

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

**The Gloucestershire section of Domesday Book: geographical
problems of the text, part 1**

by J. S. Moore
1987, Vol. 105, 109-132

© The Society and the Author(s)

The Gloucestershire section of Domesday Book: geographical problems of the text, part 1

By JOHN S. MOORE

Introduction

The opportunity afforded to the present writer of editing the Gloucestershire section of Domesday Book (hereafter *DB*), as part of a new translation of Domesday Book under the general editorship of the late Dr John Morris, has necessitated a thorough reappraisal of the text and its problems. Though the Latin text was transcribed with quite astonishing accuracy by Abraham Farley in his edition of 1783¹ – I have found only a few errors in comparing this, line by line, with the Ordnance Survey facsimile issued in 1862² – no translations of the Gloucestershire section have appeared since Rudder incorporated it in his *New History* and Bawden produced a separate translation in 1812 which is now very rare.³ Neither of these can now be regarded as satisfactory: their place-name identifications are often hopelessly wrong whilst Rudder's version could not utilize Farley's authoritative text which only appeared four years later, and the fragmentation of his translation hopelessly destroyed the unity of the text of *DB*. Partly because the Domesday county did not entirely correspond to the later county and partly for other, more obscure reasons, it is also necessary to consider out-county entries relating to Gloucestershire places; these are included in the Phillimore series and, as we shall see, in some cases greatly clarify the main county text. Above all, it is essential to identify persons and places (hundreds as well as manors) correctly before proceeding to analyse the text geographically and to extract local information; for this reason alone, in addition to the problematical meaning of much of Domesday's terminology, it is possible that the attempt by Professor Darby's team of geographers to map *DB*'s information may have been somewhat premature.⁴ Furthermore, the work of Round and Maitland has completely demolished the hypothetical system of measurements based on the fiscal hide which Taylor took over from Eyton⁵: our knowledge of any one place in 1086 may well now be more sure though statistically less precise than would appear from Taylor's now obsolete work. And though it might be imagined that Smith's *The Place Names of Gloucestershire* (hereafter *PNGl*) and Darby & Versey's *Domesday Gazetteer* (hereafter *DG*) have eliminated any problems of topographical identification, this is far from being the case; indeed, some of the identifications in both these authorities are at least dubious if not downright wrong. Finally, if we are to reconstruct the hundreds of 1086 as a first step towards progressing beyond Domesday into pre-Conquest times,⁶ the Domesday text itself needs to be corrected either from internal or later evidence. Here one must again take issue with Taylor who, though pointing out that 'there are some curious mistakes in the numbering of the owners', went on to assert

'The Commentator on the Gloucestershire Domesday must perforce, therefore, be a man of one book, which is within the area which it covers its own interpreter, and from which there is no appeal; he may illustrate its statements by reference to Abbey Chartularies and similar documents, and he may obtain help in the identification of properties by tracing their subsequent descent, but all such sources of information

must be subordinated duly to the authority of the Great Inquest; they are servants, and cannot be allowed to correct, much less to contradict, the master work. I believe the text of the county Domesday to be almost faultless . . . As Domesday Book was a work of man, there are also no doubt other mistakes and omissions, but to acknowledge this is not to acknowledge that the man is living who can point them out and correct them; emendations of the text of Domesday, and alterations of its statements are, I believe, unjustifiable except in the rarest instances.⁷

An attitude, one would think, more appropriate in the cathedral canon towards his bishop or dean than in a critical historian towards his major source.

In the following sections I propose to deal in turn with places not identified at all by previous writers (I), or wrongly identified (II), with the identification of unnamed places styled, somewhat inappropriately, 'anonymous holdings' by *DG* (III), and, finally, with the differentiation of multiple entries apparently or actually relating to the same area under the same general name (IV). Section III will appear as part 2, and Section IV will appear as parts 3 and 4. In referring to individual entries I shall use the notation a, b, c, d to denote the four columns of each folio,⁸ and I shall further identify each entry by the chapter and paragraph numbers which are being uniformly applied to the Phillimore series of translations: the chapter numbers have been italicized to distinguish them from the paragraph numbers; all references are to the Gloucestershire section of the text unless prefixed by the abbreviation for another county. Names in italics are the original form appearing in the text of *DB*.

SECTION I: PLACES PREVIOUSLY UNIDENTIFIED

In this section I shall deal with the identification of place-names not previously located, or the identification of which has not been satisfactorily established. *DG*, 147–59, lists the following names in the Gloucestershire section of *DB* as unidentified: *Aldeberie* in Rapsgate hundred (fol. 168c, 50, 4); *Chingestune*, *Chire* and *Cliftone* in Westbury hundred (fol. 163a, 1, 11), *Hundewic* in Greston hundred (fol. 163d, 1, 43), *Ladeuent* in Westbury hundred (fol. 163a, 1, 11), *Lega* in Ledbury hundred (fol. 165b, 6, 7), *Telinge* in Deerhurst hundred (fol. 166b, 19, 2), and *Uleton* in Dudstone hundred (fol. 167c, 36, 1).⁹ To these must be added *Alwintune*, *Brocode*, *Niware*, *Rwirdin*, *Stantun* and *Wiboldingtune* from the Herefordshire section of *DB*, since all these can be proved to refer to places in Gloucestershire. In addition, some of the identifications in Taylor, *PNGL* and *DG* are either wrong, e.g. *Aluredstone* (fol. 166d, 31, 2) as Allaston in Lydney and *Lechetone* (fol. 170a, 71, 1) as Clapton-on-the Hill, or at least unproven and undocumented, e.g. *Merwen* (fol. 162d, 1, 2) as Maisemore: much of the potential value of *DG* is lost because it provides no justification for its controversial identifications in an area where these cannot be taken for granted. Equally, whilst a historian would be foolhardy to query the etymological expertise behind *PNGL*, the philologists have often paid too little attention to the facts of history. From a linguistic point of view, *Alwintune* (fol. 185d, Herefs. 17, 1) could equally well be either Alvington or Elton in Westbury: only the historian can make the correct choice of Alvington. Similarly, *Rodele* (fol. 169a, 58, 2) was identified in *PNGL* and *DG* as Rodley in Westbury though an equally satisfactory etymological candidate is Ruddle in Newnham, which is historically the only possible choice.

We must therefore begin by stating what are the adequate criteria for identification purposes:

1. *Textual criticism*. Any proposal must not do violence to the accepted interpretation of the text of *DB*, must be compatible with entries elsewhere in *DB* (which indeed are sometimes sufficient in themselves to prove identification), and must not involve changing the substance of the entry, its position in the text, or, except as a last resort, its hundredal rubrication. Any proposed alterations to the orthography of *DB* must be justifiable on paleographical grounds

in the light of probable early medieval place-name formation.

2. *Etymological possibility.* Any identification which does not accord with the derivations given in *PNGl* should be in general eliminated, unless it can be satisfactorily shown from historical arguments that the *PNGl* forms do not in fact relate to the place in question.¹⁰ Occasionally, as we shall see, human frailty has made nonsense of the logical rules of etymology, and place-names rejected by philology can nevertheless be assigned on historical grounds to certain places despite *PNGl*'s omission. (This criterion does not of course apply in the case of unnamed places).
3. *Topographical possibility.* Any identification suggested on etymological grounds for a manorial name must lie in the area, normally the hundred, where the *DB* form is located, and, except in the last resort, must also relate to a place that existed as an independent manor or can definitely be shown to have been absorbed into another manor.
4. *Tenurial history.* J.H. Round asserted more than once that 'the best of all proofs of identity is afforded by feudal tenure and genealogical descent'¹¹, indeed in the case of unnamed holdings this will usually be the only means of proving identity. Certainly, where adequate historical evidence exists – and this is by no means always – any proposed identification, particularly between a choice of probabilities, should be checked by tracing the later ownership of the suggested place down to a point in time where its location on the modern map can be proved; *per contra*, any proposed identification which is contradicted by such historical evidence can be at once eliminated. Occasionally also, the pre-Domesday tenurial history of an unidentified place may promote some suggestions for its location, particularly if the fission of a larger unit is suspected.
5. *Fiscal history.* A useful though not infallible check can be provided by the accordance of proposed identifications with the known Anglo-Saxon preference for assessing geld-liability on each village in multiples of 5 hides,¹² and the Anglo-Norman preference for assessing military service in terms of the knight's fee, sometimes equal to 4 hides¹³ but, especially in the West Country, often 5 hides.¹⁴ I stress preference in both cases because neither rule is invariable, and once military service ceased to be regularly levied on this basis after the 12th century the rating of fees varied widely precisely because they had ceased to be of contemporary significance. Moreover, the hidage of some estates is not given in *DB* (e.g. Little Taynton: fol. 167c, 37, 4), whilst in a few instances small estates have been carved out of larger units and separately rated without a corresponding reduction of the hidage of the larger unit (e.g. the 1½ virgates held by William of Eu (fol. 166d, 31, 6) and the half-hide held by Roger of Lacy (fol. 167d, 39, 11) in Tidenham were both stated to have been held by Archbishop Stigand and therefore clearly once formed part of his main manor of Tidenham (fol. 164s, 1, 54), yet both *DB* and the Edwardian survey of the manor show that the original 30-hide assessment nevertheless remained unchanged.¹⁵

To sum up, the state of the historical evidence, especially in the Middle Ages, does not always admit of drawing certain conclusions, and we shall have to be content with greater or lesser probabilities: nevertheless the above criteria should at least help us to arrive at a judicious balance of the probabilities if only by reducing their number. I shall now deal first with the scattered individual places to be identified, in alphabetical order, before considering *en bloc* the Westbury entry and the Herefordshire entries.

Aldeberie

This has not previously been satisfactorily identified, so we may begin by quoting the *DB* entry on fol. 168c relating to it:

'50 LAND OF OSBERN GIFFARD. . . .

In RAPSGATE Hundred. . .

4 Osbern also holds *Aldeberie*, but it did not belong to the man Dunn's land which Osbern holds [i.e. Brimpsfield, the preceding entry], as the Shire says. Alric held it and could go where he would. 1 hide and 1 plough. The value is and was 10s.'

That the medieval name *Aldeberie*, derived from OE *ald* and *burb*, 'the old fortification', normally evolves into the modern Oldbury is abundantly clear from the better-documented instances in which Oldbury forms the name of a parish, i.e. Oldbury-on-Severn and Oldbury-on-the Hill. There is indeed a plethora of Oldbury names in Gloucestershire, occurring as field-names in Arlingham, Eastington, Pucklechurch, Stapleton, Tewkesbury, Wick and Wickwar, as well as the two parishes and 'Oldbrough' in Lcmington; there was in addition an 'Oldeburidich' in Saintbury.¹⁶ But as possible sites for the *Aldeberie* of 1086 they are all non-starters, since at no time were any of them in Rapsigate hundred; furthermore, with the exception of Oldbury Court in Stapleton, they were never held by the Giffards of Brimpsfield or their main successors the Berkeleys of Stoke Gifford. For this very reason Taylor tentatively settled for Oldbury Court, whilst A.H. Smith quite wrongly stated that *Aldeberie* (which he misspelt) was in Langley hundred in 1086, in which case the only possible identification would be Oldbury-on-Severn, not Oldbury in Wick which was always in the hundred of Pucklechurch.¹⁷ Oldbury-on-Severn has the minor attraction of being next to Osbern Giffard's manor of Rockhampton, which no doubt explains why some other commentators accepted its identification with *Aldeberie* without question,¹⁸ but it is a totally untenable identification on historical grounds, since it remained part of Thornbury manor throughout the Middle Ages.¹⁹ We can also eliminate Taylor's location of *Aldeberie* as Oldbury Court in Stapleton which was later held by the Berkeleys of Stoke Gifford, since there is no reason to suppose that *Aldeberie* continued in the hands of the Giffards after the 12th century or ever came into the possession of the Berkeleys in the 14th century.

