DOMESDAY IDENTIFICATIONS—THE HUNDREDS.

BY R. N. WORTH, F.G.S.

(Read at Okehampton, July, 1895.)

THE appearance in the last volume of the *Transactions of the Devonshire Association* of three Domesday papers by the Rev. O. J. Reichel, one in effect a criticism of my "Identifications of the Domesday Manors of Devon," compels some comments from myself. It is perfectly true that it could hardly be gathered from Mr. Reichel's "Suggestions to aid in Identifying the Place-names in the Devonshire Domesday," that I had published a list of identifications at all, and that the only references to myself are passing and casual. Still, it is inevitable that the two papers should be in some sort read together by our fellow-members; and as the most important phase of this question is accuracy, quite apart from any personal relations to the subject of Mr. Reichel or myself, comment on my part seems imperative.

It was my sense of the supreme importance of accuracy, and of the desirability of leaving no stone unturned to secure that end, that led me to incur the trouble and expense of sending my proposed identifications to every member nine months before I sent in my paper; and it seems to me a matter much to be regretted, if any information tending to secure that accuracy, and to enhance the value of the list and of our *Transactions*, should have been withheld. Be that as it may, my duty now is clear—without delay, to give what aid I can in the further solution of these debated Domesday problems.

My remarks will be almost wholly confined to Mr. Reichel's longer paper, in which the point raised in that on the "Hundred of Hartland in the Geld Roll," is already fully dealt with. His remarks on the Leuca or Lug of Domesday do not, I think, need any further comment than simple

reference to the fact, that, so far back as 1885, the late Mr. J. B. Davidson published his reasons for assessing the areal leuca at 120 acres, which is precisely Mr. Reichel's conclusion.

The greater part of the paper on Domesday Place-names consists of a very full discussion of the various aids to identification. Upon two of those only have I anything to say; but that, with one exception, all were before me when I compiled my list, the following extract from my introduction to that list will prove. That I did not allow my scaffolding to remain when the building was completed was a mere matter of detail, and due in the main to my desire not to trespass unduly on the means of the Association. What I said then, in brief, was this:

"Where the name of a Domesday manor is distinctive and continuous, all is of course clear; and this is the case, so far as Devon is concerned, in the majority of instances. Beyond this, identification is chiefly helped by the fact that the entries commonly follow a rough-grouped or topographical order, based mainly upon the Hundreds—a point which does not seem to have had the attention its importance demands. It is when this fails that the main difficulties arise. Localities are, however, often suggested by the occurrence of fisheries or saltworks or of other special features. Relative areas are also of importance: but the large increase in the number of manors since Domesday by sub-division; with the non-inclusion of waste in the Domesday assessment; the vagueness of the terms as used; and the not infrequent shifting of boundaries, render it needful that areal deductions should be most cautiously made. Some help is to be had from the Hundred Lists; some from the secondary names attached for distinction to sundry manors, indicating situation or ownership. At times the name of the Saxon holder has supplied a valuable clue. A point to be carefully borne in mind, is the fact that names are quite as likely to change in the direction of modern forms as away from the old ones, and that a current resemblance may after all be wholly fictitious. Still more important, however, in this connection is it to remember that the Domesday scribes attached their own phonetic values to the alphabetical characters they used, and that traces of both Norman and Italian hands are manifest."

The one source to which I must confess I never did look, and never should have thought of looking, for aid, is the comparison which Mr. Reichel endeavours to draw as to the

relative values of estates from the figures given in Domesday, and the present poor-rate assessments—valuations notoriously made upon bases which differ quite fifty per cent., not only in the same county, but at times in adjacent parishes, and which cannot be taken as any real test of land-values in the gross, seeing that they include houses and other buildings, which it is impossible to distinguish without a minute and detailed examination in every instance.

The central feature of Mr. Reichel's paper is, however, his assumption of the supreme importance of the Geld Inquest, as an aid to identification. He lays it down as a canon, that the treatment applied by him to Hartland Hundred "must be accorded to all the Hundreds of Devon before we can be certain that our identifications of the Domesday Place-names are correct."

Now, the particulars of the Hundreds given in the Geld Inquest are particulars of *persons*, not of places—a simple statement of the hidage in each Hundred, and its liability to geld. The only way of connecting these entries with the places named in Domesday, is through the owners, and the assessment or non-assessment of their holdings. If an owner has two estates or manors in demesne, each given at one hide, or four at half a hide a piece, and he is set down as holding a geld-free hide in each of two Hundreds, it is utterly impossible, on the evidence of the Geld Inquest only, to say which is which, or where either is situated. At the best, therefore, the aid to identification here rendered, is indirect and collateral.

But we do not get it at the best. There would be much more to be said in favour of Mr. Reichel's method if we could only be sure of three or four things, that, as a matter of fact, are more than seriously in doubt. What he says in effect is this. The Geld Inquest shows the taxable distribution of the various holdings in the county when *Domesday* was compiled. There is a list given by Risdon which gives the names of the different members of the Hundreds. Domesday identifications, to be accurate, must bring the two into harmony. You must connect the properties of the one with the persons of the other, or your work will not stand.

