

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

**The Gloucestershire section of Domesday Book: geographical
problems of the text, part 2**

by J. S. Moore
1988, Vol. 106, 87-106

© The Society and the Author(s)

The Gloucestershire section of Domesday Book: geographical problems of the text, part 2

By JOHN S. MOORE

Summary

Part 1 of this work dealt with the identification of places mentioned in the Gloucestershire section of Domesday Book which had either not been identified by previous writers on the subject (Section I) or had been incorrectly identified (Section II). Part 2 comprises Section III and endeavours to identify the so-called 'anonymous holdings', those not named in the Domesday text. These unnamed places are considered hundred-by-hundred, and are located principally by tracing the descents of manors not mentioned in Domesday Book until a secure identification can be achieved.

SECTION III: THE UNNAMED HOLDINGS

The identification of the unnamed holdings in Domesday Book (*DB*) presents special problems which preclude absolute certainty in many cases. The names of pre-Conquest holders, the tracing of manorial descents, the existence of later estates not otherwise mentioned in *DB*, the normal Anglo-Saxon practice of geld-assessment in multiples of five hides, and topographical probability are the chief means of identifying these places, which will be considered under their respective *DB* hundreds.

Berkeley Hundred

It should perhaps be stated that *DB* does not mention this hundred by name, but it is mentioned in the 12th century, as is its alternative name of 'Berkeley Harness', a name of Old English origin which proves that the area thus named antedates the Norman Conquest and was therefore in existence in 1086.¹ Within this hundred there were only two unnamed holdings, the seven hides held by ten riding men in the manor of Berkeley (fol. 163a, 1, 15) and the five hides held in 1066 by Bernard the priest and in 1086 by Roger de Berkeley (I) (fol. 163b, 1, 18). In the absence of any detailed surveys for the Berkeley estates before the 13th century, it is now impossible to locate the seven hides of the riding men without tracing the descent of all the subtenancies of the honour of Berkeley, a major task beyond the scope of the present work.

Bernard the priest's holding, on the other hand, survived as a distinct unit throughout the 12th century: it was described in 1150 as 'a prebend which Bernard the chaplain had in Berkeley and all alms which Bernard had in Berkeley Harnesse' in 1157 as 'a prebend in the church of Berkeley which Bernard the chaplain had', in 1166 as 'the whole fee of Bernard the chaplain' and in 1191 as 'the income of the prebend of Berkeley which the monks of Stanley . . . have converted to their own use'.² Fortunately, the complex historical background has been greatly clarified in a recent study. Bernard the priest was evidently the last chaplain of Berkeley nunnery which was

secularized by Earl Godwin c.1050,³ and his holding, 'the third prebend of Berkeley', remained in the hands of the Berkeley family until Roger de Berkeley (III) installed Reginald son of Walter, parson of Cam, in the prebend, which he gave to Leonard Stanley priory in 1146, when the priory became a cell of St Peter's abbey, Gloucester.⁴

What constituted the prebend is difficult to determine because of the nature of the evidence: there is a discrepancy between the list of donations in the cartulary of St Peter's, based on charters no longer extant, and Archbishop Theobald's confirmation-charter of 1150 which now survives only in a printed version in Dugdale's *Monasticon*, the original being among the Cotton manuscripts burnt in 1731. The list of donations in the cartulary does not mention the prebend as such, and describes Roger de Berkeley's gift as comprising the churches of Arlingham, Coaley, Ozleworth, Slimbridge, Stanley and Uley. The gift must also have included the church of Cam, which the cartulary states was only given in 1156, because it was included in the 1150 confirmation-charter: in any case, Roger de Berkeley lost control of the hundred of Berkeley to Robert Fitzharding in 1153 and was therefore in no position to give Stanley priory anything outside the lordship of Dursley in 1156. The 1150 confirmation-charter also differs from the list of donations in the cartulary by including 'the prebend which Bernard the chaplain had' along with a rather different list of churches: Arlingham, Cam, Coberley and Ozleworth in Gloucestershire, and Easton Grey in Wiltshire.⁵

The situation is further complicated by the faulty nature of the sources: both the list of donations and Theobald's charter of 1150 purported to summarize Roger de Berkeley's gift of 1146, but this gift was made not by means of one charter covering all the properties involved but by a separate charter for each individual property: this can be demonstrated by the one surviving charter for Ozleworth copied into the cartulary *in extenso*.⁶ Given this fact, it is easy to see how later compilations of donations and a third-hand confirmation-charter could differ. Moreover, the sources normally used by historians for checking medieval ecclesiastical property, the *Taxation of Pope Nicholas IV* of 1291 and Henry VIII's *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, are themselves not infallible. In 1291, for example, there is no indication that either Coaley or Leonard Stanley rectories belonged to the priory, yet both were recorded in the cartulary and in *Valor Ecclesiasticus*.⁷

If the confirmation-charters of 1150 and 1157 are correct in stating that Roger de Berkeley in 1146 gave to the priory both the prebend once held by Bernard and also several other churches, then the extent of this prebend should be discoverable by deducting from a total list of the priory's possessions Roger de Berkeley II's initial gift of Leonard Stanley church c. 1125, the churches granted by Roger de Berkeley III in 1146 and the few later donations. The results are shown below:

*The Original Endowment, c.1125:*⁸

Arlingham church;⁹ a virgate in Leonard Stanley;¹⁰ 60s. yearly rent from 'Hardacres'.¹¹

*The Second Endowment, 1146:*¹²

The churches of Cam,¹³ Coaley,¹⁴ Coberley,¹⁵ Ozleworth,¹⁶ Slimbridge,¹⁷ Leonard Stanley,¹⁸ Uley¹⁹ and Easton Grey.²⁰

*Later endowments:*²¹

Two acres in Berkeley;²² Coaley mill and lands;²³ Lorrington manor;²⁴ Beverstone church.²⁵

*Endowments unaccounted-for:*²⁶

Payments from the churches of Berkeley,²⁷ Dodington,²⁸ Dursley²⁹ and Slimbridge;³⁰ lands in Slimbridge.³¹

The probability that Bernard's prebend can thus be identified as the land in Slimbridge and the payments from some of these four churches is confirmed by a study of the relevant *cartae* (returns of knights' fees) of 1166. Robert Fitzharding reported that 'Roger de Berkeley holds some land of the honour of Berkeley for which he does no service, namely Ozleworth, half Newington and the whole fee of Bernard the chaplain'; Roger de Berkeley in his *carta* reported his demesne holdings as Coberley, Leonard Stanley, Newington, Ozleworth and Dodington, in addition to three hides in Slimbridge given to Robert's son Maurice and Kingswood held by the Cistercians.³² We can eliminate Coberley, Dodington, Kingswood and Leonard Stanley, none of which were in Berkeley hundred, and Newington and Ozleworth which were held in addition to Bernard's fee. Dursley and Slimbridge alone remain as possible sites, and in both cases Leonard Stanley priory received pensions from their churches, the origin of which cannot otherwise be explained; it also held land in Slimbridge. The details of Bernard's land in *DB* indicate that it was a substantial holding, assessed at five hides and containing three demesne ploughs and five tenant ploughs. The place-name evidence suggests that this land should be located in Hinton ('the farm of a religious community'), which also contains the site of Berkeley nunnery itself at Oldminster, and Slimbridge, immediately north and east of Hinton in Berkeley parish, where there was the lost site called Hinworthy ('enclosure of a religious community').³³ Since the village of Hinton in 1086 contained nine hides in two other holdings – four hides forming the manor of Hinton (fol. 163a, 1, 15) and five hides at Sharpness in Hinton (fol. 163b, 1, 19) – it is probable that the Hinton section of Bernard's prebend accounted for one hide, making a total of ten hides for the whole vill, and that the other four hides of Bernard's land in 1086 were located at Hinworthy in Slimbridge.

This would fit in with the later evidence for the identification of the bulk of 'the land of Bernard the priest' as the land in Slimbridge later held by Stanley priory. A further pointer in the same direction comes from post-Reformation glebe-terriers: in 1584 and in 1681 the old parsonage of Slimbridge was described as 'a mansion house, moated round'.³⁴ This is a very rare description for a parsonage and one which would explain Thomas de Berkeley's desire to exchange Lorrington for Slimbridge church in 1224; very possibly it was the site of Bernard's residence in 1066. Also, as late as the 19th century the rector of Dursley received tithes from parts of Cam, Slimbridge, Stinchcombe, Symondshall and Uley as well as Dursley itself,³⁴ again suggesting that the connection between Dursley and Slimbridge originated in the very early medieval period when the parish of Dursley would still have included Cam, Uley and Stinchcombe as chapelries.

Bledisloe Hundred

This small *DB* hundred, centred on the royal manor of Awre, included, in addition to Awre itself, Bledisloe, Etloe and Poulton in Awre parish and Nass and Purton in the north and east of Lydney parish. Two unnamed holdings were recorded in 1086:

fol. 167c, 37, 5: One hide and a half-virgate held by William son of Norman in 1086;

fol. 169a, 58, 3: half-hide held by Palli in 1066 and by Walter the Crossbowman in 1086.

