SOME DOMESDAY MANORS

BY S. C. MORLAND

Almost fifty years ago was published the first volume of the Victoria County History of Somerset, containing a translation of the Exchequer Domesday for the county (with additional material from the Exeter Domesday), and of the Geld Inquest of 1084; the translation was the work of the Rev. E. H. Bates, who was also responsible for the identification of manors. It remains the most convenient aid to the study of the Somerset Domesday, but it is not free from errors. In this paper I am dealing in particular with errors in the identification of manors. LANGEFORD, for instance, may be Langford in Burrington and Churchill, as Bates suggests, or Langford Budville. This is a matter of probability; but there can be no doubt whatever that CHIWESTOCH is Kewstoke, not Chewstoke, and that ECFERDINTONE is "Egforton alias Fairoak," not Egford.

The Geld Inquest gives for each hundred the total number of hides, the hides held in demesne by tenants-in-chief and exempt from geld, the hides for which no payment had been received from those considered liable to pay, and the hides for which the geld levy of 6/- per hide had been received and accounted for by the collectors. The possible difference of two years in the dates of the Geld Inquest and of the Domesday Inquest may account for occasional changes in ownership.

In a few cases the Geld Inquest shows that Bates' identification of a manor is inconsistent with the hundred in which it is clear that it lay. In Winterstoke hundred no payment had been made for 2 virgates (?) which "Osbern holds of Gilbert son of Turold" [Exon. 77]; the only manor which Osbern held of Gilbert son of Turold was CHIWESTOCH [Fo. 98, Exon. 446 CHIUUESTOC]; Bates identifies it with Chewstoke, which was in Chew hundred. Kewstoke was in Winterstoke; further, in Domesday Book, CH before E or I stands for K. (Bishop Giso's manor of Chew Magna is spelt CHIUUE [Fo. 89*b*, Exon. 159 CHIU], and was probably also pronounced with a K; in entries that apply to Chewstoke, only STOCHE is used.)

The manor of STOCHE [Fo. 99, Exon. 491 ESTOCA] held by Alward and his brothers is also one of those identified with Chewstoke; in demesne they held 2½ hides and ½ a virgate. Precisely this odd amount the Geld Inquest records as being held in demesne

by Sauard in Abdick hundred [Exon. 81*b*] ; possibly Sauard was the unnamed father of Alward and his brothers, who had held the manor in the time of King Edward. In Abdick hundred are the two little intermingled manors of Stocklynch Magdalen and Stocklynch Ottersay, of which only the former, STOCHE [Fo. 96, Exon. 364 ESTOCA] held by William of Moion, is accounted for by Bates. We can be reasonably certain that Sauard's manor was Stocklynch Ottersay.

The Glastonbury manor of EDERESIGE [Fo. 90, Exon. 172 EDERESIGA], where Godwin held 2 hides that never paid geld, is entered after Mere and Panborough and described as a " third island," terms that could not be properly applied to Edgarley between Glastonbury and West Pennard. In Bempstone hundred the Geld Inquest refers to 2 hides that never paid geld, held by Letaoldus of the abbot of Glastonbury [Exon. 77*b*] ; Andersey, now Nyland, an island between the Mendips and Wedmore, and an ancient possession of the Abbey, is clearly indicated.

The Inquest for this hundred also refers to 1½ virgates held by Roger of Courseulles [Exon. 77*b*]. Domesday Book does not record any manor in this hundred held by him in chief, but in BODESLEGE [Fo. 90, Exon. 164 BODESLEGA], which Roger held of the Abbey of Glastonbury, he had 1½ virgates in demesne. This unidentified manor was probably therefore in Bempstone hundred. The name survives in Bagley in Wedmore, and in Bagley Lane in Bleadney in Wookey ; between them is Northload, a Glastonbury estate not otherwise mentioned in Domesday Book, which I suggest was Bodeslege. Before the dissolution of the monasteries the hundred of Glaston XII Hides, which had a remarkable tendency to expand, and thereby to increase the area in which the abbot enjoyed a special jurisdiction, had come to include Northload, Andersey and parts of Clewer.

