Mr. Padel is to be not only thanked but congratulated upon having devised so splendid a programme, catering for all tastes and interweaving several leitmotivs. Articles based upon the papers by Dr. Cansell, Frances Griffith, Mr. Freeman, Dr. Morgan, M. Tanquy, Dr. Thorn and Miss Scherr are published in the present volume (owing to pressure of other duties, Mr. Watts is holding his paper over for Vol. XI).

CECILY CLARK

THE IDENTIFICATION OF Domesday places in the south-western counties of England

Great, or Exchequer, Domesday Book (GB) mentions over 13,000 places by name. Identifications have been suggested in various publications since the eighteenth century and no name has not been written about, although some remain unidentified. All five south-western counties of England have a Domesday translation in the monumental VCH series and the identifications there printed, however long ago they were made, have tended to impose themselves, particularly on researchers in other disciplines who use Domesday as a source. This paper looks at the problems of identification with particular reference to the SW. It has been found that in editing the SW. county volumes for the Phillimore series, a considerable number of identifications in each county, especially in Devon, have needed review; it is here argued that more rigour, clarity and system are required before a place-name identification can be considered secure and that in this, the onomastician, the historical geographer and the student of diplomatic can assist the historian.

In each of the SW. counties, as elsewhere in England, the first lists of identified places were provided in the late eighteenth or the nineteenth centuries by antiquarian writers of varying skills: Canon Jones for Wiltshire; Hutchins, then Eyton, for Dorset; Collinson, then Eyton and Whale, for Somerset; Worth, then Reichel and Whale, for Devon; Couch, then Carne, for Cornwall. These pioneers tended to use a small number of documents, some inadequately edited even by the standards of their time; they did not always pay systematic attention to the hundredal basis of each landholder’s fief; they were children in the jungle of place-name studies, and they often lacked the broader view that comes from the study of several Domesday counties. Yet so difficult, painstaking and time-consuming is any identification that their successors were grateful to build on their foundations, however insecure.

For those VCH volumes, Devon and Somerset, that were published at the turn of this century, fresh studies of identifications were made but they borrowed heavily from previous work, many of the faults of earlier attempts were still present and the work of local editors was not systematically reviewed by the general editors. The outstanding defect was the failure to publish the evidence that justified an identification. VCH Somerset, which has about 720 Domesday entries, has a mere 60 or so footnotes concerning identifications. Yet even if an identification is philologically unexceptionable one still needs to show — unless both the 1086 and the modern names are unique — that the Domesday place
had the particular modern successor that is claimed for it. The absence of
evidence amounts to identification by assertion and then by repetition as the
VCH builds on an earlier writer, and the *Domestic Gazetteer* (DG) follows the
VCH. Along the way, doubts and hesitations can easily be omitted. It is
particularly regrettable that the analysis of places on which the *Domestic
Geography* series is based has not been published; that DG has a number of
starting and unsupported identifications; that the modern VCH volumes for
Dorset and Wilts. are scarcely prodigal with notes; and that even the earlier
Phillimore DB volumes for many counties are content either to assert or to
reproduce others' assertions. Many early identifications have not been fully
reviewed and some are inadequate. It is too easy to give to a Domestic
place-name an extrapolated modern form and to use the apparent meaning of the
name, together with the other details of the DB entry, to locate it. Thus VCH
Devon identifies an 'Eastanton' Down near Lynton and an 'Esworthy' (Exon DB
Esseords) near Silverton and DG maps them, yet no evidence has been found for
their post-Domesday existence or for their location. In the first example,
the DB name-form is Standone, 'Stone Down', and the Exon DB form Estandone
does not contain 'east'. (The initial vowel being the Norman prosthetic e-.)
The location is probably guessed from the certain facts that the place follows a
manor, Cuffyns Haenton, that was in Lynton parish; that it can be identified in
the Tax Return or the combined hundred of Braunton and Shilwell; and that
the name contains OE dan 'hill'. In the second example, Esseords is said to
have been added to Silverton manor and has presumably been located on the
assumption that it contains as first element the name of the river Exe; but it
more probably contains OE asce 'ash-tree'. DG maps it where there is now a
place called Exeland. This may be the result of an equally dubious form of
identification which consists of taking its meaning to identify only one element in
a compound name, placing the place appears to be in the required geographical
area.
In this way, GBD Pantesheide in Somerset (21/80), containing the element
Weafed 'head', is assumed to be near Towerhead in Barnwell. Similarly, in Devon,
according to VCH or DG, or both, GBD Lidemore (17/18) is More in Pyworthy;
Landelshers (14/4) is Hawkwell; Sutreamore (23/15) is Southbrook; Ulwarendone
(1/72) is Wolvin; Pernore (19/2) and Perniordin (24/32) are Allardisworth; Hane
(52/7) is Embury; and Herstandahe (25/8) is Clinton Hayes. Of course,
other evidence sometimes shows that a Domestacy place-name loses, gains or
substitutes an element during its evolution, 
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appearance when it is coupled with an unsound idea of the evolution of forms or with the notion that the names of places change capriciously. Thus in VCH Devon, GBD Snedlede (16/88) is given as Snedleigh alias Stoodleigh in
West Buckland; Wallforde (17/93) as 'Walford' alias Collaford or Collard; and
Noocheote (46/2) as Noggacott alias Northcote. This provides a convenient,
even alluring, slide from the DB form to a modern village. The elderly EPPS
volumes for Wilts. and for Devon compounded the problem by uncritically repro-
ducing Domestic identifications even when they were formally impossible or
unlikely and by being less than careful in allotting a particular Domestacy
name-form to a particular modern village, when several places of the same
name lie within the county.

