The Hundreds of Domesday

I. THE HUNDRED OF LAND.

THE occasional mention in Domesday Book of hides in Leicestershire has long been a stumbling-block to students of the great survey. The obvious explanation that these hides in a county assessed by carucates meant land newly brought into cultivation, which Mr. Eyton believes to be the meaning of the carucate in the hidated counties,¹ is excluded by the language of the Domesday entries. Mr. Eyton was puzzled by these Leicestershire hides,² and another eminent Domesday student, Mr. J. H. Round, merely says that 'the *formulae* in that county appear to be very peculiar,'³ and attempts no explanation of the passages. I venture to suggest that these Leicestershire *hidæ* are not hides at all, but *hundreds*. In the survey the abbreviation *hd* stands for *hundred*,⁴ and it is fair to presume that it was so used in the original returns.⁵ The scribe who entered these returns in the Domesday Book probably extended the abbreviation as *hide* instead of *hundred* in this case, because Leicestershire is the first county in the Domesday order in which the peculiar hundreds here intended are mentioned.

The hundreds here referred to are not the administrative hundreds, but the small hundreds of twelve geld carucates, which it may be convenient provisionally to describe as 'manorial hundreds.' These hundreds, which have been often identified by English writers with the administrative hundreds, are well defined in the Rutland Survey ('D. B.' i. fo. 293 b, col. 1): *In Alfnodestou Wapent. sunt ii. hundrez; in unoquoque xii. carucatae ad geldum, et in unoquoque*

¹ *Analysis of the Dorset Survey*, p. 17; *Analysis of the Staffordshire Survey*, p. 24. See also Mr. Round, in *Domesday Studies*, i. 105.

² *Staffordshire Survey*, p. 24.

³ *Domesday Studies*, i. 204.

⁴ *Hundred* is written 'hd' frequently in i. 876a. The abbreviation is common throughout the survey. See especially the Northamptonshire and Warwickshire surveys, which precede and follow Leicestershire.

⁵ The scribe of the *Inquisitio Eliensis* seems to have made the opposite mistake of writing *hundred* instead of *hide* in the cases of Waratinge (500b) and Meleburna (502b), where *Domesday* has in the same passages (i. 190b, col. 2; 191b, col. 1) *hides*. The *Inquisitio* has *hund'* instead of *hid'* at 505a, *Wittleseia defend[ebat] ss T. R. Eaduardi pro vi. hund. . . De his vi. h. tenet S. Aedel[dreda] ii. h.* In *Domesday*, 191b, col. 2, the possessions of Ely in 'Witeaie' (Whittlesea) are described 'ii. hid'.

xxiii. carucæ esse possunt. . . . In Martinesleie Wap. est i. hundret, in quo xii. caruc[atae] terræ ad geldum; et xlviii. carucæ esse possunt. As these entries only agree in stating that the hundred contained twelve geld carucates,⁶ we may assume that this is the meaning of the manorial hundred. The definition is supported by the invaluable survey of Lincolnshire dating from the early part of the twelfth century.⁷ In this survey the wapentakes are regularly divided into hundreds, and the contents of the hundreds are sometimes given. Thus, fo. 8, *In Hazeholm habentur iii. h[undreda,] in uno quoque xii. c[arucatae] terræ; In Welle Wap. habentur vii. hundr[eda,] in uno quoque xii. carucatae terræ.* The same contents are given to the hundreds in Walecroft (fo. 9), Hawardeshou (fo. 11), Bredelai (fo. 13), Ludeburc (fo. 15), Ierburc (*ibid.*), Calswat (fo. 20), Wragehou (fo. 21), Hilla (fo. 23), Ludesc (fo. 24), and Horncastra wapentakes (fo. 26). Moreover, at fo. 19, a fee amounting, according to the particulars, to 41 carucates and 14 bovates (that is, 42 car. and 6 bovates), is described as containing 8 hundreds ($8 \times 12 = 96$) and 6 carucates and 6 bovates. Again, at fo. 23 a fee amounting to 39 car. and 20 bovates (that is, 41 car., 4 bovates) is reckoned as 3 hundreds, 5 carucates, and 4 bovates.⁸ According to Mr. Waters, this survey mentions, in Lincolnshire, 1,912 carucates and 2 bovates. Divided by twelve, this gives 159 hundreds. The survey specifies 187, exclusive of the number in the large wapentake of Manley, the particulars of which are not preserved;⁹ so that the county was systematically divided into these hundreds.