And no doubt this would be a perfectly fair method, certain premises being granted. *If* the Geld Inquest is absolutely accurate, is precisely of the same date as the Domesday record, and represents exactly the same state of things. *If* also there has been no change in the Hundreds

between the compilation of the Geld Inquest and that of the list in Risdon. The smallest variation, and the whole value of the Geld Inquest as an absolute and final court of appeal, disappears. Now it is admitted on all hands that the Geld Inquest and the Domesday Record are not absolutely contemporaneous—the Inquest being earlier, and dating from 1084—and it is impossible, therefore, in a widespread county like Devon, that some shiftings of ownership should not have occurred. For the rest, Mr. Reichel himself admits discrepancy between the old and modern Hundreds, though not to any great extent, and especially when compared with those that have taken place in counties like Berkshire. It is, however, rather a truism than a paradox, to suggest that the greatest changes are often those which have left least evidence behind; and it is well, therefore, to examine what grounds there are for Mr. Reichel's belief; and what is the real weight to be attached to the rule which Mr. Reichel believes will commend itself to all—that no "identification of the Domesday Place-names can be considered satisfactory which does not account for each and all of the contributories to the Hundreds, as they have come down to us by tradition." [1]

And may I say at once that this is no new inquiry with me. Thirteen years since, I dealt with the help to be drawn from the Geld Inquest in the identification of Domesday Place-names, in my second Presidential address to the members of the Plymouth Institution, and reviewed the question at some length, as may be seen by reference to the *Transactions* of that Society.

I then pointed out that a Hundred was a numerical term defining a unit of local government, depending originally upon population (in what precise form is not material now), and that when it was a living thing its area fluctuated with the population, just as in some countries electoral districts do at the present day. My conclusion then was precisely the same as my conclusion now, that so far from the changes in the Hundreds being slight, they were both many and great.

Three lists of the Hundreds of Devon are given in *Domesday*. Two are mere enumerations of names. The

[1] Touching the accuracy of the Inquest within its own four corners, it will suffice to indicate that the details and the totals are discrepant in the Hundreds of Tawton, Bampton, Carswell, Plympton, Wonford, and Fremington, in quantities varying from a hide to a ferling—quite enough to mislead in many points; and that the possessions of the Abbot of Tavistock in Tavistock are left out altogether. It is absurd to suppose that this is the only slip of the kind.

third is that general summary of the lords and contents of each Hundred, and of its taxation, already referred to as the Geld Inquest. The first is clearly the oldest, and differs materially from the other two, which are all but identical. That of the Inquest is presumably the latest, and yet it does not agree so nearly, as far as names go, with the Hundreds of the present day, which in certain features follow in preference either the first or second. Probably, in some cases, duplicate names were current; and it may well have been, seeing that the Hundreds were named after the places where the Hundred Courts were held, that in some large Hundreds there were two Court seats, used alternately, as in some shires alternative Assize and Sessions towns. The *Hundred Rolls*—of which more hereafter—show, however, that the names of the Devon Hundreds have remained practically unchanged since the reign of Edward I., and in any case we are less concerned with the names than with the areas they represent.

The table opposite sets forth the three Domesday lists; the hidage and taxation, as given in the Geld Inquest; the modern names; the number of contributing members in each Hundred, as given in the list in Risdon (the second figure in each case being the number of sub-members additional), and the amount which each Hundred had been set to pay to the tenth and fifteenth, or subsidy—a sum which certainly did not vary in amount or relative proportions from the early part of the fourteenth century, and was as definite a fiscal unit as the Danegeld had become by the Conquest. These figures are worthy of note, for without pressing the comparison too hard, it is evident that if there had been no serious changes either of area or value, the Hundred taxation of 1086 should bear some recognizable relation to that of 1334. It is quite clear, however, as will be shown hereafter, that the list in Risdon is anything but trustworthy or complete.

In each of the three Domesday lists we may trace something of a definite topographical arrangement, though B is more consecutive than A, and C than B. The order of A is shown in the table. C begins with Lifton, passing thence to Herteland, Toritone, Framintone, and Mertone—West Devon. Then we have Brantone, Scireuelle, Sut-Moltone, Chridiatone, Tauuentone, and Witric—North Devon. Next come Tuuuertone, Clistone, Sulfertone, Hamiohc, Offecolum, Budeleie, Hasbtone, Otri, Axeminstre, Culintone, Axemuda and Badentone—East Devon, though not in such direct order. Lastly there are Esseministre, Taintone, Carsewilla,