Having disposed of past guesswork, let us look again at our text: firstly it definitely states that *Aldeberie* was in Rapsigate hundred; secondly, it distinctly implies that it was connected with but separated from Brimpsfield, 'it did not belong to . . . Dunn's land which Osbern holds', Dunn being Osbern's Anglo-Saxon predecessor in all his other manors of Rockhampton, Stoke Gifford and Brimpsfield; thirdly, if, as is usual, Domesday villis were assessed for geld purposes in units or multiples of 5 hides, this would suggest that *Aldeberie* had once been part of Brimpsfield, since Osbern's manor there was rated at 9 hides and the total assessment for the vill, including 1 hide at *Aldeberie*, would then be a neat 10 hides. We conclude that *Aldeberie* must be in or adjacent to Brimpsfield, and almost certainly within Rapsigate hundred: as we shall see later, *DB*'s hundredal rubrication is by no means perfect, but in only one case is it absolutely necessary to change the hundredal rubric in order to locate a previously unidentified manor; if one indulged in such changes wholesale, Domesday identification would become a lot easier but, alas, less secure. Nor do we need to go far afield: perusal of the Rapsigate hundred section of *PNGI*, vol. 1 reveals that in Elkstone, the parish immediately east of Brimpsfield, there is a field-name Oldbury which Smith recorded from a lease of 1537 and the 1841 Tithe Map and Award.²⁰

Can we safely identify this Oldbury with *DB*'s *Aldeberie*? We can make a start by identifying the 1 hide of *Aldeberie* in 1086 with the 1 hide at *Aldeburbe* given to the Templars by Osbern's descendant Elias Giffard of Brimpsfield before 1185, when it was recorded as annexed to the Templars' main Gloucestershire manor of Temple Guiting. The editor of the Templars' survey of 1185 was unable to decide whether *Aldeburbe* was Oldbury-on-Severn, where at one point Rudder located the Templars' holding of Oldbury, or in Dowdeswell, which they also held, where Rudder later located Oldbury.²¹ There is, however, no evidence whatever, apart from

Rudder's unsupported guesses, either that there was an Oldbury in Dowdeswell – it is not, for example, mentioned in the Dowdeswell manor court book for the late Tudor and Stuart period²² – or that in or after 1086 the Giffards had ever held any part of Dowdeswell, which had been given to the Templars before 1185 by William de Dowdeswell and remained in the possession of his descendants as subtenants of the Templars down to the dissolution of that order in 1308 and in their own right in the first half of the 14th century.²³ There is furthermore no evidence to associate Elias Giffard's gift of *Aldeburbe* with Oldbury-on-Severn apart from Rudder's identification as part of a very unsatisfactory discussion: the earls of Gloucester, who were lords of Thornbury manor (including, as we have seen, Oldbury-on-Severn) in the 12th and 13th centuries, gave only a small estate at the end of Gloucester Bridge to the Templars of Gloucestershire.²⁴ In the 14th century *Oldeburn* (probably an error for *Oldeburie*), *Oldebury* or *Holdebury* reappears as a member of Temple Guiting manor,²⁵ whilst in the 15th century a Cirencester Abbey record of the suit of court owed to Rapsgate hundred by the major land-holders in the hundred during the 1420s mentions separately the main manor of Elkstone held by Nicholas Poyntz and 'the land and tenement of William de Oldebury formerly Wolwayn's' held by Robert Poyntz.²⁶ In the 16th century Oldbury ceases to occur in national records as one of the hamlets attached to Temple Guiting manor, probably as a result of depopulation – it was still a single holding in the 1420s though by 1537 there was only a sheephouse there – but the deeds by which Corpus Christi College, Oxford, secured Temple Guiting manor between 1514 and 1529 consistently mention lands in Elkstone amongst the appurtenances of Temple Guiting manor.²⁷ The first explicit identifications of Oldbury with the lands in Elkstone occurs in the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of 1535, when 'rents of land called Oldburii, £1' are included under 'Elston' (Elkstone) as part of Temple Guiting manor, and a similar description recurs in Temple Guiting surveys between 1517 and 1623. Its precise location and area can be determined from a 1631 survey of the Elkstone manor estate which mentions the reserved rent of £1 still paid to Corpus Christi College and a further survey and map of Elkstone in 1769–75. These records enable Oldbury to be exactly located on the Elkstone Tithe Map and Award as certainly comprising field nos. 161, 189–91, an area of 69½ acres, and probably also including field nos. 159–60, 162, 193–8, a further 195 acres called Slaite (from OE *slæget*, 'sheep pasture'), as the 'common pasture for sheep' attached to Oldbury in 1537, at SO 985127, forming a compact block of about 264½ acres on both sides of the Elkstone-Colesbourne road at Slutswell in the north-east corner of Elkstone, separated from the rest of the parish by streams running north and south from the central ridge.²⁸ The etymological continuity is incontestable, and the full elucidation of the tenorial history places the identifications of *Aldeberie* with Oldbury in Elkstone beyond all reasonable doubt.

Hundewic

The identification of *Hundewic* (fol. 163d, 1, 43) now presents no problem thanks to the work done a decade ago by the then editor of *VCH (Glos)*. In the early 1960s A.H. Smith noted the existence of the field-name Hentage in Alderton which he described as 'possibly an adaption of *Hundewic* 1086 DB', and in the addenda and corrigenda he noted some additional earlier forms supplied by C.R. Elrington, who by 1965 was thus able to assert positively that Hentage was 'clearly the *Hundewic* of Domesday Book'. In 1086 Alderton, Dixon and Hentage already formed a unified estate of 12 hides held by Humphrey the Chamberlain which it can be proved became the later manor of Dixon. The identification of Hentage with *Hundewic* derives from the mention of 'enchewiche' in the Alderton glebe terrier of 1584, represented in later glebe terriers as 'Ensiche Furlong' (1612), and 'a furlong called Entage' (1678). Though no such name occurs in

the Alderton Enclosure Award of 1809, local oral tradition places Hentage at SP 005324, immediately east of Alderton village on the north side of the road from Alderton to Stow-on-the-Wold.²⁹

Lega

Lega (fol. 165b, 6, 7) has so far eluded identification, though Taylor quite rightly saw that as it was in Ledbury (*Letberg*) hundred, which also included Osbern Giffard's manor of Stoke Gifford, it must lie in or near Stoke Gifford. A.H. Smith, preferring to locate *Lega* in Henbury because it was occasionally referred to as 'in Saltmarsh', hedged his bet by adding 'but it might have been in the adjacent part of Almondsbury'.³⁰ In support of this afterthought he ironically cited the *Cartulary of St Mark's Hospital, Bristol*, which, read with more care than he gave it, provides the basis for a decisive identification with Lea in Almondsbury, a name still in use down to the mid-19th century as one of the tithings of Almondsbury.³¹ The reference to the 'Saltmarsh' need not detain us overlong: it was the name for a large area of alluvial marshland along the east bank of the Severn from Alkington to Avonmouth,³² which in the early modern period became known as the Upper and Lower Levels of Gloucestershire, comprising about 5500 acres between Arlingham and Littleton-upon-Severn and about 6300 acres between Aust and the Avon, including 200 acres known as Marsh Common in Almondsbury which, when enclosed in the 1820s, were divided between the manors of Almondsbury, Over and Lea.³³

The references to the 'Saltmarsh' do not therefore preclude the identification of *Lega* with Lea in Almondsbury, and both the editor and the text of the Cartulary explicitly locate Lea within Almondsbury: it is referred to as 'La Lee by Over in Almondsbury'; 'near Over Park', which is once called 'the park of La Lee'; 'around St. Swithin's chapel' which is sometimes called 'the chapel of La Lee', sometimes 'the free chapel of Over'. Even more significant is the series of charters dated between 1234 and 1250 by which Sir Thomas de Doynton as mesne lord confirms the purchase by Henry de Gaunt, founder of St Mark's Hospital, of Earthcott and the Lea, reserving to himself the service due for 1 knight's fee, a transaction further confirmed by a later lord of Doynton, Sir Thomas de Tracy, in 1317.³⁴ Sir Thomas de Doynton is clearly the successor of the Robert who in 1086 held from the Bishop of Coutances the three manors of Doynton, *Lega* and Earthcott (fol. 165b, 6, 5, 7, 8). On both historical and topographical grounds it is tempting to include Over within the *Lega* of 1086; as we have just seen, Over and Lea are closely associated in 13th century records and in fact adjoin one another, whilst both the Bochans and Gansels (from whom Henry de Gaunt purchased Lea and Earthcott) and the Gournay lords of Over had a common ancestor in the 12th century. The Bochans and Gansels were descended in the female line from Richard and Cecily Gansel, Cecily Gansel probably being a sister of Robert Fitz Harding, whilst the Gournays were descended in the female line from Robert de Were, third son of Robert Fitz Harding.³⁵

The inclusion of Over within *Lega*, though topographically attractive and supported by the common ancestry of their 13th century lords, is however open to two historical objections. In the first place, whilst Lea and Earthcott were held ultimately from the Honour of Gloucester, Over in the 13th century was held from the Beauchamp earls of Warwick. Their overlordship, however, can be explained as an intrusion during the disturbed period after the death of King John, since down to at least 1202 Robert de Gournay's father Thomas of Harptree had also held his land from the Honour of Gloucester.³⁶ Not too much weight in any case should be attached to mesne lordship, since contemporaries just as much as later historians were becoming confused by the proliferation of successive subinfeudations, until the creation of new subtenancies was prohibited by the statute *Quia Emptores* in 1290.

Secondly, there is more substantial evidence which might suggest that in the 12th century Over had been part of the manor of Almondsbury rather than of *Lega*. In or before Henry I's reign, the abbey of Cormeilles had been granted lands and tithes in Cattybrook, Easter Compton, Kingston in Slimbridge, West Kingston in Hinton, Over and Tockington; of these Slimbridge, Hinton and Tockington were certainly members of the royal estate of Berkeley in 1086, and the mention in the same charter of the adjoining areas of Cattybrook, Easter Compton and Over could indicate that these were part of Almondsbury manor which in 1086 was also a member of Berkeley (fol. 163a, 1, 15, 17), especially since Easter Compton and part of Cattybrook remained within Almondsbury manor.³⁷ On the other hand, part of Cattybrook was included within Over manor, and down to the 18th century Easter Compton, though part of Almondsbury manor, was in Over tithing.³⁸ Furthermore, there is no warrant for assuming that all the lands held by Cormeilles Abbey in Henry I's time were recent grants from the royal estates: the major holdings of the abbey recorded in Henry II's confirmation charter derived from grants before 1086 by Ansfrid of Cormeilles at Elkstone and Pauntley (fol. 169d, 68, 9, 12) and Earls William and Roger of Shrewsbury at Ashton-under-Hill, Beckford, Dymock and Newent (fols. 164a, b, 1, 51, 57-8; 166a, 16, 1). Hence although most of the abbey's south Gloucestershire holdings, being members of Berkeley manor in 1086, must have originated in grants from either the Conqueror's sons or one of the Berkeleys, it does not necessarily follow that Over was also part of Almondsbury in 1086 or that the Berkeleys granted its tithes to Cormeilles Abbey.

Again, the mention of the wife of Richard Gansell in 1166 as holding 3 virgates of old enfeofment from Roger de Berkeley could be taken as referring to a subinfeudation of Over from Almondsbury before 1135. But Roger de Berkeley's lordship could well be explained as the result of his father having been given control of the lands of the Bishop of Coutances (the tenant-in-chief of Doynton, Earthcott and *Lega* in 1086) after the bishop's death in 1093 or the forfeiture of his nephew and heir Roger de Mowbray two years later and the resumption of these lands by the Crown. It is known that most of the Bishop of Coutances' estates later formed part of the Honour of Gloucester created by William Rufus for Robert Fitz Hamon, and we have already seen that Earthcott, Lea and Over were all held of that honour.³⁹ The inclusion of both Lea and Over in the *Lega* of 1086 is also supported by a comparison of the assessments of 1086 (*Lega*: 1 hide) and 1166 (3 virgates): the missing virgate can probably be assigned to the manor of Brokenborough, the origin and descent of which before the 14th century is obscure, but which can be located north-east of Over, at Sunday's Hill: in 1441 it is definitely stated to be 'in the fee of La Lee' and in the 18th century was in the tithing of Gaunt's Earthcott and the Lea.⁴⁰

Certainly the philological identity of *Lega* and Lea, and the location of Lea in Almondsbury, are both indisputable. Perhaps the best argument for the inclusion of both Lea and Over is topographical: St Swithin's chapel, we recall, was in the 13th century sometimes styled 'the chapel of La Lee', sometimes 'the free chapel of Over'; its remains are still incorporated in the modern St Swithin's Farmhouse at ST 585815, which was almost certainly the site of *Lega* in 1086. Yet this site is in the north of the later Lea tithing near the boundary with Over manor, and its location is therefore strong evidence that Lea and Over had once been united in *DB's Lega*. Since both Lea and Over were held by Cecily Gansel in the middle of the 12th century, and Lea continued to be held by her descendants down to the 1230s, Over was presumably split off by her and transferred to her brother Robert de Were, the ancestor of the Gournays who were lords of Over till the 14th century, possibly as part of some re-arrangement of family lands after Robert Fitz Harding's death in 1171.

