

From the *Transactions* of the
Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society

The Northern Boundary of Gloucestershire

by C. S. Taylor
1909, Vol. 32, 109-139

© The Society and the Author(s)

THE
NORTHERN BOUNDARY OF GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

BY THE REV. C. S. TAYLOR, M.A., F.S.A.,

Vicar of Banwell.

THAT which follows has for the most part existed in the form of notes for some twenty years, but it has not hitherto been published, because it seemed desirable to wait to see whether some additional evidence might be forthcoming which would tend to fix the date more clearly when the shire boundary of Gloucestershire was laid down. No such additional evidence, however, so far as the writer knows, has been forthcoming, and meanwhile modern alterations of boundary, by throwing parishes into adjoining counties, have tended to obliterate the old landmarks. Moreover, our President, at the Evesham Meeting, suggested three subjects of inquiry for elucidation: first, the cause of the curiously complicated set of boundaries to the north of Gloucestershire; then the origin and development of the monster Hundred of Kiftsgate; and, lastly, the fate of the vanished Shire of Winchcombe. The President of Council called upon the present writer to do his best to supply answers to these questions. There is, therefore, no other course open to him than to do his best to obey.

It will be best to begin with the question of the county boundaries, and to deal first with the actual facts of the case. The complications are caused in three ways: first, by indenta-

tions caused by the projection of parishes belonging to neighbouring counties into Gloucestershire, or by the projection of Gloucestershire parishes into neighbouring counties; then by islands of Gloucestershire lying in other counties; and, lastly, by islands of other counties lying in Gloucestershire. We begin our survey near Burford in Oxfordshire on our eastern border, and we notice that the parish of Widford, which lies locally in Oxfordshire, is an island pertaining to Gloucestershire. Passing northwards, we find that Icomb forms an island of Worcestershire in our county, while the Worcestershire parish of Daylesford is bounded on the east and south by Oxfordshire, on the west and north by Gloucestershire.

And now we enter on the really complicated part of the boundaries which we are considering—"a mighty maze, but not without a plan," as we shall see. Four parishes meet at and radiate from, the four-shire stone, two miles from Moreton-in-the-Marsh by the London road—Evenlode in Worcestershire, Chastleton in Oxfordshire, Little Compton in Gloucestershire, and Great Wolford in Warwickshire, while the huge Worcestershire parish of Blockley almost cuts off the Gloucestershire parishes of Lower Lemington and Todenham from the rest of our county. North of these two parishes lie two islands trending north and south, a Worcestershire island, consisting of Tidmington, Shipston-on-Stour, Tredington and Alderminster to the east, and a Warwickshire island, composed of Stretton-on-the-Fosse, Ilmington and Whitchurch, on the west, while the Gloucestershire parish of Preston-on-Stour runs out between Alderminster in Worcestershire and Atherstone-on-Stour in Warwickshire. From this point the boundary runs evenly, dividing the parish of Weston-on-Avon into Gloucestershire and Warwickshire parts, till the Worcestershire portion of Honeybourne indents our county deeply, as Broadway also does a little farther on, running down to within less than a quarter of a mile of the Blockley boundary, and almost cutting off the portion of Gloucestershire from Chipping Campden northwards from the rest of the shire. South of

this point is Cutsdean, a Worcestershire island. Farther west the Worcestershire parishes of Sedgeberrow, Overbury and Teddington, and Bredon run deeply south into our shire. Twining forms a Gloucestershire peninsula in Worcestershire ; while the Gloucestershire parish of Forthampton runs west from Tewkesbury also into Worcestershire. The Worcestershire island of Little Washborn lies east of Teddington. There are also two detached islands of Gloucestershire, Sutton-under-Brailes in Warwickshire, about seven miles north-east of Moreton-in-the-Marsh, and Shenington on the borders of Oxfordshire and Warwickshire, distant about thirteen miles from the same place in the same direction.

That is the line of the northern boundary of Gloucestershire and the problem is to discover a set of conditions under which such a line might be laid down, and also, if possible, the period of time at which it was laid down. Since, then, the northern boundary of our shire was at the date of Domesday just what it was until recent times, it may help us to trace out the ownership in 1086 of the estates which adjoined the boundary in its more complicated parts, and it will be better, for reasons which will be apparent, to consider the ecclesiastical and lay owners separately. The table gives the modern and ancient names of the estate, the name of the Domesday owner, and a reference to the page of Domesday Book :—

MODERN NAME.	ANCIENT NAME.	DOMESDAY OWNER.	PAGE.
1. Widford, G.	Widiforde	St. Oswald of Gloucester	164 <i>b</i> .
2. Daylesford, Wo.	Eilesford	St. Mary of Worcester	173.
3. Evenlode, Wo.	Evnilade	Do.	173.
4. Little Compton, G.	Contone	St. Denys of Paris.	166.
5. Todenham, G.	Teodeham	St. Peter of Westminster	166.
6. Lower Lemington, G.	Lemington	Do.	166.
7. Sutton-under-Brailes, G.	Sudtune	Do.	166.
8. Blockley, Wo.	Blochelei	St. Mary of Worcester	173.
9. Ditchford, Wo.	Dicford	Do.	173.
10. Shipston-on-Stour, Wo.	—	—	—
11. Tredington, Wo.	Tredinctun	St. Mary of Worcester	173.
12. Tidmington, Wo.	Tidelmintun	Do.	173.
13. Alderminster, Wo.	Sture	St. Mary of Pershore	175.
13A. Preston-on-Stour, G.	Preston	St. Denys of Paris	166.
14. Church Honeybourne, Wo.	Huniburne	St. Mary of Evesham	175 <i>b</i> .
15. Cow Honeybourne, G.	Heniberge	St. Mary of Winchcombe	165 <i>b</i> .
16. Broadway, Wo.	Bradeweia	St. Mary of Pershore	175.
17. Hinton-on-the-Green, G.	Hinetune	St. Peter of Gloucester	165 <i>b</i> .