Taylor suggested that William son of Norman's land could be identified as Norman's Farm in Newent, but this is singularly unlikely: the name is not recorded before 1830 and Newent was certainly in Botloe hundred (fol. 166a, 16, 1). Taylor further suggested that Palli gave his name to

Poulton, a derivation dismissed by A.H Smith, and adduced in support the common ownership of Poulton and Walter's other manor of Frampton Cotterell (fol. 169a, 58, 4) by the Wyllynton family in the 14th century.³⁶ This, however, is pure coincidence since in the 12th and 13th centuries the two manors were not held by the same family; in any case Poulton itself was separately mentioned in 1086 (fol. 164a, 1, 52).³⁷

Unfortunately the later history of William son of Norman's family does not help us to locate the first holding: he himself was forester not only of the Forest of Dean but also of Herefordshire (fol. 181b, Herefs, 1, 63) and the Welsh forests beyond the Wye as late as 1114; his son Hugh 'son of William the Forester' was still in charge of the forests of Dean and Herefordshire in 1129–30 and was alive as late as 1166, becoming the ancestor of the lords of Kilpeck.³⁸ In 1139, however, control of the Forest of Dean passed to Miles of Gloucester³⁹ and probably soon afterwards most of Hugh's lands were regranted to his successors in office and their subordinates. Mitcheldean and Littledean were later held by the de Dene family, whom Miles had confirmed as forest officials by c.1150, English Bicknor by the Mucegros family and Little Taynton by the Walerands, whilst Murcott seems to have been absorbed within the main manor of Minsterworth.⁴⁰ We are left with topographical probability and a process of elimination as the sole guides: the only sizeable estates in Awre and Lydney not mentioned by name in *DB* are Blakeney in Awre and Allaston in Lydney. But Blakeney can almost certainly be eliminated: it first appears as an enclosure from the forest in the late 12th century and a hundred years later only consisted of a court, watermill and one virgate of land: certainly in the 14th and 15th centuries it was part of Awre manor.⁴¹ It is therefore probable that William son of Norman's land is represented by Allaston in Lydney, the history of which is obscure since until very recently it has been confused with Alverston in Woolaston.⁴²

The half-hide of Walter the Crossbowman, despite a fair amount of information on the later history of his lands, presents another difficult problem in location. Walter must have died within a decade of Domesday since in 1096 Ralph Bloet gave Ruddle (fol. 169a, 58, 2) to St Peter's abbey, Gloucester, and in 1103 Ralph's subtenant William de Bulley gave a half-hide in Bulley to St Peter's, a gift confirmed by Ralph Bloet and by Henry I.⁴³ Later evidence shows that the main manor of Bulley (fol. 169a, 58, 1) was held by the Lacy and Mucegros families, and that the half-hide held by St Peter's was regarded as a subtenancy of Bulley manor down to between 1235 and 1265, when Walter de Mucegros remitted all claims over this property to the abbey: in 1267 it was described as one and a half virgates in East Bulley containing 87 acres of land and two acres of meadow, with two cottagers holding seven acres.⁴⁴ Since Bulley was in Westbury hundred, St Peter's half-hide there cannot be identified with Walter the Crossbowman's half-hide, which must therefore be a site with a mill in either Awre or Lydney. Two possible sites in Lydney are Gurshill and Tutnalls, both recorded in the 14th century as one-tenth of a knight's fee, which would fit well with the *DB* rating of a half-hide, but Gurshill is on high ground west of Purton nowhere near a stream (SO 661047), whilst Tutnalls, though it has an obvious mill-site at SO 637030 just east of Lydney village, was held of Lydney manor and was clearly the mill for that manor.⁴⁵

The other possibility is a site in the north of Awre, immediately south of Ruddle in Newnham, with which it may well have been amalgamated by 1096 since Ralph Bloet disappears from Gloucestershire history after confirming William de Bulley's gift in 1103: here the obvious location is Ayleford at SO 666095, with two good mill-sites on the Forge (or Soudley) Brook at Two Bridges and Rowmedley. Later evidence confirms this identification: the last effective lord of the manor explicitly stated that 'the manor of Ruddle . . . lies mostly in the parish of Newnham but partly in the parish of Awre,' and this statement is corroborated by archival sources. In 1839 the Newnham Tithe Award and Map distinguishes Ruddle tithing, which paid

a *modus* of £17 16s. 10d. annually, from the rest of the parish which was liable for full payment of tithes: this tithing comprised 702 acres subject to the *modus* and a further 100 acres of gardens and woodland which by 'prescriptive right' were tithe-free, comprising the whole of the south of Newnham parish. The Awre Tithe Award and Map of 1840 records the Revd Edward Jones (who was then lord of Ruddle manor) as the owner of just over 100 acres in the north of the parish, adjoining Newnham; though the Tithe Map boundaries of Mr Jones' land do not precisely coincide with those given either in the 1618 manorial map or in manorial perambulations of 1840 to 1892, it is clear that Ruddle manor included at least 100 acres in Awre north of the road from Rowmedley to Crosshands (indeed this road may well once have formed the southern boundary of Ruddle manor, since none of the farms along this road in 1840 had land on both sides of the road), whilst the 1618 map shows that the only mill then in Ruddle was Ayleford mill at Rowmedley. Because Walter the Crossbowman's manor of Ruddle spread into two hundreds, *DB* recorded it in two consecutive entries under the appropriate hundredal rubrics but did not repeat its name in the second entry: nevertheless the location of the mill on the Awre-Newnham boundary and the later history of the manor enable the second entry to be named safely.⁴⁶

Bradley Hundred

The location of the unnamed ten hides held by Baldwin in 1066 and by King William in 1086 (fol. 163b, 1, 22) presents little difficulty, since the only parts of this hundred not explicitly mentioned in *DB* are Coln Rogers and Eastington. The latter, however, was certainly part of St Peter's manor of Northleach (fol. 164c, 2, 8): it was described as a hamlet of Northleach in 1263–1284, and the tenants there are included in the extent of Northleach in the 1260s. Given this, the unnamed royal estate must by process of elimination be Coln Rogers, so named because it was given to St Peter's in 1105 by Roger of Gloucester, who in 1102 had given to St Peter's Sandhurst and Hatherley, also *terra regis* in 1086 (fol. 162d, 1, 3), as well as Lassington which he had leased from the Archbishop of York (fol. 164d, 2, 13).⁴⁷

Brentry Hundred

In Westbury on Trym manor there were, in addition to the named 'members' of the manor at Aust, Compton Greenfield, Henbury, Redwick, Stoke Bishop and Yate, two unnamed holdings: the five hides for which Osbern Giffard did no service, and the eight hides held by six riding men (fol. 164d, 3, 1). Osbern Giffard's five hides can safely be equated with the five hides at Stoke Gifford (named after his family) held by him in chief from the Crown (fol. 168c, 50, 2). These two discordant entries in *DB* were the opening shots in a controversy extending over two centuries regarding the overlordship of Stoke Gifford manor. Throughout the 12th and 13th centuries the bishops of Worcester continued to maintain that the five hides of Stoke Gifford formed a knight's fee held by the Giffards from them, but not until the 1280s did the Crown and the Giffards (and their successors the Berkeleys of Stoke Gifford) acknowledge the overlordship of the bishops. As a result, Stoke Gifford came under the jurisdiction of Henbury hundred (the successor to Brentry hundred) down to the 19th century.⁴⁸

By Henry II's reign only one radman, Ainulf or Einulf, is recorded in Westbury manor, holding a half-hide at Charlton in Henbury, but on other manors of the bishop of Worcester the tenure of radmen diminished considerably during the civil war of Stephen's reign. Nevertheless, the eight hides of 1086 can be located with a fair degree of probability. After eliminating the later

equivalents of the named subholdings of 1086 and also the large holding of between five and a half and eight and a half hides held by the Saltmarsh family since it was subinfeudated by Bishop Samson (1096–1115), only two major groups of tenants holding by knight service are left.

The first is described in 1208 as one knight's fee in Henbury held by Robert de Vehm, Peter de Hay and William de Westbury, which consisted of two hides in Henbury held by Roger de Vehm in 1166, by Robert de Vehm in 1208, later by William de Vehm and by John de Theshale in 1299; another two hides in Henbury held by Walter de la Hay in 1166, by Peter de Hay in 1208 and by Thomas de Hay in 1299; and one hide in Henbury held by Robert de Saltmarsh in 1166, by William de Westbury in 1208, later by Adam de Westbury and by Adam de Eyton in 1299. The second group is described in 1208 as half a knight's fee in Redland held by Gilbert de Wick and William Mansell, which comprised one hide in Redland held by Richard de Vehm in 1166, later by Ralph de Vehm and by William Mansell in 1299; and one and a half hides in Wick in Redland held by Richard de Coveley in 1166 and by Robert de Coveley in 1299.