Further problems are introduced by the desire, most evident in the work of
Reichel and of Whale, to find in DB the predecessor of every important
modern settlement, even if a substitution of name has to be assumed. In Devon,
Reichel suggested without evidence that GBD Ringedone (1/6) could be
Frenchstone near George Nympton. DG makes matters worse by naming Ringedone on the map
where Frenchstone lies. Attempts are also made to identify every entry in the
Book of Fees with a named DB counterpart. This ignores the fact that many
entries in Fees may represent either subdivisions of DB holdings that were in
existence, but unnamed, in 1086 or later subinfeudations. Finally, there exist
among published identifications a few which are no more than casual guesses.
Thus, in Devon, GBD Hedse (19/22) is said to be Ownay's (VCH) or Hayes
Park (DG); Bree (24/17) is said to be Netherdon (VCH and DG); Othi (34/47) is
said to be Heasbury (VCH and DG); and another Othi (34/45) is identified as
Deer Park (DG).

So long as the Domestacy text was studied for its bearing on historical,
constitutional, legal, and genealogical matters and on the process of the
Inquest itself, place-name identifications were not of major importance.
They were a matter of purely local history and local history was not then an
academic discipline. All is now changed. Academics are seriously interested
in local history; the field archaeologist, the social historian and the historical
geographer are using DB as a quarry in their researches. Attempts are being made to relate DB extant and resources to reality on the ground, values are being studied estate by estate, the tenancy formula is being explored by
looking at the hideage of individual estates and their potential for exploitation,
and the DB material is being put on computer so that large-scale studies
become possible. But a pre-condition of all this new work is the formal and
supported identification of DB entries and a clear idea of what the name implies on the ground.

So far we have considered general problems of identifying places and interpreting name-forms, but a series of problems particularly affect the SW. counties.

Firstly, a large number of places share the same basic name in DB and these may well be represented in modern times either by differentiated forms or by the same name in different parts of the county, or, especially in the case of river-names, by completely different replacements. Thus, in Somerset, Cruche may well evolve to Cricket, Crewkeere or 'Crook'. Somerset also contains five Continentes, three Westones and eleven Stoches, all of which may find possible equivalents in several hundreds. In Dorset fifteen places, now represented by eight settlements, are named Tarente, and there are six 'Caudles', ten 'Froames', twelve 'Fiddles' and several 'Cernes', with no less than thirty-six 'Winterbornes'. The nature of this problem becomes clearer when the figures are viewed within a particular fief. Thus, in Dorset (cap. 26) the count of Mortain holds six places called 'Cerne', three called 'Wey', nine called 'Winterborne', three called 'Fiddle' and two called 'Freme'. Devon is particularly rich in places named from the rivers Clyst, Teign, Culm and Otter; and in places called Bere, Buckland, Leigh, Combe, Holc, Stoke and Wick. Most of these names have subsequently been differentiated: in Devon, the name Nymet when it refers to what is now the river Yeof (a tributary of the Taw) is represented by ten entries in DB whose modern equivalents are Broadymett, Nichols Nymett, Nymet Rowland, Nymet Tracey (or Bow), Burston, Hanson, Naton, Wolfin and Zeal Monachorum. DB does not normally supply qualifiers for such names and it would be anachronistic to believe that such distinctions (and, in some cases, separate villages) existed but were abbreviated out of the record: none of the satellite or precursor documents shows differentiated names where GDB has none.21 Such distinctions were beginning to arise in 1086, but haphazardly: thus in Somerset, GDB has Northcote (1/19) alongside Churle and Curle.22 and Ubcede, Opecede and Sudcede which represent Upper and Lower Cheddon (the latter now Cheddon Fitzpaine).23 There is also Sudcabeberi,24 and Norpere, Nordperet, Norderpeth and Sudperet, Sudperete, Sudpereteone.25 But the usage is not consistent: Cheddon Fitzpaine appears also as plain Cedre;26 the modern North Cadbur is simply Cedabeberi;27 and North Peretone is also Peretone and Peret.28 Although, in Dorset, GDB has Litelplidele, Litelplide for one place — the river Piddle29 neither entry simply named Pldre30 can be shown to have also lain there.31 Similarly, one place occurs in the GDB text of Wilts. as both Wintreburne and Wintreburnestock.32

