-61.

I have first noted the manors that were wholly or partly freed from payment of geld, those where a reduction in hides has been recorded, and those where an unrecorded reduction seems to have been achieved by an extension of boundary. The Geld Accounts

¹ In some of these charters the grant is to the abbot or to the monastery, in others to some nobleman from whom the abbey presumably received the gift.

show that in 1084 the demesne land of a tenant-in-chief was exempt from payment of geld. This exemption had ceased by 1130 (Domesday Studies, 94), but the allocation of hides as between land in demesne and that held by villeins is relevant to this enquiry; a transfer from the latter to the former reduced taxation until that date.

I have examined evidence that a hide of villein land normally contained many more acres than a hide of demesne; exceptionally, in some manors, and possibly as a result of the exemption of demesne from geld liability, these differences were wildly exaggerated, and any relationship between fiscal and agricultural hides was lost.

Finally, I have attempted to calculate the total annual value and geld liability of the Glastonbury estate in 1084, for comparison with the other large fiefs in Somerset and Wiltshire. This should be some measure of the abbey's success in tax evasion.

GELD-FREE ESTATES

Domesday Book records that "the Church of Glastonbury has in that ville 12 hides that never paid geld" (D.B., 172, 90). The 12 hides resulted from two grants to the abbey; 6 hides at 'Glastingai', free of all services, by Centwine in 678 (F.356), and six 'manentes' on the summit of the hill called 'Pengerd' by Baldred in 681 (F.360). Ethelwulf's *Decimation* of 854 (F.408) freed 6 hides at Pennard from all secular dues. The implications of the 'Decimation', which purported to grant a tenth of the royal estates to the church, are discussed by Professor Finberg in the 'Early Charters of Wessex'. This reference to 6 hides at Pennard seems to be one of the very few cases in which the 'Decimation' (F.408) helps us to understand the development of the Glastonbury estate. (Professor Finberg may go too far in writing (F. p. 201)² 'In no case can the assessment be reconciled with Domesday or other authentic records').

Meare is mentioned in two of the earliest charters held by the abbey; grants of Cenwalh (?670 - 672) to Abbot Beorhtwald (F.353), and of Haedde (?677 - 680) to Abbot Hemgisel (F.357). In D.B. it is described as 'an island adjacent to' Glastonbury (D.B., 172, 90); there is no statement that Meare never paid geld, but no doubt that this was the case.

"Another Island belongs there called" Panborough (D.B., 172, 90), which had been granted to the abbey by Eadwig in 956 (F.470); a postscript to the charter exempted the property from all secular burdens.

"A third island lies near there it is called Andersey" (Nyland) "In which there are two hides that never paid geld" (D.B., 172, 90). Andersey was one of the islands supposedly given to Glastonbury by Cenwalh (?670 - 672). I have found no positive pre-conquest evidence for this grant (F.354). William of Malmesbury's *De Antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesiae* in the form that has come down to us contains much added matter, and Armitage Robinson (1921, p. 5 etc.) has argued that only those passages that are also included in his *Gesta Regum* can be regarded as reliable. Cenwalh's grant (F.354) does not appear in "Gesta Regum". Possibly 'Elosaneg' in a charter of Centwine (676 - 685) in the Glastonbury Landbook (F.631) was Andersey. Half a hide at Andersey was granted by Edgar (959 - 975) to Alfswith, from whom it came to the abbey (F.501). From the Geld Accounts it is clear that the two hides that never paid geld were in

² All other references to Finberg are to numbered charters, this is to page 201.

Bempstone hundred in 1084 (D.B. 77b); the extension of Glaston XII Hides to include Andersey among other places, had not then begun.

These exemptions were paralleled in Somerset by a hide at Lyng held by Athelney abbey (D.B. 191/91), and two hides in Wells held by two thegns of Bishop Giso, which never paid geld (D.B., 156, 89).

Glastonbury also held 62 carucates that 'never paid geld': 20 in Shapwick (D.B., 161b, 90), 20 in Pilton (D.B., 165b, 90), 14 in Sturminster Newton (D.B., 77b) and 8 in Buckland Newton (D.B., 77b). Similarly in Somerset the bishop of Winchester held 20 in Taunton (D.B., 173b, 87b), and the abbey of Muchleney 4 in Muchelney, Middleney and Thorney (D.B., 188, 91). In Dorset the bishop of Salisbury held 16 in Sherborne (D.B., 77) and 6 elsewhere (D.B., 77), and the monks of Salisbury 9½ in Sherborne (D.B., 77). I shall have more to say later about the Glastonbury exempt carucates; I do not accept the view that they represent land brought into cultivation at a comparatively late date.

ESTATES WITH A REDUCED ASSESSMENT

Reduced assessments on a few Glastonbury estates are recorded in D.B.

At Ashbury there were 40 hides before the conquest; this had been reduced to 16 hides 2½ virgates (D.B., 59b). Similar reductions in hidation had been made in a large number of Berkshire manors (D.G. South-East England, 249).

Mr. Welldon Finn has suggested to me that these reductions may have been more apparent than real, the differences being the number of hides in the exempt demesnes.

A charter of Edred of 955 (F.469) refers to 20 "cassati" at Pengeard Mynster (East Pennard). Domesday Book states that in King Edward's time this manor paid geld for 10 hides, "nevertheless there are 20 hides there" (D.B., 166b, 90). It is clear from the totals in the Geld Account for Whitstone hundred (D.B., 75) that the assessment in 1084 was again 20 hides, but the account also includes a note that the king had no geld from 5 hides 1½ virgates which the villeins of the Abbot held. In East Pennard the abbot's villeins held 7 hides; in no other manor in the hundred more than 2 hides; probably the 5 hides 1½ virgates were in East Pennard. Apparently a pre-conquest reduction in the assessment had been cancelled, but the villeins had not been persuaded to pay the increase.

Glastonbury had two charters, each granting 5 hides in Tintinhull; the first a grant of King Edmund (939 - 946) to Wilfric (F.451), the second of Aelfswith (959 - 975) to the abbey (F.502). In 1086 Tintinhull (D.B., 266b, 91b) was held by the Count of Mortain, who had given Camerton to the abbey in poor exchange. Domesday Book states that there are 7 hides 1 virgate in Tintinhull, but that it paid geld for 5 hides. (The 10 hides could have included the 7 hides 1 virgate in Tintinhull and 2 hides 3 virgates in Hesecombe (D.B., 137, 87b), a manor of Tintinhull hundred lost by the abbey to the Bishop of Coutances).