Thanks to the acquisition of Gaunt's Earthcott and the Lea by Bristol Corporation in 1541, a fine series of surveys and maps now in the B.R.O. enables Lea to be precisely located within the parish of Almondsbury. Delineating the boundaries of Over present rather greater difficulties,

given the apparent absence of later estate records for that manor, but this can be achieved by eliminating those areas of Almondsbury parish known from surviving maps and surveys to be within the manors of Almondsbury (in which Brokenborough has been absorbed by the early 17th century), Gaunt's Earthcott and Lea, and the results thus achieved are confirmed by the names of earlier owners of Over manor noted as the owners of adjoining lands in some of these maps.⁴¹ The original connection between Lea and Over manors is born out by the way in which their lands fit together when their boundaries are reconstituted. With the purchase of Lea by Robert Cann Lippincott, lord of Over manor, from Bristol Corporation early in 1838, the two main component parts of *Lega* were reunited for the first time since Cecily Gansel held them in the 1160s.⁴²

Telinge

The case of *Telinge* (fol. 166b, 19, 2) does not present any great difficulty, since only its precise location remains to be ascertained. A.H. Smith satisfactorily explained its *DB* form as a misunderstanding by the Norman clerks responsible for *DB* of the OE *aet elinge*, 'a place where eels were trapped'; he noted its later appearance as Ellings and Elands in Tirley and its identification, at least etymologically, with Yellings in Chaceley, the parish immediately north of Tirley, and with Nellyns or Nellings in Deerhurst, immediately east of Tirley across the River Severn.⁴³ On grounds of topography and etymology alone, we would expect to find Ellings on the west bank of the Severn in Tirley, at or near the Chaceley boundary. The later tenurial history of Ellings enables us to confirm this broad location: because it was held from Westminster Abbey since before 1066, it was included, with Rye manor also held from Westminster Abbey, in Westminster hundred when that hundred was formed in the 14th century. Later maps show that Tirley was administratively divided into three parts: the west and east lay in Westminster hundred, and the centre in Deerhurst hundred. It is known that Rye and Ellings in *DB* came to be represented later by Apperley's Court and from the 16th century by Tirley Court: both can be located in the eastern part of Tirley which was later within Westminster hundred,⁴⁴ but though the later centre was at Tirley Court, the original settlement from which the *DB* manor of Ellings derived its name lay further to the north-east, on the bank of the Severn, as the name Ellings itself implies. The Ordnance Survey map still marks this riverine area as 'liable to floods', and this no doubt explains why, when Ellings was amalgamated with Rye manor, it was Rye that became the centre of the combined estate, though the hidage figures of 1086 suggest that Ellings (2 hides) was then considerably larger than Rye (2½ virgates).

Yellings in Chaceley can be precisely located on the Chaceley Tithe Map and Award of 1840 as field nos. 428–40, 468–71, called 'Yellings Meadow' and 'The Yellings', an area of 71¾ acres immediately north of the Chaceley-Tirley parish boundary on the west bank of the Severn. The northern boundary of Yellings is the Newhall Brook which further west still formed the boundary between Chaceley and Tirley in 1840, when the largest freehold proprietor in Yellings was the dean and chapter of Westminster as successors to the medieval abbey. In addition, a late 10th century charter relating to Chaceley and an 11th-century perambulation of Tirley both prove that at the time of *DB* the Chaceley-Tirley boundary followed the Newhall Brook (then called the 'An Bourn', a name preserved in Tirley in the field-names 'Ham Bourns' south of this stream) right down to its junction with the Severn, thus including the Yellings area in Tirley at that time.⁴⁵ The exact location of what in 1631 was 'a common field called Ellings' can be determined from the Tirley Enclosure Award and Map of 1797, which names allotment nos. 140, 155, 158, 189, 220, 222–4, 230, 235, 239, 245, 248, 250 and 275 as together comprising 'the meadow called Tirley Elands', an area of 90¾ acres stretching along the Severn from Haw Green

to the modern Chaceley boundary. A further point to emerge from the Tirley Enclosure Award is that allotment no. 98, immediately north of no. 259, is described as 'adjoining Old Court', the old enclosure containing $12\frac{3}{4}$ acres immediately south of 'The Yellings' in Chaceley (Tithe Award field no. 470); since 'court' is normally applied in Gloucestershire to the site of a manor-house, this was almost certainly the original centre of Ellings in 1086, at SO 847294.⁴⁶ Nellyns in Deerhurst is not, as Smith stated, a lost name only recorded in 1718: it appears also in deeds of 1749 and 1786 and in the Deerhurst Enclosure Award and Map of 1798 as a series of allotments called 'Nellings' (nos. 422–5, 428–31) totalling $21\frac{3}{4}$ acres on the east bank of the Severn opposite Haw Green, to which probably should be added the adjoining intermixed allotments called 'Oakdale', 'Wall Meadow', 'Haw Meadow' and 'Leazenham' (nos. 290–304, 418–35), totalling $191\frac{3}{4}$ acres.⁴⁷ Ellings in 1086 thus comprised an area of about 389 acres in Chaceley, Deerhurst and Tirley, on both sides of the Severn, centred on the 'Old Court' and 'The Yellings'. Since the $90\frac{3}{4}$ acres forming 'the meadow of Tirley Elands' in 1797 seems a rather small area for the 'common field called Ellings' of 1631, the original manor may well also have comprised other lands further west of 'Tirley Elands' in and before 1631, but the later amalgamation of Ellings with Rye has successfully obliterated any place-name evidence that may once have existed to prove this point.⁴⁸

Uletone

Uletone (fol. 167c, 36, 1) has so far escaped identification, though Taylor tentatively suggested Wotton. Since there is no known place – or field-name – such as 'Owlton' or 'Woolton' which could be directly derived from *Uletone*,⁴⁹ the *DB* form must be corrupt, and since the place was in Dudstone Hundred, the only possible locations with whose early forms it might be confused are Upton St Leonards,⁵⁰ Whaddon,⁵¹ or Wotton.⁵² Of these, Whaddon can probably be eliminated as the least likely on paleographical grounds, whereas *Uletone* could quite easily result from the mistranscription of either of two readings in the 'original returns' from which *DB* was compiled: *Up(e)tone* for Upton or *W(e)(o)tone* for Wotton.⁵³ Of these alternatives, Wotton is much more probable: an inspection of the facsimile edition of *DB* shows that the 'p' of *DB* is unlikely to be confused with 'l(e)' of *DB*, since the downstroke of the 'p' always extends well below the line, whereas the 'Wo' of *DB* could easily be misread as 'Ule' by a tired or careless scribe overlooking the second diagonal downstroke in the 'W' and treating 'o' as a badly written 'e'. If therefore *Uletone* is presumed to be a misrendering of an original *Wotone*, its identification as *Wotton* becomes very possible. But is it historically likely?

The hidages recorded in *DB* for Upton (fol. 162d, 1, 2: 1 hide), Whaddon (fol. 168d, 53, 6: 5 hides) and Wotton (fol. 170a, 70, 1: 1 hide) give us no help apart from confirming that Whaddon, a complete 5 hide vill, is the least likely candidate for identification with *Uletone*. Similarly, the Godric who held *Uletone* before 1066 does not appear in any of these entries unless he is one of the unnamed 'five brothers' who held Whaddon, whilst the location of Godric's other estates is also unhelpful: he was one of King Edward's thegns and a substantial landholder in pre-Conquest Gloucestershire, holding, besides *Uletone*, lands at Ampney, *Dene*, Ellings, Haresfield, Leonard Stanley, Littleton, Norcott, Pinchpool, Postlip, Siddington and Wapley.⁵⁴ The later tenorial history is also unhelpful: unfortunately, William Froisselew, the holder of *Uletone* in 1086, did not found a successful dynasty – apart from *DB*, he himself appears only in the Winchcombe Survey of 1097–1101 as holding one burgess there, and in a grant to Abingdon Abbey in 1107–8;⁵⁵ by the early 13th century his descendant, William Frusselu, held only *Luctone* (Littleton in Dumbleton) of the honour of Richard's Castle and a meadow in Dumbleton which he gave to St Peter's, Gloucester.⁵⁶ Whaddon descended from Durand of Gloucester to the earls

of Hereford, who still held it in the 14th century, Aymer de Valence being recorded as lord of the vill in 1316; the only other important landholder in Whaddon was St Peter's, Gloucester, who had been given 112 acres by Roger Parvus, a known subtenant of the Earl of Hereford, between 1148 and 1158.⁵⁷ The Abbot of St Peter's also appears as the lord of Upton St Leonards in 1316 as the result of gifts by William de Upton, Robert de Kimsbury, Henry Hereford and John le Hunt in the 12th and 13th centuries, though there was also one carucate held in serjeantry in 1212, which was soon after divided into three smaller holdings totalling 3½ virgates, the residue also being given to St Peter's.⁵⁹ Since we know that Humphrey's hide in Upton was part of the royal manor of King's Barton in 1086 (fol. 162d, 1, 2), this can probably be identified with the carucate held in serjeantry by Osbert de Grave in 1212, and hence later named Grove court, the later donors to St Peter's (apart from Henry Hereford, whose land derived from Osbert's daughter Sybil) probably being free tenants of King's Barton manor holding that part of Upton not included in Humphrey's hide. Wotton, however, is divided in 1316 between two lords, the Abbot of St Peter's and the Prior of St Oswald's: St Peter's holding undoubtedly derived from its *DB* holding of Abbot's Barton (fol. 165c, 10, 1), together with Ford mill, land at Paygrove in Wotton and tithes given to the abbey in 1126 by Richard Fitz Nigel and his wife Emma; in 1291 the abbey's holdings comprised 2 carucates of demesne land, a mill and tenants' rents and services at Tuffley, and 6 carucates of land, 5 mills and tenants' rents and services in the main manor of Wotton.⁶⁰ In the absence of a cartulary and the paucity of other records for St Oswald's priory, the origin of its holding in Wotton remains obscure: in 1291 it is represented by 1½ carucates of demesne land at 'Colewelle', called, correctly, Tulwell in 1535.⁶¹

Given the obscure origins of St Oswald's holding in Wotton and the absence of later information on either Humphrey of Maidenhill who held Wotton or William Froisselew who held *Uleton* it is impossible to state with confidence which of these two holdings were later held by St Peter's and St Oswald's respectively. But since Hide in Wotton is known to have been owned by St Oswald's priory in 1310, when 'la Hydedych' formed the boundary of the prior's property in Wotton, it is extremely probable that Humphrey of Maidenhill's hide in 1086 became the nucleus of the later priory manor of Tulwell, which in 1545 was granted to the Dean and Chapter of Gloucester Cathedral. Its centre was the manor-house of Tulwell Court near the modern Dean's Walk north of the City Wall: Hide lay to the east of Tulwell in Windmill Field, names still preserved in Hyde Lane and Windmill Parade in Wotton, and was still associated with Tulwell manor in 17th and 18th century leases. William Breakwolf's 2 hides can also probably be identified as Ford mill, the land of Paygrove and tithes in Wotton given to St Peter's abbey in 1126 and subsequently merged in the abbey's manor of Barton since William's land was the only substantial property in the area not already held by St Peter's abbey: apart from Paygrove Wood, given by Henry I in 1109, and King's Barton manor which came into its hands in 1357, Richard Fitz Nigel's gift of Paygrove in 1128 was the only major local addition to the abbey's holdings after 1086.⁶²

The Westbury-on-Severn entry

It is probably safe to say that no one entry in the Gloucestershire section of *DB* has caused as much spilt ink as that relating to the lands abstracted from the royal manor of Westbury-on-Severn, and that none of those who have considered it previously, except A.S. Ellis and L.J.U. Way, has emerged with credit. The relevant section of this entry (fol. 163a, 1, 11) is as follows:

'Later on [after 1066] 6 hides were taken from this manor in *Chire* and in *Cliftone* 10 hides; in *Noent* and *Chingestune* 8 hides; in *Ladeuent* 1 hide. Now the Abbot of Cormeilles, Osbern and William, sons of Richard, hold these lands.'

Noent is generally agreed to be Newent, which appears, again as *Noent*, on fol. 166a, 16, 1, as 6 hides held by the abbot of Cormeilles; but Smith, Elrington and Darby all regard the remaining places as unidentified.⁶³ Clearly none of these commentators had conducted the necessary bibliographical research into this matter, since, had they done so, they would have found that previous writers had satisfactorily identified all these places, though not all the details of the entry had been adequately elucidated. As we shall see, one detail still remains unsolved and probably insoluble, but other lapses could and should have been avoided: Canon Taylor can be convicted of hypocrisy and massive plagiarism, whilst even J.H. Round corrupted the text of *DB* to suit his argument. In 1889 Taylor had professed himself unable to identify these places:

‘unless the separated lands lay in Newent to the west of the Severn and in Shirehampton and Clifton to the east, I do not know where they are to be sought; Ladeuent cannot now be identified.’