A	B	C	Hidage.	Geld.				Members.	Subsidy.	
Hertilande . .	Hertilanda . .	Hertilande . .	20	2	2	0	Hartland . . .	7	11	17 4
Mertone . .	Mertone . .	Mertona . .	48	8	12	6	Shebbear . . .	25	41	9 4
Mollande . .							S. Molton . . .			
Toritone . .	Toritone . .	Toritona . .	34	7	4	0	Black Torrington .	31 (7)	45	17 11
Framintone . .	Framintone . .	Framintona . .	20	2	14	6	Fremington . .	12	24	6 0
Tautone . .	Tauuuetone . .	Tauuentona . .	42	10	0	5	N. Tawton . . .	22	28	17 0
							Winkleigh . . .	4	4	4 11
Dippesforde . .	Dippeforde . .	Dippeforda . .	39	7	12	0	Stanborough . .	25 (4)	43	9 6
							Coleridge . . .	20 (2)	56	16 5
Cerusuelles . .	Carsuelle . .	Carsewilla . .	50	9	12	0	Haytor . . .	33 (4)	30	4 7
Taintone . .	Tainebruge . .	Taintona . .	30	5	0	0	Teignbridge . .	17	23	7 8
Wenforde . .	Wenforde . .	Wenfort . .	54	6	15	0	Wonford . . .	27	13	7 8
Esseminstre . .	Esseministre . .	Esseministra . .	50	8	4	0	Exminster . . .	21 (4)	30	14 6
Clistone . .	Clistone . .	Clistona . .	27	3	12	4	Cliston . . .	10	11	7 0
Hermentone . .							Ermington . . .	27 (3)	46	11 11
Walchentone .	Rueberge . .	Walchentona . .	25	4	16	0	Roborough . .	14 (1)	48	2 2
Plintone . .	Plintone . .	Plintona . .	25	3	10	8	Plympton . . .	21 (1)	17	5 4
Cædelintone . .	Cadelintone . .	Cadelintona . .	46	5	12	8	S. Molton (part) .			
Sulfertone . .		Sulfertona . .	52	10	6	6	Hayridge (part) .			
Lifetone . .	Listone . . .	Listona . . .	20	4	15	0	Lifton . . .	21	21	4 6
							Tavistock . . .	2	14	15 0
Tueruetone . .	Tuluertone . .	Tuuuertona . .	20	2	14	0	Tiverton . . .	13	10	18 10
Witric . .	Wetrige . . .	Witric . . .	30	5	18	6	Witheridge . .	19	19	13 2
Clauueuton and Badentone	Badentone . .	Badentona . .	25	4	16	4	Bampton . . .	6	12	15 3
Scireuuelle . .	Scireuuille . .	Scireuella . .	50	8	10	0	Sherwill . . .	15	11	6 2
Branctone . .	Brantone . .	Brantona . .					Braunton . . .	39 (1)	60	12 7
Moltone . .	Sut Moltone . .	Sut Moltona . .	22	2	8	7	S. Molton . . .	27 (2)	36	14 6
Chridiatone . .	Crediatone . .	Chridiatona . .	20	4	3	3	Crediton . . .	19	17	13 4
Hertesberie . .							Axminster (part) .			
Budeleies . .	Budeleia . .	Budeleia . .	72	12	5	5	East Budleigh . .	21 (1)	27	12 4
							West Budleigh . .	17	9	9 8
Cullinctone . .	Culitone . .	Culintona . .	25-3	4	0	8	Colyton . . .	14	21	16 3
Axamudes . .	Alsemude . .	Axemuda . .	9-1	1	1	5				
Axaministres .	Axeministre . .	Axeministra . .	50	10	6	0	Axminster . . .	15	20	10 10
Halsbretona . .	Halbretona . .	Hasbertona . .	18-2	3	18	0	Halberton . . .	12	7	5 2
See Marie Otri .	Otrie . . .	Otri . . .	25	6	0	0	Ottery . . .	1	20	0 0
	Alerige . . .	Alleriga . .	40	6	7	6	Hayridge . . .	21 (3)	22	14 10
	Hamioth . .	Hamiohc . .	24	4	13	0	Hemiock . . .	8 (1)	11	10 4
	Ofecolum . .	Offecolum . .	14	2	14	0				

Dippeforde, Cadelintone, Plintone, Walchentone, Allerige, and Wenfort—Mid and South Devon. As I said in 1882: "It is impossible that such an arrangement can be accidental; and if we look at the map of Devon, we shall see that it is really governed by the physical conditions of the county. The first group covers the district west of the Tavy and the Taw; the second, that bounded by the Taw on the west, the Creedy and Exe on the east, and Dartmoor on the south; the third lies mainly east of the Exe; and the fourth, starting from the Tavy, follows round the flank of Dartmoor, and is bounded by the sea and the Exe south and east. The only point where there is any real absence of natural definition is in the vicinity of Exeter and Crediton; and this is precisely the neighbourhood in which there have been the greatest changes in the dispositions of the Hundreds."

This matter is worth looking into a little more in detail. The Hundred of Black Torrington now interposes between Lifton and Hartland Hundreds; but there is a detached part of Hartland Hundred lying in Fremington—the parish of Yarnscombe; and it seems clear, therefore, that the area of Hartland was once more extensive than we know it; and that Black Torrington most probably grew at the cost of its neighbour or neighbours.

The next group is about as consecutive as well can be; but here we get evidence of a change or changes, in the appearance of a detached part of Braunton Hundred in the midst of South Molton, including the parishes of East and West Buckland and Filleigh.

The East Devon group is less regularly enumerated, yet there are not wanting indications that the irregularity may to some extent be more in present appearance than in ancient fact. Tiverton, Cliston, and Silverton (Hayridge) lie together; and that Cliston was once more extensive, the existence of its Butterleigh outlier in Hayridge shows. Hemyock and Uffculme are one; and if they do not touch East Budleigh now, there are the remains of the old connection still extant in the fact that Washfield, while lying topographically in the Hundred of Tiverton, is still attached to West Budleigh, while Halberton adjoins as a matter of course. The only real departure from a consecutive order in this group is the neglect to name Bampton after Halberton, and the insertion of Ottery, Axminster, Colyton, and Axmouth between. But, as Pole shows, Ashford in Burlescombe, Bampton Hundred, belongs to Halberton; and we note other evidence of change in the presence of a fragment

of Dorset between Axminster and Colyton Hundreds, with *per contra* the establishment of a part of Axminster Hundred —the parish of Thorncombe—in Dorset. I may add, for further comment hereafter, that the two Budleigh Hundreds —once one—are now separated by a spur of Wonford.

The last group is remarkably consecutive, but for one interpolation. Exminster, Teignbridge, Heytor (Carswell), Coleridge and Stanborough (Dippesforde), Plympton, and Roborough (Walchentone), follow each other with absolute accuracy, save for the insertion of Caedlintone between Dippesforde and Plintona; and so do Hayridge and Wonford. We cannot tell how far Caedlintone Hundred extended southward; but all that is needed to bring it into line with the rest of the group is its transposition after Walchentone. I was, indeed, disposed to identify it, in 1882, with the district of which Cadleigh forms the centre, when the connection with Hayridge would be clear enough. Herein, however, I was wrong; and further survey has set me right. Caedlintone is Chittlehampton — a large and important manor belonging to Gytha, and therefore a very natural Hundred-head.