It is generally accepted that the original inquest from which Domesday Book was entered in a rearranged and simplified form, was made and recorded by hundreds, and that this accounts for the fact that in Domesday Book itself the manors in each fief are usually entered by hundreds. The identification of a few manors depends to a greater or lesser extent on their position in the book. East Harptree in Winterstoke hundred and West Harptree in Chewton hundred are parishes very similar in size ; Domesday Book contains four manors of Harptree with 5 hides each ; Bates

identifies three of them with West Harptree and only one with East. This seems improbable, and the HARPETREU [Fo. 88, Exon. 139*b* HARPEDREU, 515 HAPETREUA] held by the Bishop of Coutances, which is entered immediately before Hutton in Winterstoke, should be part of East Harptree. This is confirmed by the fact that both in this manor and in the Count of Mortain's HARPETREU [Fo. 92, Exon. 272*b*] which Bates identifies with East Harptree, were 40 acres of meadow, and pasture 8 furlongs in length and 5 in breadth. The two West Harptrees, HERPETREU [Fo. 89, Exon. 150] held by the bishop of Coutances and HARPETREU [Fo. 95*b*, Exon. 354*b*] held by Walter of Douai, each had 58 acres of meadow. (A reference to Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 39] shows that the former was West Harptree Tilly and the latter West Harptree Gurney, and that the notes in the Somerset Archæological Society Proceedings 1936, pp. 40/1, are wrong on this point.)

Roger of Courseulles held three manors of Chilton, CILLETONE [Fo. 93, Exon. 423 CILLETONA], CILDETONE [Fo. 93*b*, Exon 424*b* CILDETONA] and CILDETONE [Fo. 93*b*, Exon. 425 CILDETONA], all of which are identified with Chilton Trinity in North Petherton hundred. The first is entered among manors probably in this hundred, but the two others among manors in Cannington. In Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 16], in Cannington hundred, Chilton, held by William Trevet and Sarra his wife, in the barony of Hugo Poinz, must be Chilton Trivett in Cannington ; many manors in this barony were previously held by Roger or Courseulles. These two Domesday manors were therefore Chilton Trivett.

Roger also held HOLME [Fo. 94, Exon. 431 HOLMA], identified with Hollam in Dulverton although entered between Doverhay and Exford, both in Carhampton hundred. Exton appears to have been in Carhampton hundred in the Geld Inquest, and in the Nomina Villarum [S.R.S. 3, p. 76], WHITEHOLEHAMES is shown as a hamlet of Exton. The map shows Hone in Exton and Hollam in Winsford on the opposite side of the Exe ; the former seems the more probable.

Parish boundaries, particularly as they were early in the nineteenth century, sometimes help in identifying manors. Turstin, son of Rolf, held North Cadbury and Maperton, and ULTONE [F. 97*b*, Exon. 383*b* ULFTONA, 521 ULFETONA], BLACHE-

FORD [Fo. 97*b*, Exon. 383*b* BLACHAFORT], CLOPTONE [Fo. 97*b*, Exon. 383*b* CLOPPTONA, 521 CLOPTONA], and CIRETUNE [Fo. 97*b*, Exon. 384*b* CIRETUNA]. An ordnance survey map of 1844 shows that a small part of what is now Blackford parish was then a detached part of North Cadbury, and that Hatherleigh, between North Cheriton and Wincanton, was a detached part of Maperton. Part of Woolston is in North Cadbury and there is a Clapton in Maperton. The identifications made by Bates are confirmed, with Hatherleigh for CIRETUNE in addition; the one hide in Blackford seems to have been a ring-fence farm and not strips intermingled with the rest of Blackford.

The Count of Mortain held Yarlington and Cucklington, and UFETONE [Fo. 92*b*, Exon. 275*b* UFETUNA, 519*b* UFETONA] and CLOPETONE [Fo. 92*b*, Exon. 278 CLOPPETONA, 523*b* CLOPETONA]. Here Bates misses the facts that part of Woolston is in Yarlington and that a second Clapton lies in Cucklington, and was separately assessed in the Proportion Roll [S.R.S. 3, p. 292]. These were the Mortain manors.

Moortown, near Swell, was a detached part of Fivehead in 1844; the Muchelney manor of Drayton included Fivehead Abbatis; LAMORE [Fo. 94, Exon. 429*b*] ("the moor"), a small part of Drayton, held by Roger of Courseulles, was Moortown.

