CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Tribal Hidage

Author(s): W. J. Corbett

Source: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, New Series, Vol. 14 (1900), pp. 187-230

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Royal Historical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3678152>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 04:55 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Historical Society, Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

THE TRIBAL HIDAGE

By W. J. CORBETT, M.A.

Read April 19, 1900

THE object of the present paper is to put forward a new theory in explanation of the curious list of old English districts with their hidages, or what purport to be their hidages, which is to be found printed in Birch's *Cartularium Saxonicum* (vol. i., 414), and to which attention has often been drawn, but most recently by Professor Maitland in his 'Domesday Book and Beyond' (p. 506) under the name of the 'Tribal Hidage.'

No less than six versions¹ of this list, all essentially similar, but each with its own variations in detail, are known, the most authoritative version, and the one adopted by Professor Maitland, being that contained in the Harleian MS. 3271. This is written in Anglo-Saxon, and is assigned by Mr. Birch to an eleventh or perhaps a tenth century date, whereas the others are apparently founded on later versions and are given in Latin. In outward form the list is merely a catalogue of 34 place-names, to each of which is assigned a number of hides, the numbers recorded being all multiples of 100, and ranging from 300 to 100,000 hides. In some instances the names of the districts are familiar, as, for instance, Kent or Lindsey, but the great majority cannot be

¹ These have been collated by Mr. Birch. The references are (i) *Harleian MS.* 3271 f. 6b. (ii) *Cotton MS.* D II. f. 1b. (iii) *Liber Albus*, ed. Riley. Rolls Series, vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 626. (iv) *MS. Hargrave*, 313 f. 15b. (v) Spelman, *Glossarium*, p. 292. (vi) Gale, *Rer. Angl. Scriptt.* vol. iii. p. 748.

recognised as corresponding with any names known to authentic history. The grand total of the hidages, as given in the Anglo-Saxon version, adds up to 244,100 hides, but none of the three versions of the list, which profess to make the calculation, give the amount correctly, or agree with one another in the totals they record. In one respect the Anglo-Saxon version is peculiar; for, in addition to giving the general total, it adds up the hidages of the first nineteen districts separately, and notes that their total amounts to 66,100 hides.

This brief introductory sketch of the Hidge will be sufficient to show what kind of questions arise with regard to its interpretation. To put it briefly, they are: What is the purport of the list? when and why was it compiled? where are the unknown places to be located? what, if any, is the relation between its hides and the hides recorded in the Domesday Survey? And lastly, though this may seem a minor matter, why did the compilers of the list think it necessary to stop after entering the first 19 districts and state that the total up to this point is 66,100 hides?

In attempting to answer these questions the first point to be observed is one that, up to the present time, seems to have escaped notice, but which in reality is of fundamental importance, if the significance of the Tribal Hidge is to be at all appreciated. It consists in the discovery that, if for the moment we leave out of consideration the 100,000 hides assigned to Wessex, with which the list closes, and also make one small emendation in the hidge figures as given in the Anglo-Saxon version (an emendation, however, which is justified by three of the later versions), the hides of the other 33 districts will be found to form a connected scheme. For it then becomes easy to show that these districts fall naturally into groups with hidages that are all based upon a common factor, while these again in their turn subdivide into smaller groups with hidages that are fractional parts of the totals of the original groups.

The common factor in question is the number 12,000,

a figure which is significant,¹ and whose interest is increased when we observe that the total hidage of these 33 districts, Wessex being excluded, is 144,000, or, to express it in a more telling way, $12 \times 12,000$ hides.

The emendation that has to be made in the hidage figures before this result can appear, relates to the assessment of the twelfth district in the list. The name of the district is Wigesta, and in the Anglo-Saxon version it is assigned 900 hides; but the versions contained in the Cottonian MS., the Liber Albus, and the Hargrave MS. all read, instead of 900, 800 hides, the first and last of the three having the number written in full as 'octingenta.' Adopting this reading we at once get rid of the odd 100 hides in the totals 66,100 and 244,100, and are able to see that the list is really a connected scheme as already stated.

The tables printed on page 191, one giving the Tribal Hidage as it is recorded in the oldest or Anglo-Saxon version, and the other the list as it appears when the territorial names are arranged in groups, shows better than any description what is the nature of the scheme, and how, when Wessex is excluded, the remaining items make six main groups with hidages of 30,000, 24,000, 12,000, 12,000, 30,000, and 36,000 hides respectively, all of which are multiples, or quite simple fractions, of 12,000 hides.

The object of giving two parallel tables is to show that this result can be obtained without materially disturbing the order in which the districts are named in the original record, a very important point. For, as will be seen, the only changes made are (1) the removal of the district called Hwinca, with its 7,000 hides, from its position next after the third group to a later point in the list, and (2) a slight rearrangement in the internal order of the second, fourth, and sixth groups. It should be observed, however, that

¹ It will be enough to remind the reader that in nine cases out of thirteen the so-called County Hidages are multiples of 1,200 hides (see Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 456), that the hide itself contains 120 acres, and the pound sterling twice 120 pence.

the first only of these changes is needed to bring out the existence of the six groups. The second has been made for a different purpose, the object being to show that the groups, which are composed of more than one item, can all alike be subdivided into two component parts with hidages that are in the proportion of 7 : 5 to one another ; also that this is not the limit of neat artificial-looking subdivisions, but that the sub-groups of 7,000 and 5,000 hides and their multiples are in many instances themselves divisible into smaller fractional parts with assessments that are all multiples of either 1,000 or 500 hides. Nor does this complete the tale of artificial arrangements that are found to be possible when these figures are systematically scrutinised ; for clearly, if the internal order of the fourth group is left as it stands in the manuscripts, its component items still subdivide into two sub-groups that have hidages that are in the proportion of 1 : 2 to one another.

Using the discovery just made of the artificial character of the Tribal Hidge as our starting-point, we may now approach the problem of identifying the position of the unknown territorial names with some chance of success. For, clearly, the existence of a system of groups within the list gives us a useful clue, implying, as it almost certainly does, that the items that compose any one group are not scattered about in different parts of England, but lie in the main adjacent to one another. The problem, therefore, to be solved is narrowed down to establishing the general position of the groups ; for, if this is once satisfactorily ascertained, we shall have a sure key to the approximate position of the obscurer component districts. Nor is this the limit of simplification, for in all but two cases the general position of a group is already partly established for us by the occurrence within it of a name or names that we can identify with certainty. Consider, for example, the fourth group in the list. Here we have seven place-names that it would be almost hopeless to attempt to locate if they stood alone ; but being associated with Cilternsætna, which presumably means the

TABLE I

	Hides
Myrcnalandes ¹	30000
Wocensætna .	7000
Westerna .	7000
Pecsætna .	1200
Elmedsætna .	600
Lindesarona ²	7000
Suth Gyrwa .	600
North Gyrwa .	600
East Wixna .	300
West Wixna .	600
Spalda .	600
Wigesta [³ 800]	900
Herefinna .	1200
Sweodora .	300
Gifla .	300
Hicca .	300
Wihtgara .	600
Noxgaga .	5000
Ohtgaga .	2000
Thæt is	66100
Hwinca .	7000
Cilternsætna .	4000
Hendrica .	3500
Uneungga .	1200
Arosætna .	600
Færpinga ³	300
Bilmiga .	600
Widerigga .	600
East Willa .	600
West Willa .	600
East Engle .	30000
East Sexena .	7000
Cantwarena .	15000
Suth Sexena .	7000
West Sexena .	100000

This ealles 242700

TABLE II

	Hides	
I. Myrcnalandes .	30000	30000
Wocensætna .	7000	
Westerna .	7000	14000
Pecsætna .	1200	
II. Elmedsætna .	600	
Suth Gyrwa .	600	3000
North Gyrwa .	600	
Lindesarona .	7000	7000
East Wixna .	300	
West Wixna .	600	1500
Spalda .	600	
Wigesta .	800	
Herefinna .	1200	2000
III. Sweodora .	300	
Gifla .	300	
Hicca .	300	1500
Wihtgara .	600	
Noxgaga .	5000	
Ohtgaga .	2000	7000
Cilternsætna .	4000	4000
Arosætna .	600	
Bilmiga .	600	7000
Widerigga .	600	
IV. East Willa .	600	3000
West Willa .	600	
Færpinga .	300	
Uneungga .	1200	1500
Hendrica .	3500	3500
V. East Engle .	30000	30000
East Sexena .	7000	
VI. Suth Sexena .	7000	21000
Hwinca .	7000	
Cantwarena .	15000	15000
Total	144000	
VII. West Sexena .	100000	

district of Chiltern, it follows that we can, with some confidence, place them in the neighbourhood of Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire, in which the Chiltern Hundreds are situated. Similarly with Westerna and Wocensætna in the second group, being associated with Elmet, the presumption is that they are somewhere in Yorkshire or thereabouts.

Bearing these principles in mind we may now examine

¹ 'Thær mon ærest Myrcna hæst.'

² 'Mid Hæthfeld lande,' i.e. the district east of Doncaster.

³ 'Is in Midel Englu Færpinga.'

the groups in turn, and see what can be made of them ; but as it is a sound principle to argue from the known to the unknown rather than *vice versa*, and as the known districts are mostly towards the end of the list, it will be best, in the first instance, to turn our attention to the last three groups and Wessex, and leave till later the consideration of the first 19 districts, forming Groups I., II., and III., which, as we have seen, are marked off from the rest by having the total of their hides specially noted in the Anglo-Saxon version of the hidage.