Elsewhere he identified *Chire* as Shirehampton, *Cliftone* as Clifton near Bristol, and *Chingestune* as Kingsweston in Henbury.⁶⁴ This is of course rubbish: as he himself remarked in 1913, it involves unwarrantably

‘the supposition that records which should really have been placed under Westbury-on-Trym have been misplaced under Westbury-on-Severn.’⁶⁵

It also involves, in the case of *Chire*, the elementary linguistic howler of pronouncing the Anglo-Norman *Cb-* as ‘Sh-’ when every competent scholar knows (and knew) that *DB*’s *Cb-* should be pronounced as ‘K-’, and in the case of *Chingestune* the historical howler of identifying it with Kingsweston before that name came into existence in the 13th century to distinguish it from Lawrence Weston: Kingsweston in *DB* is plain, unadorned *Westone* (fol. 163a, 1, 15); also, if one is looking for a king’s *tun* in south Gloucestershire, the obvious candidate is Thornbury, where two of its tithings are still called Kington and Kineton.⁶⁶ Having disingenuously concealed his own confusion of 1889, Taylor then hypocritically went on to blame A.S. Ellis, writing in 1878, for errors which he himself fully shared:

‘The first person who seems to have had an inkling of the true state of the case was Mr. A.S. Ellis who . . . referred to the identification of the Cliftune and Chire of the Westbury entry with Clifton by Bristol and Shirehampton, remarking that in his opinion these two places should rather be identified with Clifton-on-Teme in Worcestershire and Kyre. . . If Mr. Ellis had gone on to refer to the Domesday entries regarding these two places he would no doubt have put the matter right thirty-five years ago.’⁶⁷

Quite why A.S. Ellis, writing on ‘The Manorial History of Clifton’ (near Bristol) should need to deal *in extenso* with the history of Clifton-on-Teme is not clear; it is even less clear why what Ellis failed, according to Taylor, to do in 1878 could not equally well have been done by Taylor himself in 1889. The real reason is of course that Taylor had not thought of doing so himself in 1889 and had only realized ‘the true state of the case’ on a belated (and utterly unacknowledged) reading of J.H. Round’s introduction to the Herefordshire Domesday published in 1908. It was Round who identified *Chire* as Kyre and *Chingestune* as Kingstone in Weston-under-Penyard;⁶⁸ Taylor was responsible only for identifying *Ladeuent* as Edvin Loach in Worcestershire. However, even Round erred in the details of his identification, because he only considered the two consecutive entries for the 3 hides of Clifton-on-Teme and the 3 hides in Kyre Wyard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 3, 4), overlooked two other Kyre entries, and in order to get his *DB* arithmetic to agree, corrupted the Gloucestershire text to read ‘6 hides. . . in *Chire* and in *Cliftone*’,⁶⁹ an

astoundingly unscholarly procedure for one never backward in coming forward to criticise other historians for precisely that sort of error. The true route to the final solution of the *DB* arithmetic should be credited to L.J.U. Way, who pointed out that the entries for Ham Castle, Shelsley Walsh and Lower Sapey, all of which were later chapelries of Clifton-on-Teme, also had to be taken into account, though even he could not adduce more than 21 out of the 25 hides severed from Westbury-on-Severn.⁷⁰

The correct solution to this puzzle can now be revealed:

'6 hides in *Chire* = 2 hides in KYRE PARVA (*Cuer*) held by the Bishop of Hereford (fol. 174b, Worcs, 3, 2); + 3 hides in KYRE WYARD (*Chure*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 4); + 1 hide in KYRE PARVA (*Cuer*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 7); total 6 hides.

'in *Cliftone* 10 hides' = 3 hides in CLIFTON-ON-TEME (*Clistune*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 3); + 1½ hides in LITTLE STANFORD (*Stanford*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 5); + 1 hide in SHELSLEY WALSH (*Caldeslei*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 6); + 1 hide in HAM CASTLE (*Hamme*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 8); + 3 hides in LOWER SAPEY (*Sapie*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 9); + ½ hide in TENBURY (*Tametdeberie*) held by the Abbey of Cormeilles (fol. 174b, Worcs, 6, 1); total 10 hides.

'in *Noent* and *Chingestune* 8 hides' = 6 hides in NEWENT (*Noent*) held by the Abbey of Cormeilles (fol. 166a, 16, 1); + 2 hides in KINGSTONE in WESTON-UNDER-PENYARD (*Chingestune*) held by the Abbey of Cormeilles (fol. 182d, Herefs, 3, 1); total 8 hides.

'in *Ladeuent* 1 hide' = 1 hide in EDVIN LOACH (*Edevent*) held by Osbern son of Richard (fol. 176d, Worcs, 19, 11).

Though the arithmetic of *DB* is now satisfied, it remains necessary to document some of the above entries, and to outline the remaining, unsolved problems. The inclusion of Little Stanford, later Noverton, is justified by the fact, unnoticed by L.J.U. Way's Worcestershire informants, that this too was a chapelry of Clifton-on-Teme,⁷¹ as indeed Edvin Loach had once been.⁷² The inclusion of the Abbey of Cormeilles' half-hide in Tenbury may be unnecessary if we care to rely instead on what one eminent historian has termed 'that contempt for small fractions which is written large all over Domesday',⁷³ but it could well be the area later known as Kyre Wood in Tenbury, adjoining Kyre Wyard on the south, from which it is separated only by Kyre Brook.⁷⁴ A more serious problem is that whilst William son of Richard, *alias* William Goizenboded (fol. 167b, 34, 8), is not involved as a holder of any of the 25 hides in question – indeed he held no land in Herefordshire and only 1 hide at Chauson in Salwarpe in Worcestershire (fol. 177c, Worcs, 25, 1) which cannot be linked to the Westbury entry at all – 2 hides at Kyre Parva are held in 1086 by the Bishop of Hereford, who is not mentioned in the Westbury entry. There is also no evidence that the bishops of Hereford later held land in Kyre Parva,⁷⁵ but since the western section of Kyre Parva adjoins Bockleton on the north and is immediately preceded by the bishop's manor of Bockleton in *DB* (fol. 174b, Worcs, 3, 1) it could easily have been absorbed in Bockleton after 1086. Most probably and most simply the compilers of the Westbury entry, whether the local reeve or the hundredal jurors is immaterial, erred in associating William with his brother Osbern and in omitting Bishop Robert from the holders of Kyre: it would hardly be surprising if men of Gloucestershire were not *au fait* with tenurial conditions in the north-west of

Worcestershire 40 miles from Westbury-on-Severn. It is also easy to see why, in this context, the name of William Goizenboded would spring to their minds naturally enough in association with his brother Osbern, since certainly in Gloucestershire he did hold land which had been part of Westbury before 1066 (fol. 167b, 34, 12).

The Herefordshire entries

The second group of entries that can conveniently be considered together are the seven places in the Forest of Dean area entered in the Herefordshire section of *DB*; the eighth Gloucestershire place entered under Herefordshire in *DB* is clearly Forthampton.⁷⁶ These are recorded in the following terms:

- EH 2 'In *Niware* 2½ hides which used to come and do service, but Roger de Pistres in the time of Earl William made them part of Gloucestershire.' (fol. 181b, Herefs, 1, 73).
- EH 3 'In *Brocode* 2½ hides. Aelfric, Alfward and Brietsi held them as two manors. They were waste and up to now are in the King's wood.' (fol. 181b, Herefs. 1, 74).
- EH 4 'There also Brictric held one manor as 1 hide, and Earl Godwin held *Stantun*, one manor, as 1 hide. They were waste and up to now are in the King's wood.' (fol. 181b, Herefs, 1, 75).
- EH 5 'Earl Harold held this manor [Eaton Bishop] and Earl William gave it to Bishop Walter of Hereford for land which is now the market of Hereford and for 3 hides of *Lidenegie*.' (fol. 181c, Herefs, 2, 6).
- EH 6 'In *Wiboldingtune* 3 hides which rightly belong to the bishopric. They are waste and were waste. A fishery there.' (fol. 182a, Herefs, 2, 20).
- EH 7 'The same William son of Baderon holds *Rwirdin* and Solomon from him. Hadwig held it. 4 hides which pay tax. On the lordship there could be 3 ploughs. 1 smallholder, 2 villagers and 1 Welshman, with 3 ploughs. The value is and was 30s.' (fol. 185c, Herefs, 15, 2).
- EH 8 'Thurstan son of Rolf holds *Alwintune*. Brictric held it before 1066. 6 hides. In lordship 2 ploughs. 12 villagers with 9 ploughs. They render 20 blooms of iron and 8 sesters of honey. 5 slaves. A mill at 40d. The value was 20s; now £4. (fol. 185d, Herefs, 17, 1).

The last three entries can be disposed of quite quickly: *Rwirdin* is clearly Ruardean,⁷⁷ though Taylor wrongly identified it with *Ruardene* which is in fact Rowden in Edvin Ralph.⁷⁸ *Alwintune* is also certainly Alvington in Gloucestershire: the *DB* form is compatible with the early 13th century forms for Alvington, though it is also equally compatible with the early medieval forms for Elton in Westbury, and J.H. Round tentatively identified it as Alton Court in Ross.⁷⁹ Further investigation into philology and tenorial history is therefore necessary in order to discard two out of these three possibilities. In fact Elton can be swiftly eliminated: it was always part of Rodley manor which was itself in 1086 still part of Westbury-on-Severn, whilst Alton in Ross can also be eliminated, since the only medieval form cited by Bannister in support of Round's identification refers to Aylton, not to Alton, which really derives from a medieval form *Alleton*.⁸⁰ Fortunately we can establish the identification of *Alwintune* positively as well as negatively: the updated version of the Herefordshire Domesday, Balliol MS 350, establishes the contemporary owners of *Alwintune* as the 'Canons of Llanthony', to whom Alvington was given c. 1141–1155. This, together with the later references, decisively identifies *Alwintune* as Alvington.⁸¹ *Lidenegie* is clearly Lydney, and the three entries relating to Lydney will be considered together later, in Section II.

We are left with three consecutive entries for *Niware*, *Brocote* and *Stantun*, and a further entry for *Wiboldingtune*. *Stantun* is obviously Staunton near Coleford in the extreme north-west of the Forest of Dean:⁸² it cannot be Staunton-in-Corse which, together with Redmarley D'Abitot, was in Worcestershire until 1931 and is undoubtedly referred to in the Worcestershire section of *DB* as that part of Westminster Abbey's manor of Longdon held by Roger of Lacy in 1086,⁸³ hence Smith erroneously included the *DB* form in his entry for Staunton-in-Corse, following Taylor, who considered Staunton near Coleford to be an area of post-Domesday clearance and settlement. Smith's error here is quite inexplicable, since the *DB* form was correctly excluded from the entries relating to Staunton-in-Corse in the Worcestershire place-names survey.⁸⁴ The reference to the 'King's wood' in the *DB* entry for Staunton further confirms the identification with Staunton near Coleford, which gave its name to one of the 'baileys' or 'bailiwicks' of the Forest of Dean, covering most of the post-Domesday parishes of Newland and West Dean, though, mysteriously, there is no mention of Staunton bailey in *PNGl*, vol. 3.⁸⁵

Niware was identified by Round as New Weir near Huntsham in Herefordshire, but this, like New Weir in St Briavels, though topographically attractive, is philologically improbable: the OE *wer*, 'weir', normally evolves into *-were* in Middle English and *-wear* or *-weir* in Modern English.⁸⁶ On philological grounds *Niware* has been derived from OE *niwe-aern*, 'the new house', and identified as Newerne in Lydney, but equally possible on the same grounds are either of the two lost places called 'Newarne' in East Dean and Newland.⁸⁷ Both Newerne in Lydney and 'Newarne' in East Dean were mentioned as boundary-points in medieval documents relating to the Forest of Dean, and though 'Newarne' in Newland is not recorded before 1637 its medieval origin is clear, so further investigation is required to eliminate two out of these three possibilities. Unfortunately, the reference in the *Niware* entry to Roger de Pistres, the 'Sheriff Roger' of Gloucestershire *DB* (fol. 169a, 56, 2), is unhelpful: the latter concerns South Cerney in the east of the county, and his son Walter was recorded only as holding Colesborne (fol. 164d, 3, 2), Great Barrington and South Cerney (fol. 169a, 56, 1, 2) in 1086; the reference in the *Niware* entry clearly relates only to Roger in his administrative capacity.

More precise elucidation of the various medieval records which mention the two names is therefore called for, and it becomes clear that though Newerne is now applied to part of Lydney village, in the 13th century it was the local name of the Lyd river according to the perambulations of both Staunton bailey in 1282 and the Forest of Dean itself in 1300.⁸⁸ 'Newarne' in East Dean occurs several times as a boundary point in the detailed perambulations of the Forest bailiwicks of Abenhall, Mitcheldean and Staunton in 1282, and clearly refers to the section of the River Lyd known as the Cannop Brook near Speech House: its importance in the past is revealed by the fact that it was the meeting place of three of the Forest bailiwicks, and that later it became the site of the verderers' court for the whole Forest.⁸⁹ Indeed, this known later judicial and administrative importance of the site of 'Newarne' in East Dean leads to the further suggestion that *Niware*, rated in *DB* at 2½ hides, should be identified with *Dene* (fol. 167c, 37, 3), rated at 2 hides and 2½ virgates and stated to have been 'assigned . . . for protecting the Forest' before 1066. Certainly such an equivalence is at least as likely as earlier identifications of *Dene* as Abenhall, Little Dean and Mitcheldean (Taylor and Hart), Little Dean alone (Smith), or Mitcheldean alone (Darby): this equivalence is strongly supported by the most natural interpretation of the place-name *Dene*, which is clearly identical with the earliest forms of the name of the Forest of Dean and derived from the valley (*denu*) of the Cannop Brook.⁹⁰ If therefore *Niware* is identified with 'Newarne' in East Dean, it can be at least approximately located near Speech House on the Cannop Brook from the topographical indications given in the 1282 perambulations of the Forest bailiwicks as on a stream near Coleford, near Meerbrook in East Dean and White Lea Green in West Dean, at SO 610116.