And incidentally I may here remark that Mr. Reichel's rule, if a good one, ought to work both ways. If we are to reason from the Hundred to its components, we ought to be able to reason from the components to the Hundred. If, however, the attempt be made to identify Caedlintone in that way, the result will be utter failure. The Geld Inquest mentions as holders of land in this Hundred, Oliver under Baldwin, Robert Fitz Gervin under Baldwin, and Godeva. Now, reference to *Domesday* will show that there is no Oliver holding under Baldwin at all. Nor is there mention of Robert Fitz Gervin. There are undistinguished Roberts holding under Baldwin, besides Roberts de Bello Mont and Pontecardonis; but it is a hopeless task—the endeavour to make up out of their holdings, the three hides which Fitz Gervin is said to hold in demesne. All we can say is that most of these Robertian tenures are in the north of the county, and so far may be held to favour the Chittlehampton theory. But Godeva is wholly irreconcilable. Her two manors are Torre (Mohun) and Dodbrook; but instead of holding one hide only in demesne in either or both (the Geld Inquest figure), she has a hide and four ploughlands in each. Here we are at once confronted with inaccuracy or change; though a third cause of variation may be suggested by the fact that we actually find Robert Fitz

Pagan paying in Wonford for a hide in another Hundred which would be bound to upset other calculations.

These lists, then, I think show clearly that although the bulk of the Domesday Hundreds may have been much the same as now, there are many important variations—quite too important to allow of the Geld Inquest being taken *ex cathedra* on a question of obscure Domesday identification.

Merton is now represented by Shebbear, and Winkleigh may have been carved out of either it or North Tawton; or, for what we know to the contrary, Caedlintone.

Dippesforde and Hermtone must be taken together; only as the latter does not appear in list C, it must be included under one of the adjoining Hundreds, *i.e.* either Dippesforde or Plympton. We find, however, that Diptford, where the Hundred Court was held, is fairly central for the three modern Hundreds of Ermington, Stanborough, and Coleridge. It is certainly represented by the two latter, and in all probability included also the greater part of Ermington, Plympton taking the rest up to the Erme. I have suggested elsewhere that the reason for the disappearance of Ermington may have been the depopulation caused by descents from the sea.

Heytor Hundred we find under the name of Carswell; and here we are confronted by the noteworthy fact that the Hundred really consists of two detached parts, which may be called the Carswell and the Heytor sections, and which are divided by a piece of Wonford. Moreover, Heytor, whence the Hundred is now named, is not within the Hundred at all! *Domesday* does afford evidence of some connection between the two sections, in the mention of Deptone after Cockington — Deptone being Deandon, in Widecombe-on-the-Moor, and an appendage to Cockington to the present day; but that is not sufficient evidence that the Hundred was the same then as now. Indeed, some very special cause must have been at work to give the name of a Dartmoor height to a district on the shores of Torbay; and the fact that Heytor, if it ever was within the Hundred, is so no longer, seems to point to a series of changes, rather than one.

Wonford is a very remarkable Hundred, and I am not disposed to go back on a suggestion made in the address already quoted, that it may have once occupied what are now Teignbridge and Heytor Hundreds as well as its present limits. It has the most remarkable configuration of any Hundred in the county—stretching west from Exeter, right

away to South Tawton, circling round the city east to Topsham, sending a spur north dividing the two Budleighs, sweeping round the northern flank of Dartmoor, by Throwleigh, Chagford, and Drewsteignton, and claiming two detached portions south of the Teign, one comprising the Ogwells, and the other Coombe and Stoke-in-Teignhead and Shaldon. It is quite impossible, on any reasonable supposition, that such a unit of local government could be of original design; and when we compare the figures given in Risdon for the tenth and fifteenth with those set forth in the Geld Inquest for the Danegeld, we shall find very strong corroborative evidence for this suggestion of limitation. But on that head more anon.

The chief differences between the ancient and modern Hundreds, more directly apparent, are in East Devon. Two Hundreds which appear in A—Clauueton (with Badentone) and Hertesberie — are not found in B and C, and have not re-appeared since. Axemuda, in all three, is also gone, with Sulfertone (A and C), and Offeculm (B and C). West Budleigh has been added. Thus we find that while in list A East Devon is comprised in ten Hundreds, in list C it is divided into thirteen — an absolute proof, seeing that the Hundred was then a living thing, that in the interval between the two there had been a considerable increase of population, the density of which may further be gathered from the fact that Axemuda, Offeculm, and Hasbertone were the three least in area in the county, Budleigh on the other hand being, with Wonford, the biggest. It looks as if the Hundred system had been gradually established in Devon by an advance from the east, and that there were at least two periods when the whole sweep of the encroaching frontier, with its necessarily sparse Saxon population, formed a Hundred—first Budleigh, then Wonford, to be divided and limited as time went on and the constituencies—to adopt a modern term—increased.

Clauueton is of course Clayhidon; and here again we find change in the fact that while it is grouped with Bampton in list A, it disappears from B and C, while instead of being in Bampton Hundred now, the parish is in that of Hemyock.

Sherwill and Braunton are kept separate by name in all three lists; but the details in the Geld Inquest are given for both together, so that there is no *Domesday* possibility of distinguishing the holdings in either.

And there is another *crux* in connection with the Hundreds of Lifton and Tavistock. The latter, which is not found in

Domesday, was evidently carved out of Lifton; and indeed a part of Lifton—Sydenham and Lamerton—is islanded in Tavistock. But there is no mention of the Abbot of Tavistock in the Geld Inquest under Lifton, nor indeed in the next Hundred—Walchentone, now Roborough.

It seems to me, therefore, that the *Domesday* record yields abundant proof that in the reign of the Conqueror, the Hundred system of Devon was in a constant state of flux and reflux; and that as the Hundred remained a living unit of local government long years afterwards, it would be against analogy and common sense to suppose that changes—and important changes—came to an end at this particular time; even if we were not able to lay our hands upon positive evidence to the contrary.

When I first made this topic a matter of enquiry, I tried to see what light might be got from a comparison of the ancient ecclesiastical divisions of the county with the ancient civil—that is, of the Deaneries with the Hundreds. We know, of course, that to a wide extent the older parochial arrangement reflects the manorial, and that parishes are very commonly manors or groups of manors; and it seemed a reasonable thing, therefore, to enquire whether there was not in like manner some relationship between the Deanery and the Hundred, at any rate in Devon. It not only appeared that such a correspondence did exist, but singularly enough that it was most clearly seen in connection with presumably the oldest list—A.

