particulars by subtracting the $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides held in demesne from 9. He urges that, as the abbey had been relieved of the payment of geld to the crown on the lands within the liberty, the particulars given can only include those lands held *in servitio* of the abbot which now paid their geld to him, and not the demesne, which of course he would not tax for his own benefit. Unfortunately for this argument the particulars begin with half a hide at Bocheham, held by the abbot in demesne; the three virgates at Cedesfield are also stated to be *in dominio*, and three other items either contained no lands in service or were waste. This is my excuse for deducting the $2\frac{1}{2}$ hides of non-gelding demesne from the sum of the particulars, of which, it must be remembered, they are said to be part (*de omni hac terra*). I fully admit that my explanation does not remove all difficulties—at present, for instance, I can only find 2 hides of demesne among the particulars—but Mr. Salzmann's seems to be attended by greater difficulties.

A possible additional argument in favour of the hides at Battle being composed of 4 virgates may be derived from the distribution of the lands held *in servitio*. The 3 virgates at Bece were held by 3 villeins, the virgate at Wasingate by 1 villein, that at Pilesham also by 1 villein, the 6 virgates at Wilmint by 6 villeins, the 6 at Nirefeld by 5 villeins and 1 bordarius. This looks as if the abbey allowed a virgate to each tenant. When we find that the half-hides at Peneherst and Hov were each held by two villeins, it is tempting to infer that half a hide contained 2 (and not 4) virgates. Turning with increased interest to the last case, the 2 hides less 1 virgate at Bollintun, we are met with the encouraging entry, *ibi sunt vii villani*.

On the whole then, though somewhat saddened, as Professor Maitland would say, by my encounter with Sussex virgates, I cling for the present to the belief that four of them went to the hide in 1086, as was certainly the case at the later date, when the Battle Abbey customals were drawn up.

JAMES TAIT.

The Exchequer at Westminster.

THE following extract from the Chancery Miscellaneous Roll 4th (19 Henry III) may supplement Mr. G. J. Turner's considerations on the use of *maior ecclesia* in the April number of this Review: ¹—

Die Sabbati proxima ante festum Sancti Petri in Cathedra de dono Imperatoris Alemannie per Petrum de Vineis . . . j pannum ad aurum cum aquilis. § Dominica sequenti apud Westmonasterium. In oblacione domini Regis in majori ecclesia ad majus altare pannum illum.

But in spite of this passage and Mr. Turner's note the phrase in the *Dialogus de Scaccario* still presents difficulty. C. JOHNSON.

¹ *Ante*, p. 286.