The charter of King Edmund (939 - 946) granting Damerham, Martin and Pentridge to his wife Aethelflaed, with remainder to the Old Church of Our Lady at Glastonbury (F.63), refers to 100 'mansae'. The D.B. manor of Damerham (D.B., 66b), which included Martin, had 52 hides; Pentridge had 6 (D.B., 77b). The 100 hides may, already before the Conquest, have been found unrealistic as a basis for taxation; alternatively, as

Professor Finberg has suggested to me, the grant may have included Hundred rights extending over a wider area than the manors named.

HIDE REDUCTION BY BOUNDARY EXTENSION

In five manors, boundary changes made before the conquest seem to have resulted in a reduction in hides.

BUTLEIGH

Egbert, king of the West Saxons, granted 20 'mansiones' in Butleigh to Eadgils in 801; the boundary attached to the charter appears to be that of Butleigh parish (SRS 63, 426). The abbey also held charters of King Edgar (959 - 975) granting 5 (or 6) hides in Blackford (F.495), and 5 hides in Holton (F.497).

The 20 hides in Butleigh in D.B. (D.B., **165b**, 90) were built up as follows:

Capital Manor, Butleigh	7½	hides
Mesne Tenancies, Turstin fitz Rolf	8	„
Roger	2	„
Alestan	½	„
in 'Lodreford'	2	„
	<u>20</u>	„

The Glastonbury Feodary (SRS 26, 58), compiled from earlier sources in the 14th century, shows that Turstin's 8 hides were at Blackford (near Wincanton) and Holton, and that 'Lodreford' was Lattiford in Holton. It appears that 20 hides in Butleigh had been reduced to 10 by the inclusion of 10 hides in Blackford and Holton.

DITCHEAT

In 842, Aethelwulf granted 25 'cassati' in Ditchheat and 5 in Lottisham to Eanulf (F.405). The boundaries given in the charter, 13th century according to Grundy, are those of the old parish which included Lottisham (Grundy, 55, 73). The abbey also had charters of Aethelbald (855 - 860) granting Hornblotton (F.411), of Edmund (939 - 946) granting 8 hides at Stone (F.449), and of Eadwig (955 - 959) granting Lamyatt (F.480). The 30 hides in Ditchheat in D.B. (D.B., **170**, 90b) were built up as follows:

Capital Manor, Ditchheat	5	hides
Mesne Tenancies, Hornblotton	5½	„
Alhampton	6½	„
Lamyatt	5½	„
Alfric & Evrard	1	„
Count of Mortain	7	„ (Stone)
	<u>30½</u>	„ (D.B., 172b , 91)

Hornblotton and Lamyatt (and possibly Stone) were outside the original grant of 30 hides; Ditchheat itself probably had at least 16 hides before this extension was made.

PILTON

The charter of c.705 by which Ine, king of the Saxons, granted 20 "cassati" on both sides of Doultling stream to abbot Beornwald (F.370), may be adapted from a charter of the same date which included with other land, 20 "cassati" on both sides of Doultling stream, and 5 on the west of the valley called Croscombe (F.371). The boundary given with F.370 is a late medieval copy of an earlier survey of uncertain date (Grundy, p. 80),

and includes Pilton, Croscombe, and Shepton Mallet west of the Fosseyway. The abbey also had three charters, each giving probably the same 5 hides in (North) Wootton; Cynewulf to Abbot Guba in 760 (F.389), Aethelbald (855 - 860) to Heregith (F.412) and Edmund to Aethelnoth in 946 (F.458). The 20 hides in Pilton in D.B. (D.B., **165b**, 90) were built up as follows:

Capital Manor, Pilton, on 20 carucates free of geld.	
Mesne Tenancies, Shepton (Mallet)	6½ hides
Croscombe	3 ,,
(North) Wootton	5 ,,
Pylle	5 ,,
in Pilton	2 ,,
	<hr/>
	21½ ,,

North Wootton and Pylle are both outside the somewhat unreliable boundary of the grant; there are charters for Wootton but not for Pylle. There is a further possibility arising from F.371 that the earlier total was 25 hides and not 20. I think it probable however that Pilton itself had originally 10 hides, which were freed of geld by the inclusion of 10 hides in Wootton and Pylle.

SHAPWICK AND WALTON

By a charter of 729, Aethelheard king of the West Saxons and Queen Frithogyth granted 60 'manencia' at 'Pouholt' to abbot Coengisl (F.381); the boundaries, which are early in form, show that Cossington on the West and Street on the East lay outside the grant.³ The name 'Pouholt' survives in that of the Polden hills. In D.B. the manors of Shapwick and Walton, each with 30 hides, represent the 60 'manencia' of 729. A number of other charters relate to land on the Poldens. In 705 or 706 King Ine had granted to abbot Beorhwald, with other land, 20 'manentes' at 'Pouelt' (F.371). Sigebert (754 - 756) sold to abbot Tica for 50 gold shillings, 22 hides in 'Poholt', and also, according to Adam of Damerham, 6 hides on the West side of 'Poholt' for another 50 gold shillings (F.387). In 762 Cynewulf gave abbot Waldun 5 hides in Compton (F.393) and in 922 King Edward restored it to abbot Aldhun (F.428). A grant of King Eadred (946 - 955) of 'Stapelwille' might refer to Stawell (F.464). The 30 hides in Shapwick (D.B., **162**, 90) and 30 hides in Walton in D.B. (D.B., **163b**, 90), were built up as follows:

Capital Manor, Shapwick (and Moorlinch) on 20 carucates free of geld	
Mesne Tenancies, Sutton (Mallet)	5 hides
Edington	5 ,,
Chilton (Polden)	5 ,,
Cadcott	5 ,,
Woolavington	5 ,,
'Warmund'	½ ,,
Cossington	3 ,,
Stawell	2½ ,,
	<hr/>
	31 ,,

³ Grundy, 114. He did not identify 'Chalkbrok' the only landmark on the East; the name survives in 'Chalwell', a field on the stream that was the boundary between Street and Walton, listed in the Street Tithe Schedule.

Capital Manor, Walton	14½ hides
Mesne Tenancies, Compton	5 „
Ashcott	3 „
Pedwell	3 „
Ashcott	2 „
Greinton	2½ „
	—
	30 „
	—

Compton, Cossington and Woolavington lay outside the boundaries of the grant of 729. The abbey held charters for Compton; Cossington and Woolavington may have been included in Sigebert's sale to abbot Tica. By the inclusion of 13 hides in Compton, Cossington and Woolavington, Shapwick was apparently freed from geld.