Secondly, these problems would largely evaporate if hundred headings had been systematically inserted in the text. The rivers Otter and Clyst, from which several places in Devon were named by transference, flow through four separate hundreds, insertion of whose names in the text would assist the identifications. But there is no hundredal rubrication for the five SW. counties, even though there are isolated references to hundreds in the text. For example, in Dorset, DB mentions Buckland and Purbeck hundreds,33 and in Devon the third penny of North Molton, Bampton and Braunton hundreds went to Molland.34 Although rubrication in GDB is faulty in many other counties, especially in Oxon.,35 the complete absence of it in the SW. seems to imply a clear decision at some stage of the Inquest against its inclusion.

The third particular problem is the absence of named subholdings. Sometimes the naming of a member of the manor would identify some otherwise undistinguished 'Winterborne'; equally a specification of the members of one of the many manors in excess of 10 hides,36 which must have contained a number of settlements, would give a better idea of the extent and the shape of the manor. In other counties these members are more fully treated: e.g., in Northants; in the Terra Regis of Worcs.; and in the Daneslaw counties where a clear distinction is made between the main manor and its named sokes and bere-wicks. Sometimes subholdings that were presumably separate named settlements are plainly implied by the text, as in the case of the 22 hides of Sturminster Newton in Dorset where four distinct but unnamed holdings are listed: six hides held by Waleran, one hide held by Roger, another hide held by Ketel and four hides held by Gatshale Cook.37 More of both types of information was probably present at earlier stages of the drafting of Domesday. Certainly ExonDB gives tantalizing glimpses when it names Burnett as a subholding of Keynsham in Somerset, and when it shows that the land - unnamed in GDB - of six thames at Bridestowe in Devon lay at Kersford, Batstishill, Combebow, Eadsworthy, Pernsworth and Way.38

These being the difficulties, it is suggested that a Domesday place should not be considered properly identified until the following five questions are answered satisfactorily.

1. What is its Hundred?

Even a casual glance at ExonDB39 shows that, despite the absence of hundred
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places to hundreds and are especially important in Dorset by allowing distinction to be made between various places called 'Frome' or 'Winterborne'. They also point, now and then, to holdings omitted from DB. 57

The fatal attraction of the Tax Returns is that in theory it should be possible to deduce all the constituent settlements of a given hundred, simply by adding together the hideage of places considered likely to lie in that hundred, then adjusting the list until the desired total is obtained. The result can be an impressive, county-wide, wholesale reconstruction in which unfortunately the varying weight of the evidence is ignored. There are many discrepancies in the demesne hideage between DB and the Tax Returns, especially in the case of royal land, and demesne hideage is not always given in Domesday. Moreover, in other counties for which detailed later surveys exist, 58 it is clear that a small part of a Domesday manor often lay over the border in another hundred. Because of a lack of early evidence for the SW. hundreds, this splitting of manors cannot be allowed for in determining the composition of a hundred; in any 'complete' reconstruction a few places of small extent will therefore have been wrongly placed, even though the order of Exoni DB can provide a useful check. Thus in handling the Tax Return evidence it is important to distinguish firm evidence (in practice the exact correspondence of an individual's DB demesne with that given in the Tax Return) from varying degrees of speculation.

The Tax Return hundreds differ from those in the Liber Exoniensis hundred lists on which the construction of ExoniDB is based, as well as from the later hundreds, and presumably from the Anglo-Saxon hundreds. In the case of Somerset there are 38 hundreds listed in the Tax Returns; 59 58 names in the second Liber Exoniensis hundred list; about 36 later medieval hundreds; and possibly an original compact, territorial pattern of 30 Anglo-Saxon hundreds. The 58 names are essentially a list of manors or groups of manors that originated a Domesday return, many of them single manors belonging to the king, the sheriff or Bishop Giso of Wells. But the list is not a mere temporary, particular convenience, since many of these manorial hundreds continue as small hundreds, free-manors or liberties after Domesday. Some of these manorial hundreds are, however, included in the Tax returns within larger units, and some separate hundreds in the list are joined together to form triple hundreds in the Tax Returns.

Yet, despite discrepancies, the order of ExoniDB and the evidence of the Tax Returns, when studied and compared, enables places to be assigned more confidently to hundreds and thus allows the essential primary division of place-name material to be made.