Limited in the way indicated, the problem immediately before us presents no very great difficulties ; for a reference to the table shows that, as the identifications of Wessex, Sussex, Kent, Essex, and East Anglia are free from doubt, there are practically only two doubtful items in the second half of the list. These are Hwinca, with its 7,000 hides, and the 8,000 hides attached to the unknown names in Group IV. But with regard to the latter, as we have already seen, we have a fair idea where they are from their association with Cilternsætna ; so all we have to do is to make up our minds where to place Hwinca. This, however, is not so very doubtful, when we consider that all the other names in the group to which it belongs are names of kingdoms, that the name itself very much resembles Hwicca, and that in the list, as we find it in the manuscripts, this district is not entered with its group, but immediately precedes Cilternsætna. All these considerations evidently indicate that Hwinca, as has usually been supposed, does represent the kingdom of the Hwiccas ; but if this is so, it will fill up the counties of Herefordshire, Worcestershire, and Gloucestershire, and consequently the unknown districts associated with Cilternsætna cannot lie to the west of Oxfordshire. This means that, unless we place them to the north, and so away from all the other districts that follow them, they must, as they do in the list itself, occupy a position between the Chilterns and East Anglia and Essex. In other words, though we cannot recognise their names, we must see in them the districts

that went to form the counties of Middlesex, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, and perhaps Northamptonshire. Nor is this altogether a mere deduction from the various premises we have been arguing from. For having once tentatively placed these seven districts in this position, it seems permissible to point out that the counties named form a very suitably sized area for 8,000 hides, when, according to our hypothesis, the counties of the Hwiccas are to have 7,000, and Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire 4,000. At this point, too, we may take note of another indication which is clear as far as it goes, and which is contained in a marginal note inserted in the Anglo-Saxon version of the Tribal Hidage. This informs us that Færpinga, the fourth of the unknown districts in question, 'is in Midel Englu,' a statement that agrees with our provisional identification. For the hypothesis adopted clearly admits of Færpinga being located in the districts north of Cambridge and west of the Fens; and it is just this region that in early days must have formed part of Middle Anglia, or otherwise Peada, the king of the Middle Angles, in the seventh century, on his becoming a Christian, would not have commemorated the event by founding his great monastery at Peterborough in this neighbourhood. That Northamptonshire formed part of Middle Anglia, is, indeed, not open to doubt. For we know that the great bishop Wilfred died at Oundle in this county, and that his connexion with the monastery at this place arose from his being bishop of the Middle Angles.¹

It will appear subsequently that these are not the only, or indeed the most convincing, arguments that can be adduced to confirm the positions assigned to these doubtful districts; but for the moment let us provisionally accept the identifications arrived at, and point out that, *if* they are correct, and it must be admitted they seem eminently reasonable and consistent, then three very important corollaries can be established which themselves will serve

¹ Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 19.

as guides in the labyrinth, rendering the process of locating the remaining groups easier.

The first of these corollaries is that, as the 15 districts entered in the Tribal Hidage from Hwinca to Wessex appear to completely account for all that part of England which is situated south of a line starting along the north of Herefordshire and Worcestershire, and probably continuing along the north of Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire towards Peterborough and the Wash, then all the remaining districts entered in the first three groups must be located north of this line. The second corollary, and one that seems to throw a flood of light on our problem, is that the districts entered in the Tribal Hidage are named in their geographical order, the Cilternsætna in Oxfordshire, following the Hwiccas in Gloucestershire, Essex following East Anglia, Kent Essex, Sussex Kent, and so on. The third and remaining corollary is that, broadly speaking, the method of entering the names in the list is from north to south, though, of course, when England broadens out the direction has to be crossways as well in sweeps from west to east, or east to west.

Having deduced all we can from the consideration of the names in the second or easier half of the Tribal Hidage, easier because the proportion of known names is considerable, we may now turn to Groups I., II., and III., and see what can be made of them with the help of the conclusions we have come to in considering Groups IV., V., and VI. For it is clear that, however we may interpret it, the Tribal Hidage should be regarded as a consistent whole, and so any principles of interpretation we have evolved from studying the second half of it must equally apply and be applied to the first half. Working in accordance with these conditions, we shall find that after all there is really not so very much latitude as to where the remaining groups are to be located. For, if the northerly districts precede the southerly in our list, and if the districts are entered in geographical sequence, then Group III., with its 12,000 hides and 11 obscure place-

names, must represent the kingdom of Mercia—the Mercia, that is, of early days, when it had its centre on the upper Trent in the neighbourhood of Retford and Lichfield, and was confined to the territory stretching east and west of these places between the lands of the Southumbrians in Lincolnshire and the Welsh border. For, to satisfy our principles of interpretation, this group has to lie southward of the districts of the Peak, Elmet, and Lindsey in Group II., whose position is fixed, and also reach as far as Hwinca, the district which follows it in the list, and which we have already located in Herefordshire and Worcestershire. Similarly with Group II. The known districts it contains locate its southern portion, and show that this extended northwards from the Gyrwa or fenland through Lindsey and the districts lying north of the Peak,¹ now comprised in the West Riding, to Elmet near York. So far, then, there is no doubt. But having got as far as York, it is hardly possible not to believe that Wocenæstna and Westerna, the two remaining districts of the group, continue the sequence northwards and represent the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire with the district of Amounderness in Lancashire, so that in the group as a whole we have the early kingdoms of Southumbria and Deira.²

Finally, still following northwards, we have the comparatively large district of Myrcnalandes to account for, and this, in spite of the name apparently suggesting an identification with Mercia, must, if there is anything in our method, equate with the kingdom of Bernicia.

¹ Previous commentators have usually placed the Pecsætna in Derbyshire south of the Peak, and they will be found entered there in the map of 'England before the Conquest,' contained in Poole's Historical Atlas. There seems to be no reason, however, why they should not equally well be placed north of the Peak, especially as the Anglian settlers, pushing inland from the Humber, would first approach the Peak from the north and east.

² An independent indication that Deira was originally made up of two divisions is perhaps to be seen in the plan brought forward in 691 by Aldfrith, king of Northumbria, and opposed by Wilfrid, for creating a bishopric of Ripon, separate from the see of York; for the bishoprics of early times, as a rule, corresponded with political divisions. (Eddi's *Vita Wilfridi*, § 45; ap. *Historians of York*, I., Rolls Series.)

By utilising one or two small indications, and steadily applying the same principles of interpretation, all the groups have now been approximately located in a way that is at any rate consistent, and which further has the merit of making the Tribal Hidage an intelligible document, drawn up on an intelligible principle. For no one can have followed the various steps of our argument, without seeing, that if the interpretation is at all well founded, then the Hidage is a scheme presumably of taxation, covering the whole of England, and that the groups in it correspond to the kingdoms into which the island was divided, just about the time of the general introduction of Christianity in the first half of the seventh century.¹ The order, too, in which the kingdoms are mentioned fits in with this interpretation, for at this period Northumbria was the leading kingdom, and so the list naturally leads off with Bernicia, which was the home of the ruling dynasty. It may be objected that this is all very well, but that we are begging the whole question of the date of the document. But this is not so, for such indications as we have of its date all agree with this hypothesis. Take, for instance, such names as Elmsætna, Gyrwa, and Cilternsætna, all of them names of districts of sufficient importance in Bede's time to be mentioned by him in his 'Ecclesiastical History,' but of none at all afterwards, and couple with this the fact that so many of the names are entirely obsolete, and it will be obvious that to assign the document to an early date is quite plausible. In harmony, too, with this view is the fact, dwelt on by Professor Maitland and other previous commentators, that there is an agreement between the Tribal Hidage and some statements made by Bede concerning the kingdom of Sussex and the Isle of Ely; for Bede relates² that in his time Sussex was reckoned to contain 7,000 families and Ely 600, whereas the

¹ In discussing Group IV., we did not actually identify it with any kingdom, but in the light of what has followed it is clear that the group as a whole, and not only some parts of it, may be identified with Middle Anglia

² Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 13, 19.

Tribal Hidage gives Sussex 7,000 hides and the Southern Gyrwa 600 hides. The point, in fact, as to the date of our document need not be further laboured, the majority of commentators agreeing that, if it is authentic at all, it must be very ancient. We see, then, that from every point of view, excepting perhaps the necessity of taking the name Myrcnaland as a mistake for Bernicia and not as the equivalent of Mercia,¹ our interpretation is fairly satisfactory, but that what it lacks to make it really convincing is some further testimony to support it that is not deduced from the internal evidence of the hidage itself, but derived from independent external sources.

Looking about for such testimony, we seem to find something in the nature of what we want in another of those passages in Bede's history which tell us how many families were estimated to belong to various districts. This time Bede is speaking about Mercia under Oswy, just after the death of Penda in 652, and he describes it as consisting of North and South Mercia divided by the Trent, the one kingdom having 7,000, the other 5,000 families.² Mercia, therefore, at this date had all the characteristics of the third group in the Tribal Hidage, which we have imagined to represent it, namely, a total assessment, as compared with other districts, of 12,000 of the standard units of measurement, made up of two component parts of 7,000 and 5,000 units respectively. Our provisional identification, therefore, of Group III. is not only rendered more probable, but can now be carried a step further, and we can assign Noxgaga and Ohtgaga with their 7,000 hides to North Mercia, and the remaining nine smaller districts to South Mercia.

It will be admitted that this evidence from Bede, tallying so neatly with the phenomena of the Tribal Hidage, and

¹ On the other hand, it should not be overlooked that even the copyist of the earliest version of the Tribal Hidage recognised a difficulty in this district; for a marginal note is inserted attempting an explanation to the effect that it is Mercia in a very old sense of the term, 'Thær mon ærest Myrcna hæet.'

² Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 24.

proving that in the England of the seventh century the unit of 12,000 and the division of this unit in the proportion of 7 : 5 were both in vogue, goes a long way towards establishing both the correctness of our conclusions so far, and the general trustworthiness of the Tribal Hidage as an authentic record. The more, however, we can supplement such evidence the better ; for too much corroboration is an impossibility. It is satisfactory, therefore, to find that at this stage we can adduce an argument, drawn from facts recorded in Domesday Book, that will not only fit in with the contentions we have already brought forward, but throw a most unexpected light on the whole meaning and purport of the hidage scheme, and also perhaps on much else in English fiscal history.

The gist of the argument we are about to propound is easily stated. It consists in the discovery that, if we count up the hundreds mentioned in the Domesday surveys of the eight counties we have provisionally identified with Group IV. and at the same time allow half hundreds, and double hundreds, and such like multiples to count, not as units, but in their proper proportions, as $\frac{1}{2}$, 2, and so on, we shall find that, whereas Group IV. has 12,000 hides, which may be expressed as 120×100 hides, the total number of hundreds in the eight counties in 1086 was 120. Secondly, that these counties, in some cases when taken singly, in other cases when two are combined together, have assigned to them a number of hundreds that is a simple fraction of this total of 120, for example Northamptonshire 30 hundreds, Middlesex and Hertfordshire 15 hundreds. Thirdly, that these fractions are in the same proportions one to the other as the hidages of the sub-groups into which Group IV. is divisible. Fourthly, if we extend our inquiries, we shall find that this phenomenon is not confined to the districts comprised in Group IV., but applies also to Hwinca, which we have identified with the kingdom of the Hwiccas. For Hwinca has 7,000 hides, and the number of hundreds in the counties of Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and Herefordshire com-

bined, as recorded in Domesday, appears to be 70. The conviction, in fact, is forced upon us that in these central districts of England the Hidage scheme and the Domesday Hundred scheme are to all intents parallel, as can be easily seen from the comparative table given below, the Domesday portions of which are based upon details which will be found at length in an Appendix.