STURMINSTER NEWTON

In 968 King Edgar granted 30 "cassati" at Stoure to Glastonbury Abbey (F.609); the boundaries given are late in date, quite unreliable, and are according to Grundy (Grundy, Dorset, 77), those of Sturminster Newton parish, although Kentlesworth (Marnhull) was probably part of the original grant.⁴ The abbey also had a charter of King Edmund (939 – 946) granting 'Acford' (F.587), and of King Edmund Ironside in 1016 granting 17 hides at 'Newtone Kastel' (F.618).

The 30 hides in Domesday Book (D.B., 77b) were built up as follows:

Newton		22 hides
Mesne Tenancies, Waleran	6 hides	
Roger	1 „	
Chetel	1 „	
Goscelin	4 „	
balance, Capital Manor	10 „	
+ 14 carucates in demesne that never paid geld.		
	—	
	22 „	
'Adford' (Oakford)		8 hides
		—
		30 „
		—

The 14th century Feodary (SRS 26, 30) states that Newton gelded for 30 hides, but there were more there 'ab antiquo', and makes it clear that Kentlesworth and Oakford were part of the 30 hides. The 30 'cassati' of 968 seem to have been extended to include the 8 hides in 'Acford' and possibly the 17 hides in 'Newtone Kastel'. (In the Geld Accounts (D.B., 21) the abbey had 1½ hides in demesne in Newton hundred, suggesting that the demesne extended beyond the 14 carucates that were free of geld).

It appears that in these 5 manors or groups of manors the number of hides in the original grant had been spread over a wider territory by the absorption of other manors,

⁴ One landmark, 'Trill', must be near Trill Bridge on the Stour, on the northern boundary of Marnhull; this indicates that Marnhull was, in fact, included.

and that the assessment in hides on the capital manor had been reduced, if not entirely eliminated. The evidence for these adjustments would be weak if it depended on the often quite unreliable boundaries attached to the charters, but it is supported by the existence of charters granting many of the manors absorbed, such as Blackford, Holton, Hornblotton and Oakford.

BUCKLAND NEWTON

At Buckland the abbots demesne lay on 8 carucates that 'never paid geld' (D.B., 77b). There are three charters referring to Buckland and to Plush, which was part of the manor, but it is not clear that the D.B. total of 15 hides involved any change of boundary (F.584, F.606, F.421). None of these charters is as early in date as Aethelwulf's 'Decimation' (F.408), by which 5 hides at 'Bokland toun' were exempted from all secular dues. Possibly the possession of land free from geld in Buckland originated in Aethelwulf's 'Decimation', and antedated any other abbey estate there.

APPORTIONMENT BETWEEN DEMESNE AND VILLEINS

Domesday Book is regarded as a record of the liability of every manor to geld payment. The Geld Accounts show that in 1084 the demesne land of tenants-in-chief was exempt; it is very curious therefore that in many counties the number of hides in demesne is not recorded, and only in the Exon D.B. is the number of hides both in demesne and held by the villeins normally entered. Consequently for Somerset and Devon we (usually) know the number of hides in the capital manor and in mesne-tenancies, both in demesne and held by the villeins. In Wiltshire and Dorset we know the number of hides in demesne in the capital manor and for sub-tenancies, the total number of hides; we can calculate the hides held by the villeins in the capital manor. No apportionment can be calculated for Pucklechurch and Ashbury.

I have made analyses of the 6 manors in Whitstone hundred, and of the 11 manors in Wiltshire which, in different ways, are interesting and revealing.

WHITSTONE HUNDRED

Whitstone Hundred (Table A) according to the Geld accounts (D.B., 75) contained 115 hides, of which the Abbot had 40 hides in demesne. In D.B. the 6 Glastonbury manors contained 115 hides, but the details given add up to 117, possibly due to errors; the abbot then had 41 hides in demesne. The hundred included Pilton (where the capital manor was free of geld), Ditchheat and East Pennard, all referred to above.

Let us look first at the capital manors. Excluding Pilton and also East Pennard, where a pre-conquest reduction of 10 hides had been cancelled, the villeins altogether had 18 teams on $5\frac{1}{4}$ hides; this, at 120 acres for each team, makes a hide of over 400 acres. Conversely, on the abbey demesnes, there were 2 teams on 12 hides at Doulting and 2 teams on $9\frac{3}{4}$ hides at Batcombe, giving hides of 20 and 25 acres. Clearly on several of these manors the fiscal hide had lost its relationship with the agricultural hide. Further, the excessive hidation of the demesnes is only explicable in the context of the exemption from geld of demesne land of tenants-in-chief. Otherwise the abbey would have accepted a quite disproportionate share of the burden of geld liability on these manors for the benefit of the villeins; a most unlikely situation.

I have suggested above that a reduction of 21 hides or more, 10 in Pilton and at

least 11 in Ditchat, resulted from boundary changes. On the assumption that it had been known and accepted, both before and after these changes, that the abbey demesnes in the hundred were assessed at 40 hides, the whole reduction of 21 hides would have been allocated to the land of the villeins, the men who actually paid the geld. (Indeed between 1084 and 1086, a further hide was added to the demesnes). This re-assessment could account for at least some of the anomalies in Table A.

Turning to the details of the mesne tenancies: in these the allocation of hides as between demesne and villeins should not have been distorted to escape geld liability, because both were liable. It is therefore interesting to note that in the nine manors for which we know both the number of hides and of teams in demesne, there were $13\frac{1}{2}$ teams on $25\frac{7}{8}$ hides, giving 62 acres per hide. The villeins on 9 manors had $20\frac{1}{2}$ teams on 15 hides, giving 164 acres per hide. In 1084 when a levy of 6/- was made on each hide, the mesne tenants were liable for 11/6 per team, the villeins 4/4 $\frac{1}{2}$. Similar contrasts can be found in mesne tenancies in other Somerset fiefs. As we can hardly suppose that these lesser lords voluntarily relieved their tenants of taxation, it is a fair assumption that the Saxon and Norman kings already understood that little can be extracted from peasants living at a bare subsistence level, and that the needs of government involve taxing the comparatively rich.