In locating *Brocote*, little help is available apart from the etymology and topographical probability: the pre-Conquest holders of the main manor of *Brocote*, Ælfric, Alfward and Brietsi, were mainly Cotswold landholders, whilst the holder of the smaller manor of *Brocote*, Brietric, was a major pre-Conquest landholder in Gloucestershire, whether he is King Edward's thegn of that name or Brietric son of Algar. Fairly clearly *Brocote*, 'the cottage by the stream', was situated near Staunton, which is combined with the lesser manor of *Brocote* in the same *DB* entry, and since the only possible *broc* compounds in Newland and Staunton are Brook Farm in Newland, not recorded before 1840, and Redbrook on the Newland-Staunton boundary, first mentioned in 1216, this would suggest that the two manors of *Brocote* are to be identified with the later Upper and Lower Redbrook Farms. Upper Redbrook, as the nearer of the two sites to Staunton, is probably to be identified with Brietric's hide which was amalgamated with Staunton held by Earl Godwin, whilst Lower Redbrook represents the larger manor held by Ælfric, Alfward and Brietsi before 1066. These identifications are strengthened by a comparison of the relative areas recorded in the Tithe Awards and Maps for Newland and Staunton. Upper Redbrook Farm, owned in the 1840s by George Bengough and farmed by John Worgan, consisted of 253½ acres in Newland (Tithe Award field nos. 945–53, 1108–24, 1293–1316) and 141¼ acres in Staunton (Tithe Award field nos. 160–81), besides two smallholdings totalling 10½ acres in Staunton (field nos. 154–8), in all an area of 405½ acres at SO 537105. Lower Redbrook basically comprised the estate in Newland owned in 1840 by John Burton Phillips, extending to 1071 acres (field nos. 1337–42, 1347, 1361–2, 1364–6, 1375–8, 1380, 1418–43, 1445, 1447–40, 1452–89, 1492–1594), together with a smallholding of 29½ acres (field nos. 1383–1417), in all just over 1100 acres at SO 539097. To what extent assarting later in the medieval period would have increased the respective 11th-century areas is of course a topic requiring detailed research beyond the scope of this article, but it is likely that Lower Redbrook formed the nucleus of the later royal manor of Newland, first recorded in 1221, whereas Upper Redbrook was hemmed in by the royal woodland in Staunton to the north and Lower Redbrook to the south. Allowing for the possibility of later assarting, the ratio of 1 : 2.7 between the Tithe Award areas of Upper and Lower Redbrook fits well with the respective geld liabilities of 1 hide and 2½ hides recorded in *DB*.⁹¹ To sum up, the most probable identifications for *Brocote*, *Niware* and *Stantun* are Upper and Lower Redbrook, Newarne in East Dean and Staunton.

Additional support for this pattern of settlements on the north-west margin of the Forest of Dean is provided by the last entry to be discussed, that for *Wiboldingtune*. Round, followed by Bannister, identified this as Whittington near Ganarew in Herefordshire, which Darby transmuted into a non-existent Whittington in Staunton.⁹² But it is impossible to produce a sound etymological link between Whittington and *Wiboldingtune*, which is definitely derived from the OE personal name of Wigbald and can be traced as attached from 1292 onwards, as *Wybaltunesbroke*, to the stream forming the parish boundary between Staunton and English Bicknor, now the Whippington Brook. Whippington as a place-name in its own right does not recur after 1086 precisely because it was 'waste', though the fishery and the former episcopal ownership were perpetuated in *Bissopeswere*, at the junction of the stream with the Severn, as late as 1282; it can nevertheless be identified with some probability as centred on Braceland in English Bicknor, at SO 558135, since this is the only site on either side of the Whippington Brook where there is evidence of settlement before the 19th century, Braceland being mentioned in 1626.⁹³

It may incidentally be asked why so many Gloucestershire places are recorded in the Herefordshire section of *DB* and why some Herefordshire places are recorded in the Gloucestershire section. The first reason is that the area west of the Leadon and Severn rivers had been part of Herefordshire down to c. 1020 and continued to comprise the Forest Deanery of Hereford

Diocese down to 1542.⁹⁴ Secondly, most if not all the Herefordshire holdings attached before 1066 to Westbury-on-Severn had once been part of the estates of Worcester Priory, from whom they had been taken by Earl Hakon,⁹⁵ and when recovered were kept in royal hands or possibly those of the house of Godwin – the Herefordshire and Worcestershire sections of *DB* record that several similar estates ‘wrongfully held’ by Earl Harold were restored to Hereford Cathedral by William the Conqueror.⁹⁶

SECTION II: PLACES WRONGLY IDENTIFIED

The number of previous identifications which need correction or added documentation is not large, since in a very high percentage of the total number of entries the identifications were obvious and were only confirmed in detail by *PNGl*. The names that do need discussion on this score are as follows: *Aluredstone*, *Grenhampstede*, *Lechetone*, *Lite(n)tune*, *Merewent* and *Merwen*, and *Rodele*. *Lechetone* will be considered last, on account of its greater complexity.

Alverston, the *Aluredstone* of *DB* (fol. 166d, 31, 2) has been generally identified as Allaston in Lydney,⁹⁷ but is in fact a site in the eastern part of Woolaston, centred on Brookend and Plusterwine, at ST 595994.⁹⁸

Grenhampstede (fol. 169c, 66, 6), held by Hascoit Musard in 1086, can be definitely identified as Miserden from a deed of 1301 which equates the two names, the latter being derived from the Musard family who held it until the 14th century.⁹⁹

Taylor, uncritically followed by Smith and Darby, identified William Breakwolf’s hide in *Litetune* (fol. 167c, 36, 3) and the half-hide held by Ralph from Durand of Gloucester in *Litetune* (fol. 168d, 53, 12), both in Greston hundred, as Littleworth in Winchcombe, further complicating the issue by locating the former as Greet and the latter as Cockbury in Southam, apparently because Greet had a mill conveniently near Littleworth whilst Cockbury was held from the earls of Hereford in 1246. Since Southam was in Tibblestone hundred and held by Durand of Gloucester from the Bishop of Worcester (fol. 165a, 3, 7), the latter identification is both unnecessary and impossible, whilst Greet was part of ‘the fee of Sudeley’ represented in 1086 by the manors of Sudeley and Toddington (fol. 169b, 61, 1–2): in any case, Littleworth as a name first appears in 1830.¹⁰⁰ There is in fact no historical or etymological warrant for identifying *Lite(n)tune* as Littleworth, and most of the references cited by Smith refer to Littleton as held by Abingdon Abbey and therefore must relate to Littleton in Dumbleton, since Dumbleton was the only Gloucestershire property of the abbey.¹⁰¹ Ralph’s half-hide can certainly be identified as the half-hide in Dumbleton given to Abingdon by his father Walter the Ditcher, six years after the gift of William Goizenboded’s hide in Dumbleton (fol. 167b, 34, 13) which also can definitely be located in Littleton.¹⁰² The relocation of William Breakwolf’s hide in Dumbleton also explains how he (or a descendant of the same name) was able to give a meadow there to St. Peter’s, Gloucester, which is later named Dockham when it was sold by the Crown soon after the Dissolution.¹⁰³ It should also be noted that this new identification brings the total number of hides in Dumbleton up to the original total of ten hides:¹⁰⁴

fol. 166a, 13, 1: 7½ hides (Abingdon Abbey);

fol. 167b, 34, 13: 1 hide (William Goizenboded);

fol. 167c, 36, 3: 1 hide (William Breakwolf);

fol. 168d, 53, 12: ½ hide (Ralph from Durand).

Finally, it should be noted that the site of Littleton in Dumbleton is not lost, as Smith stated: a map of the Dumbleton Hall estate in 1875 locates three fields called ‘Near Littleton’, ‘Far Littleton’ and ‘Littleton Green’ north-east of Dumbleton village, where Lane Farm and the small group of cottages to the north, at SP 028367, may well represent the original site of the *DB*

settlement.¹⁰⁵ These three fields totalled 164½ acres and can be identified with the capital messuage, cottages, 160 acres of land, 3 acres of meadow and 3 acres of pasture held by Richard Daston in 1627 and his son Anthony in 1641: this area, together with the 10 acres of meadow and pasture 'lately enclosed from out of the common fields of Dumbleton called the Newe close', 6 acres of pasture called 'Neate Meadow' (Nut Meadow in the 1875 map) and 16 acres of meadow in the common fields, also held by the Dastons in the 17th century and part of the tithe-free Dumbleton Hall estate in the 19th century, probably constituted the 1½ hides of William Goizenboded and Ralph in 1086. The Dastons had held this property since the mid-15th century, when it was described as 'six messuages and 200 acres of pasture called *Littilton* in the parish of Dumbleton.'¹⁰⁶ The later history of William Breakwolf's hide show that it too had come into Abingdon's possession during the 13th century: in 1212 it is recorded as half a knight's fee in *Luctone* held by William Frusselu of the honour of Richard's Castle, and in 1287 as the hamlet of *Luckinton* held by 'the heirs of Frusisselou' as half a knight's fee of Robert de Mortimer. As with many returns of knights' fees, the information in the latter case was obsolete, since by 1284 the abbey already held *Luchinton* from Robert de Mortimer of Richard's Castle as half a knight's fee.¹⁰⁷ This holding can be identified as the 143 acres of College Farm immediately east of Near and Far Littleton; in 1844 this area was distinguished from the rest of Dumbleton as the one area still liable to pay tithes, precisely because the abbey had acquired it long after it obtained the tithes from the rest of Dumbleton.¹⁰⁸ In the 17th century, this farm was also held by the Dastons and was described as 'certain other closes containing 20 acres of meadow and 100 acres of pasture called Littletons *alias* Littleton fields'. The discrepancy between the 17th and 19th century areas can be attributed to the inclusion within College Farm by the latter date of Dockham meadow given by William Frusselu to St Peter's, Gloucester.¹⁰⁹

In the case of Morwent in Hartpury, *DG* distinguishes two *DB* entries, referring one to Maisemore, a matter which requires further elucidation. Both the *DB* forms *Merwen* (fol. 162d, 1, 2: 3 virgates held by Nigel the Doctor) and *Merewent* (fol. 165c, 10, 1: held by St Peter's, Gloucester) represent Morwent in Hartpury parish but need to be defined more precisely. Taylor's identification of *Merewent* as the later manor of Hartpury seems very probable, given that Hartpury had been given to St Peter's by Offa of Mercia in the 8th century and reappears in the 12th century as a major abbey estate as a result of assarting authorized by Henry I and Henry II.¹¹⁰ It is however impossible to accept either Taylor's identification of Nigel the Doctor's holding as the Paygrove given by Richard Fitz Nigel and his wife Emma to St Peter's in 1126, or his location of Paygrove in Maisemore, since Paygrove is known to have been in Wotton and their gift included Ford Mill in Wotton and the tithes of Wotton.¹¹¹ Darby's identification of *Merwen* as Maisemore, in so far as it is based on Taylor, is therefore unsupported: Maisemore was certainly given to St Peter's by Henry I in 1101, and Hartpury and Maisemore are associated in certain Abbey documents, but as they were adjacent Abbey manors this is hardly surprising.¹¹² Since Maisemore was presumably part of King's Barton manor in 1086, it is quite possible that Nigel's holding of *Merwen*, a member of that manor in 1086, could have reverted to royal hands by 1101 and was then granted to St Peter's under the name of Maisemore, but unless the site of Morwent can be more exactly located on or near the Hartpury-Maisemore boundary this must remain an unproven hypothesis. It is fair to add that the development of *Merwen* into Maisemore would be paralleled by the similar and contemporary supersession of *Merewent* by the revived use of Hartpury, and that Rudder's use of 'Morewent-end' does suggest a site away from the centre of Hartpury itself.¹¹³ Detailed study of 18th century records relating to the Compton estate at Hartpury does in fact show that Morwent can be located near the Hartpury-Maisemore boundary and that two separate areas still survived down to the 1780s: 'Morwent's Place' was a freehold of about 220 acres which can be identified with the modern Murrells End Farm in the

south-east corner of Hartpury at SO 789222;¹¹⁴ to the west and north of this there were at least 5 yardlands of copyhold land stated in 1700 to lie 'in Morwent's End', which, after enclosure by agreement and consolidation before 1731, were represented in the main by the modern Coopey's and Drew's Farms stretching as far west as Rudford Bridge and as far north as Hartpury Vicarage, a total area of at least 280 acres and if Holder's Farm (now Laughton's Farm) is added very nearly 500 acres.¹¹⁵ The comparative areas rather suggest that 'Morwent's Place' is to be identified with Nigel the Doctor's 3 virgates at *Merwen* and that St Peter's holding at *Merewent* represents the later 5 yardlands at 'Morwent's End' which formed the nucleus of the later Abbey manor of Hartpury. Whether or not Henry I's grant of Maisemore to St Peter's in 1101 and the subsequent authorization of assarts there by Henry I and Henry II are linked with either *Merwen* or *Merewent* must for the present remain an open question: certainly, however, both were centred in the south-east of Hartpury.