TRIBAL HIDAGE			'DOMESDAY'		
		Hides			Hundreds
Cilternsætna . . .		4000	Oxfordshire ¹ . . .	22	
Arosætna . . . 600	} 7000		Buckinghamshire ² . . .	18	40
Bilmiga . . . 600			Northamptonshire ³ . . .		30
Widerigga . . . 600		3000	Cambridgeshire ⁴ . . .		15
E. Willa . . . 600			Huntingdonshire ⁵ . . .	8	20
W. Willa . . . 600	} 5000		Bedfordshire . . .	12	15
Færpinga . . . 300		1500	Hertfordshire . . .	9½	
Unecungga . . . 1200			Middlesex . . .	5½	
Hendrica . . .		3500			
Total . . .		12000	Total . . .		120
Hwinca . . .		7000	Worcestershire . . .		12
			Gloucestershire . . .	(? 40)	39
			Herefordshire . . .	(? 18)	19

¹ The Oxfordshire hundred scheme is remarkable for its symmetry. Eleven hundreds lie to the west of the river Cherwell, and eleven to the east, the eastern group being in its turn subdivided into two groups of five and a half hundreds by the river Thame (see Appendix).

² The Buckinghamshire hundreds, as is well known, are in six groups of three (*Domesday Studies*, vol. i. p. 75).

³ The two hundreds of Wiceslea, east and west, which form part of Rutland, but which in 1086 were attached to Northamptonshire and surveyed with it, are not included in this total. The district of Wigesta in the Southern Mercian group may possibly be identifiable with these hundreds.

⁴ The two hundreds of Ely are not included in this reckoning, the district of South Gyrwa being entered in the Tribal Hidage in the second or Southumbrian group. It should not be forgotten that the Isle of Ely has always, even down to the present day, been reckoned a separate jurisdiction from Cambridgeshire proper.

⁵ The Domesday Survey and later records only reckon four hundreds in Huntingdonshire. It would appear, however, that they had once been reckoned as eight, for not only are they all assessed at 200 hides, or thereabouts, which is about twice as much as any other hundreds anywhere in this neighbourhood, but there is an ancient Peterborough document in Birch's *Cartulary* (vol. iii. p. 367, No. 1128), which speaks of the northernmost of these hundreds as the two hundreds of Normancross, 'of tham twam hundredum the secæd into Normannes cros.' Domesday also, in referring to the hundred of Leytonstone, once speaks of the hundred of Kimbolton, thus, perhaps, preserving a trace of the former

It is evident that in these figures we have hit upon something that is entirely novel; for no one has hitherto supposed that the number of the hundreds in any part of England made anything like an artificial scheme. And yet, when we come to consider it, this should not be unexpected, or otherwise why should the hundreds in central England be so carefully reckoned in the eleventh century, some as double hundreds, some as 'other half' hundreds, and so on? It seems certain, too, that all this must have a considerable bearing on the vexed questions connected with the origin and meaning of the hundreds. For the moment, however, we cannot turn aside to consider what the bearing may be, but must return to the question of identifying the sub-districts in Group IV. In this matter the evidence we now have is pretty conclusive, and seems to remove the possibility of our whole hypothesis having been on false lines. The probability, in fact, now seems almost the other way; and it seems fair to assume not only that Group IV. in general represents the Middle Anglian kingdom, but that the ancient boundaries of that kingdom and of its subdivisions are still preserved in the boundaries of the eight counties covered by the group. For example, it hardly seems possible to doubt that Cilternsætna with its 4,000 hides not only corresponds generally with the regions adjacent to the Chiltern Hundreds, but that it is actually identical with, and had the same boundaries as, the 40 hundreds of Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire combined. Similarly the five districts, with obscure names and 600 hides apiece, must almost certainly be identical with the 30 hundreds of Northamptonshire.¹

division of this hundred. In spite of this alteration in the way of reckoning Huntingdonshire, the Domesday Survey still gives 120 hundreds to Middle Anglia as a whole; for the loss of four hundreds in Huntingdonshire is made up for by the two hundreds of Ely added to Cambridgeshire, and the two Rutlandshire hundreds added to Northamptonshire.

¹ It seems possible to identify one of these districts of 600 hides with the six hundreds in the south-west of Northamptonshire which have the Roman town of Towcester as a centre, viz., Clayley, Towcester, Norton, Warden, Sutton, and Alboldstow, and which are differentiated in Domesday from their neighbours by peculiar features connected with their hidation (see Round, *Engl. Hist. Rev.*

Whether *Færpinga* and *Unecungga* really equate with Cambridgeshire is not so clear, a doubt being raised by the resemblance of the latter name to Huntingdon. For we have only to change the 'c' of *Unecungga* into a 't,' a form of clerical error that is very common, and the two names are not so very dissimilar. On the other hand, if we do this and regard *Unecungga* as Huntingdonshire, then we have to suppose that the modern county boundaries in this case do not preserve the limits of the older districts, an inference which spoils the consistency of our interpretation. Altogether, then, in the absence of any decisive indication, it seems best to avoid this latter dilemma, and imagine Cambridgeshire to be meant, thus leaving it possible to consider *Hendrica*, with its 3,500 hides, as the exact equivalent of the 35 hundreds of Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, and Middlesex.¹

All the districts entered in the Tribal Hidage have now been assigned to definite positions, with the exception of the component items of North and South Mercia entered in Group III. Here we cannot hope to get a definite clue by counting up the hundreds, for the greater part of the district is divided into wapentakes, which do not appear to be by any means the same thing. It seems, however, reasonable to argue that, if in Group IV. the sub-groups correspond with counties or clusters of counties, the same is to be expected in Group III. We accordingly apply this principle, and anyhow, as regards South Mercia, lying between the Trent and Welland, appear to get a

1900, p. 82n.). It is also tempting to locate East and West Willa along the Nene between Northampton and Oundle. For here we have a district, centring round the Roman town of Ircchester, which has Wellingborough and Wilby as its centre, the hundred of Wileybrook to the northward, and the Bedfordshire hundred of Wiley to the southward. Similarly it is not impossible to see a connection between *Widderigga* and the townships of 'Widerintone' and 'Witeringham,' near Peterborough.

¹ It seems natural at this point to remark how appositely *Hendrica* to the north of Thames is balanced by *Suthrice* to the south. I am informed, however, by Mr. W. H. Stevenson that it is improbable that Surrey means the southern kingdom.

satisfactory result. For here we have three sub-groups to dispose of, containing respectively 1,500, 2,000, and 1,500 hides, and these seem to fit in well, the first with Kesteven, the second with Rutland and Leicestershire, and the third with Warwickshire.¹ Turning to the 7,000 hides of North Mercia, the clues used so far all fail us in trying to distinguish between Noxgaga and Ohtgaga. All we can say is that Noxgaga, from its position in the list, ought to lie along the Trent adjoining the counties of South Mercia, that Ohtgaga should probably be somewhere to the west of it,² and that the two together must account for Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, and Cheshire, and the lands between the Mersey and the Ribble. For these last are hidated, not carucated, districts in Domesday, and always formed part of the Mercian diocese of Lichfield.

The task of identifying the different districts has now been carried through, and as a result we can compile a more or less plausible map, in which all the districts of the Tribal Hidage appear with precise positions, the boundaries shown being those of the counties as they still exist. This map, too, supposing our hypothesis to be right, does more than illustrate the Tribal Hidage; for it enables us to fix the limits of the different kingdoms in existence at the date of the Northumbrian Supremacy in a way that would otherwise be impossible. One feature of it should not escape notice,

¹ This distribution is in harmony with the suggestion made above, that the name of the district of Wigesta may possibly be traced in Wiceslea Wapentake in Rutlandshire. It also permits of Hicca being located next the kingdom of the Hwiccas in that part of Warwickshire that is still ecclesiastically part of the Hwiccan diocese of Worcester. Lastly, it brings Spalda into a position in Kesteven immediately facing Spalding in Holland.

² If a mere guess is worth hazarding, we may perhaps see in the 2,000 hides of Ohtgaga the districts dependent on Chester, which were acquired by the Northumbrians from the Welsh after the battle of Chester in 607, and subsequently transferred to Mercia. This transfer undoubtedly occurred, but its date is unknown. It would not, however, be unreasonable to connect it with the battle of Maserfield in 642, when Penda defeated and killed Oswald. Such an identification, it may be remarked, is rather supported by the fact that at the date of Domesday there were apparently twenty hundreds in this district (see *infra*, p. 210 and the Appendix).

Shewing the districts
of the
TRIBAL HIDAGE
in accordance
with the proposed scheme
of
identification.

THE NUMBERS GIVE THE HIDAGES

and that is, that it brings together all the smaller districts, with 1,200 hides and under, into the east central Midlands. It looks, in fact, as if the compiler of the list, as we have it, was interested in the details of the subdivisions just north and south of the Welland, in the districts, that is, which about the eighth century composed the Middle Anglian diocese of Leicester, but was not interested in the details elsewhere to the same extent. These indications are small, but they point to the source of the document being Peterborough, the chief ecclesiastical centre in this district in the days of the Northumbrian and Mercian Supremacies.

In compiling the map one difficulty arises which must now be alluded to, and that is, what to do about the kingdom of Wessex. At the date we have assumed for the Tribal Hidage, Wessex was not an important kingdom, and all the evidence we have goes to show that its kings had hardly begun that expansion to the west at the expense of the West Welsh, which eventually led to their playing an important part and assuming the lead in English history. Their territory, in fact, at this period seems to have been limited to their original settlements in the counties of Hampshire, Berkshire, and Wiltshire;¹ and yet the Tribal Hidage gives Wessex 100,000 hides, almost as much, that is, as the rest of England. Evidently there must be some mistake here, caused perhaps by the figures being adapted

¹ The expansion of Wessex to the west of the forest of Selwood seems only to have begun after the return of Cenwalh from his three years' exile in East Anglia. This occurred in 648, the year of the first building of the minster at Winchester. Ten years later Cenwalh drove the Welsh as far as the Parrett, but 30 years more elapsed before Ine founded Glastonbury, and it was not till 709 that Wessex had sufficient western possession to necessitate a division ecclesiastically into two bishoprics with Selwood as the boundary between them. Similarly to the east, it does not appear that Surrey was regularly part of Wessex till a much later period. For under Wulfhere, in 661, Mercia was predominant over all the southern districts, and even took away Wight and the Meonwaras from Wessex and gave them to Sussex. It may have been a desire to secure Surrey that led to Ceadwalla's campaigns against Kent in 686 and 687; but as late as 823 we still find Egbert contending for Surrey with Baldred, king of Kent, and in 835 he left Surrey with Kent to his younger son.