The figures that I have given for the acreage of the hide based on the number of teams recorded in D.B. should be regarded with caution but there is evidence supporting the wide difference in area between the hide in demesne and the villein hide.

WILTSHIRE

My analysis of the abbey's manors in Wiltshire (Table B) is less complete than that of Whitstone hundred. The details of the mesne tenancies are defective; no figures are given for the number of hides held by the villeins, and those calculated by deduction may be subject to error. The major difference between Somerset and Wiltshire is that the assessment of the latter was very much more onerous than that of the former; the average area of the hide in Wiltshire was smaller than the hide in Somerset.

There were in Wiltshire precisely 100 hides in the abbot's demesne, with 42 recorded teams, although there were probably only 33 which would give a hide of 40 acres. (The 13 teams at Grittleton (D.B., 66b) are most improbable; 4 would be consistent with other manors, and with the 480 acres which, as appears later, was the probable extent of the Grittleton demesne). The villeins, on 97 hides, had only $70\frac{1}{2}$ teams, which, using my previous calculation, gives a hide of 87 acres, and a liability to geld of $7/11\frac{1}{2}$ for each team.

The 100 hides in the abbot's demesne suggest a round figure of some antiquity. In fact this total seems to have resulted from negotiation still in progress in 1086. Three versions of the Geld account for Wiltshire survive, which are believed to represent successive stages in collecting the geld (Darlington). In Damerham the earliest version says that the abbot had 16 hides in demesne, and that geld for 18 hides of the land of the abbot was unpaid (D.B., 15); the second, in a marginal note, says that the king has not had his geld for these 18 hides (D.B., 8b); the third gives the abbot 34 hides in demesne (D.B., 2b). This apparent attempt to reduce the assessment on the villeins did not survive the Domesday inquisition, which re-asserted the demesne as 16 hides

(D.B., 66b). At Badbury the abbot was more successful (as were two other churches on their manors in Thornhill hundred). In the first version, the abbot had $9\frac{1}{2}$ hides in demesne, and the abbot's reeve had retained geld for $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides (D.B., **15b**); in the second, 13 hides in demesne of which $3\frac{1}{2}$ had been villein land in King Edward's time (D.B., **9**); in the third, $13\frac{1}{2}$ hides, of which $3\frac{1}{2}$ had been villein land (D.B., **2b**). Domesday Book gives $13\frac{1}{2}$ hides in demesne (D.B., 66b). The total of 100 hides includes the additional $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides in Badbury, but not the 18 hides unsuccessfully claimed in Damerham. (There is also a difference in the extent of the demesne between D.B. and Geld accounts of 1 hide in Thorngrove hundred, and half a virgate in Alderbury).

The note that the abbot's reeve at Badbury had retained geld for the $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides is a strong hint that it was the abbey (or possibly its reeve) and not the villeins, who benefited from a reduced assessment.

ACREAGE OF THE HIDE IN DEMESNE

The figures already given suggest that the hide of demesne was small compared with the villein hide. Can this be substantiated from records available? Roger Ford's survey (1252-61) gives details of demesne arable in 5 manors, Baltonsborough, Marksbury, Pilton, Mells and Glastonbury. Of these Pilton was unhidated, Glastonbury free of geld, and there are uncertainties about Baltonsborough. Michael of Amesbury's survey (1235-52) of the manor of Grittleton refers to the leasing of 240 acres of demesne in the North Field which make 20 virgates of land (SRS 5, 68); this is half the 10 hides in demesne in D.B.

Surveys of Dundon and Stoke-under-Ham have survived (SRS 35) dated 1287: Dundon was held in 1086 (D.B., **164**, 90), with Compton (D.B., **163b**, 90), by Roger (of Courseulles) of the Abbot of Glastonbury; Stoke by Robert of the earl of Mortain, but had been Glastonbury property before the conquest.

The figures quoted in Table C also include Cucklington and Stoke Trister, adjacent manors held in 1086 by Bretel of the Earl of Mortain (D.B., **277**, 92b), and in Queen Elizabeth's reign by William, Earl of Pembroke. In these two manors the $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides and $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides in demesne in Domesday Book have been preserved for nearly 500 years, appearing in the later survey as 168 acres and 72 acres which with 48 acres to the hide, are precisely $3\frac{1}{2}$ and $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides.

This very small sample shows a demesne hide of 48 acres at Cucklington, Stoke Trister and Grittleton, and figures in 5 manors varying from 42 acres in Mells to 85 in Stoke-under-Ham. These acreages are consistent with the average number of teams per hide in many of the larger fiefs in Somerset and Wiltshire, but such averages can conceal wide variations between individual manors.

It is fair to ask whether these small hides have any real agricultural basis, or are only the result of a fiscal reassessment. At Grittleton there may have been in 1086, four teams working 480 acres, which were counted as 10 hides of 48 acres. The same ratio, of 2 teams to 5 hides, on the demesne, appears in Table B at (Longbridge) Deverill, Winterbourne (Monkton), Nettleton and Winterbourne (Gomeldon); it is also found at Walton (D.B., **163b**, 90) and 'Sowi' (D.B., **162b**, 90) in Somerset. Table B also shows a wide variety of ratios in other manors that would have produced demesne hides of 30 acres at Damerham, 36 acres at Badbury before the transfer of $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides from the villeins to

the demesne, 40 acres at Idmiston, and 72 acres in Deverill (Monkton).

At Cucklington and Stoke Trister we find actual acreages that correspond with a hide of 48 acres. Each manor was credited with one team in Domesday Book; they were adjoining and under one ownership; if they were worked as one unit, 2 teams were there on 240 acres, assessed as $3\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{1}{2}$ hides. In these villages at least, the small demesne hide had an actual existence.

THE ACREAGE OF THE VILLEIN HIDE IN SOMERSET

Canon Jackson quotes an extract from the Glastonbury Chartulary (SRS 5, XXV) giving the standard land measurements on the Glastonbury estate as follows:

- 10 acres = 1 furlong or ferdel
- 4 furlongs = 1 virgate or yardland = 40 acres
- 4 virgates = 1 hide = 160 acres
- 4 hides = 1 knights fee = 640 acres.

Dom Aelred Watkin tells me that he is unable to trace this extract in the Glastonbury Chartulary, but it is hardly possible to attribute it to Canon Jackson's imagination. A similar note giving a hide of 160 acres is included in the *Muchelney Memoranda* (SRS 42, p. 107).