These two groups of knights' fees add up to seven and a half hides, which, with Einulf's half-hide, are exactly equivalent to the eight hides held by six riding men in 1086. Indeed, it is quite possible that the six holdings of Einulf, Richard de Coveley, Richard de Vehm, Robert de Saltmarsh, Roger de Vehm and Walter de la Hay in 1166 represent the actual holdings of the six riding men of 1086. With detailed research, beyond the scope of the present work, these subholdings could no doubt be more precisely identified with later properties on modern maps.⁴⁹

Cheltenham Hundred

The only unnamed holding requiring identification in this hundred consists of one and a half hides belonging to Cheltenham church and held in 1086 by Reinbald (fol. 162d, 1, 1). This holding can be identified as the glebe land of St Mary's, the original parish church of Cheltenham, given to Cirencester abbey in 1133 along with Reinbald's other lands, which was reunited with the vicarage as a disappropriated rectory in 1861.⁵⁰

Cirencester Hundred

The two unnamed entries in this hundred present no problems since it was only as a result of scribal omission that they were not explicitly located in Cirencester itself. The five hides held by King Edward in 1066 and by King William in 1086 (fol. 162d, 1, 7) clearly represented the royal manor of Cirencester. The two hides held before and after the Conquest by Cirencester church (fol. 166c, 25, 1) equally clearly represented the endowment of the original collegiate church of Cirencester, the parish church of St John's.⁵¹

Deerhurst Hundred

The one unnamed holding in this hundred has been safely identified in *VCH (Glos)*. The lands of the Anglo-Saxon priory of Deerhurst had been divided c.1060 between the French abbey of St Denis, Paris, and Westminster abbey, and in the chapter of *DB* dealing with St Denis' share of Deerhurst manor it is recorded that '2½ hides also belong to the manor beyond the Severn' (fol. 166b, 20, 1). This holding has been identified as Haw manor in Tirley, forming the central part of Tirley parish which remained in Deerhurst hundred after the Westminster abbey estates (Ellings, Rye and Tirley) were removed to form part of a new hundred of Westminster in the last

quarter of the 13th century. Haw remained with St Denis' abbey until the resumption of the lands of the 'alien priories', when it was transferred to Tewkesbury abbey, the owner at the final Dissolution.⁵²

Dudstone Hundred

In this hundred there were three unnamed holdings which were as follows:

fol. 162d, 1, 2: two hides held by two free men in King's Barton manor;

fol. 162d, 1, 6: half-hide next to the city [of Gloucester], held by Wulfward in 1066 and by Earl William's cook in 1086;

fol. 170c, 78, 6: half-hide held by Edward in 1086.

Neither Earl William's cook nor this Edward appear elsewhere in *DB*; Humphrey the Cook who held part of Latton had doubtless once served in the royal kitchen.⁵³

The two hides held by two free men in King's Barton manor (fol. 162d, 1, 2) can be identified with a fair degree of likelihood as forming the bulk of the Matson House estate in the parishes of Matson and Upton St Leonards. The entry for King's Barton manor appears to cover a total of ten hides, of which one was at Upton St Leonards, seven were in demesne, and two were held by the two free men. It is therefore likely that these two hides were to be found within an area consisting of Barton St Mary, Matson (which was originally a chapelry of Barton St Mary) and Upton St Leonards. Since both Barton and Upton were later represented by manors of the same name, Matson alone remains, by a process of elimination, as the probable site of these two hides.⁵⁴

One of these two hides can almost certainly be equated with the carucate at Matson held by Lanthony priory in 1291: although later records state that this carucate was part of Hempsted manor, this was purely a matter of administrative convenience, since Hempsted, lying immediately south of Lanthony, was the chief priory property in the Gloucester area; in any case Hempsted was separately recorded in *DB* (fol. 164d, 1, 10) and was given to Lanthony by Earl Miles of Hereford in 1141.⁵⁵ Lanthony's possession of their carucate at Matson dated from 1239, when John de Matson sold half the lordship of Matson, held from King's Barton manor, to Prior John de Hempsted; after the Dissolution, this property passed through several hands before it was bought in 1600 by Jasper Selwyn, when it comprised 122 acres, thus closely corresponding to the carucate (normally 120 acres) of 1291. The original manorial centre was probably, as Canon Bazeley suggested, a few hundred yards to the north of the modern Matson House, now Selwyn School, at 'Moat Leaze', a site still marked by remains of a moat down to this century.⁵⁶ It is, however, not possible to distinguish the lands comprising this carucate because it was amalgamated in the modern period with two other manors to form the Matson House estate owned by the Selwyns and their successors.

It is reasonable to suppose that the second hide of 1086 was the other half of the lordship of Matson recorded in 1239, but in order to demonstrate this it is first necessary to correct some previous work on the history of Matson. To begin with, the statement originating with Atkyns that Matson was held from Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford, in 1374 was based on a misreading of *Morton* (i.e. Moreton Valence) as *Matton* (for Matson).⁵⁷ Secondly, Canon Bazeley, though a far more careful scholar than Canon Taylor, was also led into error by assuming that there were only two manors called Matson, when in fact there were three, hence his reconstruction of the medieval and early modern history of Matson is not entirely satisfactory. Bazeley evidently failed to realize that in the 12th and 13th centuries the Matson family held part of their lands in Matson from the St Peter's abbey manor of Abbot's Barton and part from the

royal manor of King's Barton, a situation further complicated by the amalgamations of Abbot's Barton and King's Barton manors in the 14th century and of the three manors of Matson by the 18th century.

The third manor of Matson, which Bazeley overlooked, was the part of Matson still held from the royal manor *after* John de Matson sold a carucate to Lanthony priory in 1239, represented c.1266 by three virgates, held by Osbert Giffard's heirs, and one virgate, held by Philip de Matson, 'of free land of ancient tenure'. By 1373 the Giffards had reunited these two freeholds as a carucate held from St Peter's abbey (because the two manors of Abbot's and King's Barton had been reunited in the possession of the abbey in 1316) by Sir Gilbert Giffard, whose nephew John Giffard is recorded as leasing his manor of Matson in 1415. In the late 15th century this manor passed by marriage to the Lygons, who sold it to the Selwyns in 1609; in 1635, this manor was still held from the now secularized manor of King's Barton. The Giffards and the Lygons appear to have developed their half of the lordship of Matson more energetically than Lanthony priory developed its half, for the Lygon manor in 1597 contained 300 acres of arable, meadow and pasture, as well as 60 acres of woodland, in Matson and Upton St Leonards.⁵⁸ But its lands were intermingled with those of the priory manor and are now impossible to distinguish since, as we have seen, by 1609 the Selwyns had reunited both halves of the lordship of Matson divided by John de Matson 370 years earlier. It is, however, probable that the original (pre-1239) manor comprised the central part of Matson parish, since the second manor, that held from St Peter's abbey before 1316 and later from the Dean and Chapter of Gloucester, seems to have consisted mainly of the Robins Hill area in the west of Matson and Sneedham and Saintbridge in Upton St Leonards east of Matson.⁵⁹

The clue to the second unnamed holding in Dudstone hundred, the half-hide 'next to the city', is provided by Margaret de Bohun's charter of 1171 in which she confirmed gifts by her predecessors to Lanthony priory, amongst which was 'the virgate of land in Quedgeley which William Brito gave to Quedgeley church which Avenal the cook held.'⁶⁰ Since William Brito was active in public life from 1091, had been connected with Gloucestershire as a servant of Walter the Constable and his family since 'the time of Abbot William [of St Peter's, Gloucester]' (1113–30) and was probably dead by 1148,⁶¹ Avenal was almost certainly the cook of Earl William's mentioned in *DB*, and Quedgeley was undoubtedly 'next to the city', lying only two miles south of Gloucester: in 1174–9 another charter by Margaret de Bohun defines this part of Quedgeley as two virgates, precisely the half-hide of *DB*. Avenal's holding can indeed be more precisely located at Netheridge in the north of Quedgeley, which remained in the hands of the Avenel family as subtenants until the 13th century and, with Woolstrop, though in Quedgeley parish remained in Dudstone hundred.⁶²

The third unnamed holding in Dudstone hundred, Edward's half-hide, can be at least tentatively identified by a process of elimination. Of the parishes or hamlets later in that hundred which were not represented by *DB* manors of the same name, only four had become separate villages by 1316: Elmore, Hartpury, Longford and Maisemore.⁶³ It has already been proved that Hartpury and Maisemore were represented by the two manors of *Morwent* in *DB*; Longford, though later regarded as a chapelry of Hempsted parish because its tithes were owned by Lanthony priory, was originally part of the *DB* manor of Sandhurst.⁶⁴ The remaining parishes and hamlets in Dudstone hundred, which had not achieved separate status as villages by 1316, can all be shown with certainty or high probability to have been chapelries of parishes represented by *DB* manors in which they would have been included in 1086. Highleadon was part of Rudford which was in Botloe hundred in 1086 (fol. 170d, 78, 17).⁶⁵ Matson, we have just seen, was represented by the two hides held by two free men in King's Barton manor. Pitchcombe was a chapelry of Harescombe.⁶⁶ Prinknash, an extra-parochial area not mentioned

in Pope Nicholas' Taxation, *Feudal Aids* or *Valor Ecclesiasticus*, must from its position originally have been part of Upton St Leonards.⁶⁷ Quedgeley, we have just seen, was represented by an unnamed holding in *DB* and though it was probably an older settlement than Elmore (its chapel is recorded in 1095 whereas Elmore's chapel is first mentioned in the 1140s) Elmore had developed into a separate village by 1316: nevertheless the rectory of Quedgeley and Elmore remained a united benefice until after 1535.⁶⁸ Shurdington and Up Hatherley, linked together in 1316, were both chapelries of Badgeworth.⁶⁹ Twigworth was a hamlet partly in Barton and partly in Norton until it became a separate chapelry in 1844.⁷⁰ Great Witcombe, a chapelry belonging to St Oswald's priory, was probably originally part of Badgeworth, as Little Witcombe indeed remained.⁷¹ Elmore is therefore the only later parish in Dudstone hundred not represented by a *DB* manor, yet the manor of Elmore clearly existed by 1095 when Walter of Gloucester gave to St Owen's, Gloucester, 'all the tithes of my demesne', including 'from Elmore the whole tithe in all things with the whole tithe of the villagers and a certain small piece of land [for collecting the tithe]'. It is thus probable that Edward's half-hide can be identified as the manor of Elmore which certainly existed nine years later.⁷²