MODERN NAME.	ANCIENT NAME.	DOMESDAY OWNER.	PAGE.
18. Sedgeberrow, Wo.	Secgesbarue	St. Mary of Worcester	173 <i>b</i> .
19. Overbury, Wo.	Ovrebere	Do.	173 <i>b</i> .
20. Teddington, Wo.	Teotintune	Do.	173.
21. Kemerton, G.	_____	_____	—
22. Bredon, Wo.	Breodun	St. Mary of Worcester	173.
23. Twining, G.	Tueninge	St. Mary of Winchcombe	165 <i>b</i> .
24. Icombe, Wo.	Iacumbe	St. Mary of Worcester	173.
25. Cutsdean, Wo.	Codestune	Do.	173.
26. Little Washborne, Wo.	_____	Do.	—
27. Chastleton, Ox.	Cestitone	Bp. of Bayeux and others	—
28. Great Wolford, War.	Volwarde	Robert de Statford	242 <i>b</i> .
29. Ilmington, War.	Ilmedone	Earl of Mellent	240 <i>a</i> and <i>b</i> .
30. Whitchurch, War.	Witecerce	Do.	Do.
31. Stretton on-the-Fosse, War	Stratone	Gislebert f. Tuold	243 <i>b</i> .
32. Atherstone-on-Stour, War.	_____	_____	—
33. Shenington, G.	Senendone	Rex} in Tewkesbury	163 <i>b</i> .
34. Forthampton, G.	Fortemeltone	Rex}	163 <i>b</i> .

Before any use is made of this table it is needful to make a few remarks upon it. The estates which belonged to St. Denys of Paris and St. Peter of Westminster lay in 1086 in Deerhurst Hundred, and had belonged to the old Abbey of Deerhurst, a Gloucestershire house. Tidmington appears in Domesday as a member of Tredington, and Shipston-on-Stour lay in Tidmington. It will be seen that the county boundary cuts the parish of Honeybourne in two, Church Honeybourne lying in Worcestershire and Cow Honeybourne in Gloucestershire. It is clear that Kemerton had been a possession of Deerhurst Abbey, for the Survey tells us that Girard the Chamberlain had carried into Tewkesbury Hundred eight hides which had always paid geld and rendered services in Deerhurst till Girard obtained them; besides these half a hide in Kemerton belonged to St. Denys of Paris, and another half hide to St. Peter of Westminster. All the three islands of Worcestershire which lay in Gloucestershire belonged to St. Mary of Worcester; Icomb as a member of Blockley, Cutsdean of Bredon and Little Washborn of Overbury. I cannot identify the Domesday equivalent of Atherstone-on-Stour. With regard to the two estates of Tewkesbury, it must be remembered that there can be little doubt that Tewkesbury, like Berkeley, was the estate of a great minster, which may not have been secularised until the eleventh century, as Berkeley Minster was secularised by Earl Godwin.¹

If now we set on one side the estates of the Worcestershire houses of the Cathedral at Worcester and the Abbeys of Pershore and Evesham, and on the other side the estates of the Abbeys of St. Peter and St. Oswald at Gloucester, of Deerhurst and Winchcombe, with those of the great lordship at Tewkesbury, and draw a line between these two groups of properties, it will be found that the line so drawn coincides generally with the northern boundary of Gloucestershire. And it is evident that the line was drawn with the definite intention of placing the estates of the Worcestershire houses in that

¹ *Transactions*, xxv, 34.

shire, and of the Gloucestershire houses in that shire, except that it would seem that some fifty hides belonging to Evesham Abbey were of set purpose placed in Gloucestershire. The principle was followed out so closely that even the parish of Honeybourne was divided in accordance with it, Church Honeybourne, a possession of the Abbey of Evesham, being placed in Worcestershire, and Cow Honeybourne, which belonged to the Gloucestershire house of Winchcombe, being placed in that shire. The parish of Weston-on-Avon was also divided into 'Gloucestershire and Warwickshire portions but the Domesday estates of Weston and Milcote are puzzling.

Of course there were limits. The shire boundary might wind about in the strangest way among the closely-intermingled estates, and the Cathedral of Worcester might mark that its diocese extended over Gloucestershire by retaining its hold even over three outlying properties which became islands of Worcestershire in Gloucestershire, but the influence of the religious houses did not extend very far on either side of the border-line. The Worcester estate of Gotherington in Bishop's Cleeve, the border of which ran within a mile of that of Little Washborne, remained in Gloucestershire. Evesham Abbey also held some estates in Gloucestershire very near the border-line; Willersey and Weston-on-Avon actually touched Worcestershire, Lark Stoke and Hidcote Boyce adjoined Warwickshire, while Upper Swell, Mangersbury, Broadwell and Adlestrop near Stow-on-the-Wold, and Bourton-on-the-Water lay not far from the shire boundary. It would seem, then, that though the ecclesiastical ownership of estates was a paramount influence in laying down the shire boundary in this district, it must have been limited and checked by other considerations. It seems that the shires were so mapped out as to contain a certain number of hides, and it might be very likely that if all the estates of the Worcestershire houses had been placed to the north of the dividing line an unwieldy shire would have been the result. But no religious house except the Cathedral at Worcester drew territory which lay within

the boundaries of Gloucestershire into its own shire. The Wiltshire island of Kingswood, near Wotton-under-Edge, was an entirely different matter; it probably represented an encroachment on the royal estate of Berkeley, which had been made by Edric the Sheriff, and which was held in 1086 by Roger of Berkeley.¹ It is likely that Edric had transferred his stolen estate into another county to conceal his theft, as Edward of Salisbury, Sheriff of Wilts in 1086, was using the estate of Woodchester to eke out his payment as Sheriff for his county of Wilts.² It is to be noted also that while Icomb, Cutsdean, and Little Washborn were subject both in civil and ecclesiastical matters to Worcestershire authorities, Kingswood Church remained subject to the Bishops of Worcester and Gloucester; the connection with Wiltshire was a merely secular one, for Edric the Sheriff, being merely a secular official, could only transfer secular jurisdiction.