Rodele (fol. 160a, 58, 2) has generally been identified as Rodley in Westbury-on-Severn,¹¹⁶ but this name is equally compatible with the early forms for Ruddle in Newnham, and since Rodley was always a tithing of Westbury-on-Severn manor, *Rodele* must therefore be firmly identified as Ruddle.¹¹⁷

The 1 hide at *Lechetone* in Salmonsbury hundred held by Humphrey the Cook in 1086 and by Orderic before 1066 (fol. 170a, 71, 1) has not so far been satisfactorily identified. Taylor initially favoured identifying it with Leckhampton in Cheltenham hundred, presumably on the grounds of the similarity between the two names but also, explicitly, because Orderic also appeared as the pre-1066 holder of one of the two entries which definitely related to Leckhampton (fol. 170c, 78, 9: *Lechametone*). In the end he settled for Clapton-on-the-Hill in Salmonsbury hundred, apparently because his now discredited theories of mensuration based on the fiscal hide did not permit the inclusion of Clapton within the entry for its parent manor of Bourton-on-the-Water. In this location, one of his weakest and least argued, he was slavishly followed by Darby, though Smith more wisely regarded *Lechetone* as one of the places 'not identified or located'.¹¹⁸ Later research was able to show that Clapton was throughout the Middle Ages part of Bourton manor, and therefore this identification can be conclusively dismissed on historical grounds: there was in any case not a shred of philological evidence to link *Lechetone* with Clapton-on-the-Hill. Moreover, a perusal of the section of *PNGl* 1 covering the places which were in Salmonsbury hundred in 1086 fails to reveal any place- or field-name which could conceivably be linked with *Lechetone*,¹¹⁹ and unless such a name comes to light subsequently we must conclude either that *Lechetone* was in Salmonsbury hundred but has completely changed its name (in which case it remains unidentified and indeed probably unidentifiable), or that the *DB* rubrication was in error at this point and *Lechetone* was in another hundred.

Effectively the choice seems to lie between Monkleighton near Gloucester, *Lechtun* in Frampton-on-Severn, Leckhampton itself, or a site on the River Leach,¹²⁰ and all these possibilities support the need to alter the hundredal rubric, since none of the first three sites was ever in Salmonsbury hundred,¹²¹ and the Leach itself only flowed through Brightwells Barrow and Bradley hundreds. None of the parishes through which the Leach flows appears to have a place- or field-name which could be derived from *lece-tun*.¹²² Monkleighton in Barton, 'the monks' garden', *ortum monachorum*, was in the possession of St Peter's Abbey down to the Dissolution, except for a part taken by Henry I in 1108–9 for the construction of a tower, and can therefore be eliminated as a possible identification for *Lechetone* held by Humphrey the Cook in 1086.¹²³ *Lechtun* in Frampton-on-Severn can also be eliminated: it was explicitly described as 'a little meadow under the mill of Frampton' in charters of c. 1180 and c. 1195 by which Walter de Clifford and his sons gave it to Godstow Nunnery: Walter de Clifford was a direct descendant of Drogo Fitz Poyntz, the holder of Frampton-on-Severn in 1086.¹²⁴ One red herring raised by Taylor can be eliminated straight away: at one point he suggested the possible identification of

Humphrey the Cook's 1 hide at *Lechetone* with the 1 hide at Ampney Crucis sold by Humphrey the Chamberlain to Tewkesbury Abbey c. 1100–6.¹²⁵ This can be rejected out of hand since *DB*, unlike Taylor, clearly distinguished the two Humphreys (69 and 71).

As we have already noted, Taylor's two arguments for his initial identification for *Lechetone* as Leckhampton were the similarity of the two names and the appearance of Orderic as the pre-conquest holder both of *Lechetone* and of 2 out of the 4 hides held by Brictric in Leckhampton in 1086. Since Orderic held no other land in Gloucestershire before 1066, the latter argument has some force, but the identification of *Lechetone* as Leckhampton would only be acceptable if it could be shown that there were later place-name forms derived from *Lechetone* which can definitely be located in Leckhampton. Smith himself demonstrated that '-hampton . . . often interchanges in later time with -ingtun' in forms for Brickhampton, Brockhampton, Forthampton, Hockington, Rockhampton and Sevenhampton, and that medial -ing- as a suffix of association can disappear completely, be reduced to -in-, or be replaced by medial -e- derived from the OE genitive singular ending in -an.¹²⁶ On general etymological grounds there is thus nothing to preclude an identification of *Lechetone* as an alternative form for Leckhampton, but there is no evidence for the actual occurrence of the reduced form for Leckhampton. Furthermore, though Geoffrey Cook is recorded as a substantial landowner in Leckhampton c. 1163, and though Peter de Kingesham, *alias* Peter de Aula, is recorded in 1212 and 1226 as holding one carucate of land in Leckhampton by serjeantry service in the royal kitchen,¹²⁷ this service need not be linked to Humphrey the Cook's hide in *Lechetone*: it could also derive, like Thurstan Despencer's tenure of 100 shillings' worth of land in Cheltenham by serjeantry as the king's butler,¹²⁸ from the 4 hides in Leckhampton held by the king's thegn Brictric in 1086. Given the lack of firm historical or philological evidence for the equation of *Lechetone* with Leckhampton, a consideration of the geld-assessments in the original parish of Cheltenham may prove decisive in rejecting this equation, since the known holdings total exactly 30 hides:

- fol. 162d, 1, 1: 8½ hides: royal manor of Cheltenham;
1½ hides: Cheltenham church;
- fol. 164c, 2, 5: 3 hides: archepiscopal manor of Swindon;
- fol. 165a, 4, 1: 10 hides: episcopal manor of Prestbury;
- fol. 167c, 38, 1: 3 hides: William Leofric's manor of Leckhampton;
- fol. 170c, 78, 9: 4 hides: Brictric's manor of Leckhampton.

Having discarded all the possible Gloucestershire locations for *Lechetone*, one sole candidate remains, namely Latton in north-west Wiltshire, surrounded on three sides by the Gloucestershire parishes of South Cerney, Driffield and Down Ampney. The name indubitably derives from OE *leac-tun* and could certainly be represented by the *DB* form *Lechetone*,¹²⁹ whilst the county boundaries in this area presented problems in the period in question, Poulton forming a Wiltshire enclave totally surrounded by Garsdon hundred, and Minety being part of Cirencester hundred completely surrounded by Wiltshire. Moreover, the main manor of Latton, assessed at 9 hides (*DB*, Wilts., fol. 68c, 18, 2), was granted to Reinbald the priest in 1067 and regranted after his death by Henry I in 1133 to Cirencester Abbey who retained it until the Dissolution.¹³⁰ The addition of Humphrey the Cook's 1 hide of *Lechetone* would round off the total assessment of the township at 10 hides, and the hide itself can be later traced as the two half-hides in Latton acquired by Cirencester Abbey from Geoffrey de Pulham and John de Upton in 1303 and 1305 respectively.¹³¹ We conclude, therefore, that *Lechetone* should be identified as Latton in Wiltshire, and that the hundredal rubric should be amended from Salmonsbury to Garsdon. Humphrey's hide was Latton Manor in the north of the parish; the main manor was centred on Latton Court south of Latton village.

Acknowledgements

My thanks are due to the staff at the Bristol and Gloucestershire Record Offices and the Bristol University Library for their courtesy and helpfulness; to the owners of documents deposited in the Bristol R.O. and the Glos R.O. for the convenience of historians and to the Earl of Wemyss and March, Lord Neidpath and the President and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, for permission to use their private archives; to Dr Basil Cottle, Reader in Medieval Studies, University of Bristol, for his comments on an early draft of this paper; to the late Dr John Morris, formerly Reader in History, University College, London, who invited me to edit the Gloucestershire section of *DB* and thus provoked the writing of this work and to his literary executor, Professor John McN. Dodgson, Department of English, University College, London, who has seen the Domesday translation series through to completion, greatly to its advantage; to my colleagues and students in the Departments of Economic & Social History and History in the University of Bristol for suffering the recurrent mention of Domesday with altogether exemplary fortitude; finally, and not least, to Mrs L. Evans and Miss Anne Griffiths who coped admirably in producing the final typescript.

Notes

1. A. Farley, *Liber Censualis vocatus Domesday Book* (London 1783).
2. *Domesday Book of England: Photo Zincographs* (London 1861–3, 2 vols); the Gloucestershire facsimile was issued separately in 1862.
3. S. Rudder, *A New History of Gloucestershire* (Cirencester 1779), 66–80 (text); the translation appeared piecemeal under each parish. W. Bawden, *Dom. Boc. A translation of the record called Domesday so far as related to the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, Buckingham, Oxford and Gloucester* (Doncaster 1812).
4. J.S. Moore, 'The Domesday Teamland in Leicestershire', *Eng Hist Rev* 78 (1963), 696–703; J.S. Moore, 'The Domesday Teamland: a reconsideration' *Trans Roy Hist Soc* (5th ser) 14 (1964), 109–30.
5. R.W. Eyton, *A Key to Domesday . . . a Digest and Analysis of the Dorset Survey* (London 1878); J.H. Round, *Feudal England* (London 1895), 45, 63; F.W. Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond* (Cambridge 1897), 446–51.
6. H.M. Cam, 'Early Groups of Hundreds', in *Liberties and Communities in Medieval England* (London 1963), 91–106.
7. C.S. Taylor, *An Analysis of the Domesday Survey of Gloucestershire* (Bristol 1889), 16, 19.
8. This is Vinogradoff's system: other systems used by earlier writers refer to the first two columns of a folio, e.g. 162, variously as 162, 162; 162, 162a; 162, 162.2; 162a1, 162a2; and to the last two columns as 162b, 162b; 162b, 162b2; 162b1, 162b2. *DG* uses the 162, 162, 162b, 162b system.
9. *PNGl* 4, 61, n.2 also considered *Wenitone* and *Wiche* to be 'not identified or located', but elsewhere the former is identified as Ullington and the latter as Painswick (*PNGl* 1, 132, 253); *DG*, 153, 158 agrees, and I see no reason to dissent from these identifications.
10. Detailed checking of parts of *PNGl* has revealed that some confusions exist between Lea in Almondsbury and Lea in the Forest of Dean, and between Staunton-in-Corse and Staunton in the Forest of Dean; more thorough perusal of MS. sources had in some cases brought additional forms to light, e.g. for Oldbury in Elkstone.
11. E.g. *VCH (Worcs)* 1, 303.
12. Round, *op. cit.*, 44–5, 65–9, 91–2, 232–4; Maitland, *op. cit.*, 156–64; J.H. Round in *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 270 and *VCH (Worcs)* 1, 236; E.H. Bates, 'The Five Hide Unit of the Somerset Domesday', *Proc Somerset Archaeol Natur Hist Soc* 45 (1899), 51–107; F.M. Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism* (Oxford 1932), 157–8, 163–8; E. John, *Land Tenure in Early England* (Leicester 1960), 140–61; C.W. Hollister, 'The Five Hide Unit and the Old English Military Obligation', *Speculum* 36 (1961), 61–74; C.W. Hollister, *Anglo Saxon Military Institutions on the Eve of the Norman Conquest* (Oxford 1962), 21–6, 38–58, 76–80, 102–15; M. Powicke, *Military Obligation in Medieval England* (Oxford 1965), 7, 18–9, 25, 31–2, 61–2, 73.
13. H. Hall, *Red Book of the Exchequer* (Rolls Series 99 (1896), parts 1–3), 2, clxi–iv; Hall's view has not, however, been generally accepted by later writers, e.g. Round, *op. cit.* 293–5; M. Powicke, *op. cit.*, 31–2; C.W. Hollister, *The Military Organization of Norman England* (Oxford 1965), 41–71.
14. M. Hollings, 'The Survival of the Five Hide Unit in the West Midlands', *Eng Hist Rev* 63 (1948), 453–87; see also the *carta* of Roger de Berkeley in 1166 (Hall, *Red Book* 1, 292–3).
15. D.C. Douglas & G.W. Greenaway, *English Historical Documents*, 2 (London 1953), 817–8.
16. *PNGl* 1, 246, 257; 2, 66, 176, 195; 3, 8, 28, 42, 67, 72, 101. As we shall see, there was no Oldbury in Dowdeswell (*cp. PNGl* 1, 170).
17. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 197; *PNGl* 3, 72.
18. W. Bazeley, 'Brimpsfield Castle and its owners', *TBGAS* 20 (1897), 233; J.N. Langston, 'The Giffards of Brimpsfield', *TBGAS* 65 (1944), 106.