In making his identifications, Bates made extensive use of records of the later ownership of manors, but sometimes seems to have come to the wrong conclusion. For instance, SOCHE [Fo. 94*b*, Exon. 435 SOCA], held by Roger of Courseulles, is identified with part of Sock Dennis; Bates may have been influenced by the fact that the two manors of SOCHE would together make a 5-hide unit. Old Sock or Mudford Sock appears in Exchequer Lay Subsidies [S.R.S. 3, p. 212] in Stone hundred as SOKMALERBE, and the Malesherbe family held several Somerset manors previously held by Roger. It can also be shown that the IVLE [Fo. 96*b*, Exon. 439 JULA] held by William of Eu was later Henford Matravers [Williams' sub-tenant Hugh was presumably Hugh MALTRAVERS who held half a hide in HANTONE, Exon. 439] (with Yeovil borough), and that PRESTETONE [Fo. 99, Exon. 467 PRESTETONA] held by Ansger of Montacute was the part of Preston Plucknett parish known as Preston Bermondsey [Collinson III, p. 223]. Kingston in Yeovil and Yeovil Marsh, Preston

Plucknett, Barwick and Chilton Contelo may have been included in the huge royal manor of Milborne.

Bates identifies three manors of WICHE with Bathwick, but does not account for Swainswick. WICHE [Fo. 88*b*, Exon. 144 WICA], four hides, held with Woolley by the bishop of Coutances, is definitely Bathwick. " Aluerd " held another WICHE [Fo. 99, Exon. 492*b* WICA], two hides, and in the time of King Edward " Alured " had also held the third WICHE [Fo. 88*b*, Exon. 144*b*, 518*b* WICA], one hide, which he lost to the bishop of Coutances. In the supplement to Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 49], Edmund Husee held half a fee in SWANWYKE, and John Champenays held the fourth part of a fee in the same village ; Swainswick was still divided in the same proportions in the 14th century as in the 11th.

Newton in North Petherton is represented by five manors in Domesday Book, of which two, those held by John the Usher and Anschitil, are identified with North Newton. NEWENTONE [Fo. 91*b*, Exon. 282 NEWENTONA], held by Count Eustace, was Newton Comitis or West Newton ; in Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 10], Richard de Newton held Newton of John Tregoz who held many other manors previously held by Count Eustace of Boulogne ; Collinson [Collinson III, p. 70] states that West Newton or Newton Comitis was held by the de Newton family. NEWETONE [Fo. 94*b*, Exon. 441 NEWENTONA] held by Roger Arundel, was Mansell ; he also held Durston. In the time of Henry II, William of Erleigh [Collinson III, p. 72]. held Durston and Mansell. The Manor of NIWETONE [Fo. 93, Exon. 422 NIUUETONA], held by Roger of Courseulles, may be the TOKINGTON [S.R.S. 3, p. 45] in the list of the fees of the de Fortibus family, most of which had been held previously by Roger ; Tuckerton lies between North and West Newton.

I have mentioned instances of the name of a Domesday manor not covering the same ground as the same name covers today ; part of Newton becomes Tuckerton, part of Cheriton, Hatherleigh. The three manors of Stockland, all identified with Stockland Bristol, together had 11½ plough teams, which could have cultivated twice the area of the parish, 670 acres in 1841. Shurton in Stogursey was Moion property in Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 16], and was probably William of Moion's manor of STOCHELANDE [Fo. 95*b*, Exon. 356, 509 ESTOCHELANDA] ; I have found no Moion

property in Stockland Bristol. A series of 12th Century Charters in the Stogursey [S.R.S. 61, pp. 27 and 44 chartulary] refers to a messuage in Staninges which " Anketillus filius Herberti " held ; this suggests that Steyning (in Stogursey) may be the STOCHELAND [Fo. 93*b*, Exon. 425 ESTOCHELANDA] that an earlier Anschitil held of Roger of Courseulles. Stockland Bristol was the STOCHELAND [Fo. 96*b*, Exon. 562*b* STOCHELANDA] held by Radulf Paganel.