to fit later conditions, even if the number 100,000 ($10 \times 100 \times 100$) is not intentionally designed to contrast with the 144,000 ($12 \times 120 \times 100$) of the other districts put together. But to say that there must be a mistake is not a sufficient explanation. The question is, what should the figure really be to make it consistent with the others? It might seem hopeless to expect to get an answer to this question, were it not that this scheme of figures is so artificial that we may fairly expect all the entries to be mutually dependent, and to fit together. Acting on this assumption we can propound a solution, which it is very difficult not to believe is the right one, so neat is the result thereby attained. The solution is to suppose that the true figure for Wessex is 10,000, thus giving it the same hidage as the Southumbrian districts.¹ For if this is done, the whole list will be found to group itself symmetrically by kingdoms, and, more surprising than all, a clue will be furnished to explain why the compilers have noted the total hidage of the first 19 districts to be 66,000

¹ We may imagine an alteration of either 'x thusend' into 'c thusend,' or 'tien thusend' into 'hund thousand.' It is worth observing that if we read 10,000, the figure harmonises exactly with a statement made by William of Malmesbury (*Gesta Regum*, ed. Stubbs, i. 29) in referring to the grant of land made in 648 to his kinsman Cuthred by Cenwalh, king of Wessex. Cenwalh had just returned from a 'four years' exile in East Anglia, whither Penda had driven him, and he wished to set up a buffer between himself and his enemy. He accordingly gave Cuthred all the northern part of his kingdom, known as Ashdown, that is, the area now covered by Berkshire and North Wiltshire, as a sub-kingdom. In the Chronicle this transaction is described as a gift of 'iii thusendo londes,' a phrase which undoubtedly means 3,000 hides (see Plummer, *Saxon Chronicles*, ii. 23). William of Malmesbury, however, describes the grant as 'pene tertiam regni partem,' which is just what it would be, if the Wessex of the seventh century were reckoned as containing 10,000 hides. It is to be noted also that on this supposition Cenwalh must have left himself with an immediate dominion of 7,000 hides, a figure which is assigned by the Tribal Hidage to no less than seven other districts. If we like to go back another seventy years to the period before the attacks on Wessex of either Penda or the Northumbrians, when Ceawlin was Bretwalda and the dominions of Wessex less restricted, we get another remarkable result. For then, if the figures of the Tribal Hidage be applied, the hidation of the West Saxon territories would be as follows: Wessex proper 7,000, Ashdown with Cilternsætna 7,000, Hwicca 7,000.

hides. Adopting the emendation suggested, the scheme we obtain is as follows :

		Hides	
Bernicia	30000	} 44000	} 66000
Deira	14000		
South Humberia	10000		
Mercia	12000		
East Anglia	30000	} 44000	} 66000
Essex	7000		
Hwicca	7000		
Middle Anglia	12000		
Wessex	10000	} 22000	} 22000
Kent	15000		
Sussex	7000		

The symmetrical repetition of the figures in this list can hardly be an undesigned coincidence, but it certainly adds to our mystification. For here we have reached an entirely new unit of 220, to place beside the more usual ones of 100 and 120, with which Domesday familiarises us. It is true that 100 added to 120 makes 220. But this observation does not help us much. We have termed it a new unit, and so it probably will be to most people, but yet the only thing that can be certainly affirmed about it is, that it also reappears in the Domesday Survey. The evidence on which this assertion is made cannot here be given in detail, but it will be found that if the hides in the hundreds of Middlesex and Cambridgeshire be counted, they both form elaborate schemes based upon a unit of 220. These Domesday hidage schemes, given below, show that the unit of 220 was one employed quite at the end of Saxon times. They do not, however, afford an explanation of its meaning or origin, and none can be attempted at this point.

MIDDLESEX

		Hides	
Eastern Hundreds	{ Ossulston	220	} 440
	{ Edmonton	70	
	{ Gore	150	
Western Hundreds	{ Elthorn	225	} 330
	{ Hounslow	105	
	{ Spelthorn	110	
Total		880	

CAMBRIDGESHIRE ¹

		Hides	
North Eastern Hundreds	Ely	80	} 220
	Staplehoe	90	
	Cheveley	50	
	Stane	50	
South Eastern Hundreds	Radfield	60	} 110
	Fleamditch	56	
	Chilford	54	
	Whittlesford	80	
South Western Hundreds	Triplow	90	} 220
	East Cambridge	50	
	West Cambridge	50	
	Wetherley	80	
North Western Hundreds	Armingford	100	} 330
	Long Stow	100	
	Papworth	97½	
	North Stow	112½	
	Chesterton	120	} 330
		1320 hides	

Total of Middlesex and Cambridgeshire 2,200 hides.

Returning to the consideration of the Tribal Hidage, it is more illuminating to observe that in the scheme of kingdoms we have just worked out, the largest hidages, connoting presumably the greatest wealth and the densest populations, are assigned to Bernicia, whose kings held the Bretwaldaship in the years to which we assign the scheme, and to East Anglia, whose kings had previously held it. We note, too, that the general arrangement is to divide the country into a northern and a southern sphere, equally hidated, the one headed by Bernicia, the other by East Anglia, while Kent and Sussex form a kind of appendage outside the main scheme. Presumably this is not a chance arrangement. We accordingly look for a period in early English history when this arrangement would be suitable, and have no

¹ To bring this scheme to light we have first to assume that the borough of Cambridge, which Domesday (i. 189a) says 'se defendebat pro uno hundredo,' was charged with 100 hides, and then to lay 50 on the part of the town to the east of the Cam, and 50 on the part to the west. The symmetry of the scheme that results makes it practically certain that these assumptions are correct, especially when it is further remarked that the boundaries of the groups and sub-groups are for the most part important physical features, such as the Ouse, the Cam, the Roman Ways, and the four great dykes that run across the Icknield Way.

difficulty in seeing that such a scheme harmonises best with the state of affairs under Edwin, the founder of the Northumbrian Supremacy and the first of the Bretwaldas whose power extended both north and south of the Humber. For Bede, who is our great authority for the period, is careful to tell us that 'Edwin had the dominion over all the races of the English, save only the men of Kent,'¹ the reason being that his wife was a Kentish princess, and that he treated his father-in-law as an ally rather than a subject. At any subsequent period this was hardly the case, the later Bretwaldas treating Kent as an ordinary subject province, like any other in their dominions.

There are fair grounds, then, in the construction of the Tribal Hidage alone, when reduced to its simplest form, for tracing its origin to the reign of Edwin. But if this is so, there cannot be much doubt as to its object and meaning, and we must see in it the first effort to tax England as a whole, made by the first king that ever reduced it to subjection. In a word, the Tribal Hidage is nothing else than Edwin's tribute roll, or if not his actual scheme, as regards all the details, at any rate a modification of it, evolved by the succeeding Bretwaldas, Oswald and Oswy, and preserving the main outlines. Nor is there really anything so very startling in this solution. At first sight it may seem an assumption to say that the Bretwaldas had a tribute roll. But after all, what can their so-called supremacy have meant to these 'wielders of Britain,' if not the levying of tribute? In the exactly parallel case of the consolidation of Norway by Harold Haarfager it seems to have done so, for the sagas are full of allusions to the conquered kings as payers of tribute; and the same, of course, was the case when the Danes conquered England. *A priori*, then, though the historians do not dwell on it, it is legitimate to regard the Bretwaldas as exactors of tribute. But if tribute is to be regularly paid over any large area, then there must be some scheme whereby the burden is distributed, and the work of collection facilitated.

A *rotulus exactorius* of some kind, recording the amounts due, and distributing them, must therefore have probably existed, just as we know it did in the later case of the Danegeld, though as yet no one has taken the trouble to piece it together from Domesday. The tribute roll of the Bretwaldas, then, is not so much a flight of the fancy as a natural inference from the few known facts of early English history, and one which might equally well have been arrived at, even if no such list as the Tribal Hidage had existed. Indeed, it is somewhat remarkable that commentators on Bede have not already suggested that something of this kind must really be the source of the estimates of population that he records. For primitive people do not undertake statistical inquiries out of mere curiosity, and the numbering of a people has often been resorted to as an obvious preliminary to the imposition of taxes. Bede's figures, therefore, can most naturally be explained as fragments of some financial scheme undertaken by the great Northumbrian kings. But then, in the only cases in which we can compare them, his figures agree with the figures in the Tribal Hidage; so once more we are brought round to the conclusion that the Tribal Hidage, and with it the whole plan of assessing England in hides, which certainly existed in the seventh century, as Bede so frequently alludes to it, are to be attributed to the fiscal activity of the Bretwaldas.

We are now in a position to approach the question of the relation of the Tribal Hidage to the later hidages, but first let us see whether there is any connection between the figures of the Tribal Hidage and the number of the hundreds in the remaining southern counties, similar to the connection already noticed in the case of the kingdoms of the Middle Angles and the Hwiccas. To do this, we must compile a table of the hundreds in all the counties, where hundreds existed in the eleventh century—a task which is by no means easy. For not only are the names of the hundreds spelt in such a great variety of ways in the Domesday Survey, that it is often difficult to tell whether

one or two hundreds are meant by names that are nearly identical ; but there are several of the south-western counties where the names of the hundreds are not entered at all. Here we have to fall back upon the Exeter Domesday, which gives several lists of the hundreds, but these unfortunately do not agree with one another, and appear to be both incomplete and ambiguous. Occasional omissions, too, of a hundred¹ name may be suspected even in those districts where the Domesday Survey professes to give them, not to mention such clerical errors as the insertion of portions of some hundreds in quite the wrong counties.² Altogether, then, there are many pitfalls. Avoiding these as best we may, we arrive at the remarkable scheme for the southern counties given on the next page. The details of this scheme, owing to their length, cannot be given in the text, but they will be found in an Appendix, which shows the names of the hundreds and how they have been counted in the reckoning.

In spite of the admitted difficulty of counting up the hundreds,³ it is hardly possible to look at this list and not to come to the conclusion that the round numbers it contains are due to design, and that here we have once more stumbled on one of those artificial fiscal schemes which seem at all periods to underlie the Anglo-Saxon methods of organisation. As some of the numbers are open to doubt, and as one or two emendations have to be made before the total comes out exactly at 700 hundreds, it is natural to hesitate before accepting this conclusion ; but, after all, the proportion

¹ For example, Farnham in Surrey, or Tewkesbury and Berkeley in Gloucestershire.

² It appears certain that the appearance of the Staffordshire hundred of Cudolvestan in the surveys of both Warwickshire and Northamptonshire is due to this kind of error. It is also clear that large tracts of Oxfordshire are by mistake entered in the Northamptonshire survey, though in this case the names of the Hundreds are not given.

³ The figures given in the table will be found to differ in some instances from those given by Dr. Stubbs. (*Constitutional History*, vol. i. ch. v.) This is partly to be accounted for by the fact that Dr. Stubbs makes no distinction between hundreds, half hundreds, and hundreds and a half ; but even so, it is difficult to see how one or two of his figures have been reached.