Some of the hundreds of this later survey appear in Domesday as sokes. Of the fee of the earl of Chester ten carucates in Lecheburna Soca ('D. B.' i. 849a, col. 1) appear as 10 car. in *hundr[edo] de Lecheburna* in the later survey (fo. 20); the twelve carucates in *Suabi et Elgelo et Toresbi et Clactorp et Totele Soca* ('D. B.' *ibid.*) are in *hundr[edo] de Suabi xii. c[arucatae]* in the later survey. Geoffrey

* Kelham, *Domesday Book Illustrated*, p. 169, quotes *Carucatae terras* (12) *faciunt i. hidam*, but gives no reference. If derived from Domesday, it must refer to these Rutland entries. The passage has been, rather unfortunately, copied from Todd into the *New English Dictionary*, s.v. 'Carucate.'

⁷ My references are to the facsimile edition of this survey published by Mr. Greenstreet in 1884. He assigns the survey to between 1101 and 1109, or, at the outside, 1119. Mr. Chester Waters had previously dated it between 1114 and 1116, in the *Transactions of the Associated Architectural Societies*, vol. xvi. 1882.

⁸ At fo. 20 a fee of 47 carucates and 14 bovates (that is, 48 carucates 6 bovates) is reckoned by some error as 4 hundreds and 10 bovates.

⁹ A discrepancy no doubt arose from the wapentakes being divided into hundreds, some of which did not quite contain 12 carucates. Ludborough wapentake containing 86 carucates is correctly described as 8 hundreds, but the 10 hundreds of Louth Eskc contained only 119 carucates 4 bovates, whilst the 14 hundreds of Yarborough wapentake contained 171 carucates $1\frac{1}{2}$ bovat instead of 178 carucates. Similarly the 6 hundreds of Gartree wapentake contained 75 carucates 2 bovates, whilst Bradley wapentake with 78 carucates 4 bovates only contained $8\frac{1}{2}$ hundreds and 8 bovates, and Aslaoce wapentake with 104 carucates $4\frac{1}{2}$ bovates was divided into 7 hundreds.

de la Wirce granted the hundred of Crowle to Selby abbey shortly after the completion of Domesday. He describes it as *Crull, scilicet hundredum terrae cum tota soca et saca ut in uiccomitatu Lincolnie iacet*.¹⁰ But the fact that the hundred consisted regularly of twelve geld carucates suggests that the division was really a fiscal one, and therefore the identification of a hundred with a soke is accidental. In the later survey, fo. 20, the lands of the earl of Chester, lying in at least five hundreds, are divided, irrespectively of their situation, into four hundreds, and ten carucates. There is a similar division at fo. 23.

It may be necessary to explain, before analysing the Leicestershire 'hides,' that in Domesday the value of a manor is estimated in three ways. The first is the number of ploughlands at which the manor is assessed for geld. This is the *hida ad geldum* of the south and the *carucata ad geldum* of the north. The assessment generally varied from the actual number of ploughlands in the manor, which are usually given in Domesday. The real ploughlands are distinguished as *terrae ad carucas*.¹¹ In addition to these details, we have the number of ploughteams recorded. These again frequently differ from the number of ploughlands. In exceptional cases, as in Anlepe, Leicestershire (i. fo. 231b, col. 2), all three sets of figures agree. More often the assessment for geld agrees with the number of ploughlands in the manor.

We will now proceed to the Leicestershire hides. In vol. i., fo. 236a, col. 1, we read: *Ogerus Brito tenet in Cilebe de rege ii. partes unius hidae, id est xii. car[ucatae] terrae*. We are, I think, justified in treating the gloss as defining the *hida*=hundred. Two-thirds of a hundred of twelve carucates are eight carucates. This is precisely the number of ploughlands recorded as being in the manor in King Edward's time (*Ibi fuerunt viii. car[ucatae]*).¹² At the time of the survey there were, however, only six teams on the manor. In Wichingestone, fo. 232a, col. 1, there were one 'hide' and the third of another. This, on my suggestion, means sixteen carucates. This was precisely the number of ploughlands in the manor, which were cultivated by seventeen teams. Moreover, we learn that the demesne consisted of a third of a 'hide,' i.e. four caru-

¹⁰ *Monasticon Anglicanum*, iii. 149. In John's confirmatory charter, A.D. 1204, it is described as *Crull, scilicet unum hundr' in uiccomitatu Linc. Rot. Chart. 131a*.