The confusion in ecclesiastical matters in North-east Gloucestershire was scarcely less than it was in secular matters. In South-western Mercia the shire boundaries did not follow the boundaries of the ancient dioceses. Gloucestershire east of the Severn was carved out of the Diocese of Worcester, but the Forest Deanery lay in the Diocese of Hereford. Shropshire lay partly in the Diocese of Hereford, partly in that of Coventry and Lichfield. In Warwickshire the Deaneries of Arden, Coventry, Marton and Stoneley lay in that diocese, those of Kington and Warwick in the Diocese of Worcester, in which diocese also the whole of Worcestershire lay. But Alderminster, Tredington and Shipston-on-Stour, though in Worcestershire, lay in the Warwickshire Deanery of Kington, no doubt for the sake of convenience. The Deanery of Blockley, moreover, though it lay in the Diocese of Worcester, was in the Archdeaconry of Gloucester, and the cure of Ditchford, though it appears in Domesday as a member of Blockley, was attached to the Warwickshire parish of Stratton-on-the-Foss, which

¹ D.B., f. 72b.

² D.B., f. 164; *Domesday Analysis*, pp. 26, 186.

also lay in the Blockley Deanery. Of course the division into archdeaconries and deaneries dates from a much later period than the laying down of the shire boundaries, but it seemed better to mention these anomalies.

We are now in a position to attempt to fix the date when the boundary between Gloucestershire and its neighbouring shires was laid down. So far as the boundary between Gloucestershire and Oxfordshire is concerned, it no doubt coincided with the division between the ancient diocese of the Hwicceans and the South Mercians; our task begins at Kingham, where the Worcestershire parish of Daylesford comes in. We have noted that one of the main determining factors in guiding the course of the county boundaries was the ecclesiastical ownerships of the adjoining estates, the line being laid down in such a way, as far as possible, as to set estates belonging to religious houses in Worcestershire to the north of the line and estates belonging to Gloucestershire houses to the south of it. This being so, it is clear that the line must have been laid down at a time when the heads of these houses were men of influence, and not at a time when the monastic system was depressed. It is impossible, for instance, that such a boundary could have been laid down in the time of King Alfred, when, as he himself tells us, the monasteries generally lay empty and waste, that there were few on either side of Humber who could either render their services in English or translate a letter from Latin into English, when it was a subject for thankfulness to God that there were any teachers in office.¹

It may be taken that this period of depression of the churches lasted in the Hwiccean realm from about the end of the reign of Ethelwulf in 857 till the adoption of the Benedictine system by several of the chief minsters in 969, and that it is not probable that a boundary determined by ecclesiastical considerations would have been marked out during that time. We proceed, then, to consider whether the boundary

¹ Introduction, St. Gregory's *Pastoral Care*.

would have been adopted before the death of Ethelwulf. Certainly some of the Worcester estates belonged to the cathedral before that time, such as Daylesford, Blockley, Bredon and its member Cutsdean. Todanhom was bequeathed to Deerhurst Minster in 804, while, if Evesham charters are to be trusted, Church Honeybourne belonged to that abbey as early as 709. But Widford, which formed a Gloucestershire island in Oxfordshire, was a possession of St. Oswald's Priory at Gloucester, which was founded by Ealdorman Ethelred and the Lady of the Mercians about 909, and Hinton-on-the-Green, a Gloucestershire border parish, was given to St. Peter's Abbey by Elflada, sister of King Ethelred, in 981.¹ We may conclude, therefore, with very fair certainty, that the boundary was not marked out before the beginning of the reign of Ethelred the Unready. But it was certainly in existence before the end of that reign, for the King died on April 23rd, 1016, and in the autumn of that year, after the Battle of Assandun, we are told that Cnut went up with his army into Gloucestershire—wende Cnut cing upp mid his here to Gleaweceastrescire.

We are thus led to the conclusion that our shire boundary was very probably laid down during the thirty-eight years of the reign of King Ethelred. We have seen that the course of the boundary was determined to a great extent by ecclesiastical considerations, and it is a strong confirmation of the accuracy of the period named that during the whole of that reign the See of Worcester was held by the Archbishops of York, and that two of those Archbishops, St. Oswald and Wulfstan, were, on account of their personal character, as well as on account of their high position, among the most influential men of their day. At the time of the accession of Ethelred in 978 St. Oswald had already held the two Sees for six years, and Aldulf, who succeeded him in 993, held them for nine years. Wulfstan, succeeding to both Sees in 1003, resigned the See of Worcester in 1016, and held that of York till his

¹ Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i, 547.

death in 1023. It might very well have been that either of these Archbishops would have been powerful enough to insist on the desirability of keeping the estates of the various minsters as far as possible in the same shires as those in which the minsters lay. At any rate, an immediate result of the resignation of Wulfstan was that Edric Streon deprived the cathedral of three estates, Batsford, Kingham and Eisey.¹ I cannot find that Kingham was an ancient estate of Worcester, but Batsford was a gift of King Ethelbald in the first half of the eighth century,² and Eisey was a gift of King Offa about 775.³ Eisey appears in Domesday as Aisi, near Cirencester, north of the Thames; very probably Edric had it transferred to Wiltshire to make his theft more secure. He must, however, have been prompt in his iniquity, for the theft is stated to have occurred in the time of Leofsige, who was consecrated to the See of Worcester in 1016, while Edric was executed at the Christmas Gemot of 1017.

In a paper on "The Origin of the Mercian Shires"⁴ reasons were given, drawn almost entirely from secular considerations, for thinking that the boundaries of the Mercian shires date from the time of Edric Streon about 1008. There is no reason for repeating any part of that paper here, but it is certainly a striking thing that the purely ecclesiastical considerations which have come before us in the present paper point to the reign of Ethelred the Unready as the most likely period for the marking out of the northern boundary of our county.

Dr. Maitland has pointed out⁵ that the arrangement of the Mercian shires is a purely artificial one, based apparently on an unit of 1,200 hides and its multiples; and he gives

¹ Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i, 598: Boecceshofre, Aesige, Keingaham.

² K., *C.D.*, lxxxviii; *C.S.*, 163. ³ K., *C.D.*, cxxxiv; *C.S.*, 226.

⁴ *Transactions*, xxi, 32-57.