19. S.J. Madge, E.A. Fry & E. Stokes, *Abstracts of Inquisitiones Post Mortem for Gloucestershire* 4–6 (British Record Society 30(1903), 40(1910), 47(1914); J. Caley, *Calendarium Inquisitionum Post Mortem sive Escaetarum* 4 (London 1828), 276, 364.
20. *PNGl* 1, 144–62; Oldbury in Elkstone occurs on 160.
21. B.A. Lees, *Records of the Templars in England in the Twelfth Century: the Inquest of 1185* (London 1935), 48 and n. 21; 49 and n. 17, citing Rudder, *op. cit.*, 414–5, 755; *PNGl* 1, 170, accepted without question that *Aldeburbe* was Oldbury in Dowdeswell.
22. M.C. Hill, 'Dowdeswell Court Book, 1577–1673', *TBGAS* 67 (1949), 119–216. The only reference to Oldbury supposedly in Dowdeswell apart from Rudder, *op. cit.*, 414–5, is *Aldeburbe* in the Templars' Survey, which is not otherwise located (Lees, *op. cit.*, 48; *PNGl* 1, 170).
23. Lees, *op. cit.*, 49; H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, *Inquisitions and Assessments relating to Feudal Aids* 2 (London 1900), 238 (1284–5), 246, 260 (1303–4), 271 (1316), 278 (1336).
24. Rudder, *op. cit.*, 755; Lees, *op. cit.*, 49; *vide supra*, n. 21.
25. *Calendar of Miscellaneous Inquisitions 1307–49*, 254 (1328); *Calendar of Patent Rolls 1327–30*, 321, 448, 475, 488 (1328–30); *Cal. Pat. Rolls 1334–8*, 40 (1334); Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 5, 356 (1355).
26. C.D. Ross, *The Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey* (Oxford 1964, 1980, 3 vols) 2, 629.
27. J.S. Brewer, *Letters and Papers. . . of Henry VIII* 2, 1 (London 1864), 513; Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Archives, Bursary Transcripts 21, 78–273.
28. J. Caley & J. Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus tempore Henry VIII* (London 1810–34, 6 vols) 2, 244; Corpus Christi College, Oxford, Archives, Fb. 13(1517), 10(c. 1529), 13(c. 1550, 1583), 15(1583), 13(1599, 1603), 10, 13(c. 1620); Mc9 (1621, 1623); Glos R.O. D 184/M24, 178, 184(1630); D184/P 1 (1769, 1775); P 135/SD 2/1 (1841). The 'common pasture for sheep' attached to the 'Shipphouse called Oldburye and a severall close . . . which conteynith by estimacon v acres or thereabowte' occurs in the 1537 lease (Glos R.O. D184/T 38).
29. *PNGl* 2, xi, 50; *VCH (Glos)* 6, 191 and n. 59. Alderton Enclosure Award, *penes* Earl of Wemyss and March and Lord Neidpath, Stanway; Glos R.O. V5/8T/1–3 (Glebe Terriers, 1584, 1612, 1678); *ex. inf.* A.L. Baker, Esq., Holt Farm, Alderton.
30. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 193; *PNGl* 3, 132; *DG*, 153.
31. Almondsbury Parish Registers (Almondsbury Church) 1, 60–62; 2A, 5–8; 2B, 2–3; Bristol R.O. EP/A/32/2 (Almondsbury Tithe Award), 1–8; Lea manorial surveys and maps cited below, n. 41.
32. *PNGl* 2, 211; 3, 11, 19, 109–10, 127, 137; see especially Smith's own comments in *PNGl* 3, 127 and *PNGl* 4, 13.
33. T. Rudge, *The History of the County of Gloucester* (Gloucester 1803) 1, xxvii. The records of the Commissioners of Sewers for the Upper and Lower Levels of Gloucestershire are now in Glos. R.O. (D272) and include surveys of 1684 and 1753 (D272/10/1–2) and a map of 1835 (D272/9/1); the Almondsbury Marsh Common Inclosure Award and Map is Glos R.O., Q/R1 2.
34. C.D. Ross, *Cartulary of St Mark's Hospital, Bristol*, (Bristol Record Society Pubs. 21 (1959), xix, 180, 181n, 183–6, 189, 217–9, 243, 247–8).
35. *Ibid.*, 193n, 206n, 213; D. Gurney, *The Record of the House of Gournay* (London 1848) 4, 591–2, 600–10; Madge Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 42.
36. Gurney, *op. cit.*, 610; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 42, 129.
37. T. Madox, *Formulare Anglicanum* (London 1702), 8–9; for part of Cattybrook and Easter Compton as later within Almondsbury manor, see A. Sabin, *Some Manorial Accounts of St. Augustine's Abbey*, (Bristol Record Society Pubs. 22 (1960), 82–3, 85–6, 135, 137–40) and the detailed surveys of Almondsbury manor c. 1536–40 (Glos. R.O. D 674a/M 2; Bristol R.O. MS 11372).
38. Bristol R.O. MS. 01024/6, 17; Rudder, *op. cit.*, 225.
39. *Hall Red Book* 1, 292; Taylor, *op. cit.*, 190, 192–3, 196.
40. Glos R.O. D 674a/T 1 (1326), T 2 (1339), T 3 (1441), E 51 (1613); Rudder, *op. cit.*, 224. Detailed topographical research, unfortunately beyond the scope of the present work, on the deeds and leases relating to Brokenborough manor (Glos R.O. D674a/T 9A, 14, 37, 154; D140/T 1; D333/T 2; D892/T 4; D2762/T 1; D2957/11/1, 3, 5, 10–2), linking these with later surveys of the Almondsbury estate (in which Brokenborough was absorbed early in the 17th century (Glos R.O. D674a/M 5 (1658), P1 (c. 1700), E 3 (1704), E 40 (1767), E 105, P 2 (1811)) should enable the boundaries of Brokenborough to be ascertained more precisely.
41. R.C. Latham, 'Bristol charters, 1509–1899' (Bristol Record Society Pubs. 12 (1947), 84–92); Gaunt's Earthcott and Lea surveys of 1648, 1655, 1738, 1785, 1833 (Bristol R.O. MSS. 04236/2, 04237, 04241, 01024/6, 04246) and maps of 1738, 1783, 1824, 1837 (Bristol R.O. MSS. 04480, 32395/13, 070905/1–2, 4312/3; Almondsbury Tithe Award and Map (Bristol R.O. EP/A/32/2); Almondsbury manorial surveys cited in nn. 37, 40 *supra*.
42. Bristol R.O. MSS. 04030/11, 98; 04818/2, 247–8; 04305/1, 56–7, 61–2, 80, 101–2, 118.
43. *PNGl* 2, 57; *PNGl* 3, 149–50.
44. *VCH (Glos)* 6, 238–9; 8, 98, 269.

45. G.B. Grundy, 'Saxon Charters of Worcestershire', *Trans Birmingham Archaeol Soc* 52 (1927), 45–6, 48; Finberg, *op. cit.*, 48; Glos R.O. P72/SD.2/1 (Chaceley Tithe Award and Map).
46. Glos R.O. Q/RI. 145 (Award), D369/1 (Map); *PNGl* 3, 149; *PNGl* 4, 114, 192.
47. Glos R.O. D1263/6 (1718–86); P112A/SD.1/1–2 (Award and Map); *PNGl* 3, 149. The name Nellings was still current in the 19th century (Glos. R.O. D1245/E 1 (c. 1815)).
48. Though Smith (*PNGl* 2, 79 (Naight Brook); *PNGl* 3, 161 (Alney)) relocated *Olanige*, where Edmund and Canute made peace in 1016, at Naight in Deerhurst, opposite Ellings and immediately north of Nellings, the name cannot be explained as a version of *Elinge* except as a result of a series of hypothetical MS. errors which is overall 'ingenious but unnecessary' (*ex inf.* J. McN. Dodgson) and is to be derived from 'Ola's island', which is the context of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle entry is quite reasonable.
49. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 177; *PNGl* 4, 61 (n.2), 257, 272–4; *DG*, 158.
50. *PNGl* 2, 171: *Optune* in *DB*, later *Opton* or *Upton(e)*.
51. *PNGl* 2, 173: *Wadune* in *DB*, later (*Wad(d)on(e)*).
52. *PNGl* 2, 158: *Utone* in *DB*, later *Wotton(e)*, *Wutton* or *Wuttun*.
53. The compilation of *DB* is examined in V.H. Galbriath, *The Making of Domesday Book* (Oxford 1961), chaps. 12–13; R.W. Finn, *The Domesday Inquest and the Making of Domesday Book* (London 1961), chaps. 2, 6.
54. 19, 2; 26, 1, 3; 36, 3; 37, 3; 39, 16, 18; 43, 1, 2; 53, 10; 60, 3; 68, 5.
55. A.S. Ellis, 'On the Landholders of Gloucestershire named in Domesday Book', *TBGAS* 4 (1880), 93, 133–4.
56. Hall, *Red Book* 2, 604 (1211–12); W.H. Hart, *Historia et Cartularium Monasterii Sancti Petri Gloucestriae* (Rolls Series 33, pts. 1–3, 1863–7). 230 (before 1216). For the identification of *Luctone* as Littleton in Dumbleton, *vide supra*, 124–5.
57. Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids*, 253, 265, 290; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.*, 1, 120; 2, 149–52, 294.
58. Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids*, 265; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 40, 120–1, 327; 2, 182, 202, 207, 295–6, 302; 3, 225, 277–8.
59. H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, *The Book of Fees* (3 vols., London 1920) 1, 51, 344, 377; 2, 1339, 1407; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.*, 2, 295–6; 3, 70.
60. Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids*, 265; Hart, W.H. *Glos. Cart.* 1, 59, 107, 118, 318–9; 2, 89, 161–2; S. Ayscough & J. Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Wallie auctoritate Papae Nicolai IV* (London 1802), 231.
61. G.R.C. Davis, *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain* (London 1958), 51–2; A. Hamilton-Thompson, 'The Jurisdiction of the Archbishops of York in Gloucestershire with some notes on the history of the priory of St Oswald at Gloucester', *TBGAS* 43 (1921) 85–180 remains the only substantial work on the estates of St Oswald's Priory; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 233; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 487.
62. H.W.C. Davis, C. Johnson, H.A. Cronne, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, 2 (1956), 105–6; *Gloucs Cart* 1, 48, 59, 65, 79, 107, 318–9; 2, 89; *Cal Ch R* 1341–1417, 50.
63. *PNGl* 4, 61, no.2; *VCH (Glos)* 10, 85; *DG*, 149, 153.
64. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 34–5, 198, 203.
65. C.S. Taylor, 'Note on the entry in Domesday Book relating to Westbury-on-Severn', *TBGAS* 36 (1913), 183.
66. *PNGl* 3, 15, 133.
67. Taylor, *op. cit.*, (1913), 183.
68. *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 283, 325.
69. *Ibid*, 283, n. 125.
70. L.J.U. Way, 'The 1625 Survey of the Smaller Manor of Clifton' (*TBGAS* 36 (1913), 220–1, n. 2).
71. *VCH (Worcs)* 4, 254, 343, citing Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 3, 278; the important references in W.W. Capes, 'The Register of John Trefnant, 1389–1404' (*Canterbury York Soc Pubs* 28 (1921), 247–8, A.T. Bannister, 'The Register of Charles Bothe, 1516–35' (*Canterbury York Soc Pubs* 6 (1909), 134) and Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 3, 280 should be added.
72. *VCH (Worcs)* 4, 254, 274–5, citing W.W. Capes, 'The Register of Richard de Swinfield, 1283–1317' (*Canterbury York Soc Pubs* 6 (1909), 134) and Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 3, 280: the reference in W.W. Capes, 'The Register of John Trefnant, 1389–1404' (*Canterbury York Soc Pubs* 20 (1916), 36–7) should be added. Swinfield's Register, *loc. cit.*, also proves the former attachment of Little Sapey and Shelsley Walsh to Clifton by its mention of pensions paid '*ab antiquis*'; though both occur in later registers as rectories, the pensions were still being paid in 1535 (*VCH Worcs*) 4, 331, 337, citing Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 3, 278, 9). Ham Castle was situated in the later parish of Clifton and is once recorded as having a chapel, though this may only have been a private oratory (*VCH (Worcs)* 4, 254).
73. H.P.R. Finberg, *Lucerna* (London 1964), 183.
74. *VCH (Worcs)* 4, 364.
75. *VCH (Herefs)* 4, 279–85, 349–54.
76. *DB*, fol. 180d, 1, 44; *PNGl* 2, 57; *DG*, 151.
77. *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 335; *PNGl* 3, 240; *DG*, 156, 182.