Longtree Hundred

Only one unnamed holding has to be identified in this hundred, namely the one and a half virgates held by Roger of Ivry from Ralph Pagnell 'which both abandoned' before 1086 (fol. 168b, 44, 2).⁷³ This is obviously somewhere in Rodmarton since, apart from Hampnett in Bradley hundred, all Roger's other holdings were in this area, at Culkerton, Hazleton, Tetbury and Tetbury Upton (fol. 168a, 41, 2-5) and Ralph's only other holding was Tarlton which, though in Cirencester hundred, was in Rodmarton parish (fol. 168b, 44, 1). A.R.J. Jurica has suggested that this holding should be identified as Little Tarlton, but this is unlikely since Tarlton was in Cirencester hundred, not Longtree hundred, and Little Tarlton is much more probably the hide in Tarlton held by Herbert from William of Eu (fol. 166d, 31, 8). It is far more likely that the one and a half virgates were located in the hamlet of Culkerton in Rodmarton, since the geld-assessments of the adjoining hamlets of Culkerton and Hazleton would then total almost exactly nine hides.⁷⁴

	Hides	Virgates	Acres	Holder
<i>Culkerton</i>				
fol. 166d, 31, 10:	—	3	5	Herbert from William of Eu
fol. 168a, 41, 4:	1	2	—	Ansketel from Roger of Ivry
fol. 168b, 44, 2:	—	1½	—	Roger of Ivry from Ralph Pagnell
fol. 168d, 53, 4:	2	2½	—	Roger of Ivry from Durand of Gloucester
<i>Hazleton</i>				
fol. 168a, 41, 5:	3	3	—	Roger of Ivry
Total	9	0	5	

Swinehead Hundred

There were four unnamed holdings in this hundred:

- fol. 163b, 1, 21: 1 hide held by a riding man;
- fol. 165a, 6, 3: 1 hide held by Goismer from the bishop of Coutances;
- fol. 170b, 75, 2: 1 hide held by Roger son of Ralph;
- fol. 170b, 75, 3: 1 virgate held by Walter from Roger son of Ralph.

The hide held by the riding man occurs within the entry for the royal manor of Barton Regis, in which six hides were located at Bristol and three hides held by Bristol church were located at Mangotsfield. The riding man's hide was therefore the tenth hide in a normal double-five hides vill. Barton Regis remained a royal manor throughout the Middle Ages but the documentation available to me when I edited *Domesday Book: Gloucestershire* did not enable me to identify this hide with certainty. On grounds of topographical probability I therefore suggested that this hide was the nucleus of the later small manor of Ridgway in Easton, Stapleton and Wickwick; though this manor first occurs under that name in the early 15th century, the name itself is recorded as early as 950 attached to the ancient trackway from Bristol to Marshfield, and a holding centred on this route would be appropriate for a riding man to occupy. Unfortunately for this plausible argument, a year later Dr Sharp's work on Bristol Castle appeared, and Mr Tony Nott pointed out to me that it contained evidence for a decisive identification of the riding man's hide. This survived into the 13th century as a carucate at Stapleton, held by the serjeantry service of 'carrying the king's writs, summonses and the letters of the Constable of Bristol within the county of Gloucester at his own costs', which Mr Nott has convincingly identified as the later Oldbury Court estate.⁷⁵

The entry relating to Goismer's hide is remarkable for its inclusion of one of the very rare examples of additional information in the Gloucestershire section of *DB* derived from the 'original returns' which is usually excluded from the Exchequer *DB*: 'When it is ploughed, there are only 64 acres of land in that hide'.⁷⁶ This unique piece of information can in fact be used to confirm a probable identification in the absence of better evidence: Goismer's name does not help us, and the lands of the bishop of Coutances (Goismer's overlord) reverted to the Crown on his death. But two individually weak lines of argument converge to suggest a probable location. The first is the strongly geographical arrangement of the return for the bishop's lands, running from north to south, which would place Goismer's land between or at least near Hambrook in Winterbourne and Harry Stoke in Stoke Gifford (fol. 165b, 6, 2, 4). The second is the process of elimination, for there is only one sizeable manor in the northern part of Swinehead hundred recorded in later records but not mentioned by name in *DB*.

Both lines of enquiry lead to the same result, the manor of Sturdon in Winterbourne. Sturdon is first mentioned by name in the 1242 Pipe Roll which records among the Gloucestershire *terre date* (lands granted-away by the Crown) land worth 15s held by 'William Fokeram, heir of Alice de Gundeville, in *Stridene*, a member of Winterbourne'. The value and the mention of Alice de Gundeville enable us to trace this holding back through the Pipe Rolls to the first of the continuous series in 1156, when it appears as '15s in the same township [Winterbourne] from the sister of Hugh de Gundeville'. Since this entry always appears under the heading of Bitton, Wapley and Winterbourne (compare fol. 162d, 1, 9), we can deduce that, when the bishop's lands reverted to the Crown in William Rufus' reign, Sturdon was added to Winterbourne for administrative purposes but retained its separate identity (Hambrook (fol. 165a, b, 6, 2), by contrast, was absorbed into the main manor of Winterbourne after this reversion). From William Fokeram's time onwards Sturdon manor is reasonably well documented in the inquisitions post

mortem after 1257, reference still being made to the annual rent of 15s due to the Exchequer. Other details in the extents attached to these inquisitions confirm the tentative identification of Goismer's hide as Sturdon: it is termed a carucate in 1257 and 1374, and from 1297 to 1362 the demesne is stated to comprise 60 acres of arable, four acres of meadow and two acres of underwood, almost exactly the 64 acres of *DB*; the 1086 value of 16s. is very close to the rent of 15s. paid from 1156 onwards; the *DB* mention of one demesne plough without any tenants is reflected in the small tenant area of 1257 (two virgates and four cottage holdings). Cumulatively, all these points, small in themselves, add up to a reasonably secure identification.⁷⁷

The same lines of enquiry, the process of elimination and topographical probability, enable us to suggest at least tentative locations for the two manors held by Roger son of Ralph and his subtenant Walter in entries following that for Roger's named manor of Clifton (fol. 170b, 75, 1). This rather suggests that the two unnamed manors may be near Clifton in the south of Swinehead hundred, where there were two medieval manors not represented by named Domesday manors, Clifton St Lawrence in Clifton⁷⁸ and Blackswarth in the outparish of St Philip and St Jacob and, after 1754, the new parish of St George.⁷⁹ Since there is no known connection between Roger son of Ralph or Walter and the later lords of Clifton, Clifton St Lawrence and Blackswarth, the only guide must be the very unsafe method of comparing geld-assessments: all that can be said in defence of this procedure is that, in a restricted area within the same hundred, geld-assessments are more likely to be in proportion to agrarian realities than would be the case with comparisons over larger areas in more than one hundred.

In 1746 a survey of Clifton parish estimated the total area in individual occupation at 604 acres, the remaining 380 acres constituting the commons of Clifton Down, though Latimer believed that the surveyor of 1746, J.J. de Wilstar, had overestimated the area of the commons which in 1860 amounted to only 230 acres out of a total parish area of 910 acres. The Clifton Tithe Award and Map of 1844 confirm that de Wilstar radically overestimated the area of commons, which was given as 250 acres, but also adds its own error by radically underestimating the area of the whole parish as a result of omitting the south of the parish entirely: the award was clearly not well executed and had to be amended by the Tithe Commissioners in London after local protests. It seems probable that de Wilstar underestimated the occupied area by about 80–100 acres and overestimated the area of the commons by about 100–150 acres. Of the 604 acres stated to be occupied in 1746, the two freeholds of Mr Freeman and Mr Hodges probably comprised the manor of Clifton St Lawrence which in 1625 had been surveyed at 206 acres.⁸⁰

In the absence of any earlier manorial records for Clifton itself and given the doubtful accuracy of de Wilstar's survey the only additional information on the area of Clifton manor comes from feet of fines (final concords), a source of somewhat doubtful reliability. A final concord of 1509 described this manor as comprising 300 acres of arable, 60 acres of meadow, 100 acres of wood and 200 acres of [? common] pasture; the total area of 660 acres is closely confirmed by a later fine of 1602 dealing with half the main manor, involving an area of 343 acres, i.e. 686 acres for the whole manor. Another fine of 1646 dealing with three-quarters of the main manor confirms the area of commons, 'furze and heath' as 200 acres and the cultivated area as 390 acres for three-quarters of the manor and, therefore, 520 acres for the whole manor.⁸¹ Taking all these figures together, it seems probable that the cultivated area of the main manor of Clifton was approximately 500 acres, compared to 176 acres for Clifton St Lawrence manor (30 out of the total of 206 acres for this manor had been common woodland), whilst the commons comprised about 200 acres attached to Clifton manor and 30 acres attached to Clifton St Lawrence manor. The ratio of 2.8:1 between the estimated cultivated area of the two manors in the 16th and 17th centuries is sufficiently close to the ratio of 3:1 between the geld-assessments for Roger's two

manors in 1086 to make plausible the argued identification of the one hide holding with Clifton St Lawrence manor.