⁵ *Domesday Book and Beyond*, "The County Hidage," pp. 456-60: *Transactions*, xxi, 45.

numbers, taken from various ancient lists of shires, which would seem to show that with regard to shires in our neighbourhood the intention was that Oxfordshire and Gloucestershire should each contain 2,400 hides, and Worcestershire and Warwickshire 1,200 hides each. Dr. Maitland's calculation from Domesday Book gives the following totals for these shires: Oxfordshire, 2,412; Gloucestershire, 2,388; Worcestershire, 1,189; and Warwickshire, 1,338 hides; an approximation quite sufficiently near to show that the principle which the writer lays down is a true one. In the *Domesday Analysis*, p. 332, the number of Gloucestershire hides is given by the present writer as 2,611, still quite sufficiently near to the supposed unit of 2,400 to support its accuracy.¹ Of course, an artificial system of land division of this kind must be to a great extent independent of natural landmarks, and so the Mercian shire system is; even such great rivers as the Trent and Severn scarcely at any point of their course form shire boundaries for any distance. Perhaps the best example of a boundary laid down on a natural landmark is the fact that for some twenty miles the north-eastern boundary of Warwickshire is drawn along the Watling Street. When Mercia was mapped out into shires the method adopted was apparently the choice of certain towns as centres, and the allotting to a district round each town a pre-determined number of hides.

Worcestershire presents probably as good an example² as any other shire of the practical working of this system.

¹ With regard to Dr. Maitland's note (²) on page 457 of his book on Domesday, I have gone carefully into the matter, and am satisfied that the method of calculation adopted in the *Analysis of Domesday* is correct; and, in fact, a comparison of the Domesday hidage with the number of ancient holdings in various Gloucestershire estates, as shown in the paper on "The Pre-Domesday Hide of Gloucestershire" (*Transactions*, xviii, 288-319), will show that the process of calculation was rightly used.

² *Domesday Book and Beyond*, pp. 451-5.

Domesday Book shows that the land of the shire was thus divided in 1086 :—

St. Mary of Worcester	300	hides.
St. Peter of Westminster	200	„
St. Mary of Pershore	100	„
St. Mary of Evesham	65	„
Other owners	539	„
	<hr/>	
	1,204	„

And these 1,204 hides were systematised into twelve hundreds of 100 hides each. The two hundred Westminster hides had originally belonged to Pershore Minster, which indeed still retained certain rights over them.¹ Clearly the arrangement is a purely artificial one, and bears strong marks of the impress of the hand of an ecclesiastic. The shire should include the estates which lay in the three ancient hundreds pertaining to the cathedral, and in the three hundreds over which Pershore Minster possessed rights, with a good proportion of those of Evesham Abbey, and the remainder of the 1,200 hides should be made up in any way which might be most convenient.

Almost of necessity the boundaries of such a shire as this must be purely artificial. The Avon would have been the natural boundary between the shires of Worcester on the one side and Gloucester (and Winchcombe) on the other. But, as we have seen, the Mercian shire boundaries do not follow natural lines; the valley of the Avon was full of Worcester and Pershore estates, and, in fact, the river only divides the two shires at the point where it runs between the cathedral estate of Bredon and the Winchcombe Abbey estate of Twining. The boundary line between the shires of Warwickshire and Worcestershire to the north and Gloucestershire to the south would then be merely a line of convenience; and bearing in mind the strong ecclesiastical impress which the shire

¹ D.B., f: 175b: Dicit Comitatus quod Ecclesia de Persore debet habere Circset de omnibus trecentis hidis.

of Worcester bears, and the fact that Gloucestershire and the part of Warwickshire which touches our district also lay in the Diocese of Worcester, it is no matter for surprise when we find that the dividing line between the shires was generally so laid down as to keep the estates belonging to religious houses in the shire in which the religious house which owned them would lie.

We now pass to the consideration of the causes and the date of the disappearance of the ancient shire of Winchcombe. The document which tells of this event is a schedule, drawn up by Heming, a Worcester monk, of the estates of which the Cathedral at Worcester had been deprived during the Danish Wars in the reign of Ethelred the Unready and afterwards. The passage runs thus: "In the time when Edric, whose cognomen was Streona, that is 'adquisitor,' ruled over the whole realm of the English, first under King Athelred, and afterwards for a while under Cnut, and held dominion over it like an under-king, insomuch that he joined hamlets to villages, and districts to districts at his will, for the county of Winchcombe which at that time used to be independent, he joined to the county of Gloucester."¹ Edric, as we have seen, was slain in 1017; but as Heming alludes farther on in this passage to Archbishop Thomas of York, who was consecrated in 1070, and also to a visit of Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester, to Chester for the purpose of compiling the Domesday record of that district in 1086, his words concerning the disappearance of Winchcombeshire were not written until some seventy years had passed away since the death of Edric.

We notice first of all that Heming applies the word *vicecomitatus* to the district which was attached to Winchcombe as well as to that which was attached to Gloucester; and this expression might give rise to the idea that both Winch-

¹ Quasi subregulus dominabatur, in tantum ut villulas villulis et provincias provinciis pro libito adjungeret, nam vicecomitatum de Wincelcumb quæ per se tunc erat vicecomitatu Gloceastre adjunxit.—Heming, *Cartulary*, p. 280; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i, 598.

combeshire and Gloucestershire were full-blown shires, such as the Worcestershire and Gloucestershire which Heming knew at the time when he wrote. But such an idea would very probably be quite an erroneous one. The word *scir* meant simply a region divided off for any purpose; a *Biscop-scir* was a diocese, a *preost-scir* or a *scrift-scir* was a parish,¹ and it is likely that in this case *vicecomitatus* was used as a Latin equivalent of *scir*, and meant nothing more than "district," whatever the nature of that district might be. Gloucester and Winchcombe were the heads of independent districts, and Edric destroyed the independence of the district of Winchcombe by merging it in that of Gloucester. Now it is quite certain that there was once a shire or district of Winchcombe. A document relating to rights at Beckford and Cheltenham determined at the Council of Cloveshoe on October 12th, 803, is headed, "Into Wincelcumbe scire."² Unfortunately this document is first found only in Heming's *Cartulary*. Furthermore, the schedule of Gloucestershire estates belonging to Evesham Abbey in Domesday Book closes with the note: "In feringo de Wincelcumbe habuit S. Maria de Evesham lvi hidas, T.R.E."³ A similar entry at the end of the schedule of the estates of Winchcombe Abbey runs thus: "T.R.E. defendebat se hæc ecclesia in Glowecestrescyre pro lx hidis."⁴ The "quarter" of Winchcombe would seem, then, to be like the shire of Gloucester, a territorial area.⁵ It is not unlikely that the schedule from which the testimony as to the hidage of Evesham Abbey was taken dated back to time when the shire of Winchcombe was still well remembered.