Thus the deanery of Tavistock is the old Hundred of Lifton, or the modern Hundreds of Tavistock and Lifton, with a fringe cut off to the north and east, more convenient of access from Okehampton, and joined thereto. Okehampton Deanery takes, however, most of its parishes from Torrington, and Holsworthy Deanery is wholly so formed. Hartland Deanery includes—and this is very noteworthy—not only the whole of the present Hartland Hundred, but the northern portion of Shebbear, over which the Yarnscomb outlier has already given us reason to believe this Hundred formerly extended. Torrington Deanery in the main represents Merton Hundred. Sherwill Deanery is another significant factor, for it includes, just as the Geld Inquest, both the Hundreds of Sherwill and Braunton, except Barnstaple, Pilton, and Filleigh, which are taken by Barnstaple itself, thus partly carved out of both. Chumleigh Deanery is chiefly North Tawton Hundred. South Molton includes

parts of its own Hundred and that of Witheridge. Cadbury is mainly West Budleigh Hundred, with the bulk of Crediton added. Tiverton Deanery swallows the Hundreds of Tiverton, Bampton, and Halberton. The other deaneries in East Devon, as we should expect to find from the changes in the Hundreds, are very much mixed. Dunkeswell includes parts of Hemyock and Axminster, and may fairly represent the lost Hertesberie. Honiton is chiefly Axminster, with Axmouth and part of Colyton. Plymtree Deanery is chiefly Hayridge, and may most nearly represent the ancient Silverton. Aylesbeare Deanery takes in East Budleigh and Ottery, the bulk of Cliston, and a little of Wonford. Kenn is mainly Exminster, with portions of Wonford; while Durnford is mostly Wonford, with a portion of Exminster. Moreton Deanery closely corresponds with Teignbridge Hundred. Ipplepen is Haytor Hundred, with the South Teign parishes of Wonford added. In fact, of all the Hundreds, Wonford is the most parcelled, and the only one which does not retain a fair amount of individuality. Totnes and Woodleigh Deaneries correspond in the main with Stanborough and Coleridge Hundreds, but the extension of the latter westward into the Hundred of Ermington seems to indicate a close reflection of the ancient Dippesforde, especially as the whole of the rest of Ermington Hundred is included with that of Plympton in the Plympton Deanery. The Deanery of Tamerton represents the Hundred of Roborough, *minus* the Three Towns, which no doubt went to Plympton Deanery (ere they were recently erected into a deanery of their own), in consequence of the proprietorial rights exercised by Plympton Priory.

Of course, it is not contended that the Deaneries have been free from change, any more than the Hundreds. All that is suggested is this:—That the Deaneries do indicate a close and unmistakable connection with the Hundreds, in their earlier rather than their later stage, and that they have retained their original characters more closely, in accordance with the more conservative instincts of matters ecclesiastical.

At bottom, however, the existing divisions of the Deaneries are based upon parochial lines, while those of the Hundreds are founded on manorial.

Let us now see what deductions, if any, can be drawn from the comparison of the Domesday geld of the various Hundreds, with the subsidy contributions given in Risdon under the same names. We cannot hope for very exact

results, nor, where towns are concerned, is it possible to deduce data that can be regarded as approximately trustworthy. But if areas of the same class remain fairly unchanged, and subject to the same general conditions, their financial positions in 1084 or 1086, and in 1334, when the tenth and fifteenth had become a fixed levy, ought to be reasonably proportionate.

We find, then, on examination, that Hartland, Merton, Teignbridge, Plympton, Tiverton, Crediton, and Colyton, shew on the average a five-fold increase; that Hayridge, Haytor, Exminster, North Tawton, Winkleigh, Witheridge, and Ottery give between three and four-fold; that in Black Torrington the increase is six-fold. And as this deals with something like half the total, these conclusions will, I think, give us some figures on which we may fairly work.

Hence, it would seem likely that Wonford, which had only risen from £6 15s. to £13 7s. 8d.—not two-fold—had suffered serious limitations, a conclusion to which we have already been led by other considerations; and that Bampton, with its £4 16s. 4d. and £12 5s. 3d.; Axminster, with its £11 7s. 5d. and £20; Halberton, with its £3 18s. and £7 5s. 2d.; and Hemyock, with its £7 0s. 4d. and £10 11s. 4d. were in a similar plight.

On the other hand, the tenfold advance of Fremington from £2 14s. 6d. to £24 6s. may probably be set down to the prosperity of Torrington; as the still greater advance of Roborough, from £4 16s. to £48 2s. 2d., is undoubtedly due to the growth of Plymouth, especially as the list for the Hundred in Risdon is seriously imperfect.

But there must have been other causes at work for the enormous increase of South Molton, from £2 8s. 7d. to £36 14s. 6d.; and that there are very good grounds for ascribing this to the addition of Cædelintone, is apparent when we add the gelds of these two Hundreds together, the joint £8 1s. 3d. bearing to this £36 14s. 6d., precisely what we have been led to regard as the normal relations between the two periods.

Sherwill and Braunton gelded together at £8 10s., and their joint subsidy quota is £71 18s. 9d. This, of course, is largely in excess of the relative proportions indicated, and it may point to some enlargement. The more reasonable explanation, however, is the fact that the quota of Barnstaple alone was £18 14s., the deduction of which brings the case practically within the sixfold margin.

The case of East and West Budleigh points directly to the limitations suggested by the map. The Domesday geld of £12 5s. 5d. should be at least £60 in the subsidy, whereas that is but £37 1s. Besides, so extensive a Hundred, in such a flourishing part of the county, had exceptional chances of progress. The probability is that something like a half of the ancient Budleigh must now be sought for under other names.