Finally, however, we must note that though it might at first sight seem attractive to give support to this ratio by reference to the description of the estate purchased by the Society of Merchant Venturers of Bristol in 1676 as 'three-quarters of the manor of Clifton' (the manor of Clifton St Lawrence being purchased by the Society ten years later), this cannot be sustained. The three-quarters of the manor purchased in 1676 represented the lands of three out of the four daughters of Hugh Brook, lord of Clifton manor, who died in 1588: the descent of the remaining quarter is obscure and caused problems for the Merchant Venturers. It is probable that the history of Clifton will be illuminated if and when Miss Ralph's catalogue of their archives is completed. The history of Clifton St Lawrence manor is unknown before St Lawrence's hospital (of which the manor was the major endowment) was given to Westbury College as part of Bishop Carpenter's augmentation in 1463.⁸²

The fourth unnamed holding in Swinehead hundred was the virgate held by Walter, entered under the heading of Roger son of Ralph and therefore held from him. That being so, it was presumably in the south of the hundred and may possibly be identified as the nucleus of the manor of Blackswarth or Blakesworth in Easton. St Augustine's manor of Blackswarth evolved into an agglomeration of abbey lands east of Bristol derived from several donors, but its core was an area of 66 acres given by Richard de Hanham c.1150: this can be located by later surveys and maps as the area known in the first half of the 19th century as Mugland Farm, an area now bounded on the north by Church Road, St George, on the east by Strawberry Lane, on the south by the River Avon and on the west by Netham Road and the northern end of Blackswarth Road. Given the poorer quality of the soil in this vicinity, a geld-rating of one virgate for an area one-third of that of Clifton St Lawrence does not seem unfair.⁸³

Wattlescomb Hundred

Only two small subtenancies in the bishop of Worcester's manor of Withington (fol. 164d, 165a, 3, 5) require precise identification in this hundred. The first, the priest's half-hide, represents the later glebe of Withington church, held c.1166 by Bertram the clerk. The second is the land of the four riding men, assessed at two and three quarter hides in 1086, which can be identified in two later surveys of the manor, c.1166 and in 1299, by first eliminating the named subtenancies of 1086. The residue after this process of elimination comprises one and a half hides held by Segen c.1166, one hide in Upcote and a half-hide held by Alured: in 1299 Segen's land is represented by the Prior of Studley's one and a half hides in Owdeswell, and Alured's land by Nicholas de Staveley's half-hide in Upcote, whilst the other hide in Upcote has been divided into virgates and half-virgates held in villeinage. The land of the four riding men of 1086 can thus be precisely placed at Owdeswell and Upcote in Withington parish. It may be noted that the total geld-liability of Wattlescomb hundred in *DB* is 99 $\frac{3}{4}$ hides, and if the *Red Book of Worcester* correctly states the assessments of the four riding men's holding as three rather than two and three quarter hides (a correction supported by the Worcester 'satellite' texts), this total would rise to the expected 100 hides.⁸⁴

Westbury Hundred

Finally three unnamed holdings in Westbury hundred require identification: fol. 167a, 32, 9: two and a half virgates held by Wihanoc in 1066 and by William son of Baderon in 1086;

- fol. 167b, 34, 12: half-hide with a half-fishery held by Alwin the sheriff in 1066 and by William Goizenboded in 1086;
 fol. 168d, 53, 1: three hides held by Alfwold in 1066 and by Durand, sheriff of Gloucestershire, in 1086.

The first two holdings are both stated in *DB* to be 'part of the King's revenue in Westbury' and must therefore be located either in Westbury-on-Severn itself or in Minsterworth and Newnham which remained chapelries of Westbury until the 14th century. William son of Baderon's two and a half virgates have been identified as the Hill House estate in Newnham, though, like Stears in Newnham which he also held in 1086 (fol. 167a, 32, 8), it did not remain in the hands of his descendants, the Monmouths: possibly the county's assertion in *DB* that this holding had been part of the royal demesne of Westbury was effective, since it was later held of Rodley manor which was in 1086 still part of Westbury-on-Severn.⁸⁵

The location of William Goizenboded's small estate is difficult because of William's obscurity: as Ellis pointed out, he disappears from history after 1107/8, and Ellis mentioned, without endorsing it, an earlier identification of William's 'land in Westbury hundred . . . as Dunny [now Duni] in Minsterworth, upon what authority does not appear.'⁸⁶ In fact, the evidence now available does favour this identification. The mention of the half-fishery predicates a site on the west bank of the Severn opposite one of the two sites on the east bank also having a half-fishery, namely Hempsted (fol. 164b, 1, 60) or Standish (fol. 164c, 2, 10); Brawn in Sandhurst (fol. 169c, 64, 1), the only other manor with a half-fishery in the Severn, is ruled out since it is not opposite any part of Westbury hundred. There is also some evidence to connect William Goizenboded with Minsterworth parish: all his major estates later came into the hands of the de Bosco (Boys) family (which would, incidentally, explain the lost name 'Boyfield' in Minsterworth), whilst he himself was explicitly commemorated, under his *alias* of William son of Richard (fol. 167b, 34, 8) in a grant of land in Murcott (in Minsterworth) to St Peter's abbey, Gloucester, by William de la Mare in 1165-79.⁸⁷ The half-fishery of Duni is independently recorded when it was also given to St Peter's by Earl Roger of Hereford c.1150.⁸⁸

The link between William Goizenboded and Ernaldus de Bosco, the founder of his family's fortunes, is provided by the Abingdon Abbey Cartulary, which preserves a copy of a grant of the hide in Dumbleton held by William in 1086 (fol. 167b, 34, 13) to the abbey by William himself in 1107-8 'with the consent of his lord Robert, Count of Meulan, of whose fee he held that land.'⁸⁹ Clearly William, who had been a tenant in chief in 1086, had found it expedient to commend himself to Count Robert. If he died some time after 1107/8 without heirs, his lands would naturally escheat to Count Robert's honour of Leicester: alternatively, his lands may have come to the de Boscos through a marriage with William Goizenboded's daughter. By 1148-9 Ernaldus de Bosco was already an important official and subtenant of Count Robert's son, also Robert: a later Ernaldus de Bosco is reported as holding ten knights' fees in Gloucestershire c.1210, and his son, another Ernaldus, is recorded in 1277 as holding 'of the Earl of Winchester as of the fee of Leicester' the manor of Ebrington with its members and manors, more precisely defined in other inquisitions post mortem as the manors of Ebrington, Pebworth, Clapton, Farmcote, Guiting Power, Castlett and Caldecote, held in demesne by the de Boscos, and Taynton, held by the Mucegros family from the de Boscos.⁹⁰

The only lands of William Goizenboded (apart from the half-hide in Westbury) not held in the later 13th century by or from the de Bosco family were Little Barrington, later held by the Templars (to whom it was presumably given by the de Boscos after 1185 since it does not appear in the Templars' Inquest of that year),⁹¹ Dumbleton (which we have already seen was given to Abingdon abbey by William himself in 1107/8) and Rose Court in Aylworth, held at least from

the late 13th century by St Oswald's priory, Gloucester. The donor, and indeed the entire medieval history of Rose Court apart from the bare fact of St Oswald's possession, are unknown, because of the sparse documentation for the priory. But it is quite possible that it was originally held by the de la Mares who also held Murcott, since that family were definitely subtenants of the other manor of Aylworth, held by Gilbert son of Turol in 1086 (fol. 168c, 52, 6),⁹² and the William de la Mare who gave Aylworth to Lanthony priory in the late 12th century is almost certainly the same William de la Mare who was lord of Murcott at that time and nephew of Miles, Earl of Hereford, who founded Lanthony.⁹³

In short, William Goizenboded almost certainly had been a holder of some land in the chapelry of Minsterworth, in view of William de la Mare's grant of land in Murcott 'for the soul of William son of Richard', but this land cannot have been either Murcott itself, held in 1086 by William son of Norman (fol. 167c, 37, 1), or the main manor of Minsterworth (which we will shortly show can be identified with Durand of Gloucester's three hides in Westbury hundred); the small estate of Duni in the far west of Minsterworth, bordering the Severn, is thus the only probable location for William Goizenboded's half-hide and half-fishery.⁹⁴

Lastly, there remains for identification Durand of Gloucester's three hides. Taylor initially suggested as a possible location the main manor of Minsterworth, which is not mentioned by name in *DB*, but finally followed Rudder in identifying *Hamme* in Longbridge hundred (fol. 165c, 10, 8) as Minsterworth; *Hamme* is, however, undoubtedly Highnam.⁹⁵ Walker nevertheless rejected this identification with Minsterworth on the grounds that it had been part of Henry I's royal demesne and was only granted to Earl Roger in 1154–5: but it is difficult to sustain this argument in the face of charters, printed by Walker himself, showing Earl Roger disposing of lands in Minsterworth before that date.⁹⁶ In any case the Gloucester family, as hereditary sheriffs of Gloucestershire, tended to treat royal demesne and their own estates as interchangeable, an important example of which is relevant to our argument.