It will be seen that both Heming and Domesday Book are fully seventy years later than the creation of Gloucestershire, but the Great Record bears testimony in another way to the former dignity of Winchcombe. As a rule, the record of a Mercian shire begins with an account of the shire-town, then there

¹ *Transactions*, xxi, 32.

² K., C.D., clxxxiv; C.S., 309.

³ D.B., f. 166.

⁴ D.B., f. 165b.

⁵ *Domesday Analysis*, p. 218.

follows a list of the landowners, and finally a schedule of the estates in the shire. To this rule there are but three exceptions. On f. 162*b* an account of Winchcombe appears immediately after that of Gloucester; on f. 280 the accounts of the boroughs of Nottingham and Derby appear side by side between the records relating to Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire; and on f. 336 an account is given of the city of Lincoln, followed immediately on f. 336*b* by an account of the royal borough of Stamford, and on f. 337 by an account of Torksey. But Torksey seems to appear merely as a member of Lincoln, with which city it was closely connected in many ways, even to the extent of paying, in King Edward's time, one-fifth of the geld of Lincoln. Stamford, however, stands independent with its twelve *Lagemanni* like those of Lincoln. Only two of the Mercian shires possessed two county boroughs; the shires were those of Lincoln and Gloucester, and the second county boroughs were Stamford and Winchcombe. And surely it is a striking proof of the ancient dignity of Winchcombe that on the page of Domesday it possesses a distinction in which its single peer is that only one of the five great boroughs of the Northmen which did not head a shire of its own.

We now proceed to try to discover, if possible, the nature of the district of which Winchcombe was the head. Side by side with the list of the county hidage already alluded to, Professor Maitland has set another list, which he calls "The Burghal Hidage."¹ It is really a list of fortresses in the realm subject to a West-Saxon King, with the number of hides in the territory attached to each fortress; and it was probably compiled about 918, in the time of King Edward the Elder, after the death of his sister, the Lady of the Mercians. The list begins with Sussex, and works westwards through the Kingdom of Wessex to Devon; then it turns northwards by Somerset, through Bath, Wilts, Oxford, Buckingham, to South-

¹ *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 502; *C.S.*, 1335; *Transactions*, xxi, 49.

wark, and finally mention is made of Essex, Worcester and Warwick. The hidage attached to the fortresses in our neighbourhood is as follows: Bath, 3,200; Oxford, 2,400; and Worcester, 1,200 hides. We notice that already by the reign of King Edward the Elder the 1,200 hide unit was in use, and also that the hidage attributed to the fortresses of Oxford and Worcester is the same as that which belonged to the shires of those boroughs in later times. We notice, too, that there is no mention of Gloucester, and that a very large hidage is attributed to Bath, which at that time was probably still in Mercia. Gloucester had been the capital city of the Mercian realm in the days of Ethelflæd, and it is likely that King Edward had removed the centre of the military system of the district to Bath in order to obliterate as far as possible any trace of the former independence of the Mercian Kingdom. We may take it, therefore, that the hidage of what is now Gloucestershire is included in the 3,200 hides attached to Bath. If now from the 2,611 hides contained in Gloucestershire in 1086 we subtract the 227 hides contained in the Forest Hundreds, West of Severn,¹ we find that there were in Gloucestershire, east of Severn, at that time 2,374 hides, a striking approximation to the total of two 1,200 hide units.² And if we were to say further that it is likely that one of these military shires or districts had pertained to Gloucester and the other to Winchcombe, there would be nothing to be said against the idea; and as Winchcombe was certainly in early days the head of a shire of some sort, there would be a good deal to be said in favour of it. If this is a true statement of the case, then we should suppose that Edric Streon combined the two 1,200 hide units of Gloucester and Winchcombe into a single administrative shire of the later type, and that it is

¹ *Domesday Analysis*, p. 332

² It is likely that the approximation is even closer than this, for of the twelve hides in the little Hundred of Tolangebrige, eleven belonged to the Minsters of St. Peter and St. Oswald, so that it would seem that this Hundred should be reckoned with those east of Severn.

to the loss of the independence of Winchcombe brought about in this way that Heming alluded. There is, of course, nothing to show in what parts of the present shire the respective districts of Winchcombe and Gloucester lay. But a guess that the district of Winchcombe lay mainly on the hills and that of Gloucester mainly in the vale might not be far wrong.

But the question arises whether we are to suppose, of necessity, that the limits of the later shire coincided exactly with the boundary enclosing the two 1,200 hide units. If we compare the hidage attached to the fortresses in Wessex with the hidage of the shires which contained them, it is clear that in most cases there is no close relation between the two sets of figures, and it is obvious that in many cases the fortresses must have been supported by men drawn from other shires than their own. If, however, we suppose that the later shire of Gloucester was composed of the two 1,200 hide units of Gloucester and Winchcombe, together with some 220 hides taken from the region dependent on Hereford between Severn and Wye,¹ then there would be little opportunity of variation of boundary except on the northern frontier, for the old frontier between the Mercians and Hwiccians on the east, the West Saxon counties on the south, and the Severn on the west would form fixed lines. But it is likely enough that there may have been considerable rectification of the northern boundary, in order that the ecclesiastical estates which abound in that district might, as far as possible, lie in the same shire with the minster to which they belonged.

We now pass to the subject of the growth and development of the great Hundred of Kiftsgate which now includes more than one-tenth of the area of the shire. The following table is taken from Rutter's *Gloucestershire*, pp. 38 and 39, and after each place-name is set the initial letter of the Domesday Hundred in which it lay: Ch = Cheftesihat; C = Celfede; W = Wideles; G = Grestestanes; H = Holeforde. The Record

¹ This portion of Gloucestershire lay in the Diocese of Hereford till 1541, and in the Archdeaconry of Hereford till 1836.

does not state in which Hundred Sudeley and Todington lay, and the dependencies of Winchcombe, other than the one marked, lay in the hundred of the town.

KIFTSGATE HUNDRED.

UPPER DIVISION.