William of Moion's manor of TETESBERGE [Fo. 95*b*, Exon. 355 TETESBERGA, 508*b* TEGESBERIA] is tentatively identified with Adsborough in Creech St. Michael. I have not been able to find any connection between the Moion family and Adsborough itself, but Thurloxton, one mile away and unaccounted for by Bates, was held by John of Moion in Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 10], and was surely the site of this manor.

Holcombe, also unaccounted for in Domesday Book, may be a similar case. William of Moncellis held of the Bishop of Coutances, Stratton (on the Fosse) and 1½ hides in PICOTE [Fo. 88*b*, Exon. 146 PICCOTA]. Edmund, son of Pagen, held 3½ hides in PICOTE [Fo. 98*b*, Exon. 480 PICOTA] and 3 hides in Walton. In Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 3] George of Cantilupe held half a fee in Walton and half a fee in Holton, presumably Holcombe, in Kilmersdon hundred. I suggest that the 5 hides in PICOTE covered both Pitcot and Holcombe, but that only the smaller part attached to Stratton has retained the original name.

The manor of STAWE [Fo. 99, Exon. 491 STAUUE] which Dodo held is now called after him, Dodington, to distinguish it from other parts of Stowey.

Robert of Auberville had half a hide that had belonged to DOLVERTONE [Fo. 98*b*, Exon. 478*b*, " added to " DOLVERTONA]. William of Wrotham succeeded to much of his land, and Hawkridge, Wrotham property in the 13th century [Collinson III, p. 529], may be this estate.

It is difficult to account for the identification of LANGEFORD [Fo. 86*b*, Exon. 104 LANGEFORTDA] with Langford in Burrington and Churchill. Grundy's work on Saxon charters shows that the grant of 20 hides in Wrington [Grundy, p. 171] to Glastonbury in 904 included Upper Langford, and that the 30 hides in Banwell [Grundy, p. 167] granted by William the Conqueror to Bishop Giso included Lower Langford. These two large estates

were intact in 1086; no new manor of Langford had been carved out for them. Langford Budville is not accounted for by Bates; it is entered in the Exchequer Lay Subsidies [S.R.S. 3, p. 262] as being outside any hundred. LANGEFORD is one of the royal manors previously held by Earl Harold and his sons, and most of these manors were either separate hundreds or free manors in later centuries. Collinson's identification was with Langford Budville, and it is difficult to see why Bates sought to improve on it.

Bishop Beckington's Register shows that ECFERDINTONE [Fo. 94, Exon. 434 HECFERDINTONA] was not Egford, but EKFORTON [S.R.S. 49, p. 31], which appears among the churches in the deanery of Frome, with a footnote that this is Egforton, alias Feyroak, united with Berkley in 1460. The process of uniting the two parishes is also recorded [S.R.S. 49, p. 403]. Fairoak is a farm in Berkley parish in the hamlet of Berkley Marsh.

Walter of Douai held DONEHAM and CRUCE [Fo. 95, Exon. 350 CRUCA]; the former is identified with Dunball or Downend. In Exchequer Lay Subsidies "Donewere" [S.R.S. 3, p. 241] is entered as a tything, and "Johanne atte Croyce" paid 5/- in it. Dunwear is in North Petherton hundred, which agrees with the position of the entries in DB., whereas Dunball and Downend are in Puriton parish, which was in Loxley hundred. The borough of Downend was not in existence in 1086, and I have seen no record of a manor of Dunball.

Two little manors, ECEWICHE [Fo. 92*b*, Exon. 276*b* ECCHEUUICA] held by the Count of Mortain, and ECEWICHE [Fo. 95*b*, Exon. 354*b* HECUIUUICCA], held by Walter of Douai, are more likely to have been parts of Ekweek in Wellow than Wick in Camerton and Wick in Brent Knowle. ELCWYK is entered in the Nomina Villarum [S.R.S. 3, p. 61] as a hamlet in Wellow.

Roger of Courseulles held HUNECOTE [Fo. 94, Exon. 431 HUNNECOTA, 512 HUNECOTA] and Almsworthy; in Kirby's Quest, Matthew de Fornel held a fee in HOLNE [S.R.S. 3, pp. 36, 37] and half a fee in Almsworthy. This suggests that HUNECOTE may have been Holnicote rather than part of Huntscott.