2. Do the details of the DB entry accord with the proposed identification? The memorial details given for each DB entry are a useful check on its identification and occasionally show something of its extent. Fisheries require reasonably ample rivers while, in the SW., salt-ponds suggest tidal or coastal sites. Again, water-mills cannot be established just anywhere and the fact that mills are frequently shared between manors will sometimes identify an otherwise uncertain place. 60 The presence of moor, water-meadow, waste, 'forest', 61 and wild mares will often limit the possibilities as to the identification of a place; an odd fraction in the hideage of a place may find a partner elsewhere in the text; 62 and the sum of the hideage of places assumed to be adjacent may produce a 5-hide unit, or a multiple of it, 63 this being the areal unit of taxation that seems to have been widely imposed in the SW. But these things are only one element of identification. Followed mechanically, they can lead to error. A 5-hide unit cannot be constructed in isolation from other adjacent units or from its hundred, and the presence of saltworkers in the entry for inland Honiton in Devon (15/23) and of blooms of iron as a mill render at Lexworthy near Bridgewater in Somerset (17/3, 21/75-6) point not to a wrong identification, but to outlying parts of each manor, respectively on the coast and on the Brendon Hills.

3. Can the DB name evolve to the modern name proposed? Most of the identifications in the SW. were laid down before the growth of English place-name studies and the appearance of the first EPNS volumes. An imperfect knowledge of place-name etymology and of the principles of phonological development, combined with the urgent wish not to leave places unidentified, led in many cases to the wide acceptance of unlikely forms as precursors of modern place-names. Thus, in Somerset, GDB Croke (24/7) is unlikely to be Crosse (DC) when a 'Crook' is available; Netcombe (8/38) is 'Hiscoke' rather than Ashcombe (VGH); and Honicote (16/13) is Holnicote rather than Huntscott (VGH). GDB Gildencote (21/64) can hardly be Gilsocote (DC) when there is a Gilcott known locally, and Sordenemord (25/42) must be 'Shortenford' not Stelford (DC). VGH Devon and DC are especially full of such cases: for example, GDB Beldrendiland (3/15) is identified as Brandize (DC), when it should be connected with Barrington; and Madescane (19/36) is identified as Woodscombe (VGH, DC), when it should be Mackham. GDB Alfelmestone (35/27) is not Yealmestone (VGH, DC), but a lost place, now represented by Train in Wembury parish; Cachesberge
(16/22) is not Klgbear (VCH), but Cookbury; Nechecote (46/2) is not Nogacott alias Northcote (VCH), but Nutcott. A re-scrutiny of the name-forms in all the SW counties except Dorset might reveal more philologically unsatisfactory identifications.

4. What unit is being identified?

It tends to be assumed that the DB place to be identified corresponds to a modern parish or village. But the modern name chosen can be too precise and can preclude further investigation. Thus, in Dorset, Sherborne (2/6) at 43 hides, Sturminster Newton (8/1) at 22 hides, Cerne Abbas (11/1) at 22 hides, and Canford Magna (31/1) at 25 hides must have extended beyond the present parishes and evidence should be sought to show their extent and name their members. In the case of Canford the addition of Magna to the identification is unhelpful, since 'Canford' included Little Canford, Parkstone, Hamworthy, Longfleet and Poole.64 GDB Bretemer in Somerset (8/33), a 20-hide manorial hundred, is often identified as (East) Brent, a modern parish, but the corresponding name in the second Liber Exoniensis hundred list is Sudbretna and the holding also included the parish of Lynmouth: 'Brent' or 'Bretemarsh' might be a better way to represent the identification.65

Where adjacent modern villages or parishes share the same basic name but are distinguished by affixes such as 'Great' and 'Little', 'East' and 'West', it is tempting to identify particular DB holdings with particular modern villages. Frequently it is right to do so: the holdings of the bishop of Coutances and of Aiulf in 'Worlinton' in Devon can be shown to be represented by East Worlinton and West Worlinton respectively.66 But while their lands may have been distinct in 1086, only documents or the spade will prove if separate settlements existed then. Many of these differentiated villages date from quite recent times; often in 900 years the settlement centre has shifted, dispersed or nucleated and Domesday cannot be expected to point to an exact spot on the ground, even though the Domesday mapper may choose as his reference point a church or crossroads. Moreover, Domesday vills can sometimes be shown to be divided in ways that differ from the modern settlements: it is not obvious that the parishes of East and West Lulworth in Dorset correspond to the respective lands of the king and the count of Mortain, since the latter held in both.67 The division of Barrow in Somerset in 1086 does not correspond to the later villages.68 Examples could be multiplied. Indeed one needs to allow for a great deal of tenurial complexity in 1086: vills split by hundreds; manors with surviving members often in other hundreds and unnamed in DB;69 vills where

the arable of different lords is intermixed and only later disentangled by 'exchanges' which created separate and compact estates. Exactly what the DB estates were and precisely where they lay is a fruitful meeting point for the Domesday editor, the archaeologist and the local historian.