Aston-sub-Edge	C.	Mickleton, with	C.
Batsford	W.	Hidcote Bartram	C.
Campden	W.	Pebworth	C.
Condicote	W.	Quinton, with	C.
Cow Honeybourne	C.	Admington	C.
Dorsington	C.	Saintbury	W.
Ebrington, with	W.	Sezincot	W. & C.
Charingworth	W.	Swell, Upper	W.
Hidcote Boyce	W.	Weston-sub-Edge	C.
Lark Stoke	W.	Weston-on-Avon	C. & W.
Longborough	Ch. & W.	Willersey	W.
Dry Marston	C.		

LOWER DIVISION.

Aston Somerville	G.	Sudeley Manor	
Buckland	W.	Sudeley Tenements	
Charlton Abbots	G.	Todington	
Child's Wickham	G.	Twining	G.
Didbrook	H.	Winchcombe, with	
Dumbleton	G.	Cotes	
Guiting Power, with	H.	Coclebury	
Farmcott	H.	Corndean	
Guiting Temple	H.	Greet	
Hawling	H.	Gretton	
Hayles	H.	Naunton	
Pinnock	H.	Postlip	G.
Rowel	H.	Stanley Pontlarch	
Snowhill	H.	Wormington	G.
Stanton	G.		

It will be seen that with the exception of Buckland the places in the upper division lay in the Domesday Hundreds of Celflede and Wideles, and those in the lower division lay in the Domesday Hundreds of Gretestanes, Holeford and Winchcombe; but Buckland is placed in the former list in a Winchcome Abbey rental of 1485.¹

It is easy to learn from Domesday how these two groups of hundreds grew up. Of Langeberge in Cheftesihat Hundred we are told (f. 163) that in King Edward's day its profits were included in the sheriff's ferm, but that in 1086, together with two hundreds which the sheriff joined to it, it paid £15. These two hundreds would have been those of Celflede and Wideles, which were afterwards known as the upper division of the Hundred of Kiftsgate, or as Kiftsgate Hundred simply. We are also told (f. 162b) with regard to the Borough of Winchcombe that in 1086, together with three hundreds which were joined to it, it paid £28 of 20 pence to the ounce; that is to say, the payment was by weight, not simply by tale. The three hundreds would have been those of Gretestanes, Holeford, and the hundred of the town, in addition to the payment from the town itself, four elements in all. And this group of estates was known as the lower division of the Hundred of Kiftsgate, or as the Hundred of Gretestanes and Holeford.

The only estate in the Domesday Hundred of *Cheftesihat* or Kiftsgate was Langeberge, now a part of Longborough, with its member Mene. This last-mentioned place I cannot identify; the idea that it is now represented by Meon in Quinton has nothing but the similarity of name to recommend it. The other portion of Longborough lay in Wideles Hundred. It was, then, from the part of Longborough which lay in Cheftesihat Hundred in King Edward's time that the great Hundred of Kiftsgate grew up. And it does not seem that the consolidation of the hundreds into two groups was the work of a long time; it was begun and completed in the first twenty years of the Conqueror's reign. One of the Conqueror's

¹ Fosbroke, ii, 290.

sheriffs joined the Lordships of Celfede and Wideles Hundreds to Longborough, the capital Manor of Cheftesihat Hundred, and indeed the only manor in that hundred. With regard to the lower division of the existing hundred, the process was more gradual, though here also it was begun and completed between 1066 and 1086.

In King Edward's time the Borough of Winchcombe used to pay £6, of which the Earl had his third penny. In the early days of the Conqueror's reign, together with the hundred of the town, it paid £20. Then Roger de Ivri, while he was sheriff, added £3 to this rent, Durandus, the Domesday sheriff, added another £5, and in 1086, together with three hundreds, the payment due from Winchcombe amounted to £28 by weight.

The two groups of hundreds, then, that is to say, the upper and lower divisions of the modern Hundred of Kiftsgate, date from the reign of the Conqueror; but the time when they were consolidated into a single hundred is not clear, though it is clear that the groups were distinct in 1086. A writ of certiorari was issued on April 3rd, 1391, to discover the profits of the Hundreds of Kiftesgate, Holford and Grestona, together with the fairs of Winchcombe and others held in the hundreds;¹ and in answer to this it found that in 1350 John Musard held the bailiwick of the Hundreds of Kiftesgate for life. It was found also that Kiftesgate and Greiston, Kiftesgate, [Holford] and Greiston and Winchcombe in the county of Gloucester are of old styled hundreds, and ought so to be styled, and have been accustomed to be one and the same hundred called Kiftesgate and Greiston, and are not different hundreds, nor separate one from another.² It will be seen that the two

¹ *Landboc or Register of Winchcombe* (Royce), ii, 20.

² Kiftesgate et Greistone, Kiftesgate [Holford] et Greistone et Wynchcombe, in comitatu Gloucestrensi, antiquitus Hundreda nuncupata sunt, et esse debent, et esse consuerunt unum et idem Hundredum, vocatum Kiftesgate et Greiston, quod idem Iohannes eodem anno vicesimo quarto tenuit, ex concessione dicti Avi, et non diversa Hundreda, nec ab invicem separata.

groups of Kiftsgate and Greiston are first mentioned; and that then the single Hundred of Kiftesgate, and the threefold Hundred of Holford, Greiston and Winchcombe are enumerated separately. The same condition of things is found in the Record of the Pleas of the Crown for Gloucestershire in 1221.¹ The Record begins with the heading, *Hundredum de Kyftesiate*, then comes the Villate of Campden, then the entry, *Adhuc de Hundredo de Kiftesiate*,² *Hundred de Holeford et de Gretestane*. It is evident that the Hundred of Kiftsgate included the dependent Hundreds of Holeford and Gretestane. The same conclusion is supported by the entry relating to the last Plea from the Villate of Winchcombe, which runs thus: "52. Marinus of Winchcombe who was accused concerning a certain man who was found dead in his father's house, paid two marks that an inquiry might be held whether he were guilty or not; they were received by the pledge of Mathew the Cook, Odo of Dumbleton and Joseph de Mariscis. The jurors of Winchcombe and of Kiftsgate and of Gretestan say distinctly that he is not guilty, so he is quit." Here we have the jurors of the two divisions of the Kiftsgate Hundred and of the Borough of Winchcombe uniting in a single verdict, acting, that is, as the single authority for the one great Hundred of Kiftsgate. The condition of things was then just what it is now. This takes us back to within one hundred and thirty-five years of the date of Domesday, and I have not been able to carry the matter farther back than this. But it would seem that the consolidation of the two groups of hundreds into a single hundred must have been effected between 1086 and 1221.