The surveys of manors in the times of Henry of Sully, Michael of Amesbury and Roger Ford give details of the rents and services due from holders of virgates, half virgates, ferdells, 5 acres etc., but none of these surveys state the number of acres in the hide or virgate. An entry at Wrington stating that 10 acres were larger and ampler than a ferdell (SRS 5, 75) suggests a ferdell of $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres and a hide of 120 there. At High Ham (SRS 5, 163-4) and East Pennard (SRS 5, 127) are references to holdings of 5 acres that were counted as ferdells; this is not a statement that the ferdell contained 5 acres, and does not preclude a ferdell of $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres.

It would seem that in Somerset, villein hides of 160 acres and 120 acres were normal. The highest of these figures corresponds with the average of 164 acres to the fiscal hide on the mesne tenancies in Whitstone hundred.

THE ACREAGE OF THE VILLEIN HIDE IN WILTSHIRE

I have stated above that, on the basis of a team working 120 acres, the villeins held an average of 87 acres of land in the 11 capital manors in Wiltshire for each hide of assessment.

This average conceals wide variations. Three manors, the two Deverills and Christian Malford, give figures of 172, 192, and 137 acres per hide; two manors, Badbury and Idmiston, figures below 60 acres; (before the transfer of $3\frac{1}{2}$ hides from villeins to demesne the Badbury figure would have been only 36 acres); the remaining six manors fall between 72 and 84 acres per hide. The Deverills are on the border of Somerset, where lower assessments are usual.

In the Geld Account for Damerham hundred (D.B., 2b), geld had been received for 14 hides less 4 acres; 4 pence was due from these 4 acres. With a levy of 6 shillings per hide, a fiscal hide of 72 acres is indicated. In Domesday Book the villeins had 19 teams on 27 hides which, if a team worked 120 acres, gives about 84 acres per hide (D.B., 66b). Table D shows that at Damerham the fiscal and agricultural hide were apparently equal. The difference between 72 and 84 acres may be as small as we can expect.

A survey of the Wilton Abbey manor of South Newton in 1315 gives virgates of 24 acres in South Newton itself, 40 acres in the hamlet of Stovord and half-virgates of 18 acres in the hamlet of Chillhampton (Pembroke, 535-540). Elizabethan surveys of Washern give virgates of 20 acres; of North Newton a 4 virgate holding of 82 acres; and of Burcombe, half-virgates averaging $13\frac{1}{2}$ acres (Pembroke, 8-21).

These additional figures indicate hides of 96, 160, 144, 80, 82 and 108 acres; the larger hides were in small hamlets.

It has long been recognised that Wiltshire was highly assessed as compared with Somerset and many other counties. The small villein agricultural hide which appears from these figures, varying widely between manors, is a reflection of this high assessment.

FISCAL AND AGRICULTURAL HIDES

From the surveys, which give details of the holdings of the abbey tenants in each manor, I have calculated the total hides held by them, for comparison with the villein hides and teams recorded in Domesday Book. (I have excluded land in the surveys held by free tenants, where this appears to represent a mesne tenancy in D.B.). Most tenants held virgates, half virgates or ferdells; others, the cottagers, 5 acres or less; in calculating the total number of virgates held by the cottagers, I have assumed, for the purpose of these calculations, that the hide contained 120 acres in Somerset and Dorset and 80 acres in Wiltshire.

I have omitted the large number of holdings of meadow, moor and enclosure, which were probably extra to the villein virgates in 1086, as they were at the date of the surveys. Table D therefore shows the number of (fiscal) hides on which the villeins paid geld in 1086, and the number of (agricultural) hides tenants held according to the surveys.

A number of manors were surveyed for Henry of Sully in 1189 and again for Michael of Amesbury in 1235-52. At least in the larger manors that were surveyed on both occasions, there was little change during these 50 or 60 years. This suggests that we are dealing with a stable agriculture, where holdings could be sub-divided, but the total area cultivated in the village open fields remained almost unchanged.

It appears in Table D that at Pilton and Shapwick, where there were no geldable hides in 1086, the tenant holdings in the surveys were measured, in the usual way, in virgates. In a number of manors Baltonsborough, Blackford, Brent, Butleigh, Ditcheat, Doultling, Leigh, Buckland and Newton, the total number of hides held by the tenants was roughly equivalent to the number of the villein teams, not to their hides, in 1086. As in all these manors the number of teams greatly exceeded the number of hides, this may be a fair measure of the under-assessment of these manors. At Ham, 'Sowi', Walton, Winscombe and Wrington the number of hides held by the tenants falls somewhere between the number of the villein hides and of their teams in 1086. In each there appears to have been some under-assessment. At Walton and Wrington the number of villein teams in 1086 is so large as to give some cause to doubt its accuracy.

The Wiltshire figures create other problems, bearing in mind that, except at Christian Malford and the Deverills, the hide in all these manors was small, sometimes 72 or 84 acres. The stability at Damerham is remarkable, where the 27 hides held by the villeins in 1086 was almost unchanged for 150 years. At Badbury, Damerham, Idmiston with Winterbourne (Gomeldon) and Langley the number of tenant hides is roughly equal to

the villein hides in 1086. At Winterbourne (Monkton) there is a wide disparity, which may be accounted for by the fact that a tenant in 1235-52 paid twice the rent for half a hide here that a tenant with a similar holding paid at Nettleton.

I have not included in Table D every manor in the surveys. The records of some are defective, others are difficult to elucidate, and a few do not correspond with a manor in Domesday Book. The figures given from the surveys are, I believe, close approximations where absolute accuracy is impossible. (The Tabulations are deposited with the Somerset Archaeological Society).

GELD ASSESSMENT ON THE GLASTONBURY ESTATES

In conclusion I have attempted in Table E to compare the total value and total assessment to geld on the Glastonbury estate with those of other large fiefs in Somerset and Wiltshire. Such a comparison is only possible in counties where the number of hides held by the villeins on the capital manors is given or can be calculated. For many manors two values are recorded, the 'valet' of 1086, and the 'valuit' of an earlier date, possibly 1066. These values presumably include the produce of the demesne, the rents and services of the villeins and sometimes other items such as fisheries, mills and markets, though no markets are recorded on the Glastonbury estates. A substantial proportion of each fief was occupied by mesne tenants, holding knights' fees, who fulfilled the obligations of the fief for military service; Domesday Book records the value of these holdings to the mesne tenant, but not to the tenant-in-chief who only at long intervals enjoyed the feudal rights and perquisites of wardship etc. The value of these rights is not stated nor is it calculable. I have therefore ignored mesne tenancies in Table E, which is limited to the hidation and value of capital manors.