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF THE HUNDREDS
IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

		Number of Hundreds				
Anglian Districts	West Mercia	North Wales (hidated)	2	10	300	
		„ (not hidated) (?)	2			
		South Lancashire	6	50		
		Cheshire	10			
		Shropshire	15	20		
		Staffordshire	5			
	Hwiccas	Warwickshire	10	70		
		Worcestershire	12			
		Herefordshire	19	70		
		Gloucestershire	39			
	Middle Anglia	Oxfordshire	22	40		
		Buckinghamshire	18			
		Northamptonshire	30	30		
		Rutland (part of)	2			
		Huntingdonshire	(?) 4	35		
		Cambridgeshire	17			
		Bedfordshire	12	50		
	Hertfordshire	9½				
East Anglia	Middlesex	5½	15			
	Norfolk	36				
	Suffolk	[24½] 24	60			
	Essex	[19½] 20				
Saxon Districts	Kent	Essex	[19½] 20	20		
		Essex	[19½] 20			
	Sussex	East Kent	40	60		
		West Kent	20			
	Sussex	Sussex	(?) 60	60		
		Surrey	14			
	Wessex	Berkshire	22	80		
		Hampshire	44			
	East of Selwood	Wiltshire	40	40		
		Dorsetshire	[39] 40			
	Wessex	Somersetshire	[59] 60	40		
		Devonshire	33			
	West of Selwood	Cornwall	7	40		
Total number of hundreds			700			

Total number of hundreds 700

of doubtful figures is very small, and the emendations trifling, and only used to bring those few items into line that would otherwise look exceptional. The list, too, has a noticeable feature which perhaps may be appealed to as giving it weight, and which certainly seems to throw some light on its origin, and that is, that it divides into two parts, one containing 400 hundreds and the other 300. For it is easy to see that the districts thus separated correspond with the political divisions of the ninth century, the 400 hundreds covering the territory which was brought under the direct rule of the West-Saxon house by Egbert in 823 when he

founded the West-Saxon Supremacy,¹ while the 300 hundreds correspond with territories that continued to be ruled by the Mercian and East-Anglian kings for another 50 years, and which were only incorporated with Wessex in the tenth century upon the expulsion of the Danes by Alfred and Edward the Elder. If, then, we are really dealing with a fiscal scheme, as we have suggested, it is pretty clear to what period it belongs, and we must connect it with the rise of Wessex and the reorganisation of the country after the Danish invasions. And now what is the relation of this scheme to the Tribal Hidage? Clearly, though they are different in detail, they are both of the same kind. In other words, they are both schemes based on the hundred as the unit. We did not actually reach this conclusion as regards the Tribal Hidage when discussing it, but all the indications pointed to it; for the figures it contains are all multiples of 100, and in the Midland districts correspond with the numbers of the still existing hundreds. It was quite tempting, therefore, to see in it a scheme of hundreds rather than of hides. But until some independent evidence was forthcoming that the hundreds ever had been units in an artificial scheme, such an interpretation could only be regarded as a guess. Now, however, this is not the case, for it has been found that the later hundreds did apparently form such a scheme. There is accordingly a considerable probability that at all periods there had been a somewhat similar arrangement, and it no longer seems a rash interpretation to regard the Tribal Hidage as in reality a scheme of hundreds artificially arranged.

¹ *A.-S. Chron.* ann. 823. 'The same year Egbert sent his son Ethelwulf with a large force into Kent, and they drove Baldred the king northwards over the Thames. And the men of Kent, and the men of Surrey, and the South Saxons, and the East Saxons submitted to him.' According to Mr. Plummer, in his note on this passage, Sigred of Essex is found signing charters as 'rex' in 811, but disappears after 823, 'unless he is to be found among the Sigreds who sign a little later as 'dux.' Egbert dying in 836 and Ethelwulf in 858, both kept these acquisitions separate from Wessex proper, and left them to a younger son.

The two schemes, then (we may call them the West-Saxon and the Northumbrian), appear to be parallel. But though this is so, it is clear that they are independent, and that the later is not a mere modification of the earlier. For a comparison shows that it is only in the Midlands that they agree. In both schemes the Hwiccas have 70 hundreds and Middle Anglia 120; but in East Anglia, where the Northumbrian scheme records 300 hundreds, the West-Saxon scheme only records 60, a reduction of exactly 80 per cent. Similarly in the cases of Essex and Kent. In Essex the earlier scheme records 70 hundreds, the later apparently 20; in Kent and Surrey the earlier scheme 150, the later 74 or almost exactly half. In Sussex and the original Wessex the divergence is not so great, but still there is no agreement. For Sussex has 70 hundreds in the Northumbrian scheme and apparently 60 in the West-Saxon, while the figures for Wessex show an increase from 100 in the earlier scheme to 106 in the later. Nor is this all; for the grouping is also altered, Surrey, if our interpretation is right, being taken in the earlier scheme with Kent but in the later with Wessex.¹ The whole symmetry, too, and balance of the later scheme is different from that of the earlier, depending upon the inclusion of the counties west of Selwood, which formed no part of the Northumbrian dependencies, and upon a division of Mercia, not as in Bede's time into a north and a south kingdom, but along the line which in the eleventh century separated the carucated from the hidated districts and which seems to have originated in the partition effected between the Danes and Ceolwulf in 877.² The relation, then, between the two schemes, except in the Midlands, is at most one of

¹ This certainly points to the Wessex portion of the West Saxon scheme being later in date than the accession of Alfred. For until his accession Surrey went with Kent and formed a part of the eastern sub-kingdom several times assigned to a younger scion of the West-Saxon house. (*A.-S. Chron.* an. 836, 855.)

² Here, again, we have an indication, as to the date of the West-Saxon scheme, evidently in agreement with the tradition that the hundreds as they existed in the eleventh century had been reorganised, if not, as some would have it, created by the West Saxons.

imitation; and we seem to see dimly put before us two successive attempts to organise a scheme of taxation, both utilising the hundred as the unit, but made at widely different times, and suited to quite different stages in the economic and political development of the country. It must be admitted, however, that it is surprising to find the eastern districts treated so differently in the two schemes. That they were more important, more thickly populated, and wealthier than the centre of England in the Northumbrian period, and that accordingly their hundreds were smaller, is intelligible, as they were the regions of the first settlements; but that they should have lost their relative pre-eminence to the extent implied by the later scheme is hard to understand. On the other hand, if the earlier hundreds along the eastern coasts were no bigger than those still existing in Sussex, there would be no difficulty in finding room for 300 in Norfolk and Suffolk, or 150 in Kent and Surrey, as implied by the Northumbrian list. Indeed, it is not impossible to see traces of some such small divisions in the leets, into which the East-Anglian hundreds were still divided at the date of Domesday. The difficulty consists solely in seeing any reason why, if the districts along the eastern coasts had in the seventh century been able to provide such a large proportion of the total taxation, their burden should have been so enormously lightened in the tenth, especially as that of Sussex remained approximately the same. All that can be said is, that the same kind of phenomenon is met with in later times, and that there is evidence in the Domesday Survey of wholesale alterations having recently been effected in the hidation of some of the counties, alterations which it is equally difficult to account for and which apparently must have shifted the burden of taxation to an equal extent and with equally unfair results.¹

We come now to the final question, the relation of the

¹ See on this question, Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 457-9; also Round, *Engl. Hist. Rev.* 1900, p. 83, where it is pointed out that the Domesday figures for Northamptonshire point to a recent reduction of 60 per cent,

Domesday hidages to the two schemes we have just been comparing. Assuming that the explanations we have hazarded of these two schemes, though admittedly hypothetical, have some foundation, it is not very difficult to suggest a rational answer to this question also. It is simply this: that just as in course of time the Northumbrian scheme became obsolete and was replaced by the West-Saxon scheme, so somewhere about the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh, a need arose, very likely owing to the great exactions of Danegeld by Sweyn and Canute, for some more accurate method of distributing fiscal burdens than was provided by any scheme that simply took the hundred as the unit, and ignored the comparative size and wealth of these divisions. The practice of attributing 100 hides to each hundred which characterises the Tribal Hidage, and which was presumably continued under the West-Saxon scheme,¹ was therefore abandoned, and an entirely new scheme devised in which each county or group of counties was first allotted a round sum of hides, a sum which itself no doubt fitted into a general scheme for the whole country but which bore no direct relation to old divisions into hundreds, and then this in its turn was distributed among the hundreds in a way that paid some regard to their wealth and area, some having 20 hides, some 40 hides, some 80, some 100, some even 120 hides, and so on. In this way a much more elaborate scheme was produced than any that had preceded it, and a more equal distribution of fiscal burdens was effected. At the same time nothing like a modern standard of equality was attempted, tenth-century ideas of justice being satisfied by giving the average vill 10 hides, large vills or vills with many appendant hamlets multiples of 10 hides, small vills fractions of 10 hides, and so on. In the north, in the districts divided into wapentakes a similar scheme was introduced, only there a unit of

¹ It will be shown directly that in both East Anglia and Northamptonshire there existed an equal assessment of the hundreds at 100 hides, even after it was abandoned elsewhere.

12 carucates took the place of the unit of 10 hides, to suit the Danish methods of reckoning. It is important, however, to observe that in an important part of England, in the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk, the new scheme was not introduced. The reason for this cannot be guessed; but it is clear from the Domesday Survey that in these counties the older method was maintained and the hundreds still treated as equal units. For the entries that relate to their fiscal assessment are not given in these counties in the form of either hides or carucates, but proceed on the assumption that each hundred is to find 1*l.*, each half hundred 10*s.*, and each hundred and a half 30*s.* Assessments in pence are accordingly entered for each vill, proportioned in such a way as to make up 20*s.* when the vill in any hundred are reckoned together,¹ with the natural result that there is great inequality, and that the vill in large hundreds are much less heavily burdened than the vill in small ones. It appears, too, from the Pipe Rolls that as a matter of fact, when a Danegeld was taken, 10*l.* and not 1*l.* was charged on each of these hundreds, which, as the rate elsewhere was 2*s.* on the hide, is the same thing as saying that each hundred was treated as if it had contained 100 hides.² It would seem, then, that there is sufficient proof that in this

¹ As examples we may give the assessment of a Norfolk hundred and a Suffolk half hundred. *Walsham hundred*:—Acle, 24*d.*; Wood Bastwick, 16*d.*; Beighton, 12*d.*; Fishley, 10*d.*; Halvergate, 24*d.*; Hemblington, 16*d.*; Moulton, 15½*d.*; Panxford and Ranworth, 16*d.*; Reedham, 16*d.*; Tunstall, 8*d.*; Upton, 24*d.*; South Walsham, 48*d.*; Wickhampton, 10½*d.*—total, 1*l.* *Cosford half hundred*:—Ash, 1½*d.*; Bildeston, 5*d.*; Brettenham, 10*d.*; Chelsworth, 3½*d.*; Elmsett with Aldham, 15*d.*; Hadleigh, 11½*d.*; Hitcham with Kettlebarston and Wattisham, 15*d.*; Kersey, 7½*d.*; Lafham, 3½*d.*; Layham, 7½*d.*; Layham, 4½*d.*; Lindsey, 6*d.*; ‘Manetuna,’ 3*d.*; Naughton, 5*d.*; Nedging, 2½*d.*; Semer, 2½*d.*; Thorpe Morieux, 5*d.*; Whatfield, 5*d.*; alia Whatfield, 6*d.*; Total, 9*s.* 11¾*d.* In area these two districts are much about the same size.