The Domesday name itself can mislead. The names are those of 'estates', or more precisely of taxable units, which do not reveal the number of settlements within them, nor describe the exact distribution of lands, nor the manorial structure, nor the management of the estate. The many examples of areal or river or general names, so puzzling at first, are probably those of fiscal units, book-names, names allotted in charters70 or in lists to 5, 10, 30 hides as an administrative convenience and ignoring the more precise identities of the individual units. Most of these latter names were Anglo-Saxon and were probably in use before Domesday, but the administrator, and probably the tenant holding his 'charter', continued to use a more general name. Thus, in Somerset, two adjacent entries in GDB for Ile (9/4-5) in reality represent Fivehead and Isle Abbotts, Ile being a convenient name for the unit and one given in a charter.71 Meavy in Devon is the DB name of five settlements totalling 1½ hides, but in reality they were probably known individually in 1086 as Meavy, Goodmansway, Gratton, Cadover, Brimsworth and Laxton.72 The six places called Awliscombe in Devon were no doubt similarly differentiated before the Conquest.73

Finding the place on a map and looking at it in relation to others is an essential adjunct to other methods of identification. Does the place still exist as a settlement? Is it now lost but its site known? A careful study of modern maps, nineteenth century O.S. one-inch and six-inch sheets, Tithe Apportionment maps and the earlier works of county cartographers will sometimes locate places unidentified or supposedly 'lost'; equally it may suggest that a place such as 'Guscott' in Devon (16/13) has found its way onto the VCH or GDB Domesday maps without real evidence. Moreover, a close study of the map may show that a place has been identified in the middle of an extensive manor held by a different tenant-in-chief and of which it does not appear to be an alienated part. Thus upper and Lower Langford in Barrington and Churchill parishes in Somerset, with which the VCH identifies GDB Langeford (1/16), seen in fact to be accounted for as unnamed members at the manors of Wington (8/27) and Barwell (6/9). Langeford should be sought elsewhere; it is Langford Budville near Milverton.74
5. What documentary evidence, before and after 1086, supports the identification? Domesday is as unclear about tenure as it is about the extent and identity of estates. At most it usually gives the names of three holders: that of the 1066 tenant, of the 1086 tenant-in-chief and of the latter's subtenant (if any), the last usually without any distinguishing by-name (at least in GD). Questions of tenure and extent, and ultimately of identity, can only be settled by a study of documents before Domesday and after. Charters must be sought out. If they are grants to churches of a large number of hides, they will often specify the members: thus charter evidence shows that Cerne Abbey held Minterne in Dorset, unmentioned under its own name in DB, and that Milton Abbey's Over (12/13) contained Green Island and 'Fromemouth'. A charter will sometimes allow an understanding of the larger units that preceded Domesday. The 30 hides of Ditcheat in Somerset (8/30) were a grant of Æthelwulf, king of the West Saxons, to Eanulf his princeps of 25 cassati at Ditcheat and five at Lottisham; in DB it was already breaking up. In Devon, Eggbear, Lambert, Medland, Cheriton and Combe (Hall), held by three different lay tenants in 1086 in six parts, had once been the subject of a single grant by charter.

Equally important is the later history of the Domesday holding. If it is followed for the next 250 years in various acquisitions, the Book of Fees and other feudal documents, its exact identity (thanks to the growth of prefixes and suffixes) and its extent (due to the naming of members and increasing subinfeudation) will become clear. This requires a study of the later history of families and fiefs. Thus, the lands of Judhael of Totnes in Devon are divided between the honours of Totnes and Herberton; and of William Capra and Ralph of Limely combine to form the honour of Bradninch. Under the count of Mortain in Devon, individual subtenants' lands form separate honours: Bretel of St Clair's lands become the honour of Ashill; Ansger the Breton's become the honour of Odcombe; and Robert son of Ivo's become the honour of Hatch Beauchamp. In the case of churches, their cartularies and Dissolution documents add detail and precision. None of this is simple, because of the absence of documentation for some manors, confusions in the documents, alienations, exchanges, and the frequent recording of grants to churches without stating the honour from which they came.

But the rewards of this approach are great. In Dorset, the 41 hides of Sherborne (2/6) resolve themselves into sixteen or so settlements; the count of Mortain's holdings named 'Cerne' (26/5;8-11) become Forston, Herrison, Pulston; and holdings simply called 'Iwerne' can be shown to lie at Ranston and Lazerton (30/3. 56/32). More is still to be fleshed from the mainstream of published feudal documents, especially when they are re-indexed and cross-referenced.