For each fief I have given the total number of hides in the capital manors (column 1); the number held by the villeins on which geld was levied (column 2); and the total 'valet', which includes the value of manors in the fief that were wholly or in part free of geld (column 3). In column 4, I have shown the results of dividing the total annual value (if that is what the 'valet' represents), by the number of villein hides liable to geld. This should give the best indication of the relative tax burden on each fief and shows how successful Glastonbury had been in easing it.

In Somerset, the Abbey's villeins held 64 hides; the capital manors were worth £296 4s. 0d.; this gives a value of £4 13s. 0d. for each taxable hide. The highest values on other Somerset fiefs were £3 11s. 6d. on the Mortain estate (which lay, for the most part, on the rich land round Montacute, and included the fat manor of Tintinhull obtained from Glastonbury after the Conquest); and £3 11s. 9d. on the Winchester estate which included the immensely valuable manor of Taunton.

I have shown in column 5 the 'valuit' per villein hide on fiefs where this is available for a sufficient proportion of manors to make a comparison valid. It appears that the value of the Glastonbury and Winchester fiefs in Somerset had more than doubled between 1066 (?) and 1086, while that of other fiefs in the county had shown no such increase.

Glastonbury manors may have been exceptionally ill-managed before 1066 and exceptionally well managed in 1086; the fact remains that by 1086 the various changes discussed earlier in this paper had resulted in a very favourable liability to geld compared with annual value.

In Wiltshire Glastonbury had not apparently succeeded in obtaining any reduction in villein hides except at Badbury, and the 'valet' of hides liable to geld was a little below the average of the larger fiefs in the county.

I have included at the bottom of Table E figures for Newton, Buckland and Uplyme, where assessments satisfactory to the abbey seem to have been obtained, and Pucklechurch and Ashbury, where D.B. gives no indication of the number of hides in demesne or held by the villeins, so the figures are necessarily incomplete.

I have suggested that where an assessment was reduced, the abbey rather than the villeins benefited. At Badbury it was the abbot's reeve who had retained the geld. Of Damerham (D.B., 66b), D.B. tells us: "The whole manor in the time of King Edward was worth £36. Now it pays £61, but by the men it is not valued at more than £45 on account of the confusion (inter-mixing?) of the land, and on account of the farm-rent, which is too high". At Damerham the abbey had attempted, unsuccessfully, to reduce the villeins' assessment to geld from 6 shillings on 27 hides to 6 shillings on 9, by transferring 18 hides to demesne. This could have done something to mitigate an excessive increase in the farm-rents that the villeins had apparently suffered at the hand of their landlord. Or was it the Reeve who was to blame?

Henry I in his coronation speech gave a promise that demesne lands not only of tenants-in-chief, but of mesne tenants also, would be free of geld. But the needs of government increased, and in 1130, as the Pipe Rolls show, the exemption of demesne lands had come to an end. I have therefore shown in column 6 the result of dividing the 'valet' by total hides on each fief. This indicates what the burden would have been after 1130 if the annual value of the manors had remained unchanged from 1086 onwards. Glastonbury on this basis too had done very well in Somerset and in the 5 manors in Dorset, Devon, Gloucestershire and Berkshire, but badly in Wiltshire.

During the 12th century, other forms of taxation were coming in. In 1194, when vast sums were collected to ransom Richard 1st, Damerham Hundred contributed £31 4s. 10d. (Roll of King's Court, 91). Of this sum, the first Aid amounted to £21 13s. 6d. the second Aid to £3 5s. 4d. and the Hidage, at the rate of 2/- a hide, to £6 6s. 0d. I do not know what basis of assessment was used for the first and second Aids; the hidage was losing importance, and becoming a relic of an earlier system of taxation.

In this paper I have discussed a number of changes in the hidation of Glastonbury manors that in fact resulted in a lower geld liability, some the result of a royal exemption, some possibly achieved by negotiation, and others that may have escaped the notice of collectors of taxes. These changes which for a time seem to have benefited the abbey, were, we may assume, not an accident but the outcome of a persistent policy carried out by able men.

TABLE A.

WHITSTONE HUNDRED

	Total Hides	Total Hides	Capital Manors		Villeins		Value		Mesne Tenancies			Value			
			Demesne Hides	Teams	Hides	Teams	Valuit £	Valet £	Demesne Hides	Teams	Hides	Teams	Valuit £	Valet £	
Pilton (D.B., 165b)	20	—	—	10	—	10	16	24	6½	4¾	2	2½	3	7	7
Shepton									3	2½	1	3	3	1.10	2
Croscombe									5	3½	2	1½	1	2	3
Wootton									5	1¾	1½	3¼	2	4	3
Pylle									2	2	1			2	1.10
Pilton															
									(21½)						
E. Pennard (D.B., 166b)	20	19	12	5	7	6	4	12	1			1	2	1.10	1.10
Baltonsborough (D.B., 167)	5	5	4¼	2	¾	2	6	6							
Doulling (D.B., 167)	20	14	12	2	2	6	6	14							
Chalton									3¼	2¾	1	¾	1	1	1
'alirbi'									2¾	1¾		1	1	1.10	4
									(6)						
Batcombe (D.B., 167b)	20	10¼	9¾	2	½	3	2	7	2	2	1			2	1
Westcombe									7¾	5¼	2	(2½)	2½	1	4.10
									(9¾)						
Ditcheat (D.B., 169b)	30	5	3	3½	2	7	x	12	5½	x	1	x	7	3	5
Hornblotton									6½	x	1	x	3	2	4
Alhampton									5½	3	2	2½	5	6	5.10
Lamyatt									1	x	x	x	x	x	1
'Alfric & Evrard'									7	x	x	x	x	7	5
Stone (D.B., 172b)															
									(25½)						
	(115)	(53¼)	(41)	(24½)	(12¼)	(34)		(£75)	(63¾)	(28¾)	(15½)	(15)	(30½)	(£41.10)	(£49)

Hidation on the Glastonbury Estates

Note: (1) Figures in brackets are calculated and not stated in D.B.
 (2) Omissions in D.B. indicated by x.

TABLE B.