² Norfolk, excluding the two urban hundreds of Norwich and Thetford, contained 34 hundreds, and we find from the Pipe Rolls that the sum charged on it for the Danegeld about the year 1150 was 330*l.* 2*s.* 2*d.* Suffolk, excluding Ipswich, contained 23½ hundreds, and was charged with 235*l.* 0*s.* 2*d.* These figures, taken from Professor Maitland’s *Domesday Book and Beyond* (p. 400), are not exactly at the rate of 10*l.* a hundred, but they are sufficiently near it to warrant the statement in the text.

district a method of taxation by hundreds lasted on well into Norman times, exactly similar to the method that we have postulated as being implied by the Tribal Hidage.

A similar case of the old system surviving is apparently presented by Northamptonshire. Here, if the Domesday hidages be analysed, it will be found that each hundred is assessed at 40 hides.¹ Mr. Round, however, has very acutely pointed out, that many of the hidages in this county are given in such peculiar fractions that they can only be accounted for by supposing a recent reduction of 60 per cent., with the result that 10 hides had become 4 hides, two hides $\frac{4}{5}$ of a hide, 4 hides $1\frac{3}{5}$ (or as Domesday expresses it, 1 hide + $\frac{1}{2}$ hide + $\frac{1}{10}$ hide), and so on.² The assessments, therefore, of 40 hides imply original assessments of 100 hides a conclusion which is in conformity with half the entries in the document known as the Northamptonshire Geld Roll.³ For this, speaking from a date somewhere about 1070, gives all the western hundreds 100 hides apiece. It is fair, then, to assume that up to the eve of the Conquest the West-Saxon assessment of the 30 hundreds of Northamptonshire remained at the 3,000 hides it had always stood at, and that the Northamptonshire Geld Roll, which shows the eastern hundreds reduced, but not the western, records a temporary step, which was not found satisfactory, and which was quickly followed by the general reduction to 1,200 hides,

¹ The Domesday returns hardly ever work out quite correctly to this amount, but they are so very near to it in every case that this conclusion is hardly doubtful. For example : Corby hundred, 39 hides ; Stoke, $39\frac{5}{10}$; Warden, $37\frac{3}{4}$; Higham hundred and a half, $60\frac{1}{2}$; the eight hundreds of Oundle, which formed the Soke of Peterborough, 320 hides + $1\frac{1}{2}$ hides at Little Catworth in Huntingdonshire. As a specimen of the distribution of the 40 hides among the villis, we may give the figures for Mawsley Hundred. They are : Brixworth, $9\frac{1}{2}$ hides ; Faxton with Mawsley, 2 ; Hanging Houghton, $4\frac{3}{4}$; Holcot, $4\frac{1}{2}$; Lamport, $4\frac{3}{4}$; Scaldwell, $4\frac{3}{4}$; Walgrave and Old, $9\frac{3}{4}$ —total, 40 hides.

² Round, *Engl. Hist. Rev.* 1900. The reduction had not been carried out in many of the hundreds by this simple method of doing a proportion sum. In several the hides would appear to have been distributed afresh.

³ Round, *Feudal England*, p. 153. Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 457.

witnessed to by the entries in Domesday. For, deducting the 160 hides which belong to the two hundreds of Wiceslea in Rutland, the Geld Roll gives a total assessment for Northamptonshire of 2,504 hides, and charges the 15 western hundreds with 1,500 hides, and the 15 eastern hundreds with 1,004 hides. This last figure, however, looks as if it were an error for 1,000 hides, and anyhow shows that the idea had been to relieve half the county of one-third of its assessment.

The explanation we have ventured on of the origin of the Domesday hidages and of their relation to earlier schemes has been necessarily stated in a theoretical form, and a theory it must remain until the real totals for the different counties, as recorded in Domesday, have been accurately ascertained, and their relation to one another revealed. But to ascertain these totals would require the accurate analysis of the whole of Domesday Book, an enormous undertaking, which every one has as yet shrunk from, and which certainly could not be thought of for the purposes of this paper. In the hope, however, that a partial effort to carry out this work would be of some use, a more or less complete examination has been made of the eight counties forming the Middle-Anglian area, the result of which may now be given. For this purpose let us compile a table, and place in it (i) the number of hundreds in each of the eight counties as recorded in Domesday, (ii) the Danegeld charged upon them about the year 1150,¹ (iii) the hides as they have been reckoned by Professor Maitland, (iv) the hides as we compute them, and (v) the rounder totals which these figures may be held to imply, after making some trifling allowances to complete a number of 10 hide units that are slightly imperfect in the Domesday returns, and after restoring the assessments of Northamptonshire and Rutland to their original amounts.

¹ Quoted from Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 400.

The table we thus obtain is as follows :

—	Hun- dreds I	Danegeld c. 1150 II			Hidage (Mait- land) III	Hidage (Corbett) IV	Hidage (cor- rected) V	—
		£	s.	d.				
Oxfordshire . . .	22	249	16	5	2492 ¹	2494	2500	} 5500
Northamptonshire . .	30	119	10	9	1196 ²	[1200]	3000	
Rutland (south part) . .	2	11	12	0	80	[80]	200	} 5500
Huntingdonshire . . .	4	71	5	0	747 ³	817 $\frac{1}{4}$	820	
Bedfordshire . . .	12	110	12	0	1193	1215	1220	
Buckinghamshire . . .	18	204	14	7	2074	2125 $\frac{1}{3}$	2140	
Hertfordshire . . .	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	110	1	4	1050	1118	1120	} 2200
Middlesex . . .	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	85	12	0	868	880 $\frac{1}{4}$	880	
Cambridgeshire . . .	17	114	15	0	1233 ³	1317	1320	
Total . . .	120 hundreds				Total 13,200 hides			

Though it is possible that there may be some undetected error in the above figures, on the whole they can be accepted with some confidence ; for, except in the case of Oxfordshire, they have not been compiled by merely adding up the Domesday entries, but all the entries have been extracted and regrouped by hundreds and villages, and the 10 hide units restored. The total, therefore, we have arrived at of 13,200 hides is probably the correct one, in spite of our items for Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire not agreeing very well with Professor Maitland's calculations. But if so, it is clear how the new assessment was made. For 13,200 is the same thing

¹ The figure given by Professor Maitland is 2412, but 80 hides are to be added to this for the Oxfordshire fiefs of the Bishop of Contance (46 $\frac{1}{2}$), Hugh de Grentmaisnil (29 $\frac{1}{2}$), and William Pevrel (4), erroneously entered in the Northamptonshire Survey.

² The figure given by Professor Maitland is 1356, but the 80 hides belonging to Oxfordshire must be deducted, and also the 80 hides belonging to the two hundreds of Wiceslea in Rutland.

³ Professor Maitland excludes the boroughs (*Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 409) ; but in the survey Huntingdon is given 50 hides, and Cambridge is said to defend itself as a hundred. We have already shown what a symmetrical result is obtained if this latter is reckoned as 100 hides (*supra*, p. 206). On the other hand, we have only reckoned Bedford as one hide, though for some purposes it counted as a half hundred. For Domesday says, 'nunquam hidata fuit praeter 1 hidam' (*D. B.* i. 209a). In this respect it resembled Buckingham. Oxford, Northampton, and London do not seem to have been hidated.

as 12,000 + 1,200, and this shows that the intention of the assessors was to increase the old assessment of the eight counties by 10 per cent.—to raise it, that is to say, from $10 \times 1,200$ hides to $11 \times 1,200$. At the same time the old method of dividing the Middle-Anglian group into two parts in the proportion of 7 : 5 to one another was not wholly abandoned, though the line of the subdivision was somewhat altered. As before, too, simple fractions of the whole are in some cases furnished by single counties, Cambridgeshire furnishing $\frac{1}{10}$ and Middlesex $\frac{1}{15}$. The origin of the unit of 220 or 110 hides, which puzzled us before, is also explained. For $110 = \frac{1}{120} \times 13,200$.

Altogether, then, we have reached a very satisfactory result. But this is not all. For, having arrived at the conclusion that the Domesday assessment of the Middle-Anglian counties is a multiple of 1,200 hides, we cannot fail to notice how this fits in with some other county assessments that are pretty certain, and also with the general drift of the figures in the document known as the County Hidage.¹ For this last gives Worcestershire 1,200 hides, Gloucestershire 2,400 hides, Shropshire 2,400 hides, Warwickshire 1,200 hides, Cheshire 1,200 hides, Wiltshire 4,800 hides; and, though in most cases these assessments differ from the Domesday figures, still, for Worcestershire and Gloucestershire, they are in agreement, while the group composed of Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, Cheshire, and Lancashire seems in Domesday to have 3,600 hides.² Nor should it be forgotten that, though the East-Anglian hundreds were not hidated, still their contributions to the Danegeld were calculated as if each contained 100 hides, and that accordingly, as there were 60 hundreds, the whole district paid as if it contained 6,000 hides, Norfolk

¹ Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, p. 456.

² For the assessments of Worcestershire and Gloucestershire, see Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond*, 451-5, 457. The figures for the more northern counties are:—Warwickshire about 1,300 hides, Staffordshire 500 hides—total 1,800 hides. Shropshire about 1,200 hides, Cheshire about 520 hides, South Lancashire 79 hides—total 1,800 hides.

being charged as if it had 3,600 hides, and Suffolk as if it had 2,400.