78. *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 319, 344; A.T. Bannister, *The Place-Names of Herefordshire* (Cambridge 1916), 165; *DG*, 182.
79. *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 336; *PGNI* 3, 203, 249; *DG*, 147, 174.
80. *VCH (Glos)* 10, 89, 97–8; Bannister, *op. cit.*, 5; J. Tait, 'The Herefordshire Domesday, ca. 1150–1160 (*Pipe Roll Soc Pubs* n.s. 25(1950), 109); G.B. Grundy, 'The Ancient Woodland of Gloucestershire', *TBGAS* 58 (1936), 87, 139; C.E. Hart, 'The Metes and Bounds of the Forest of Dean', *TBGAS* 66 (1945), 175; Herefs & Worcs R.O. (Hereford), Red Book of Hereford (MS. HE 1/1), (CC. 133677), 78, 80 (*ex. inf.* Miss E.M. Jancey).
81. J. Tait *op. cit.*, 57, 79; W. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, rev. edn., 6 vols., 1817–30) 6, 137; Ayscough & Caley *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 172; C.E. Hart, *op. cit.* (1945), 179, 186; Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids*, 273; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 426.
82. *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 319; *DG*, 156, 182.
83. *VCH (Worcs)* 4, 198–200, confirmed subsequently by H.P.R. Finberg, *The Early Charters of the West Midlands* (Leicester 1961), 116–7.
84. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 26, 210; *PGNI* 3, 186; A. Mawer & E.M. Stenton, 'The Place Names of Worcestershire' (*English Place Names Soc Pubs* 4 (1927), 226–7).
85. The 1282 perambulation of the bailiwicks is printed in J. Maclean, 'A Perambulation of the Forest of Dene in the County of Gloucester, 10 Ed.I, 1281–2', *TBGAS* 14 (1890), 363–4 and in C.E. Hart, *op. cit.*, (1945), 205; the details of all the forest perambulations are worked out in Grundy, *op. cit.*, (1936), 82–155, with a few amendments in C.E. Hart, *Royal Forest* (Oxford 1966), 12–20, 251–5.
86. *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 319; *PGNI* 3, 245; 4, 15. Bannister, *op. cit.*, 145, cites only *DB's Niware* for New Weir in Huntsham.
87. *PGNI* 3, 218–9 (Newarne in East Dean), 240 (Newarne in Newland), 259 (Newerne in Lydney); *DG*, 154, 181.
88. Grundy, *op. cit.*, (1936), 98, 133, 136 and map facing 112: the name also appears in unprinted Forest proceedings of 1275–82 (*PGNI* 1. 3, 259). C.E. Hart, *op. cit.*, (1945), 205, in printing a further perambulation of Staunton bailiwick in 1299, misread *Newerne* as *Sewerne*, an easy error in certain 13th-century scripts.
89. Maclean, *op. cit.* (1936), 363–4; Grundy, *op. cit.* (1936), 116, 133, 136–8, 146, 150–1 and map facing 112: the name also occurs in unprinted Forest proceedings of 1279–1430 (*PGNI* 3, 218–9). The role of the Speech House as a judicial and administrative centre is studied in C.E. Hart, *The Verderers and Forest Laws of Dean* (Newton Abbot 1971), 89–93. For purposes of mining administration the Cannop Brook divided the Forest 'above' and 'below' the Wood (C.E. Hart, *The Free Miners* (Gloucester 1953), 51–2). In addition to Kensley at or near the later Speech House, the Speech Court also met at Cannop House 1 mile west of Speech House (C.E. Hart, *op. cit.*, (1971), 128, 133–4).
90. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 25, 204; C.E. Hart, *op. cit.* (1971), 43; *PGNI* 3, 209–10, 225; *DG*, 150, 154.
91. *PGNI* 3, 236–40, 247–8; Glos R.O. T1/128 (Newland Tithe Award and Map, 1840), 170 (Staunton Tithe Award and Map, 1844).
92. *VCH (Herefs)* 1, 322; Bannister, *op. cit.*, 210; *DG*, 158, 184; H.C. Darby & I.B. Terrett, *Domesday Geography of the Midlands* (Cambridge, 2nd edn. 1971), 3, n. 1.
93. *PGNI* 3, 212–3; Glos R.O. T1/25 (Tithe Award and Map, 1838).
94. Finberg, *Early Charters*, 225–7; *PGNI* 4, 1–2, 32.
95. T. Hearne, *Hemingi Chartularium* (Oxford 1723) 1, 251.
96. Fols. 181c – 182c, Herefs, 2, 6, 9, 23, 28–30, 34, 47; fol. 174b, Worcs, 3, 3.
97. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 109, 207, 321; *PGNI* 3, 258; *DG*, 147.
98. *VCH (Glos)* 10, 103. 107–8; C.E. Hart, *op. cit.*, (1945), 169, n. 19, citing G. Ormerod, *Strigulensia* (London 1861), 94, n. 10: there is however no mention of 'Alwoods Grange' in *PGNI* 3, 268–9.
99. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 103, 173; *PGNI* 1, 130; *DG*, 152, 154.
100. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 141, 237; *PGNI* 2, 34, 90; *DG*, 153; D. Royce, *Landboc sive Registrum Monasterii . . . de . . . Winchelcumba* 1 (Exeter 1892), 47–8, 77–91, 95, 169–70, 222–3; Lees, *op. cit.*, 50, provides independent confirmation for Greet and Gretton being part of the Sudeley fee.
101. Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids*, 238, 254, 267, 291; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* 233. There is no surviving return in *Valor Ecclesiasticus* for Abingdon Abbey (*VCH Berks* 2, 61).
102. J. Stephenson, 'Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon', *Rolls Series* 2 (1858), 104–5, 192; *Regesta* 2, 43–4; Rudder, *op. cit.*, 421; *PGNI* 2, 11.
103. W.C. Hart, *Glos. Cart* 1, 230; J. Gairdner & R.H. Brodie, *Letters and Papers . . . of . . . Henry VIII* 20.1, 665.
104. Finberg, *Early Charters*, 52; the later assessment of 24 hides (*ibid.*, 65) included lands far outside Dumbleton, e.g. Aston Somerville and Flyford Flavell in Worcestershire.
105. Glos R.O. SL 164, field nos. 71, 78, 107.
106. Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 1, 105–7; 2, 144–8; J. Bayley & J. Caley, *Calendarium Inquisitionum Post Mortem sive Escaetorum* 4, (Rec. Comm. 1828), 333.
107. Hall, *Red Book* 2, 604; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 144; Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids*, 238.
108. Glos R.O. GDR/T1/70. The abbey certainly possessed the tithes of Dumbleton when Abbot Faritius (1100–17)

assigned them for purchasing parchment for the library (Stephenson, *Chronicon* . . . Abingdon 2, 153); probably the abbey of Abingdon's title to these tithes originated at the latest in 1004, when the main manor of Dumbleton was restored to the abbey by Archbishop Aelfric (Finberg, *Early Charters*, 65; Stephenson, *Chronicon* . . . Abingdon 1, 415–9).

109. Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 1, 105; 2, 144; W.H. Hart, *Gloucs. Cart* 1, 130; 'List of the Lands of Dissolved Religious Houses', (*P.R.O. Lists and Indexes, Supplementary Series* 3.1, 191).
110. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 87, 90, 100, 268, 324; 2, 18, 27, 264–5; 3, 86; Taylor, *op. cit.*, 175; *PNGl* 3, 156. Hartpury was one of the largest Abbey manors in the 13th century, with 4 carucates in demesne in 1291 and over 1700 acres of tenant land in the 1260s (Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 231; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 3, 77–88).
111. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 175; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 107, 118, 319; 2, 89, 161–2; *PNGl* 2 159–60; *DG*, 154. *vide supra*, 118, for the suggested identification of Richard and Emma Fitz Nigel's gift with the hide of Wotton held by Humphrey of Maidenhill in 1086.
112. *DG*, 154; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 12, 99–100, 123, 223, 226, 232, 268, 350; 2, 18–9, 27, 101, 126. In 1291 Maisemore had 4 carucates in demesne and 570 acres of tenant land in the 1260s (Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 231; W.H. Hart, *Gloucs. Cart.* 3, 170–6, 239–40).
113. *PNGl* 3, 156, citing Rudder, *op. cit.*, 477.
114. The ownership of Morwent's Place cannot easily be traced before 1648, when Richard Dowdeswell sold it to the Maddock family who held it until 1726; c. 1731 it had an area of 220 acres (Glos R.O. D306/1; D123/L2); by 1784 it had come into the hands of Charles Hayward (Glos R.O. D123/T10/2) and can be identified as Murrells End Farm from the mention of 'Mr Haywood' as an adjoining owner east of Coopey's Farm and south of Drew's Farm, and the estimated area of 223¾ acres given in the Hartpury estate survey of the same year (Glos R.O. D199/2, maps x, xi).
115. Glos R.O. D199/1, 13, 15–9, 22, 24, 27–30, 39 (1700); the map associated with this survey (Glos R.O. D1008/P1) is unfortunately too decayed to be of much use though it does show most of Hartpury as still in open field strips; Glos R.O. Q/RNc 2/8 (1731); D199/2, maps x, xi (1784). The size of the yardland in Hartpury was about 56 acres in 1700 (Glos R.O. D199/1, 16), so that the 5 yardlands definitely stated to be in Morwent's End in 1700 would account for about 280 acres, equivalent to the 281¾ acres of Coopey's and Drew's Farms in 1784. The names of both these farms derive from tenants at Morwent's End in 1700, Richard Coopey and John and Thomas Drew (Glos R.O. D199/1, 13, 15–6, 19); the smithy shown on the 1784 map between Coopey's Farm and Hartpury vicarage can be identified as 'John Fletcher's blacksmith's shop . . . in Morewent's End' in 1700 (*ibid.*, 24, 27–8).
116. Taylor initially hesitated between Rodley and Ruddle before settling for Rodley, which was followed by Smith and Darby (Taylor, *op. cit.*, 203, 317; *PNGl* 3, 203–4; *DG*, 156).
117. *PNGl* 3, 198–9; *VCH (Glos)* 10, 37, 98.
118. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 19, 143, 150, 261; *DG*, 149, 153; *PNGl* 4, 61, n.2.
119. *VCH (Glos)* 6, 40–1, 59–61; *PNGl* 1, 195–228.
120. *PNGl* 1, 10–1, 31, 33, 40, 175: early forms for the river or the names derived from it include *Lec* (721X743), *Lec(c)e* (1086) and *Lec(c)b(e)* (1111–1154). *PNGl* 4, 149, cites only Monkleighton near Gloucester (*ibid.* 2, 140) and *Lechtun* in Frampton-on-Severn (*ibid.* 2, 197) as derived from *leac-tun*, Leckhampton from *leac-ham-tun* and *Leklond* in Bibury (*ibid.* 1, 29) from *leac*. *PNGl* 4, 147, cites only Lechniere in Walton Cardiff (*ibid.* 2, 2, 74) as a definitely located *lece* compound not connected with the River Leach and its villages. Elrington also favoured Leckhampton but gave no reasons for so doing (*VCH (Glos)* 6, 3).
121. Monkleighton was always in Dudstone (later Dudstone and King's Barton) hundred; Frampton-on-Severn was always in Blacklow (later Whitstone) hundred; Eastleach and Lechlade were always in Brightwell's Barrow hundred; Leckhampton was always in Cheltenham hundred and Northleach was always in Bradley hundred.
122. *PNGl* 1, 23–4, 29–34, 40–6, 171–2, 175.
123. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 59, 223, 226; 2, 126; 3, 156, 257, for references to Monkleighton as *ortum monachorum*; for other references to Monkleighton, see Kirby, *op. cit.*, 4, 7, 12, 60, 86, 124–7.
124. A. Clark, 'The English Register of Godstow Nunnery', (*Early English Text Soc Pubs* 129 (1905), 135–80; *DB*, fol. 168d, 54, 1.
125. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 150; Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, 2, 66 gives a faulty text of Henry I's confirmation charter to Tewkesbury Abbey in 1106, which is correctly given in *Calendar of Charter Rolls, 1257–1300*, 490.
126. *PNGl* 1, 74, 177–8; 2, 57–8, 109, 120; 3, 13, 132, 170; 4, 77–8.
127. Ross, *Ciren. Cart.* 2, 371; Maxwell-Lyte, *Book of Fees* 1, 51, 376.
128. Maxwell-Lyte, *Book of Fees* 2, 1338 (1221); in 1226, the value was reduced to 60s. (*ibid.*, 1, 376).
129. J.E. Gover, A. Mawer & F.M. Stenton, 'The Place Names of Wiltshire', *Eng Place Names Soc* 16 (1939), 45.
130. Ross, *Ciren. Cart.* 1, 20–2; Maxwell-Lyte, *Book of Fees* 2, 738; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 193; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 463, 465–6, 468.
131. Ross, *Ciren. Cart.* 1, 85–6; 3, 1033–7, 1039–40. The additional hide of *Lechetone* would also round up the geld-liability of the half-hundred of Cricklade in Wiltshire to exactly 50 hides (*VCH (Wilts)* 2, 186).

1982, with revisions to 1987