LEGE [Fo. 97, Exon. 373*b*, 510 LEGA], held by Alfred of Epaignes, and identified with Leigh in Old Cleeve, may have been Woodcock's Ley in Luccombe.

Both SIREDESTONE [Fo. 93, Exon. 422*b* SIREDESTONA] and SIWOLDESTONE [Fo. 98*b*, Exon. 477*b* SIWOLDESTONA,

509 SIUUOLDESTONA] are identified with Shearston in North Petherton. The form of the name in Kirby's Quest [S.R.S. 3, p. 10] shows the former to be correct ; it is hardly possible that the latter is also correct.

CONTITONE [Fo. 91*b*, Exon. 283 CONTITONA], held by Count Eustace, remains an enigma ; it can not have been Compton Bishop. The 30 hides in the Banwell charter correspond with the 30 hides in the Domesday manor of Banwell, and it is clear from Grundy's analysis that Compton Bishop was part of these 30 hides [Grundy, p. 167]. Most of the hundreds in the Geld Inquest can be reconstructed precisely enough for us to be able to say that this 5-hide manor was not in them ; but it could have been in Frome, Bruton, Yeovil, or Milborne (Horethorn), or in one of the hundreds for which there is no Geld Inquest return, such as Somerton, Liet or Martock. Under Martock is a reference to 1 hide and 1 virgate in CONTONE [Fo. 87, Exon. 113*b* CONTONA, 516*b* CUMTONA] taken away from that manor, and identified with Compton Durville in South Petherton. It is conceivable that CONTITONE was also part of Compton Durville and in Martock hundred ; I have found no evidence to support this, but the other Comptons are fully accounted for.

The Glastonbury manor of BLACHEFORD [Fo. 90, Exon. 163 BLACHEFORDA] has been identified by Bates with Blackford, near Wincanton, although the abbey also held Blackford in Wedmore. In the Glastonbury Feodary reference is made to 8 hides in Blackford and Holton [S.R.S. 26, p. 59], to which Loderford (Lattiford) was added, held of the abbey by Henry of Newmarch in 1189, by Roger de Meoles in 1271, who was succeeded by " John de Meoles." These 8 hides must be the 8 hides in BODUCHELEI [Fo. 90, Exon. 165*b* BODUCCHELEIA], held of the abbey by Turstin, who also held in chief North Cadbury and 1 hide in Blackford already referred to ; the 2 hides in LODERFORD [Fo. 90, Exon. 165*b*, 522 LODEREFORDA], held of the king by Humphrey the Chamberlain are also stated to be part of the 20 hides in Butleigh. " John de Moeles " also held Cadbury [S.R.S. 3, p. 45] toward the end of the 13th century. If Blackford, near Wincanton, is thus accounted for, BLACHEFORD must be Blackford in Wedmore. If Holton itself was part of the 8 hides in Butleigh, ALTONE [Fo. 99, Exon. 466 HALTONA], held by Humphrey the Chamberlain, must be identical with LODERFORD.

DENESMODESWELLE [Fo. 86, Exon. 89*b* DENESMODESUELLA and 515*b* DENEMODESWELLA], half a hide taken away from Somerton, should be Deadmanswell in Broomfield. The hundred of Andersfield, in which it lies, was attached to the manor of Somerton, and under HUSTILLE [Fo. 98*b*, Exon. 479] in the same hundred is a reference to half a virgate and 1 ferling there that had belonged to Somerton.

SCOBINDARE [Fo. 87*b*, Exon. 174 SCOBINALRE], one of the estates owing service in Taunton, should be Shopnoller in West Bagborough.

The name of PILLOCH [Fo. 93*b*, Exon. 425 PILLOC] survives in " Pillock's Orchard " in the Cannington Tithe Schedule ; the orchard adjoins " The Grange," ½ mile S.E. of Cannington Church. This may be the site of the manor.

The Church at Northover is dedicated to St. Andrew, and must be the S. ANDREE DE GUIELCESTRE [Fo. 91, Exon. 171*b*, etc.] held by Bishop Maurice.