* * * * *

This paper has argued for a more aware, systematic and rigorous approach to the identification of Domesday places. Although there are particular problems in the SW., the approach can usefully be applied to other Domesday counties especially those for which there is an elderly VCH translation, no subsequent VCH 'topographical' volumes and a primitive or non-existent EPNS volume. Some other methods of identification have been employed that need circumspection. Sometimes it seems to be assumed that the meadow and arable of a Domesday vill remained constant and indeed that a manor cannot be correctly identified because there is insufficient room for the Domesday quantity of plough-lands. This begs questions about the nature of the hide and the plough-land and the extent of the manor: it also ignores the fact that manors can expand their agrarian capacity by bringing under the plough upland or 'waste' or assarts that may be some distance away and separated from the manor. Nor should it be assumed that the manors in a fief are arranged in some logical order that corresponds to the 'itinerary' of the Domesday Commissioners. Some places have in the past been located purely on this basis, yet modern ideas of the speed and nature of the interrogators passing from vill to vill, even though it would not be unreasonable to expect some of the predecessor documents or the returns of fief-holders to be organised by groups of manors.

The rejection of such methods, the searching re-examination of existing identifications, the re-reading of printed and unpublished sources, together with progress in place-name studies and in local history and field archaeology will allow us to reconsider or clinch identifications and give flesh to the Domesday estate-names. Certainly 'more can be had than is had'.

NOTES AND ABBREVIATIONS

*This is a revised version of a paper given on 6th April 1986 at the XVIIIth Annual Conference of the Council for Name Studies held at the University of Exeter.

I am grateful to my wife Caroline Thorn for help at every stage in preparing both lecture and article. Professor John McN. Dodgson has constantly encouraged my interest in place-name identification.
The following abbreviations have been used:

DB ... Domesday Book, when used as a general term to refer to the surviving records of the Domesday Imprint.
EWR ... H. P. R. Finberg, The Early Charters of Wessex (London, 1964); quoted by document number. EWR.
EHRE ... English Historical Review. EPNS ... English Place-Name Society. ExonDB ... Exeter Domesday Book, first printed in vol. IV of the Record Commission edition, Librari Cornualles Vociati Domesday Book, Additamenta ex Codic. Antiquiss. (London, 1816); references are to the folios, recto and verso being lettered a and b, the final figure referring to the order of the entry on the page as indicated in the MS; generally by a 'gallows' sign or paragraphs. Fees ... Book of Fees (Testa de Nevill), 3 vols. (HMSO, 1920-31). CB ... Great Domesday Book; references are to the chapter and section numbers of the Philimore volumes (see n.2, below). JRC ... Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall. PN ... County Abbreviation ... County volumes of the EPNS Survey of English Place-Names. PSANNS ... Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society. Sawyer ... P. H. Sawyer, Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography (London, 1968); quoted by document number. DB ... Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art. VCH ... The Victoria History of the Counties of England.


6. R. N. Worth, 'The Identification of the Domesday manors of Devon', TDA XXV (1893), 309-42. O. J. Reichel: a series of articles, some posthumous, was published in TDA between 1894 and 1938 and spanned the publication of his identifications in VCH Devon, I (1906); full bibliographical details are given in Philimore, DB Devon, pt. I.

7. The identification of the Domesday manors of Devon, TDA XXV (1893), 309-42. O. J. Reichel: a series of articles, some posthumous, was published in TDA between 1894 and 1938 and spanned the publication of his identifications in VCH Devon, I (1906); full bibliographical details are given in Philimore, DB Devon, pt. I.


J. Couch, 'Translations from Domesday', Transactions of the Natural History and Antiquarian Society of Penzance 11 (1851-5), 110-25, 167-85, 244-69, J. Carne, 'An attempt to Identify the Domesday manors', JRIC 1 (1865), 11-59, II (1867), 219-22.

8. E.g., the Record Commission editions of the Book of Fees or Testa de Nevill (1807), heavily criticized in the preface to the Later edition (vol. I, 1921); of the Rotuli Hundredorum (1812-18); and of the Inquisitions post Mortem (1806-28).

9. Holdings and subholdings are inconsistently treated in VCH Somerset; an entry is here taken as a block of translation preceded by a Blank Line.


11. See above, n.1.

12. Similarly, the most recent attempt at Cornish DB place-names, that of I. S. Maxwell, The Domesday Settlements of Cornwall (Historical Association, Cornwall Branch, 1967), includes supporting evidence.

13. VCH Devon, 481, n.1, 543, n.11; see DB Devon, General Notes 1/7, 34/17 and cap. 44.


15. ExonDB 501b 1.


17. Wolfin is a post-Conquest name, found as Wolvynymet in 1359, deriving from a family called lupum 'wolf' in Latin, see Low in OS; see DB Devon, II, 368.