This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that Silverton, now partly represented by Hayridge, gelded at £10 6s. 6d., while Hayridge, gelding at £6 7s. 6d. only, advanced to £22 14s. 10d. The deficient proportions for Budleigh and Silverton are, however, so nearly balanced by the requirements of most of the other East Devon Hundreds, as to furnish additional proof that this quarter of the county has been specially fruitful in Hundred changes.

The case of the Hundred of Dippesforde is at first sight very remarkable. It gelded at £7 12s., which we may put as representing a normal subsidy taxation of some £40. We find, however, Coleridge taxed at £56 16s. 5d. and Stanborough at £43 9s. 6d., and undoubtedly something ought to be added for the £46 11s. 11d. of Ermington, though part went to Plympton. We shall not, in all probability, be very far wrong if we put the subsidy quota of ancient Dippesforde at £100 more than the proportional £40. Some of this may have been appropriated by the Coleridge section from Haytor, where the proportionate advance is below what we have taken as the normal; and far-reaching Wonford, too, may have been a sufferer. But they would not suffice. It is quite evident also that allowance has to be made for the wealth of some of the members of these Hundreds. Thus, Dartmouth in Coleridge was assessed to the subsidy in £11 2s., Harberton and Stokenham, £5 14s. 1d. and £5 3s. 4d., respectively, and Totnes, £8 7s.—together £30 6s. 5d. Still it is impossible to bring this particular instance within even exceptional limits; and I am forced to the conclusion that not only are we to allow for change of area between what was Dippesforde with the adjacent Hundreds, and for the exceptional town growth of Coleridge, but that a portion of the South Hams area cannot be brought into the calculations; and that much of the ancient Hundred of Ermington is not represented in any collective form in the Geld Inquest at all—that somehow or other it has disappeared, in fact as well as in name.

It may have been observed that I have not spoken, as Mr. Reichel has done, of the list in Risdon as Risdon's list. Mr. Reichel, indeed, says without limitation of any sort, "Risdon, in his *Survey of Devon*, gives a list of the Hundreds as they existed in Edward III.'s time, and the places contributory to each Hundred."

That, however, is a point on which I am by no means clear. The list, such as it is, appears in the last edition of Risdon; but it does not appear in some, at any rate, of the MS. copies of the *Survey*. It makes no claim to be Risdon's; it has no date attached, and it is obviously inaccurate. I at first thought it might have been compiled from the Hundred Rolls of the early years of Edward I.; but I soon found that this could not have been the case; and I am quite at a loss myself to suggest its source. I can, however, do what is more important—test the value of this second term in Mr. Reichel's argument.

Risdon's *Survey* was written early in the seventeenth century. Before Risdon, however, came Sir William Pole, whose *Collections* (from which Risdon derived much help) contain a much more detailed genealogical and topographical place and personal view of the county, classed under the several Hundreds. It would take up too much space to make a complete comparison, but I give the results for several Hundreds in every part of the county, taken at random, showing the distribution in Pole, about the year 1600–20—(the fullest and most accurate old Hundred list we have), as compared with the list in Risdon.

Pole. *Axminster and Axmouth Hundred.*	Risdon. *Hundreds de Axminster.*	Pole. *Axminster and Axmouth Hundred.*	Risdon. *Hundreds de Axminster.*
Thorncombe	Thorncombe	West Waters	
Forde		Childhaye	
Holdich		Swobridge	
Beerball		Wycroft	
Sutborough		Haccombfee	
Uplyme	Uplime	Uphay	
Axminster		Wike	
Prestaller		Trill	Trill
Kilmenton	Killmington	Musbury	Musbery
Hill		Forde	
Dovilshays		Ash	
Ballehays		Axmouth	Axmouth
Maimbury	Membury	Bowdon	
Est Membury		Shuttecomb	
Yarty		Buckland Trill	

Axminster.	*Axminster.*
Buckland Prior	
Downe Raph	
Comb Pyne	Combpine
DownUmfraville	cum Downe
Upottery	
Charleton	Churleton
Welcomb	
Gosehayes	
Trenhayes	
Yarkcomb	Yearcombe
Paynshay	

Axminster.	*Axminster.*
Shevehayne	
Loveputt	
Doldich	
Sabbecombe	
Combralegh	
Ellishayes	
Honyton	Hunnington
Battishorne	
Northcote	
Blancombe (?)	
	Ottery Mohun

POLE.	RISDON.
Coliton Hundred.	*Hundreds de Colliton.*
Coliton	Colliton
Whitford	Whiteford
Colcombe	
Tudhay or Minchenhorne	
Whitwell	
Yardbyry	
Farwood	Farwood
Shute	
Nore	
Sparkheghes	
Borcomb	
Gatcomb	
Stowford	
Hedhayn or Hethen	
Beere	Beare
Seaton	Seaton
Bovye	
Branscomb	Branscombe
Egge or Edge	
Hole	
Littlecomb	
Salcomb	Salcombe

POLE.	RISDON.
Coliton Hundred.	*Hundreds de Colliton.*
Southlegh	Southleigh
Wiscomb	
Morganhays	
Scrivell	
Northlegh	Northleigh
Farway	Farway
Netherton	
Widecomb	
Whitlegh	
Bromlegh	
Poltimor	
Knoll	
Boycomb	
Widworthy	Widworthy
Sutton Lucy	
Lucyshays	
Morecokshays	
Ofwell	
Colwell	
Cotlegh	
Wombernford	Wombriford
Munkton	
	Culliford
	Gidesham

POLE.	RISDON.
Halberton Hundred.	*Hundreds de Halberton.*
Halberton	Halberton
HalbertonAbbot	
Boycote	
Correham	
Manlegh	
Colhey	
Morston	Morston
Ovelton	
Lynor	Lynor Abbott
Bredenpotpin	
Pytt	