As we shall shortly see, the history of Minsterworth in the Norman period is indeed complex, but it is true that Minsterworth is the only sizeable estate in Westbury hundred not mentioned by name in *DB*,⁹⁷ and the identification of Durand's three hides as Minsterworth also conforms to the normal Anglo-Saxon practice of assessing geld in units or multiples of five hides. A memorandum, admittedly late, in St Peter's abbey cartulary stated that Hampton (probably the original centre of Minsterworth north of the Westbury-Gloucester road) 'is within the lordship of Minsterworth and belongs to the manor of Highnam';⁹⁸ St Peter's manors of Churcham, Highnam and Morton were assessed at twelve hides in 1086 (fol. 165c, 10, 8, 11) which with Durand's three hides would constitute an original unit of fifteen hides conforming to the five hides system. Against this it could be argued that Highnam is in a different hundred (Longbridge) from the other manors, but Longbridge is clearly not a normal hundred, its constituent manors totalling only twelve hides (fols. 164d, 2, 13 (Lassington), 165c, 10, 8–9 (Highnam and Preston), 167c, 37, 1 (Murcott)), rather an *ad hoc* grouping not recorded after 1086. A further point in favour of the grouping of Durand's three hides with Churcham, Highnam and Morton, and for identifying these three hides as Minsterworth, is the very name, 'the enclosure belonging to the monastery', first recorded c.1030,⁹⁹ which must refer to St Peter's abbey as owner some time before 1066, and this confirms the later memorandum in the abbey cartulary cited previously.

The key to solving this muddle is provided by a curious transaction, also recorded in the abbey cartulary, in which Roger of Gloucester in 1102 gave to Abbot Serlo of Gloucester Sandhurst, Hatherley and the land of Ulfketel in exchange for 'what the abbot had in Westbury'.¹⁰⁰ The transaction is curious because Roger of Gloucester in his own right, as son of Durand, held only Lassington, 'the land of Ulfketel', and that only as subtenant of the archbishop of York (fol. 164d,

2, 13); Sandhurst and Hatherley were part of the *terra regis* over which at best Roger could only exercise temporary administrative control. Given the power of the Gloucester family and their increasing standing with the Crown, this transaction was unlikely to be challenged until Earl Roger fell from royal favour in 1155 (it may well have had Henry I's implicit consent anyway) but its dubious nature would explain the need for its confirmation by Henry II in the changed circumstances of 1154–55.¹⁰¹ If we then ask 'what the abbot had in Westbury' in 1102, the only possible answer, since the abbey's existing rights in Churcham were carefully safeguarded in that exchange, and Churcham remained an abbey estate down to the Reformation, must be Minsterworth, to which presumably Abbot Serlo had made good a longstanding claim by the abbey on Durand's death c.1095. Roger was therefore forced to repurchase Minsterworth, which he accomplished at little cost to his family by alienating part of the King's land as well as Lassington; when Henry II came to investigate the affair nearly two generations later, he would naturally claim that Minsterworth, obtained by the unauthorized granting-away of royal demesne, should itself be regarded as royal demesne in Henry I's time, which would need to be confirmed to Earl Roger by a fresh charter.¹⁰² Certainly, as has already been stated, Earl Roger was in possession of Minsterworth before 1154–5, and, with that sole objection removed, it can safely be identified with Durand's three hides in Westbury.

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 Mediaeval 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 *Domesday Book* and thus provoked the writing of this work and to his literary executor, Professor J. McN. Dodgson, Department of English, University College, London, who has seen the Phillimore Domesday translation series through to completion, greatly to its advantage; to my colleagues and students in the School of History for suffering the recurrent mention of Domesday matters with exemplary fortitude, especially to Professor W. Doyle, Head of the Department of History, who has given me the welcome opportunity to run a Special Topic course on 'Domesday England, 1066–1135'. Finally, and not least, I am grateful to Leila Evans and Anne Griffiths, successive secretaries in the Department of Economic and Social History, who coped admirably in producing the final draft typescript, and to my wife Brenda who, in the traditional manner of academic wives, has added proof-reading to her other virtues.

Notes

1. A.H. Smith, 'Place Names of Gloucestershire' (*English Place Names Society* 39–43 (1963) [hereafter *PNGI*] 2, 206–7. References to Domesday Book (*DB*) are to the folio, column, chapter number, and paragraph number in the Phillimore edition, since this is the only edition with national coverage which permits precise citation of individual entries. All references are to the Gloucestershire folios unless the chapter number is preceded by an abbreviation for another county.
2. A. Saltman, *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London 1956), 476–7 (1150); C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard of Stanley' (*Archaeologia* (2nd ser) 21 (1921), 204–5) (1157); H. Hall, *Red Book of the Exchequer* (Rolls Series 99 (1896), parts 1–3) 1, 298 (1166); W.H. Hart, *Historia et Cartularium Monasterii Sancti Petri Gloucestriae* (Rolls Series 33 (1863–7), parts 1–3) 3, 12, 15 (1191).
3. C.S. Taylor, 'Berkeley Minster' (*TBGAS* 19 (1895), 70–84).
4. B.R. Kemp, 'The Churches of Berkeley Hernesse' (*TBGAS* 87 (1968), 96–110, esp.99–103). The history of the

- priory is examined in R. Graham, 'The Priory of Stanley St Leonard' (*VCH (Glos)* 2, 72-3); C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard'; C. Swynnerton, 'Stanley St Leonards' (*TBGAS* 44 (1922), 221-69); C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard of Stanley' (*Antiq J* 9 (1929), 13-25).
5. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 106, 113-4; A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 476-7. The charters allegedly confirming the transfer of the priory to St Peter's, Gloucester, by 1138 (W.H. Hart, *Glos Cart* 1, 222-8; A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 334) have been exposed as forgeries (A. Morey & C.N.L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and his Letters* (Cambridge 1965), 125-7).
 6. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 2, 69.
 7. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 106, 113; S. Ayscough & J. Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae auctoritate Papae Nicolai IV* (London 1802), 220-1; J. Caley & J. Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus tempore Henrici VIII* (London, 6 vols, 1810-34) 2, 419.
 8. As given in Henry II's confirmation-charter of 1157 (C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard of Stanley' (*Archaeologia* (2nd ser) 21 (1921), 204)), though the text of this charter does not support Swynnerton's description of it as a reconfirmation of Henry I's confirmation-charter and is clearly corrupt, since it refers to Leonard Stanley as Maisemore (C. Swynnerton, 202-4). The virgate in Leonard Stanley is stated in the *carta* of 1166 (Hall, *Red Book* 1, 292) to be 'of old enfeoffment', i.e. dating from before 1135.
 9. C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard of Stanley' (*Archaeologia* (2nd ser) 21 (1921), 204); W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 106; 113; 3, 31; A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 476-7; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 224; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419, 498.
 10. C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard of Stanley' (*Archaeologia* (2nd ser) 21 (1921), 204); Hall, *Red Book* 1, 292; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 233; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 11. C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard of Stanley' (*Archaeologia* (2nd ser) 21 (1921), 204-5); Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 224; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 12. The result of collating the donations recorded in 1146 (W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 106, 113-4) and in Archbishop Theobald's confirmation charter of 1150 (A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 476-7).
 13. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 114 (dated 1156; *recte* 1146); 3, 31; A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 476-7; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419, 494.
 14. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 106, 113; 3, 31; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 15. A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 476-7; C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard'; C. Swynnerton, 'Stanley St Leonards' (*TBGAS* 44 (1922), 233-52, 266-9); Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 221; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 496.
 16. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 106, 113; 2, 69; 3, 31; A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 476-7; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419, 493.
 17. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 27, 106, 113-4.
 18. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 113; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 221; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 19. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 106, 113; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419, 494.
 20. A. Saltman, *Theobald*, 476-7; C. Swynnerton, 'The Priory of St Leonard of Stanley' (*Archaeologia* (2nd ser) 21 (1921), 204-5); Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 193; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 3, 32; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 21. It is doubtful whether the grant of Berkeley mill by Roger, son of Maurice de Berkeley, c.1217-9 (W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 64) ever took effect; in 1219-20 the mill was granted to St Augustine's abbey, Bristol (I.H. Jeayes, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Charters and Manuscripts . . . at Berkeley Castle* (Bristol 1892), 56) and was subsequently included in the abbey manor of Canonbury (A. Sabin, 'Some Manorial Accounts of St Augustine's Abbey, Bristol' (*Bristol Record Society* 22 (1960), 148)).
 22. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 64, 319; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 23. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 73, 113-4, 242-3; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 233; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 24. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 27, 114; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 233; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 25. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 65; 3, 20-2, 31; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
 26. Newington is once mentioned among the advowsons belonging to St Peter's abbey (including St Leonard's priory) (W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 3, 31) but no other evidence for any connection between this church and either abbey or priory exists: *cp.* Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 493.
 27. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 486.
 28. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 221; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 3, 31; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.

29. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 3, 31; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
30. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 220; *cp.* Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 419.
31. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 233.
32. Hall, *Red Book* 1, 293, 298.
33. *PNGI* 2, 234–5, 248.
34. *Glos. R.O.* V5/274T/1–2.
35. *Glos. R.O.* V5/115T/1–3, 5–7.
36. C.S. Taylor, *An Analysis of the Domesday Survey of Gloucestershire* (Bristol 1889), 202; *PNGI* 3, 179.
37. H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, *The Book of Fees* (3 vols., London 1920) 1, 439, 443; S.J. Madge, E.A. Fry & E. Stokes, *Abstracts of Inquisitions post Mortem for Gloucestershire 4–6* (British Record Society 30 (1903), 40 (1910), 47 (1914)) 4, 3–4, 60; 5, 106–9, 160.
38. A.S. Ellis, 'On the Landholders of Gloucestershire named in Domesday Book' (*TBGAS* 4 (1880), 133–4); H.W.C. Davis, H.C. Johnson, R.H.C. Davis, H.A. Cronne, *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum* (Oxford, 3 vols, 1913–68) 2, 102; *Pipe Roll* for [hereafter *P.R.*] 31 Henry I, 77; Hall, *Red Book* 1, 283; I.J. Sanders, *English Baronies: their Origins and Descent, 1086–1327* (Oxford, 1960), 73, n.7.
39. Davis, Johnson, Davis & Cronne, *Regesta* 3, 150. This charter supports the narrative of the Lanthony Chronicle (A. Caley & B. Bandinel, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (London, 6 vols, 1817–30) 6, 134), which has been doubted (W.E. Wightman, *The Lacy Family in England and Normandy, 1066–1194* (Oxford, 1966), 181).
40. Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 24, 159–60 (Mitcheldean, Littledean), 230–1 (English Bicknor); *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem* 2, 8; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 4; 5, 336 (Little Taynton, the last Gloucestershire property of the Kilpecks, who held it until the 1240s). In the mid-12th century Earl Roger held Minsterworth, and his daughter Margaret de Bohun held Murcott later in the 12th century, her subtenant, William de Mara, being Walter of Gloucester's nephew (D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford, 1095–1201' (*Camden Society* (4th ser) 1 (1964), 26, 34–5, 38, 72)). In 1316 Henry of Lancaster was sole lord of the vill of Minsterworth (H.C. Maxwell-Lyte, *Inquisitions and Assessments relating to Feudal Aids* (London 1900, 6 vols) 2, 268) and was lord of the manor of Minsterworth at his death in 1361; the Butlers and Hathways held their lands in Murcott of the Earls of Lancaster (Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 5, 164–5; 6, 1–2, 15–6, 21).
41. *P.R.* 31 Hen. II, 147; *P.R.* 32 Hen. II, 120; *P.R.* 8 Ric. I, 108; *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem* 2, 195–6; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 6, 49–50, 159.
42. Taylor, *Analysis*, 207, 321; *PNGI* 3, 258; *cp.* *VCH (Glos)* 10, 103–4, 107–8.
43. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 61, 110, 123, 203, 334; Davis, Johnson, Davis & Cronne, *Regesta* 2, 105. For the redating of the supposed charter of William I from 1086 to 1096, see *ibid.* 2, 403, note to no. 379a, which is supported by the abbey's list of donations (W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 110: *rege Willelmo Confirmante juniore*), for the identification of Rodele as Ruddle in Newnham rather than Rodley in Westbury-on-Severn, see *VCH (Glos)* 10, 37–8, 89.
44. Maxwell-Lyte, *The Book of Fees*, 439, 443; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 34; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* I, 115, 203–4; 3, 47–8.
45. Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids* 2, 251, 285, 298.
46. R.J. Kerr, 'Notes on the Borough and Manor of Newnham' (*TBGAS* 28 (1894), 169); *Glos. R.O.* GDR/T1/12, 129; *Glos. R.O.* D15/16; *Glos. R.O.* D265/M10. A similar conflict of sources occurs with regard to the north-eastern boundary of Ruddle in Newnham: though both the 1618 map and the 1840–92 manorial perambulations name Callo Pill as the northern boundary, the Tithe Map included nine acres called 'Underhill' beyond Callo Pill within Ruddle Tithing (field nos. 311–2, 742–3) and earlier deeds definitely locate these fields within Ruddle (*Glos. R.O.* D154/T4).
47. Taylor, *Analysis*, 154; *PNGI* 1, 165; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 69, 112, 123, 223, 226, 235–6, 350, 352; 2, 126, 128, 229; 3, 181, 183. Eastington is also described as a chapelry of Northleach in 1535 (Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 448).
48. Hall, *Red Book* 1, 300; Maxwell-Lyte, *The Book of Fees* 1, 38; M. Hollings, 'The Red Book of Worcester' (*Worcestershire Historical Society*, 4 parts, 1934–50) 4, 380, 405, 412, 414–5, 430, 436, 448–9; Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids* 2, 234, 252; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 211–3; 5, 315; 6, 225; *Glos. R.O.* Q/RE/Henbury Hundred.
49. Hollings, *Red Book of Worcester* 4, 380–1, 405–6, 413–7, 429–30, 433, 437; Maxwell-Lyte, *The Book of Fees* 1, 38. The survey of '1182' has been redated to c.1165–6 (R.R. Darlington, 'The Cartulary of Worcester Cathedral Priory' (*Pipe Roll Society*, N.S. 38 (1968), lxiii, n.9); M.G. Cheney, *Roger, Bishop of Worcester* (Oxford 1980), 57, 108–11).
50. C.D. Ross, M. Devine, *The Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey* (Oxford, 3 vols, 1964, 1980) 1, xxii, 22, 137, 140, 150, 157, 161, 164, 298; 2, 368–78, 381–2, 408; 3, 814–5, 905–6; *GRO GDR/V6/21*. The site of the rectory grange has been located near the junction of High Street and Cambray Place: the area of the rectory estate in the 17th century

- was 224 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres (B. Rawes, 'Three Properties of Cirencester Abbey in the Cheltenham area', *Cbelt Loc Hist Soc J* 1 (1983), 1-4).
51. E.A. Fuller, 'Cirencester: the Manor and the Town' (*TBGAS* 9 (1885), 298-344); E.A. Fuller, 'Medieval Cirencester' (*TBGAS* 54 (1932), 107-15); W. St Clair Baddeley, *History of Cirencester* (Cirencester, 1924), 83-219; R. Graham, 'The Abbey of Cirencester' (*VCH (Glos)* 2, 79-84); C.D. Ross, M. Devine, *Cartulary of Cirencester Abbey* 1, xix-xx, xxii, xxvi, xxxii.
 52. *VCH (Glos)* 6, 238-9; 8, 27-8, 97-100, 269-70.
 53. J.S. Moore, 'The Gloucestershire Section of Domesday Book: geographical problems of the text, part 1' (*TBGAS* 105 (1987), 126-7).
 54. Matson is recorded as a chapelry of Barton in 1291 (Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 224) and remained a chapelry until the 14th century (W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 100, 328; 2, 41, 259; 3, 31); thereafter it is usually termed a rectory, though sometimes a vicarage (*VCH (Glos)* 4, 445). It has been suggested on topographical grounds that Matson was once part of Upton St Leonards (*ibid.*, 438). Dr Jurica does not attempt to disentangle 'the earlier descent of estates at Matson . . . obscured by a complex pattern of landholding', but his account does not contradict my own reconstruction of Matson's earlier history (*ibid.*, 440-3).
 55. D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 13-4, 17, 43; Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 232; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 423; *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of Henry VIII* 17, 488; 18, pt 2, 242; 'Lands of Dissolved Religious Houses' (*PRO Lists and Indexes, Supplementary Series* 3, pt 1, 164; *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1560-3*, 132; *VCH (Glos)* 4, 422).
 56. J.N. Langston, 'Priors of Lanthony by Gloucester' (*TBGAS* 63 (1942), 44); W. Bazeley, 'Some Records of Matson in the County of Gloucester, and of the Selwyns' (*TBGAS* 2 (1878), 244-5, 250-1); W. Bazeley, 'Matson in Tudor and early Stuart Times' (*TBGAS* 46 (1925), 327-38); *Glos. R.O.* D2957/201/18, 25-8, 30, 34, 39, 44-9.
 57. R. Atkyns, *The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire* (London 1712), 551-2; S. Rudder, *A New History of Gloucestershire* (Cirencester 1779), 541-2; T. Rudge, *The History of the County of Gloucester* (Gloucester 1803) 2, 172-4; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 6, 69-70; *cp.* *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem* 13, 141-2; *VCH (Glos)* 10, 208-9.
 58. W. Bazeley, 'Matson in Tudor and early Stuart Times', 326, 332, 343; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 3, 67-8; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 6, 79-80; *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem, Henry VIII* 3, 184; *Glos. R.O.* D2957/201/9, 23, 32-3, 37, 40-3, 53-4, 58; *VCH (Glos)* 4, 441.
 59. In the 17th and 18th centuries the Dean and Chapter's estate was centred on Robinswood Farm, named after the Robins family who were tenants from 1526 to 1759 (W. Bazeley, 'Some Records of Matson', 241, 249-50; W. Bazeley, 'Matson in Tudor and early Stuart Times', 327, 348; *Glos. R.O.* D936/E 73; D1740/E 1, ff.120r-lv; D936/E 180, E327), but earlier Sneedham and other parts of Upton St Leonards, especially around Saintbridge, had also been part of this estate (*Glos. R.O.* D2957/201/18, 25-8, 30; D1609/VI/1A, 2A, 13; D1609/VII/8, 10, 12A, 14; D1609/IX/16; D1609/X/1A); *VCH (Glos)* 4, 443.
 60. D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 54.
 61. William Brito began his career as the bishop of London's steward from 1091 to c.1110 (M. Gibbs, 'Early Charters of the Cathedral Church of St Paul, London' (*Camden Soc.* 3rd ser, 58 (1939), 45, 137); Davis, Johnson, Davis & Cronne, *Regesta* 1, 82; 2, 53) but apparently transferred his services to Walter of Gloucester and his family, probably when Walter of Gloucester became Constable c.1114. All his later activities were concentrated in Gloucestershire and Herefordshire, and he died c.1148 (D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 14, 19; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 103, 111; 2, 113, 150; M. Gibbs, 'Early Charters of St Pauls', 135; Davis, Johnson, Davis & Cronne, *Regesta* 3, 186; J.C. Davies, 'Cartae Antiquae Rolls, 11-20' (*Pipe Roll Society*, NS 30 (1960), 152)).
 62. D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 57; *VCH (Glos)* 10, 119, 216, 218-9.
 63. Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids* 2, 265.
 64. For *Morwent*, see J.S. Moore, 'The Gloucestershire Section of Domesday Book, part 1', 125-6. Longford is described as part of the 'fee of Sandhurst' c.1200 (W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 353); in 1535, the tithes of Longford were attached to Hempsted rectory (Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 424) but this was purely a matter of administrative convenience; *cp.* on the same page, the attachment of Brookthorpe and Harescombe to Painswick rectory.
 65. *DB*, fol. 170d, 78, 16; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 2, 102, 258; 3, 109; R. Atkyns, *The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire*, 630; S. Rudder, *A New History of Gloucestershire*, 634.
 66. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 224; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 499.
 67. R. Atkyns, *The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire*, 793-4; S. Rudder, *A New History of Gloucestershire*, 609.
 68. D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 17, 38; Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids* 2, 265; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 423.
 69. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 223; Maxwell-Lyte, *Feudal Aids* 2, 258; Caley & Hunter, *Valor Ecclesiasticus* 2, 441.