Three manors clearly included in the Geld Inquest are omitted from the Somerset Domesday. The Geld Inquest records in Bath hundred [Exon. 76], 3 hides held in demesne by the Abbess of St. Edward ; later records show that this manor was Kelston, owned by the abbey of Shaftesbury (S.R.S. 3, p. 49]. In Chew hundred [Exon. 81], " the king has no geld from 6 hides and 1 virgate which the king's villeins at Stocha held " ; Domesday does not include any royal manor at Chewstoke, and the number of hides recorded in the manors in Chew hundred is 6½ less than the total the Geld Inquest gives for the hundred. In Frome hundred [Exon. 527], " the king has 5 hides in demesne at Crenemere." West Cranmore was a Glastonbury manor later lost to Wells, but East Cranmore is entered in the Exchequer Lay Subsidies [S.R.S. 3, p. 263] as a free manor, which is quite consistent with its having earlier been in the king's hands.

Maps showing the distribution of population, plough-teams and other features based on the Domesday survey, are assuming an increased importance in historical research. Their accuracy must depend on the correct identification of manors, and also on a correct understanding of what places were included in composite manors. This paper is an attempt to assist in the first of these, in so far as Somerset is concerned. I do not claim that all my

suggestions are original; LANGEFORD is not the only case in which Collinson is right and Bates is wrong; nor is this the final word on the subject.

NOTE:

The Folio references are to the Exchequer Domesday followed by the Exeter Domesday with alternative spellings.

S.R.S.—Somerset Record Society publications.

Grundy—*The Saxon Charters and Field Names of Somerset.* G. B. Grundy, 1935

Collinson—*The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset.* Rev. John Collinson, 1791.

APPENDIX

Among the identifications in V.C H. are a few others that lack precision, and the following notes may be helpful :—

"HESCOMBE IN ODCOMBE." The tithing of Hesecombe in Tintinhull hundred was separately assessed for Land Tax in 1831; at this date the Earl of Westmorland was the only landowner, and Thomas Barnard was tenant, and the annual value was £15. In West Coker parish the Earl of Westmorland, with Thomas Barnard as tenant, had land valued at £30. The tithe maps (1844) show that the Earl owned the land in West Coker lying north of the road from Yeovil to Odcombe, and that Thomas Barnard was his tenant for almost the whole of this block, but apart from a few acres in Brympton, was not his tenant elsewhere. Hesecombe must have been part of this estate in West Coker; this is confirmed by a field-name in the Tithe Schedule, "Hiscombe Mead," ¼ mile E. of Broad Leaze Dairy House.

"MIDDLECOTE IN BABINGTON." Millescote was part of the 20 Hides of Mells, and a lease of 1478 (S.R.S. 57, p. 110) refers to "part of the parish of Mellys called Middilcote Fraunces." Babington and Millescote were both in the possession of the Bishop of Coutances, and a comparison of the Land Tax Schedules and tithe maps for Babington and Mells shows that the tithing of Babington extended into Mells parish, and included Vobster, Branch Farm, and other scattered properties which previously comprised Middlecote.

"LITELANDE" or "LITTELANEIA," Bishop Giso's manor "probably in Huish Episcopi," was in the part of the parish that lies W. of the River Parrett, where "LITNES" appears as a field-name.

"WOODWICK IN FRESHFORD." The Title Schedule shows fields called Woodwicks lying on both sides of Piepards Farm, which should be the site of the manor.

"PETHERAM IN CANNINGTON" is now represented by Moxhams Farm in Otterhampton.

"ALMSWORTHY IN EXFORD" lies between Wellshead and Westermill Farm.

" BROWN IN TREBOROUGH " is now represented by Court Farms.

" NEWHALL IN HOLFORD " is now in Nether Stowey parish, and is ¼ mile S.W. of Dodington Church.

" HORSEY PIGNES IN BRIDGWATER." In the 18th century the manors of Horsey and Pignes were in the same ownership and were known as Horsey Pignes. The Land Tax returns for Pignes show that it included land on both sides of the Parrett, now in Chilton Trinity parish ; Hawkhurst Farm may be the site of the manor.

" EASTRIP IN BREWHAM." In the Land Tax returns, Eastrip contained two substantial properties, Brewham Lodge, now in Brewham parish, and Sheephouse Farm, in Bruton, and one very small property called " Eastrip." A field called Eastrip adjoins Sheephouse Farm, on the north, and should be the site of the latter.