POLE.	RISDON.
Halberton Hundred.	*Hundreds de Halberton.*
Esse	Ash Thomas
Soure Apeldore	SouthAppledore
Mokisbeare	Monkesbeare
Sealake	Selake Manley
Wobernford	
Wildelond	Willand
Sanford	Sampford Peverell
Esseford	Ashford
Legh Boty	Boterleigh
	Witneigh

POLE. *Crediton Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Crediton.*
Bp Morchard	
Easton	Camfee E. Town
Colbrooke	Colbrooke
Wootton	
Horwell	
Copleston	
Dowrish	
Creedy	
Sandford	
Kynawerslegh	Kingwardleigh
Wolmerston	Wolmerston
Comb Lancelles	
Cumb	
Trowbrigge	
Bisshoplegh	Rigbisshops (?)

POLE. *Crediton Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Crediton.*
Crediton	Crediton
Yewton Arondell	Yeuton
Yewe	
	Woodland
	Knolle
	Youford
	Hingest-hill
	Dodridge
	Pidsley
	Northbrooke
	Smalebrooke
	Southcott
	Rige Arundle
	Lolweston

POLE. *Ermington Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Armington.*
Ridmore	Rinmore
Bigbery	Bigbury
Aveton Giffard	Authton Gifford
Kingston	Kingston
Wonewell	
Newton Ferrers	Newton Ferrers
Postlinch	
Pruteston	Painston
Holbeton	Holbeton
Fleete Damerell	Flete Damerell
Mymeland	
Adeston	
Carswell	
Revelstoke	
Combe	
Modbiry	Modbury
Wymston	
Penquit	
Orcherton	
Shilston	
Little Modbiry	
Edmerston	
Bromston	
Oldport	
Legh Durant	
Colemore	
Trewin	
Boyshele	
Vgborow	Ubburrow
Bawcomb	

POLE. *Ermington Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Armington.*
Fowelscombe	
Fileham	
Spridelscomb	
Langford Lestre	Longford de lesse
Torrepeake	
Stone	
Woodland (Ug.)	
Ermington	Armington
Strechlegh	
Woodland (Erm)	
Ivebrigge	
Worthyheale	
Strode	
Hereford	Harford
Stowford	
Cornwood	Cornwood
Slade	
Hele	
Fardell	Fardell
	Butterford
	Lupridge
	Morley
	Batoksborowe
	Ledbrocke
	Esse Abbes
	Heathfield
	Stodbury
	Killburey
	Dunston
	Lambside

POLE. *Hartland Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Hartland.*
Harteland	Hartland
Harteland Abbey	Stoke St. Nectan
Southole	
Milford	
Hardesworthy	Hardsworthy
Hole	Hole
Ashmondesworthy	Ashmansworthy
Welcomb	Welcombe
Almerston	
Clavelly	Clovelley
Bokeishe	
Wallen	
Ernscomb	Yernscombe
Little Ernscomb	
Meddon	
Dupeford	
Wolfesworthy	

POLE. *Sherwell Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Sherewill.*
Shirwell	Sherewill
Alrington	Arlington
Chollacomb	Challacombe
Parracomb	Parracombe
Ilrington	
Mattinho	Martinhow
Kerne Welton	
Lynton	Lynton
Heanton Foryn	
Stoke Rivers	Stokerivers
High Bray	Highbray
Charneys	Charles
Lokeshore	
Over Lokeshore	
Nither Lokeshore	
	Bratton
	Midleton
	Wollacombe
	Pickewill
	Lynmouth
	Brendon

POLE. *Lifton Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Lifton.*
Lamerton	Lamberton
Collacombe	
Wellestrewe	
Northcot	
South Sidenham	Sidenham
Milton	
Donterton	Dunterton
Mary Stowe	Marstow
Sprey	
Kelly	Kelly
Ashlegh	
Bradeston	Braditon
Coriton	Coriton
Lidford	Lidford
Doubrige	
Leive	Lew Trenchard
Wadelescot	
Sourton	Sourton
Thrusselton	Thrushelton
Milford	
Bridestow	Bridestow
Okhamton	Okehampton

POLE. *Lifton Hundred.*	RISDON. *Hundreds de Lifton.*
Stratton	
Combe	
Gondiscot	
Burneby	
Stowford	Stoford
Boveland	
Stone	
Hayne	
Ashlegh	
Lifton	Lifton
Westwike	
N. Sidenham	Sidenham
Wortham	
Worrington	
N. Pederwyn	
Bradwood Wiger	Bradwood
Norton	
German's weeke	Germansweeke
Southwike	
	Virgenstow
	Bratton
	Mary Tavy

Pole. *Roborough Hundred.*	Risdon. *Hundreds de Rowburrow.*
Plymouth	Burg de Plymouth
Est Stonhous	
West Stonhous	
Stoke Damerell	Stoke Damerell
Egge Buckland	Ecbuckland
Compton	Compton
Efford	
Weston Peverell	Weston Peverell
St. Budocks	St Buddox
Tamerton Folliott	Tamerton
Bicklegh	
Beere Ferrers	Bereferris
Legh	
Buckland Monachorum	
Mewy	Mevy
God Mewy	
Huge Mewy	
Gropeton	
Waggefen	
Loveton	
North Buckland	North Buckland
Shcitestor	
Wakhampton	
Sampford Spiney	Sampford Spiney
Whitchurch	White Church
Brittesworthy	
Tavy Folliot	
Tavyton	
Whiteham	
Mary Tavy	
Peters Tavy	Peters Tavy
	Colridge cum Leigham

The plain fact now comes out that this presumed Hundred List in Risdon, whether it belong to him or not, is no Hundred List at all; but simply what it professes to be, a memorandum of the tenth and fifteenth assessments in Devon arranged under Hundreds, and very imperfect at that. The heading is perfectly clear: "Memorand. xv. Devon in Decimis subsequent et Patet."