	Total Hides	Total Hides	Capital Manors Demesne		Villeins		Value		Mesne Tenancies		Valet £
			Hides	Teams	Hides	Teams	Valuit £	Valet £	Total Hides	Total Teams	
Damerham (D.B., 66b)	52	(43-8 ac)	16	6	(27-8 ac)	19	36	61	9+8 ac	3½	7.15
Deverill (Longbridge)	10	(8½)	5	2	(3½)	5	8	10	1½	x	x
Christian Malford	20	(19¼)	14	3	(5½)	6	x	10.10	¾	x	x
Badbury	20	20	13½	3	(6½)	3	8	10			
Winterbourne (Monkton)	25	(21½)	10	4	(11½)	7	12	20	3½	x	x
Nettleton	20	20	10	4	(10)	6	8	13			
Grittleton	30	(20½)	10	13 (?)	(10½)	7	x	12	9½	10	9
Langley	29	(23¼)	11	4	(12¼)	8	8	14.10	5¾	3	5
Idmiston	10	(7½)	3	1	(4½)	2	5	6	2½	1	x
Winterbourne (Gomeldon)	5	(4¾)	2½	1	(2¼)	1½	4	4	¼	x	x
Deverill (Monkton)	10	(8¾)	5	3	(3¾)	6	x	12	1¼	x	x
	231	197-8 ac	100	42 (?)	97-8 ac	70½		£173 or £157	34+8 ac		

Note: (1) Figures in brackets are calculated and not stated in D.B.

(2) Omissions in D.B. are indicated by x.

TABLE C.

	Domesday Book		Later Surveys		Acres in Later Surveys	
	Hides	Teams	Acres	Demesne Teams needed	per Hide	per D.B. Team
(1) Baltonsborough (D.B., 90b)	4¼	2	219¾ +66 (?)	4	52 or 67	110 or 143
(2) Marksbury (D.B., 90b)	4½	2	263	2	58	131
(3) Pilton (D.B., 90)	—	10	763	x	—	76
(4) Mells (D.B., 90b)	10	2	419¼	3	42	210
(5) Glastonbury (D.B., 90)	9⅞	5	524	6	53	105
(6) Grittleton (D.B., 66b)	10	4 (?)	240 = 5 hides		48	120 (?)
(7) Dundon (D.B., 90)	3½+2¼	2+1	305½		57	102
(8) Stoke-under-Ham (D.B., 92)	3+1½	2+?	385		85	?
(9) Cucklington (D.B., 92b)	3½	1	168		48	120
(10) Stoke Trister (D.B., 92b)	1½	1	72		48	

- (1) SRS 5 p. 195. The survey includes 66 acres of pasture that could be ploughed. If these were arable in 1086, the higher figures would apply. I have suggested earlier that the number of hides in demesne may have been increased to reduce geld liability.
- (2) SRS 5 p. 200.
- (3) SRS 5 p. 208. The low figure per team may be due to arable land having been included in Pilton Park.
- (4) SRS 5 p. 218.
- (5) SRS 5 p. 180. The 9⅞ hides were free of geld.
- (6) SRS 5 p. 68. I have suggested that the 13 teams in demesne should read 4. This would give 120 acres per team.
- (7) SRS 35 p. 25. D.B. figures include Compton & Dundon, both held by Roger of Glastonbury. The later demesne included 15 acres in 'Middelgarston on East of Chapel of Compton', which suggests that Compton was included.
- (8) SRS 35 p. 10. D.B. figures include Stoke and Stoket, both held by Robert of the Earl of Mortain. No ploughs are entered for Stoket.
- (9) Pembroke, 418. Arable land let with Sheepphouse in Cucklington.
- (10) *ibid.* 425. Demesne in Stoke, 39¼ acres in West Field and 32½ acres in East Field.

TABLE D.

VILLEINS FISCAL AND AGRICULTURAL HIDES

D.B.	Somerset	Domesday Book		1189	1235/52	1252/61
		Hides	Teams	Hides	Hides	Hides
167	Baltonsborough	$\frac{3}{4}$	2			$2\frac{1}{2}$
167b	Batcombe	$\frac{1}{2}$	3	$2\frac{5}{8}$		
163	Blackford (Wedmore)	$1\frac{1}{2}$	4	$5\frac{1}{4}$		
170b	Brent	11	16	$19\frac{3}{4}$	$18\frac{1}{4}$	(East Brent, Lympham, Berrow, South Brent)
165b	Butleigh	$2\frac{1}{2}$	6	$7\frac{1}{4}$	$6\frac{1}{2}$	
167	Doultling	2	6		6	
169b	Ditcheat	2	7	$7\frac{1}{2}$	$6\frac{1}{2}$	
165	Ham	$3\frac{3}{8}$	8	$5\frac{1}{4}$	$5\frac{3}{4}$	
164b	Leigh/Street	2	5	$4\frac{1}{2}$	$4\frac{3}{4}$	
169b	Marksbury	3	3			$5\frac{7}{8}$
168	Mells	$3\frac{1}{2}$	3			$3\frac{3}{8}$
166b	Pennard (East)	7	6		$5\frac{1}{4}$	(+1 hide (?) paying 24/8)
162b	'Sowi'	7	14	$9\frac{1}{4}$	$9\frac{1}{2}$	(Weston, Middlezoy, Othery)
163b	Walton	$4\frac{1}{2}$	18	6	6	
161	Winscombe	$4\frac{3}{4}$	9	$6\frac{3}{8}$		
169	Wrington	6	20	$8\frac{7}{8}$	8	
165b	Pilton	—	10			$6\frac{1}{8}$
161b	Shapwick	—	12		$7\frac{3}{4}$	(Shapwick, Moorlinch)
Wiltshire						
66b	Badbury	($6\frac{1}{2}$)	3	$4\frac{3}{4}$	$6\frac{1}{2}$	
66b	Christian Malford	($5\frac{1}{4}$)	6	9		
66b	Damerham	(27)	19	28	$27\frac{1}{2}$	(Damerham, Martin)
66b	Grittleton	($10\frac{1}{2}$)	7	$7\frac{1}{2}$	8	
66b	Idmiston	($4\frac{1}{2}$)	2		8	
66b	Winterbourne (Gomeldon)	($2\frac{1}{4}$)	$1\frac{1}{2}$	$6\frac{7}{8}$		
66b	Langley/Kington	($12\frac{1}{4}$)	8	$11\frac{7}{8}$		
66b	Nettleton	(10)	6	$13\frac{1}{8}$	$13\frac{1}{2}$	
66b	Winterbourne (Monkton)	($11\frac{1}{2}$)	7	$5\frac{5}{8}$	$6\frac{3}{8}$	
66b	Deverill (Longbridge)	($3\frac{1}{2}$)	5		$4\frac{3}{4}$ (?)	
66b	Deverill (Monkton)	($3\frac{3}{4}$)	6		$3\frac{1}{2}$ (?)	
Dorset						
77b	Buckland	($5\frac{3}{8}$)	8		7	
77b	Newton	($8\frac{1}{2}$)	12	$12\frac{3}{8}$	14	(Newton, Kentlesworth, Burton, Marnhull)

Note: (1) Figures in brackets are calculated, not stated in D.B.