It is evident that the moving cause of these consolidating measures was financial. One sheriff of the Conqueror united the two large Hundreds of Celflede and Wideles to the one-manored Hundred of Cheftesihat, simply, apparently, for his

¹ *Pleas of the Crown for the County of Gloucester, 1221.*—F. W. Maitland.

² Interpreted by Dr. Maitland to mean "Hundred of Kiftsgate continued."

own convenience. Another of the Conqueror's sheriffs, or the same, united the three Hundreds of Holeford, Gretestanes and the town of Winchcombe to the town itself, also, apparently, as a matter of financial convenience. It only remained for some later sheriff to follow on in the path marked out for him, also to suit his own convenience, and to weld the two groups into one. The really wonderful thing about the whole matter is that the little one-manored Hundred of Cheftesihat should have given its name to this huge territory of some 84,000 acres. The only manor in the Hundred of Cheftesihat was a part of Longborough with a member called Mene. Where or what Mene was I do not know. Longborough now contains about 2,770 acres. In Domesday it lay partly in the Hundred of Cheftesihat, with 1,080 acres of arable, partly in that of Wideles, with 1,200 acres of arable; the Domesday acreage of 2,280 arable acres agreeing very fairly well with the 2,770 acres of modern ascertainment. But which part of Longborough lay in Wideles Hundred, and which in the Hundred of Cheftesihat cannot now, I think, be discovered. I made many inquiries in days gone by to ascertain the locality of Cheftesihat, not only in Longborough, but throughout the north of the shire, but without success. The Fosse runs by the lower part of Longborough parish, and what is evidently a very ancient road from Stow-on-the-Wold to Evesham traverses the upper part, and it is more than likely that Cheftesihat or Kiftsgate lay on one or other of these roads, but its place can, I think, now nowhere be found. The method of the development of Kiftsgate Hundred is clear enough; its birthplace is obscure. When it is said that the Hundred Court of Kiftsgate Hundred used to be kept on the top of a hill in Weston-sub-Edge,¹ this may have been the trysting-place of the old Hundred of Celflede in which Weston-sub-Edge lay, but it cannot have been the trysting-place of Cheftesihat Hundred, for that must have been situated in Longborough.

¹ Fosbroke, ii, 202.

The answers to the President's questions, then, would run somewhat in the following way. The northern boundary of Gloucestershire is a very broken and complicated one, because when it was laid down, about 1008, it was so arranged as to place the estates belonging to religious houses as far as possible in the shire in which the house would lie to which they belonged. This intention was, however, apparently checked by the desire to arrange the hidage of the shires according to 1,200 hide units. The "shire" of Winchcombe was probably a 1,200 hide military unit, which ceased to exist when it was joined to a similar unit attached to Gloucester in order to make up, together with some 220 hides taken from the west of the Severn, the existing area of Gloucestershire. The Hundred of Kiftsgate is made up of the Domesday Hundreds of Cheftesihat, Celflede, Wideles, Gretestanes, Holeforde and Winchcombe. In the first twenty years of the Conqueror's reign the Hundreds of Celflede and Wideles were annexed to the Hundred of Cheftesihat, and the Hundreds of Gretestanes, Holeforde, Winchcombe and the town of Winchcombe were consolidated into another group. In each case the consolidation was an act of a sheriff, apparently for purely financial reasons. At some time between 1086 and 1221 the two groups were welded into one. In Domesday the only estate in the Hundred of Cheftesihat was a portion of Longborough which formed a royal manor, and the exact position of Cheftesihat seems to be unknown.

The following schedule is added because it seemed that it might be useful to those who are interested in the early history of the north of the shire. The Roman numbers (LXIX) refer to documents in Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, the Arabic numbers (139) to those in Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum*. The document DXIV,* 1135, which is starred by Kemble as being doubtful, is in its present form probably a twelfth-century document, no doubt, however, containing older material, and so possessing a certain value. The Pershore document DLXX,* 1282, though starred, is probably genuine.

NUMBER.	DATE.	GRANTOR.	GRANTEE.	PLACE.	REMARKS.
			I. WIDFORD.		Appears first in Domesday.
			2. DAYLESFORD.		
LXIX, 139	718	Ethelbald Rex	Bægia	Dæglesford.	
CXXX,* 222	777	Offa Rex	St. Mary in Eouesham	Deilesford.	
CCLI, 436	841	Bcorhtwulf Rex	Eps. Heaberht.. ..	Dæglesford	Freedom from charges.
CCCVI, 540	875	Werfrith Eps. ..	Ceolwulf Reg.	Dæglesford	Grant for three lives in part payment for freedom from charges.
CCCCXXVI, 882	949	Eadred Rex	Wulfric Miles	Dæglesforda	vii hidæ the hireth into burgtune.
DXIV,* II35	964	Eadgar Rex	Cath. Wig.		
DCXXIII	979	Oswald Archieps.	Athelstani fratri ..	Degilesford	Grant for three lives.
DCCCCLXIII	Ælfgar Dux	Ægelwio (Abbot of Evesham, 1058-66)	Deilesford	Paying to the Abbot 6 marks of gold for the sustenance of the brethren of Evesham.
MCCCLXVII.	Mention in <i>Land-boundaries of Adlestrop.</i>

NUMBER.	DATE.	GRANTOR.	GRANTEE.	PLACE.	REMARKS.
CXX, 209	772	Offa Rex	3. EVENLODE. Ridda, his wife.. .. Bucga, and daughter Heburg.	Euulangeladæ ..	
CXXX, 222	As under Daylesford.
CXXXVI,* 229	Mention of river in <i>Land-boundaries</i> only.
CXLVII, 244	784	Offa Rex	Esme Comiti	Rura iii tributari- orum	Sale for two lives with reversion to Evesham.
DXIV,* II35	
DLIV, 1238	969	Oswald præsul.. ..	Ealhstan	viii mansas.	
DCCCCXII	Edward Rex	Ad mensam fratrum	Eunelade	Mannig Abbot and Æde- lwijs Monk bought the land from Eammer. Man- nig was Abbot of Eve- sham, 1044-58.
MCCCLXII	<i>Land-boundaries of Evenlode.</i>
MCCCLXVII	<i>Land-boundaries of Adlestrop.</i>
			4. LITTLE COMPTON.		Probably a member of Todenham.
			5. TODENHAM.		
CLXXXVI, 313, 314	804	Æthelric	Deerhurst Minster ..	Todanhom.	