¹¹ The ploughlands are very frequently omitted in the Leicester survey. Are we to assume that in cases of omission they agreed in number with the geld carucates?

¹² This and similar entries in Leicestershire are very puzzling. It is impossible to determine whether they mean geld carucates, actual ploughlands, or merely plough teams. Mr. Round, *Domesday Studies*, i. 204, considers *car'* to mean in these cases ploughlands. If it be read *carucata*, we must conclude that the terms of assessment had been changed since the death of the Confessor. But the word is frequently followed by details of the number of the ploughs at the time of survey, which seem to be contrasted with these entries concerning the time of King Edward. So that after all *caruca*-plough team may be the meaning of this formula.

cates. It was tilled by four teams. This case seems to strongly support my theory. In Ailestone, fo. 291*b*, col. 1, there were $1\frac{1}{2}$ of a 'hide,' i.e. fourteen carucates. I am again supported by the survey, which says there were there fourteen car[ucates] in king Edward's time, although at the time of the survey there were only seven teams.¹³ But if the six ploughlands held by Saxi are to be counted, there were at least thirteen ploughlands. In Brandinestor, fo. 297*a*, col. 2, we read: *Ibi sunt ii^m partes unius hidae, id est xii. car[ucatae] terrae*. Here, as in Cilebe, we have the 'hide' = hundred defined as twelve carucates, but the evidence in support of the suggested reading is not so clear as in the Cilebe case. We should expect in Brandinestor eight carucates. There were, however, only six car[ucates] there in Edward's time. At the time of the survey there were five teams, and, in addition, three carucates tilled by one team. Thus there seems to have been really eight ploughlands in the manor. In Cnihtetone, fo. 291*a*, col. 1, there were two parts of a 'hide,' i.e. eight carucates, but there were only six ploughlands tilled by six teams. Precisely the same figures occur in Cnapetot, fo. 281*b*, col. 1. In Fostone, fo. 295*a*, col. 2, the half-'hide' (six carucates) contained only five ploughlands worked by, apparently, seven teams. In the next entry, Erendesbi, half a 'hide' and three bovates ($6\frac{3}{4}$ carucates) contained seven ploughlands, and were tilled by seven teams. Here the discrepancy is not very great. In Setintone, fo. 290*b*, col. 1, there was one 'hide,' minus one carucate, i.e. eleven carucates. The number of ploughlands is not given, the teams numbering nine. In Dislea, *ibid.* col. 2, there was one 'hide' (twelve carucates) worked by eight teams, the number of ploughlands not being given. Half a 'hide' and one carucate, i.e. seven carucates, at Westham, fo. 297*a*, col. 2, was six car[ucates] in Edward's time. At the time of the survey they were tilled by seven teams. Saltebi (fo. 294*b*, col. 2) was assessed at two 'hides' and three carucates (= 27 carucates). In the time of king Edward there were there twenty-eight car[ucates], and at the time of the survey it was cultivated by twenty-six teams.

The fact that the actual number of ploughlands falls short of the assumed number of carucates in some of the above instances is not fatal to my hypothesis, for in Leicestershire there are several instances where the carucates exceed the ploughlands. For example, in Chenemundescote, fo. 291*a*, col. 1, there were thirteen and a half carucates, but only eight ploughlands and five teams; in Walecote, on the same page, there were six carucates to three ploughlands and three teams; in Stoctone, 292*a*, col. 1, there were twenty-eight carucates against twenty-two ploughlands and twenty-

¹³ Similarly 13 carucates at Terlintone, fo. 290*b*, col. 2, were cultivated by only nine teams, and the 8 carucates in Lubanham by five teams.

five teams. But such instances of apparently excessive assessment will not explain the Duntone entry, fo. 236*a*, col. 1. Here there were three 'hides' (thirty-six carucates), but only six ploughlands. No teams are mentioned. But there was something abnormal in this holding, for it had gone down in value from 20*s.* to 2*s.* and was 'waste' when the holder received it. There is an entry of a 'hide' in Burtone, a soke of Loughborough (fo. 237*a*, col. 1), of which the only details given are that there was one team in demesne.