18. Examples from Devon are GB Litelcorlande (15/16) for Little Torrington identified by O. J. Reichel in VCH Devon as 'Woodland in Little Torrington'; Birland (15/46) for Bee Ferrers; and Hertine (1/30) for Hartland.

19. PN Devon, 1, 51, following Reichel, accepted GB Hagtinton as a predecessor of Kings Headton despite the fact that other forms of Headton in GBD and elsewhere point to OE heafan and ethan 'high farm', while Hagtinton points to Hagginton 'Hægga's farm' (PN Devon, 1, 28). PN Wilt. only located the GBD form New(m)tone (13/2) to North Newton (p.322), although South Newton is a DB place (DB Wilt., Places Notes 13/10). It similarly omitted Allington near Amberley and Middleton near Wimborne by allowing only Allington in Chippenham (p.90) and Milton Lilliborne (p.349); see DB Wilt., Places Notes 16/3, 24/29, 48/5.

20. Some indication of recent work can be found in P. H. Sawyer, ed., Domesday Book, a Reassessment (London, 1965) and in Domesday Studies (Proceedings of the Winchester Domesday Conference, 1967; forthcoming). Examples of detailed estate studies are: S. Everett, 'The Domesday geography of three Exmoor parishes', PSANNS CXII (1968), 24-9, and M. E. Hill, 'The demesne

21. Some place-names in Evesham A (see P. H. Sawyer, "Evesham A", a Domesday text', Wcrs. Hist. Soc. Miscellany I (1960), 3-36; Phillimore DB 16: Worcestershire (1962), eds. F. and C. Thorn, Appendix 4) have an explanatory addition, e.g. Croela Odonis, Croela Quilteri. The only instances are of pers.nm. in the genitive and refer in the above example to Odo's and Walter's portions of 'Crowle', not necessarily indicating a separate settlement. The pers.nm. were probably added in the 12th cen. when the original document was abstracted.

22. DB Somerset I/5. 16/11. 19/17-18; 23-5; 27-29. 21/1-2. 47/5. Representing Curry Rivel and Curry Mallet.


24. DB Somerset 36/7.

25. DB Somerset 1/3-5; 13. 16/5. 19/2.

26. DB Somerset 22/22.

27. DB Somerset 36/5.

28. DB Somerset 16/5. 35/1-2.

29. DB Dorset 1/14. 11/2.

30. DB Dorset 12/15.

31. A similar case in Devon is Little Torrington (1/31. 15/16. 16/34).

32. DB Wilts. 1/17. 24/8.

33. DB Dorset 1/30. 37/13.

34. DB Devon 1/41.

35. The hundredal rubrication is deficient in many counties in GDB; e.g., in Northants. there are about 200 headings in the text and about 150 missing and in Salop about 20% need to be supplied.

36. In Somerset alone there are 22 manors with hedges between 20 and 54. The largest is Taunton (12/1), many of whose members are specified.

37. DB Dorset, General Notes 8/1.

38. GDB 114a 2; see DB Somerset 1/28; GDB 788b 7, see DB Devon 16/7.

39. GDB is the circuit volume for the SW counties, written by several scribes and now incomplete. Its name-forms have been briefly studied by P. H. Sawyer in an important article: 'The place-names of the Domesday manuscripts', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library XXXVIII (1956), 483-506. It is often assumed that there was a fair copy of GDB made and that GDB was compiled from it; but see Phillimore DB Devon, pt. II, Exon. Introduction, and C. Thorn, 'The relationship between the Exeter and Exchequer Domesday Books' (forthcoming).

40. GDB 63a-64b.

41. The purpose of the first list in each case is unclear.

42. See Phillimore DB Somerset, Appendix I; and F. Thorn, 'The hundreds of Somerset' in the County Volume of the Alecto Domesday edition (forthcoming).

43. E.g. in DB Dorset, caps. 12-13, the manors of Milton Abbas and Abbotsbury are put at or near the head of their respective fiels.

44. The order of the entries in GDB as compared to GDB is: 15/6-15/32-316; 47/34; 39-55; 60-157-620; 16/1; 34-62-131-19-3-54; 21; 20; 22; 31; 42; 23; 54-3; 35/64; 6-44; 67; 36-74; 66-72; 26-7; 73; 38-74-6; 28; 77; 49; 51-29; 50; 52; 78-9; 53; 46; 1.

45. E.g., DB Devon, General Notes cap. 1.

46. DB Somerset, caps. 31-2, 45.

47. DB Devon, caps. 22, 26-7, 31-3, 40-1, 43, 45-6. In the process of separation one holding, Sackrebus (GDB 459a 3) was omitted from the GDB schedule. See DB Devon, Exon. Notes cap. 22.