Finally, we may bring these figures into connection with the statements made in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle concerning the sums levied as Danegeld by Sweyn and Canute between the years 991 and 1018, all of which may be expressed as multiples or quite simple fractions of 12,000*l*. These may be tabulated as follows:—

	<i>£</i>		<i>£</i>
991	10,000	=	$\frac{5}{6} \times 12,000$
994	16,000	=	$1\frac{1}{3} \times 12,000$
1002	24,000	=	$2 \times 12,000$
1007	36,000	=	$3 \times 12,000$
1009	3,000	=	$\frac{1}{4} \times 12,000$ paid by East Kent
1012	48,000	=	$4 \times 12,000$
1014	21,000	=	$1\frac{3}{4} \times 12,000$
1018	72,000	=	$6 \times 12,000$
1018	10,500	=	$\frac{7}{8} \times 12,000$ paid by London

These figures are easily intelligible, regarded as the result of taxes levied on a number of districts that were all assessed at multiples of 1,200 hides. For, if all the districts combined contained $100 \times 1,200$ hides, then a tax of 2*s*. on the hide would produce 12,000*l*., a tax of 3*s*. 6*d*. 21,000*l*., a tax of 12*s*. 72,000*l*., and so on. We have only to suppose, then, that the writer of the chronicle believed that England contained $100 \times 1,200$ hides, and we can interpret his remark that in 991 the Danes took 10,000*l*. as meaning that in that year they demanded 20*d*. or 1 *ora* from each hide, and the statement that in 994 they took 16,000*l*., as meaning that in that year they raised their demands to 32*d*.

Interpreted in this way there seems nothing very unlikely in these two statements, nor, though it seems improbable, is it altogether impossible that the Danes should have gone on raising the rate of their exactions, until in 1018 they demanded the 12*s*. on the hide implied, on our hypothesis, by the sum of 72,000*l*. For the average hide seems to have been worth 1*l*. a year. A rate, then, of even 12*s*. would not mean much more than an attempt to appro-

priate half-a-year's produce, and it is as likely as not that the Danes asked for more than they expected to get.¹ The question, however, that interests us in all this is not so much the probability or improbability of these rates, as whether, supposing the figures in the chronicle were computed as we have imagined, there was any justification for the assumption that England contained 100 groups of 1,200 hides. In other words, can we see here a true indication of what the total of the West-Saxon hidage scheme had originally been, or only an extravagant fiction indulged in by the author of the chronicle? That the total was probably some multiple of 1,200 hides we have already shown. So far, then, the chronicler would be right. But was that multiple 100? It is very difficult to give any decided answer to the question. The hidages, as they appear in Domesday, of course, do not justify such a number. All told, they roughly come to about $60 \times 1,200$ hides. But then it is equally clear that this was not the full complement. For Domesday tells us nothing of England north of the Tees. There is no reason, however, for supposing that these districts either escaped contribution or were treated leniently. On the contrary, were Bernicia assessed at anything like the same proportion as in the Tribal Hidage, its tale of hides must have been considerable. Then, again, there are nearly all the big towns to be accounted for, London, Winchester, Canterbury, Oxford, Gloucester, Exeter, and so on, and the chronicle itself is witness to the large amounts that were levied on such centres. Lastly, we have to reckon with reductions that may have been made before the date of Domesday in other counties similar to the one detected in Northamptonshire. Kent, for example, in 1086, seems to be absurdly under-assessed in proportion to its neighbours, while the County Hidage

¹ It must be admitted that the figures given for the London tribute in 1018 are quite unaccountable. Even if we suppose that London gelded at 1,200 hides, it would take a rate of 17s. 6d. to produce 1,050 $\frac{1}{2}$ l., and the chronicle speaks of 10,500 $\frac{1}{2}$ l. It is a somewhat remarkable coincidence that in the Tribal Hidage Hendrica and Essex, the two districts which immediately adjoin London, together have an assessment of 10,500 hides.

shows us Cheshire and Shropshire with double the number of hides attributed to them in Domesday. Putting all these things together, it is clear that the original total of the West-Saxon scheme may conceivably have come to $100 \times 1,200$ hides, and that in any case it can hardly have fallen much short of $80 \times 1,200$ hides. One is bound, however, to admit that the latter figure seems on the whole much the more likely of the two ; nor is it so very far off the 100,000 hides which the Tribal Hidage, in its unamended form, ascribes to Wessex, and which may have been accepted by the copyists because they thought it agreed with the hidage of the West-Saxon dominions in their own day. On the other hand, it is always to be remembered that the Tribal Hidage gives the still larger total of 154,000 hides, so perhaps there once was a time when the total for all England stood at the intermediate figure of 120,000 hides.

The questions that we set out to examine have now all been dealt with, but before concluding it will perhaps be as well to point out how large a modification will be needed in one generally accepted doctrine, if our theory of the development of the successive hidage schemes is to be accepted. The doctrine in question is the one maintained by Dr. Stubbs,¹ that during the early periods of English history 'the unity of the Church was the only working unity,' and 'that the Bretwalda never stood, as the Archbishop of Canterbury did, at the head of an organised and symmetrical system.' So far this view has never been challenged ; but if, as we have suggested, the Tribal Hidage dates from the early years of the seventh century and was the work of the Bretwaldas, then for this particular period almost the converse of these propositions might be maintained. For the system it reveals was certainly symmetrical and was intended to weld England into a single whole. Edwin, too, and Oswald and Oswy, all flourished many years before Theodore began the organisation of England ecclesiastically ; while a large part of their dominions was not even nominally converted to

¹ Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* ch. vi. § 68.

Christianity at the time when we suppose them to have levied their tributes. We must hold, then, that it was the State, and not the Church, that led the way in treating England as a unit.

In conclusion, let us say one word as to the way in which we ourselves regard our theory. We do not in the least claim that it accounts for all the facts quite satisfactorily, or that it has not to meet many difficulties which we have not had time to touch on, and we are fully aware that, at the best, it is based on some very large assumptions. We put it forward merely as a working hypothesis. But we do claim that the facts and coincidences we have brought to light, and the figures we have collected, do deserve attention; that in fact they form a new basis from which to approach the study of the hidage system; and that they will have to be reckoned with by any future inquirers who wish to deal with the question of the hides seriously.

APPENDIX

LIST OF THE HUNDREDS IN THE HIDATED COUNTIES

N.B.—In cases where the hundreds are reckoned as counting either more or less than 1, a number is affixed to the name showing the amount reckoned

SOUTH LANCASHIRE—6 hundreds

Blackeburne	Lailand	Salford
Derbei	Neweton	Walintune

NORTH WALES—4 hundreds

<i>Hidated</i>	<i>Not hidated</i>
Atiscros	Arvester
Exestan	Atiscros (Ruddlan)

CHESHIRE—10 hundreds

Bochelau	Mildestuic	Tunendune
Cestre	Risedon	Warmundestrou
Dudestan	Roelau	Wilaveston
Hamestan		

SHROPSHIRE—15 hundreds

Basecherche	Lenteurde	Recordine
Condretret	Merset	Rinlau
Conendoure	Odenet	Ruesset
Culvestan	Ovret	Sciropesberie
Elnoelstruil	Patintune	Witentreu

STAFFORDSHIRE—5 hundreds

Cudolvestan	Pireholle	Tatemaneslau
Offelau	Saisdone	

WARWICKSHIRE—10 hundreds

Bedricestone	Fexhole	Patelau
Bomelau	Honesberie	Stanleie
Coleshelle	Meretone	Tremeslau
Fernecumbe		

WORCESTERSHIRE—12 hundreds

Came	Dodintret	Oswaldeslau 3
Clent	Esch	Persore 3
Cresselau	Fisseberge	

HEREFORDSHIRE—19 hundreds

Bromesesce	Naisse	Sulcet
Cutestornes	Pegelgete	Tornelaus
Dunre	Radelau	Tragetr
Elsedune	Stepleset	Ulfei
Greitrewes	Stradford	Wermelau
Hezetre	Stradel	Wimundstruil
Lene		

GLOUCESTERSHIRE—39 hundreds

Bachestane	Derherst	Respigete
Begeberie	Dudestan	Salemanesberie
Bernintreu	Edredestan	Sineshovedes
Bernintone	Gersdones	Tedboldestan
Biselege	Grestetan	Tedenham
Blackelaw	Grimboldestowe	Tuiferde
Bliteslav	Holeforde	Wacrescumbe
Botelau	Langebrige	Westberie
Bradelege	Langelei	Witelei
Brictvoldesberg	Langetreu	Witestan
Celfledestorne	Ledenei	—
Cheftesihat	Letberge	Berchelai ¹
Cilttenham	Pulcrecerce	Teodeschesberie ¹
Cirecestre		

¹ These two royal manors—the one containing over 100 hides, the other 95 hides—are not stated in Domesday to be hundreds, but they were always treated as such subsequently.

OXFORDSHIRE—22 hundreds

NOTE.—In this county the *Domesday Survey*, for the most part, omits the names of the hundreds; but there are entries under the Crown Manors (*D. B. i. 154b*) stating how many hundreds were appendant to each, which give the clue to the number of the hundreds.

West of the Cherwell

Bampton .	. 2	} 11
Banbury .	. 1	
Bloxham .	. 2	
Shipton ¹ .	. 3	
Wootton .	. 3	

East of the Cherwell

Dorchester .	. 1	} 5½
Headington ² .	. 2	
Kirtlington ³ .	. 2½	
Bensington ⁴ .	. 4½	} 5½
Thame .	. 1	

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE—18 hundreds

Bonestov	Essedene	Sigelai
Burneham	Lamua	Stanes
Coteslau	Molesoveslau	Stoches
Dustenberge	Muselai	Stodfald
Elesberie	Riseberge	Tichesele
Erlai	Rovelai	Votesdone

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE—30 hundreds

Alwardslea	Hochelau	Spelehou
Andferdesho	Maleslea	Stoche
Claeslea	Narresford	Stodfald
Corbi	Neveslund ²	Sudtone
Elboldestou	Niwebotlegrave ¹ ½	Tovecestre
Foxeslea	Optonegrave ²	Waredone
Gisleburg ¹ ½	Ordinbaro	Wilebroc
Gravesende	Pochebroc	Wimareslea } ¹ ½
Hecham ¹ ½	Rodewelle	Colentreu }

RUTLAND—2 hundreds

Wiceslea (East)	Wiceslea (West)
-----------------	-----------------

HUNTINGDONSHIRE—4 hundreds

Herstingestan	Normancros	Toleslund
Lectunestan		

CAMBRIDGESHIRE—17 hundreds

Cestretone	Grentebrige	Staplehou
Chavelai	Norestov	Stou
Cildeford	Papesworde	Trepeslau
Eli ²	Radefelle	Wedrelai
Erningford	Stanes	Witelesford
Flamingdic		

¹ Now the hundred of Chedlington.

² Now the hundreds of Bullington and Sotlaw.

³ Now the hundred of Ploughley.

⁴ Now the Chiltern hundreds of Ewelme, Benfield, Langtree, Lewknor, and Pirton.