The manor of Burbece (i. 231*a*, col. 2), the property of Coventry abbey, appears to be an instance of 'beneficial hidation,' i.e. the assessment had been reduced by royal grant. It was assessed at one and a quarter hides, that is, fifteen carucates, although it contained twenty-two and a half ploughlands. The survey only specifies ten teams in spite of the fact that the manor had increased enormously in value.

The case of Medeltune, fo. 235*b*, col. 1, is puzzling. We read: *Ibi sunt vii. hidae et una carucata terrae et una bouata : in una quaque hida sunt xiiii. carucatae terrae et dimidia.* This reveals, again assuming *hida* to mean hundred, a larger hundred of fourteen and a half carucates. Apart from my theory, it is obvious that the contents of this manor were 102½ carucates and one bovate. In Medeltune itself there were only ten and a half teams. The members of the manor contained in Edward's time forty-eight car[ucates], whilst at the survey there were forty-three ploughs. The entry is as incomprehensible as the Loughborough one (237*a*, col. 1).¹⁴ The larger hundred of fourteen and a half carucates here mentioned may possibly be intended in the Bladi entry, 237*a*, col. 2. Here there were half a 'hide' and one and a half carucates, but in Edward's time there were there nine car[ucates]. With the larger hundred we should get eight and three-quarter carucates, agreeing very nearly with the contents in the Confessor's time. With the smaller hundred, we have seven and a half carucates, agreeing approximately with the seven ploughteams in existence when the survey was taken. In Scepeshefde, fo. 230*b*, col. 2, two and a half hides and four carucates were worked by thirty-eight ploughteams. The assessment is here thirty-six and a quarter carucates by the larger hundred, or thirty-four by the smaller one.

The above exhausts the list of 'hides' mentioned in the Leicestershire Survey, and there is, I contend, nothing in them that conflicts with the suggestion that *hida* is a mistake for 'hundred.'

¹⁴ Mr. Pell, with his usual freedom from the trammels of facts, airily explains the Medeltune entry in *Domesday Studies*, i. pp. 187, 323, by the simple process of treating the carucates as virgates, and then making the virgate so obtained a tenth of the hide instead of the fourth. In other words, he makes the carucate into the tenth of its areal equivalent the hide.

A reference to one of these small hundreds may be, I think, detected in Derbyshire. In Domesday, i. fo. 273*a*, col. 2, occurs the title *Morelestan Wap. Salle Hd.* This is just the way in which these hundreds are entered in Lincolnshire. We find that the bishop of Chester had in Salle (Sawley) and two berewicks twelve carucates *ad geldum*, the exact contents of the hundred. In Aitone (Long Eaton), which follows under the same heading, he had twelve more carucates. This is probably another hundred. The transcriber appears to have omitted the heading *Aitone Hd.*, as, indeed, he has apparently done in every case except that of Sawley. He has even omitted the name of the wapentake before the next entry to Long Eaton, whereby the manor of Bubedene, which was really in Appletree wapentake, is made to appear in Morley wapentake at the other extreme of the county. There are other instances in the survey where the scribes, by omitting the names of the wapentakes or hundreds in codifying the holdings under the owners' names, have caused a manor to appear in a wrong division of the county. In the Nottinghamshire survey *Blidsvorde Hd.* is written against the entry of Alwoldestorp (i. 291*a*, col. 1), just as the hundreds are entered in Lincolnshire. In the Notts survey this position is frequently occupied by *soka* or *berewica*. Hundreds are mentioned in Notts at i. 291*a*, col. 1, where we read that five sokemen *in aliis hundret* pertained to the manor of Aigrun; at Lecche (291*b*, col. 2), a berewic that pertained to Pluntre Hundred; and at Farnesfeld (288*b*, col. 2), where we are told that the soke of one bovate pertained to Southwell and of the other belonged to the king, *sed tamen ad hund. de Sudwelle pertinet*. These details are essentially manorial, and seem to argue that these Notts hundreds are also manorial hundreds. The Farnesfeld entry is supported by the statement at 288*a*, col. 1, that *in Sudwelle numerantur xx. bereuu[icae]*.

In a future paper I hope to be able to throw further light upon these hundreds, which were not restricted to the three counties here dealt with.

W. H. STEVENSON.