48. DB Somerset, caps. 11-13, 15-16.

49. DB Dorset, caps. 1, 18, 24.

50. DB Devon, caps. 24-5.

51. DB Devon, cap. 52, 'Land of Colwin and others of the King's Thanes', consists of 53 small holdings whose descent is often difficult to trace; without the consistent hundredal order of DB many would be unidentified.

52. E.g., in Northants., caps. 6, 6a were probably once a single schedule; on this assumption hundredal headings can be restored systematically.

53. Wilts. (three versions) Liber Ewiniensis, 1a-3b, 7a-9b, 13a-16a; Dorset 1a-2a; Devon 65a-71a; Cornwall 72a-73a; Somerset 75a-82b; 526b-527a. The problem of dating is admirably reviewed by Dr Ann Williams in VCH Dorset, II, 117-18. There appear to be too many discrepancies of hideo and holder for the Tax Returns to have formed a part of the Domesday Inquest, although this is the emblematic view of V. H. Galbraith, 'The date of the gold rolls in Exon. Domesday', PPR LXV (1950), 1-15 and idem, The Making of Domesday Book (Oxford, 1961), 723-30.

54. About twenty p.n.m. in all are given in the Somerset Tax Returns, of which Woodadventure (ODA), Lefort and Pitrochevaux in the Williton hundred return, Crommore in that for Frome, and Chew Stoke in that for Chew refer to holdings that are unnamed in GDB. The Tax Returns also give some additional p.n.m. and by-names.

55. GDB often supplies demesne hideo which has been omitted from GDB.
56. Some hundreds in Wilts. and Dorset cannot be satisfactorily reconstructed in their entirety. For the Wilts. Returns see VCH Wilts., II, 178-217; for Dorset see VCH Dorset, III, 124-49; for Somerset (translation only) see VCH Somerset, I, 507-37. The Somerset Tax Returns are reconstructed in Eyton's Somerset; those for Devon in various articles by O. J. Ritchel in TDA (for details see the Philimore DB Devon, Bibliography). Both Eyton's and Ritchel's handling of their material is uneven. The Cornwall Tax Returns are reconstructed in H. M. Whitley, 'The Cornish Domesday and the Geld Inquest', JRIC XIII (1898), 568-75.

57. Shaftesbury Abbey is shown to have held land in Bath hundred in Somerset. Hervey of Heliam held land in Budleigh and Colyton hundreds in Devon; see DB Devon, General Notes cap. 44.


59. Thurlestone manorial hundred is entered twice.

60. In Somerset, the lost 'Woodwick' (7/12) can be partly located because it shares a mill with Freshford (5/35). In Dorset, a mill is shared between Watercombe and Ringstead (1/29, 52/2).

61. That is, land outside (foris) the manor, not necessarily wooded.

62. See DB Dorset, General Notes 37/13. 56/56.


64. VCH Dorset, III, 90, n.243 identifies Canford Magna; see DB Dorset 31/1.

65. VCH Somerset, I, 467 prints Brent, but DC identifies East Brent. There are now parishes named East Brent and Brent Knoll. 'South Brent', marked on the first series O.S. map of 1809 (sheet 20) lay in the latter.


67. DB Dorset, General Notes 1/6. 26/30-1.

68. DB Somerset, Places Notes 19/62.

69. In Somerset, Withiel Florey on the Brendon Hills was a detached part of Taunton hundred, unmentioned in DB (DB Somerset, Places Notes 2/1). In Devon, the manor of Iddesleigh (1/61) had land in North Taunton hundred; and Halberton (1/70) according to the Tax Return lay in both Halberton and Tiverton hundreds.

70. Charter names often give imprecise locations; e.g., in Somerset, what ECW 361 (Sawyer 237) refers to as 23 manseones 'by Quowntock Wood' corresponds to West Monkton and part of Creech St. Michael; ECW 371 (Sawyer 268) mentions 20 cassets by the river Tone; and the 12 hides at Scoy in ECW 379 (Sawyer 257) probably included Westonzoyland, Middlezoy and Othery.

71. ECW 492 (Sawyer 740).

72. DB Devon 17/79-82. 29/9.


74. The identification is due to Collinson, confirmed by S. C. Moreland, 'Some Domesday Manors', PSANHS XCIX-C (1954-5), 45. There is similarly no room for ECW's Wick in Brent Knoll in Somerset; it is probably Eckweek (DB Somerset, Places Notes 24/32; Moreland, ibid., 44).

75. ECW 613 (Sawyer 1217); see DB Dorset, General Notes cap. 11.

76. ECW 580 (Sawyer 391); see DB Dorset, General Notes cap. 12.

77. ECW 405 (Sawyer 292).


79. The members of some large manors, e.g., Leominster in DB Herefs., Montgomery in DB Salop, do seem to be arranged topographically.