70. R. Atkyns, *The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire*, 585; S. Rudder, *A New History of Gloucestershire*, 578; I.M. Kirby, *Diocese of Gloucester: a Catalogue of the Records of the Bishop and Archdeacons* (Gloucester 1968), 204.
71. Ayscough & Caley, *Taxatio Ecclesiastica*, 224; R. Atkyns, *The Ancient and Present State of Gloucestershire*, 241; S. Rudder, *A New History of Gloucestershire*, 251.
72. D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 38; the bracketed phrase occurs in the mid-12th century confirmations (*ibid.*, 17, 43) and in all the other local grants listed in the 1095 charter.
73. H.C. Darby & G.R. Versey, *Domesday Gazetteer* (Cambridge 1977), 159, records among the 'anonymous holdings' 4 hides held by two men from Earl Hugh (*DB*, fol. 166c, 28, 5). Why is inexplicable, since the text unambiguously locates these lands in *Westone* which is undubitably Westonbirt (*PNGl* 1, 114; *VCH (Glos)* 11, 285–7), unless Darby was unable to add 3 hides and 1 hide of 1066 to equate with the 4 hides of 1086.
74. *VCH (Glos)* 11, 240; the appearance of geld acres is rare in the Gloucestershire section of *DB*. Part 4 will include an examination of all the holdings in the parish of Rodmarton.
75. *PNGl* 3, 101–2; J.S. Moore, *Domesday Book: Gloucestershire* (Chichester 1982), note to 1, 21; M. Sharp, 'Accounts of the Constables of Bristol Castle in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries' (*Bristol Record Society* 34 (1982), xxxix and references cited in n.212); *ex inf.* Mr A.G. Nott.
76. The bishop's return also includes, for Hambrook, the unique occurrence in the Gloucestershire section of *DB* of the 'teamland' formula: 'Land for 5 ploughs.'
77. *P.R. 2 Hen.II*, 49, and *passim* to *P.R. 26 Hen.III*, 248; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 19–20; 6, 18, 27, 45, 81. The last reference has a mangled text which should be corrected from *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem* 14, 50–1. Hugh de Gundeville's sister is entered as the holder until 1200 (*P.R. 2 John*, 118), thereafter her unnamed heir (*P.R. 3 John*, 40 *et seq.*).
78. L.J.U. Way, 'The 1625 Survey of the Smaller Manor of Clifton' (*TBGAS* 36 (1913), 220–50). Taylor, ignoring the later existence of a second manor of Clifton, thus wrongly stated that Clifton manor was coterminous with the parish in 1086 (C.S. Taylor, 'Bristol and its neighbourhood in Domesday' (*Proc Clifton Antiq Club* 2 (1893), 72)), though the existence of the second manor was known a generation earlier (A.J. Knapp, *Handbook to Clifton and its neighbourhood* (Bristol 1867), 13–7; A.S. Ellis, 'On the Manorial History of Clifton' (*TBGAS* 3 (1879), 211)). This second manor has now been identified as Clifton St Lawrence (J.S. Moore, *Clifton and Westbury Probate Inventories* (Bristol 1981), ix–x, xxviii–ix, xxxiv).
79. I.M. Kirby, *Diocese of Bristol: a Catalogue of the Records of the Bishop and Archdeacons and the Dean and Chapter* (Bristol 1970), 115, 117, 121–2; A. Sabin, 'Some Manorial Accounts of St Augustine's Abbey, Bristol', 110–3, 155–9.
80. J. Latimer, 'Clifton in 1746' (*TBGAS* 23 (1900), 312–22, reprinted in *Proc Clifton Antiq Club* 5 (1904), 25–34); Bristol R.O. AC/M 15/1, printed in L.J.U. Way, 'The 1625 Survey'; Bristol R.O. EP/A/32/12.
81. A.S. Ellis, 'On the Manorial History of Clifton', 221; J. Latimer, 'The Manor of Clifton' (*TBGAS* 16 (1892), 202–3).
82. A.S. Ellis, 'On the Manorial History of Clifton', 226; J. Latimer, 'The Manor of Clifton', 202–7; H.J. Wilkins, *Westbury College from 1194 to 1544* (Bristol 1917), 153; P.V. McGrath, *The Merchant Venturers of Bristol* (Bristol 1975), 88.
83. A. Sabin, 'Some Manorial Accounts', 155–6, citing the 'Red Book of St Augustine's' (Berkeley Castle MSS, Select Book 1); Bristol R.O. DC/E/11/3, 5, 14, 18.
84. Hollings, *Red Book of Worcester* 4, 354–60, 367. For the evidence of the Worcester 'satellites', see J.S. Moore, *Domesday Book: Gloucestershire*, note to Wo A 2.
85. Taylor, *Analysis*, 204; *VCH (Glos)* 10, 38–9, 46–7, 89, 98–9.
86. A.S. Ellis, 'On the Landholders of Gloucestershire', 132–3.
87. *PNGl* 3, 163–4; W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 99; 2, 32; D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 72.
88. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 73, 259–60; 2, 72, 128; D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 26.
89. J. Stephenson, 'Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon' (*Rolls Series* 2 (1858), pt 2, 102–3, 110); Davis, Johnson, Davis & Cronne, *Regesta* 2, 82.
90. Davis, Johnson, Davis & Cronne, *Regesta* 3, 37–8, 252, 309–10; Hall, *Red Book* 1, 157; Madge, Fry & Stokes, *Glos. I.P.M.* 4, 16, 49, 103, 232. The de Quincy Earls of Winchester held half the honour of Leicester from 1204 to 1264 (I.J. Sanders, *English Baronies*, 61–2).
91. *VCH (Glos)* 6, 19–20; B.A. Lees, *Records of the Templars in England in the Twelfth Century: the inquest of 1185* (London 1935), *passim*.
92. *VCH (Glos)* 6, 80.
93. D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 38, 72.
94. In 1839 the area of Duni bounded by streams to east and west and the Severn to the south was 132½ acres (*Glos R.O. GDR/T/121*, field nos. 162–233).
95. Taylor, *Analysis*, 204; *PNGl* 3, 159; Darby & Versey, *Domesday Gazetteer*, 152; *VCH (Glos)* 10, 17–8.

96. D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 26, 34; D. Walker, 'The "Honours" of the Earls of Hereford in the Twelfth Century' (*TBGAS* 79 (1960), 180–1). The original charter printed in D. Walker, 'Charters of the Earldom of Hereford', 34–5, is now Glos R.O. D2783, and the Glos R.O. calendar points out, firstly, that this charter can be more closely dated 1143–9, since one of its witnesses, William de Berkeley, was dead by 1149 and, secondly, that Awre manor is a precisely parallel case of a manor erroneously stated by Walker not to have been granted to Earl Roger until 1155, despite evidence that both Earl Miles and Earl Roger granted land there much earlier than 1155.
97. *VCH (Glos)* 10, 1, 3, explicitly includes Minsterworth in the Domesday hundred of Westbury.
98. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 331, n.2; Hampton is termed a township with its own church in 1148–79 but is included in the extent of Highnam in 1265 (*ibid.* 1, 88, 331–2; 3, 111).
99. *PNGI* 3, 162–3.
100. W.H. Hart, *Glos. Cart.* 1, 112, 352; 2, 128.
101. As we have already seen, Roger also used the royal demesne to endow St Peter's abbey with Coln Rogers in 1105 (above, 91).
102. As Walker points out, this charter exists only in a copy of c.1200, but its authenticity is established by the Pipe Rolls.

1982, with revisions to 1988