BEDFORDSHIRE—12 hundreds

Bedeforde $\frac{1}{2}$	Flittham	Stodene
Bereforde	Manesheved } 2	Weneslai $\frac{1}{2}$
Bicheleswada	Odecrost	Wichestanestou
Bochelai $\frac{1}{2}$	Radborgestoc	Wilga
Cliftone	Stanbruge $\frac{1}{2}$	

HERTFORDSHIRE—9 $\frac{1}{2}$ hundreds

Albanestov	Danais	Hiiz $\frac{1}{2}$
Brachinges	Edwinestreu	Odesei
Bradewatre 2	Hertford	Treunge

MIDDLESEX—5 $\frac{1}{2}$ hundreds

Delmetone $\frac{1}{2}$	Helethorne	Osulvestan
Gara	Honeslav	Spelethorne

NORFOLK—36 hundreds

Blafelda	Feorhou 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Lawendic
Brodecros	Fredebruge 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Lothninga
Clachelosa 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Galgou	Mitteforde 1 $\frac{1}{2}$
Clavelinga	Gildecros	Norwic
Depwada	Grenehou (North)	Scerepham
Dice $\frac{1}{2}$	Grenehou (South)	Smatheduna
Dochinga	Grimeshou	Taverham
Ensford	Hapinga	Tedfort
Erpingaham (North)	Heinesteda	Tunesteda
Erpingaham (Suth)	Hersam $\frac{1}{4}$	Walesham
Flec (East)	Holt	Wanelund
Flec (West)	Humiliart	

SUFFOLK—24 $\frac{1}{2}$ hundreds ¹

Babenberga 2	Cosfort $\frac{1}{2}$	Plumesgata
Biscope	Hertesmera	Risebruge
Blachebrune	Gepeswiz $\frac{1}{2}$	Sanfort 1 $\frac{1}{4}$
Blidinga	Lacforda	Stou
Bosemera	Losa	Thewardestreu
Bradamera	Ludinga ¹	Thingehov
Carleforda	Ludingaland $\frac{1}{2}$	Waineforda
Claindune	Perreham $\frac{1}{2}$	Wileforde
Colenesse		

¹ Though Ludinga is never termed a half hundred, it is by far the smallest district in Suffolk. It appears probable from the geld assessments that it counted as slightly over a half hundred, and formed, with Waineforda, which is slightly under a hundred, a hundred and a half. If so, the total number of hundreds was 24.

ESSEX—19½ hundreds

Angra	Frossewella ½	Turestapla
Berdestapla	Hidingaforda	Udelesfort (East)
Beventre	Herlava ½	Udelesfort (West)
Ceffeorda	Laxendena	Waltham ½
Celmeresforda	Melduna ½	Wensistreu
Clavelinga ½	Rochesfort	Witbrictesherna
Colecestra	Tendringa	Witham ½
Domnawa	Thunreslau ½	

EAST KENT—4 lathes ; 40 hundreds

Adilovesbrige	Estrei	Piteham
Berham	Estursete	Prestetun
Beriscolt	Favresham	Rovindene
Beusberge	Felcberge	Roculf
Blacheburne	Forewic	Sandwice
Boltone	Fulchestan	Selebrist
Brige	Hame	Stotinges
Calehelle	Heu	Tanet
Cantuaria	Lamport	Therham
Certh	Langebrige	Werde
Cistelet	Moniberge	Wit
Cornelai	Newecerce	Wingeham
Dunehamesfort	Oxenai	Witestaple
Estraites		

WEST KENT—2 lathes ; 20 hundreds

Achestan	Helmestrei	Ostreham
Bronlei	Hou	Rovecestre
Broteham	Lavrochesfel	Summerdene
Ceteham	Litefelle	Tollentreu
Essamele	Litelai	Tuiferde
Grenviz	Medestan	Wachelestan
Haihorne	Middeltone	

SUSSEX—6 rapes, 60 hundreds

Avronehelle	Burbece	Folsalre
Babinrerode	Colespore	Foxer
Baldeslei	Edluestone	Framelle
Benestede	Eldretune	Ghestelinges
Bercham	Eseburne	Ghidenetroi
Berie	Essewelde	Grenestede
Bexelei	Estocbridge	Hailesaltede
Bocse	Estrat	Hamesford
Borne	Estreu	Hamfelde
Bosgrave	Eswende	Havochesberie
Botingelle	Falemere	Henhert
Bradfota	Flexeberge	Hertevnel

SUSSEX—*continued.*

Homestreu	Redrebrige	Summerlege
Isiwiridi	Reredfelle	Tifeld
Latille	Kisberge	Totenore
Mellinges	Ristone	Wandelmeſtrei
Pageham	Sillentone	Welesmere
Pevenesel	Staneberge	Westringes
Poninges	Staninges	Wiledene
Prestetune	Stapleham	Windeham

SURREY—14 hundreds

Amelebrige	Copededorne	Tenrige
Blacheatfelde	Ferneham ¹	Waletone
Brixestan	Fingeham	Wochinges
Chercefelle	Godelei	Wodetone
Chingestun	Godelminge	

BERKSHIRE—22 hundreds

Beners	Gamenesfelle	Riplesmere
Blitberie	Iilleslau	Roeburge
Borgeldeberie	Hornimere	Seriveham
Brai	Lamborne	Sudtune
Cerledone	Merceham	Taceham
Cheneteberie	Nachededorne	Wanetinz
Eglei	Redinges	Wifol
Eletesford		

HAMPSHIRE—44 hundreds

A. *On the mainland*

Andovre	Egheiete	Neteham
Basingestoches	Esseborne	Odingetone
Bermesplet	Esselei	Odiham
Bertune	Evingare	Ovretune
Boseberg	Falelie	Portesdone
Bovre	Falemere	Rincuede
Broctone	Ferneham	Rodbrige
Bytlesgete	Fordingebrige	Rodedic
Ceptune	Holesete	Sirlei
Cillei	Manesbrige	Sumburne
Clere	Mantesberge	Ticefelle
Corondel	Mene	Waltham
Drochensford	Menestoch	Welford
Efedel	Miceldevre	

B. *In the Isle of Wight*

Bovecombe	Canborne	Hemreswel
-----------	----------	-----------

¹ Not stated by Domesday to be a hundred.

WILTSHIRE ¹—40 hundreds

Ailestebba	Crichelade	Selchelaia
Alwareberie	Dolesfeld	Stanford
Ambresberie	Domerham	Staple
Blachegrave	Donoworde	Stercheleia
Bradeforde	Dontone	Stodfald
Brenchesberge	Duneslawe	Suaneberge
Cadeworde	Ferstefeld	Thornegrave
Calne	Hechetredeberie	Thornehelle
Caninga	Melchesham	Warminstre
Cauduna	Mera	Wervedesdone
Cepeham	Ramesberie	Westberie
Chenewarstan	Rugeberge	Windredic
Chingbrigge	Scipe	Worde
Cicemethorne		

DORSETSHIRE ²—39 hundreds

Aileveswode	Cuferdestrowe	Lodre
Albretesberge	Dorcestre	Morberge
Bedeberie	Etheminstre	Newentone
Beieministre	Ferendone	Oglescome
Bere	Frontone	Pidetone
Bochene	Gelinge ham	Pinpre
Brunehelle	Giochresdone	Redeham
Canendone	Goderonestone	Sexpene
Celeberge	Haltone	Sireburne
Celberge	Hanglega	Stane
Chenoltune	Haselore	Tolreforde
Cocdene	Hunesberge	Winfrode
Concredic	Langeberge	Witchirce

SOMERSETSHIRE ³—59 hundreds

Abedicche	Blachethorne	Cainesham
Andretesfelle	Bolestan	Cantetune
Bade	Briwetone	Carentone
Betministre	Brunetone Regis	Cetdre
Bimestan	Brunetone Vicecomitis	Chinesmoredone

¹ See Exon Domesday, *D. B.* iv. 1-18.

² See Exon Domesday, *D. B.* iv. 18-26.

³ See Exon Domesday, *D. B.* iv. 58, 67-75, 489. The list given on fol. 58 is by far the most complete, but it is not so early as the others, the modern names appearing in two instances instead of the Domesday ones. The chief changes are as follows: Axebrige for Cetdre; Betministre for Cainesham; Chori for Bolestan; Haretorne for Meleborne; Stane for Givle; and perhaps Ascleie for Hareclive. If, on the contrary, these last two names are distinct, or if Chori (Curry Malet) was distinct from Bolestan, the total number of the hundreds would come to 60.

SOMERSETSHIRE—*continued*

Chiu	Hunespille	Sud Brent
Chori	Jatone	Sumertone
Cingesberie	Lidiart	Sut Peretone
Ciwetone	Lieget	Tantetone
Cluie	Lochesleie	Tintenelle
Congresberie	Maneheved	Walintone
Crice	Meleborne	Welle
Cruche	Mertoche	Welwe
Cudecome	Milvertone	Willetone
Cumbe	Monachetone	Winestoch
Dulvertone	Nort Chori	Wincantone
Frome	Nort Pedret	Winisforde
Givele	Pipeministre	Witestan
Hareclive	Porberie	Wyvelescombe
Hundesberie	Ringoldteswee	

DEVONSHIRE ¹—33 hundreds

Allerige	Dippeforde	Plintone
Axeministre	Esseministre	Scirewelle
Axemuthe	Framintune	Sud Moltone
Badentone	Hamioch	Sulfertone
Brantune	Halsbretone	Taintone
Budeleie	Hertiland	Tawentone
Cadelintone	Listone	Torintone
Carsewella	Mertone	Tuwertone
Chridiatone	Nord Moltone	Walchentone
Clistone	Officolun	Wenfort
Culintone	Otri	Witric

CORNWALL ²—7 hundreds

Cornaditone	Rilestona	Tibestene
Fawitone	Stratone	Winnentone
Pantone		

¹ See Exon Domesday, *D. B.* iv. 56, 59–68. In the list on fol. 56, Allerige is called Hermintone, and Nord Moltone Molland, but compare *D. B.* i. 101a, Molland. The *Domesday Survey* gives Taintone Hundred as Tenebrige, and Teignbridge is the modern name. The modern names are largely different from the ancient, e.g. Allerige = Ermington; Cadelintone = Coleridge; Carsewelle = Hay Tor; Dippeforde = Stanborough; Mertone = Shebbear; Officolun = Bampton (southern part); Sulfertone = Hayridge; Walchentone = Roborough.

² See Exon Domesday, *D. B.* iv. 65–67. The corresponding modern names are: Penwith; East Wivelshire; West Wivelshire; Pyder; Stratton with Lesnewth and Trigg; Powder; Kerrier.