			6. LOWER LEMINGTON.		Probably members of Tod- enham.
			7. SUTTON-UNDER-BRAILES.		
CCLXXVIII, 488-9	855	Burhred Rex ..	8. BLOCKLEY. Alhun Eps.	Bloccanleah	Purchase of freedom from royal rights for 300 shil- lings.
			9. DITCHFORD.		A member of Blockley.
			10. SHIPSTON-ON-STOUR.		This town lay in Tidmington
DCXX	978	Oswald Archieps.	11. TREDINGTON. Ælfnoth	Blacewellan	Blackwell in Tredington. At the end of the <i>Land- boundaries</i> : "and vi foðra truses on Bloccanlea." <i>Trus</i> is fallen wood, twigs, etc., used for firewood. ¹
DCLXXVI	991	Oswald Archieps.	Eadric	ii hides Niwebol- dan i hide Tætlintune..	Newbold in Tredington. Tollon in Tredington.
DCXIV	977	Oswald Archieps.	12. TIDMINGTON. Ælfweard	Tidelminctune.	

¹ I owe this information to the Rev. C. Plummer.

NUMBER.	DATE.	GRANTOR.	GRANTEE.	PLACE.	REMARKS.
DLXX,* 1282 ..	972	Eadgar Rex ..	13. ALDERMINSTER. Persore Minster ..	v mansi in Sture..	Charter of Confirmation.
CLXXXVI, 313, 314	804	Æthelric	13A. PRESTON-ON-STOUR. Deerhurst Minster ..	Sture.	
LXI,* 125	709	Kenred Rex ..	14. CHURCH HONEYBOURNE. Evesham Mon. ..	Huniburna	The name Honeybourne occurs in four other charters, but only in <i>Land-boundaries</i> .
LXIV,* 130 ..	714	Ecgwin Eps. ..	Evesham Mon. ..	Huniburnæ.	
			15. COW HONEYBOURNE.		Appears first in Domesday.
DLXX,* 1282 ..	972	Eadgar Rex ..	16. BROADWAY. Persore Minster ..	xx mansi Bradanwege	Charter of Confirmation.
....	981	Elfreda, sister of King Ethelred	17. HINTON-ON-THE-GREEN. St. Peter's, Gloucester	Hynetone.	

CXXXI, 223	..	777	Offa Rex	18. SEDGEBERROW. Aldred, Subregulus..	iv mansi, Segces- bearue.	
DXIV,* II35	..	964
CCCVIII, 54I	..	878	Ceolwulf Rex ..	19. OVERBURY. Werferth Eps. Wig..	vi cassates in Uferebreodun or Uferebiri.	
DXIV,* II35	..	964
DXIV,* II35	..	964	20. TEDDINGTON.
DLII, I232	..	969	Oswald Eps. ..	Ætheleard.. ..	vii mansi Tidinc- tune.	
DLVII, I233	..	969	Oswald Eps. ..	Osulf	Teottingtune and Ælfsigestun	Teddington and Alston.
DCXVII	..	977	Oswald Archi- præsul	Eadric	iii mansi Tidingc- tun.	
DCLI	..	985	Oswald Archi- præsul	Eadric	v mansi Tidantun.	
DCCCv	..	1046-60	Ealdred Eps. Wig.	The Monks of Worcester	Deotinctun and Ælfsigestun	Toki, the king's thegn, gave the land to the bishop; his son Alsi claimed the lands when he succeeded to his father, but gave them up in consideration of 8 marks of gold.

NUMBER.	DATE.	GRANTOR.	GRANTEE.	PLACE.	REMARKS.
			21. KEMERTON.		No doubt in early days a possession of Deerhurst Minster.
CXX, 210	772	Offa Rex	22. BREDON.	Refer to 3. EVENLODE. The reversion after the passing of the three lives was to the Minster at Bredon.
CXXXVIII, 234 ..	780	Offa Rex	Breodune Eccl. ..	x man. Wærssetfelda, v cass. Cof-tune, v cass. Wreodenhale.	
CXL, 236	780	Offa Rex	Breodun Monast. ..	v man. Teotting-tun, x cass. Was-sanburnan, x mans. Codeswel-lan, x mans. Norðtun.	
CXLIII, 241 ..	781	Heathored Eps. Wig.	Offa Reg.	xc man. æt Bathum	Confirmation by Offa of other estates to the See of Worcester.
CXLVIII,* 232 ..	778	Place-name Breodun.
CCXLVIII, 434 ..	841	Berhtuulf Rex..	Eanmund Abbat.	Grant of privileges.
CCLXI, 454	844	Berhtuulf Rex..	Eanmund Abbat.	Grant of privileges.
DXIV,* II35 ..	964
DCLXXIV	990	Oswald Archieps.	Two brethren	Upthropp	The land belongs to Breodune

CCIII, 350	814	Coenuulf Rex ..	23. TWINING. Deneberht Eps. ..	Bituinæum Monas.	The king remitted the maintenance of twelve men at Worcester in consideration of the grant of the Minster at Twining.
CXLII,* 240	781	Offa Rex	24. ICOMBE. St. Mary of Worcester	Icancumb.
DCIV,* 1135
CXL, 236	25. CUTSDEAN.	See under Bredon.
CCXLV, 430	840	Berhtwulf Rex	Heaberht Eps. Wig.	Codeswelle.	
CCLXXIX, 490	855	Alhwine Eps. Wig.	Æthelwulf Duci ..	Codeswellan.	
			22. LITTLE WASHBORNE.		A member of Overbury.
			33. SHENINGTON.	}	Possessions of Tewkesbury, which was probably in early days the seat of a great minster.
			34. FORTHAMPTON.		