(2) In the survey of 1235/52, both Deverills are called "Longbridge"; one must be in error for Monkton.

(3) Blackford (Wedmore) was held by a mesne tenant in D.B.

TABLE E.

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Somerset Fief.	Capital Total Hides	Manors Villeins Hides	Total Valet £	'Valet' per Villeins Hides £	Valuit per Villeins Hides £	'Valet' per Total Hides £
+ Glastonbury	$177\frac{3}{4}$	$63\frac{7}{8}$	296.4	(4.13.0)	(2. 5.0)	(1.13.6)
+ Wells	133	$72\frac{1}{4}$	209	(2.18.0)		(1.11.6)
+ Bath	$61\frac{1}{2}$	$27\frac{3}{4}$	55	(1.19.6)	(1.15.4)	(17.9)
+ Muchelney	$55\frac{7}{8}$	$24\frac{1}{4}$	48.13	(2. 0.0)		(17.9)
+ Winchester	71	$53\frac{3}{8}$	192	(3.11.9)	(1.11.9)	(2.14.0)
+ Coutances	$78\frac{1}{8}$	39	91	(2. 6.6)	(1.19.6)	(1. 3.3)
Mortain	$52\frac{1}{2}$	$19\frac{7}{8}$	72	(3.11.6)	(2.17.0)	(1. 7.6)
W. of Donai	$38\frac{1}{4}$	$18\frac{3}{8}$	52	(2.15.0)	(3. 7.0)	(1. 7.3)
W. of Moion	$52\frac{3}{8}$	$21\frac{7}{8}$	66.12	(3. 2.0)	(2. 8.0)	(1. 5.3)
R. of Arundel	$40\frac{3}{8}$	$21\frac{7}{8}$	47	(2. 3.0)	(2. 7.0)	(1. 3.6)

TABLE E. (continued)

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
	<i>Capital Manors Total Hides</i>	<i>Villeins Hides</i>	<i>Total Valet £</i>	<i>'Valet' per Villeins Hides £</i>	<i>Valuit per Villeins Hides £</i>	<i>'Valet' per Total Hides £</i>
Wiltshire						
+ Glastonbury	197	(97)	173 or 157	(1.15.6) or (1.12.6)	(1. 3.0)	(17.6) or (16.0)
+ Salisbury	180 $\frac{3}{4}$	(120 $\frac{1}{4}$)	219.15	(1.16.6)		(1. 4.4)
+ Malmesbury	207 $\frac{3}{4}$	(99 $\frac{1}{4}$)	124	(1. 5.0)	(1. 2.9)	(12.0)
+ Shaftesbury	150	(84 $\frac{1}{4}$)	152	(1.16.0)		(1. 0.3)
+ Wilton	201 $\frac{7}{8}$	(135 $\frac{1}{4}$)	197	(1. 9.0)		(19.6)
+ Winchester	186 $\frac{3}{4}$	(89)	201	(2. 5.3)	(1.19.3)	(1. 1.6)
+ Winchester St. Peter	116 $\frac{1}{8}$	(76 $\frac{3}{4}$)	90	(1. 3.6)	(19.0)	(15.6)
E. of Salisbury	103	(46 $\frac{1}{4}$)	127	(2.15.0)	(1.19.0)	(1. 4.6)
A. of Marlborough	52	(18 $\frac{3}{4}$)	67 or 61	(3.11.6) or (3. 5.0)	(4. 0.0)	(1. 5.9) or (1. 3.6)
H. of Lisle	70 $\frac{1}{8}$	(33 $\frac{1}{8}$)	66.10	(2. 0.0)	(1.19.6)	(19.0)
Newton, Buckland and Uplyme						
+ Glastonbury	21 $\frac{5}{8}$	(17 $\frac{1}{8}$)	49	(2.17.0)		(2. 5.4)
Pucklechurch and Ashbury						
+ Glastonbury	26 $\frac{1}{8}$?	50	?		(1.18.3)

Note: (1) Figures in brackets are calculated, not stated in D.B.

(2) Manors have been omitted from the totals where the D.B. record is defective.

REFERENCES

Somerset Record Society publications:

SRS 5	Rentalia and Custumaria of Michael of Amesbury, 1235-52, and Roger Ford, 1252-61	1891
SRS 26	Feodary of Glastonbury Abbey	1910
SRS 35	Two Beauchamp Registers	1920
SRS 42	Muchelney Memoranda	1927
SRS 59, 63 and 64	The Glastonbury Chartulary	1944-50

Roxburgh Club publications:

Soliaco	An Inquisition of the Manors of Glastonbury Abbey of the year 1189, Book of Henry of Soliaco, Abbot of Glastonbury	1882
Pembroke	Survey of the Lands of William, First Earl of Pembroke	1909

Pipe Roll Society's publications:

Rolls of the King's Court in the Reign of Richard the First	1891
D.B. Domesday Book and Geld Accounts	
Exon. folios (heavy type)	
Exchequer folios (standard type)	
F. <i>The Early Charters of Wessex</i> , H. P. B. Finberg	1964
Grundy <i>The Saxon Charters of Somerset</i> , D. G. Grundy	1934
Grundy, Dorset <i>Proc. Dorset Natur. Hist. Archaeol. Soc.</i> LX (for Sturminster Newton)	1938
Armitage Robinson <i>Somerset Historical Essays</i>	1921
Stubbs <i>Select Charters of English Constitutional History</i> , William Stubbs	1870
<i>Domesday Studies</i> , H. C. Round <i>et al</i>	1888, 1891
Darlington <i>Wiltshire Geld Accounts</i> , R. R. Darlington, in V.C.H. Wilts., II	1955
D.G. <i>Domesday Geography of England</i> , Berkshire, Darby and Campbell	1962