The most casual glance will show, from the examples given, that Pole is not merely much fuller than Risdon; but that there are differences between them that are utterly irreconcilable by any parochial grouping or kindred alternative. Pole's is a generally consistent list of manors, of which some form parishes and some do not, while the catalogue in Risdon is a jumble of parishes, manors, and tithings, and ancient lordships.[2] The difference will be clear enough to those who are acquainted with the county, but still a few of the more important variations may be indicated, by way of sample.

Thus in Colyton Hundred, Shute parish appears in Pole and not in Risdon; and *vice versâ*, Gittisham in Risdon and

[2] I had never heard, until I read Mr. Reichel's paper, of the Hundred of Wonford passing by the name of "Southinge"; and surely the reference in Risdon to the "antiqua dom. de Southinge" is to the ancient lordship or domain of Southing, just as in the case of the "antiqua dom. de Lifton." When an earlier name of a Hundred is intended, the reference, as in "Molland quondam Hundred," is unmistakable. The Rev. Mr. Whale read Southinge, or the manor of South Teign.

not in Pole. In Ermington we get both Membland and Revelstoke in Pole, and only Lambside in Risdon. Axminster is actually absent from the Hundred of that name in Risdon; and it cannot have filled the blank opposite the second monetary entry of £1 7s. In Mr. Reichel's selected example of Hartland, the parish of Wolfardisworthy is omitted in Risdon, given by Pole. In like manner Risdon drops Loxhore in Sherwill. The Risdon list gives Virginstow, Bratton Clovelly, and Mary Tavy in Lifton, neither of which appears in Pole; but it omits the important parishes of Werrington and North Petherwyn, given by Pole, and transfers them to Black Torrington. The climax seems to be reached in Roborough, from which the Risdon list drops Stonehouse, West Stonehouse, Bickleigh, Buckland Monachorum, Walkhampton, Sheepstor, and Mary Tavy!

I now give a list of the Hundreds of Devon, as they appear in the *Hundred Rolls* of the second and fourth years of Edward I., in tabular form, as compared with the lists in Pole and Risdon. The first set are the *Hundred Rolls* proper, and should be, but are not complete. Those of the fourth are extracts from various inquisitions made under the same head.

Hundred Roll, 2 Ed. I.	Hundred Roll, 4 Ed. I.	Pole.	Risdon.
Axemue	Axeminster	Axminster and Axmouth	Axminster
Baunton	Baunton	Baunton	Beaunton
Blak'toriton	Blaktoriton	Blaktoryton	Black Torrington
B[a]nton	Brantone	Braunton	Branton
Buddeleg'	Budeleg	E. Budleigh W. Budleigh	E. Budleigh W. Budley
Clifton	Clifton	Cliston	Cliston
	Colrig	Coleridge	Colridge
Coliton	Colyton	Coliton	Colliton
C'diaton	Crydiaton	Crediton	Crediton
Ermy'tone	Ermynton	Ermington	Armington
	Exminster	Exminster	Exminster
Fremington	Fremington	Fremington	Fremington
Harrig		Harridge	Hairidge
Hauberton	Hauberton	Halberton	Halberton
Haytorr'	Haytorr'	Haytor	Heytor
	Hemyok	Hemiock	Hemiocke
Hertiland	Hertiland	Hartland	Hartland
Lifton	Liston	Lifton	Lifton
Nortauet'	Northtauton	N. Tawton	N. Tawton
		Ottery St. Mary	Ottery St. Mary
Plympton	Plintone	Plymton	Plympton
	Rouburg	Roueburgh	Rowburrow

Hundred Roll, 2 Ed. I.	Hundred Roll, 4 Ed. I.	Pole.	Risdon.
Schefbeare	Shifbeare	Shebeare	Shebbere
Syrewell	Sirewille	Sherwell	Sherewill
Stanburg'	Stanburg	Stanburrowe	Stamborrow
Sudmolton	Sudmolton	S. Molton	Moulton
Tavistok'		Tavistock	Tavistocke
Teynebrugg'	Tingebrigg	Tingebrigge	Tengbridge
Tyv'ton	Tyv'ton	Tiverton	Tiverton
Wonford	Wonford	Wonford	Wonford
Wynkelegh	Wynkelegh	Winkleigh	Winkleighe
Wyrigg	Wyrugg	Witheridg	Witheridge

The Rolls of 2 Ed. I. also include the ville of Aspton, the burghs of Barnestable, Bidevorde, Colford, Huniton, Okh^{a}mton, Plumpton, Sudmolton, Taustok, Toritone, Totteneys, Tyv'ton, the city of Exeter, the manor of Braneys, Huniton, Ofculm, Kenton, Yalhampton; the fee of Wonford Hundred (which is said to contain 66 vills), and the baronies of Plympton, Okehampton, Gloucester, Barnstaple, Braneys, Harb'ton, Swale, Ot'ton, and Beri.

In like manner the Inquisitions make independent mention of Exon, Plumton, Braneys, Crediton, Lideford, Sutton, Ochamton, Bideford, Tiv'ton, Colford, Touton, Dertamouth, Tavistock, Toteneys, Modbyr', Suth-mouton, Aspton, Honiton, Kenton, Moland.

Like the Geld Inquest, the *Hundred Rolls* deal rather with persons and taxation than with places, which are indeed cited incidentally, rather than of set intention. They do, however, carry us a good deal further in the topographical direction than the earlier record, while still forbidding the compilation of an accurate and comprehensive comparative list.

There is only one other ancient record to which we can refer on this topic—that known as the *Testa de Nevill*, in the main an enquiry into fees and holdings in chief, dating somewhere in the later years of Henry III. and the earlier of Edward I. The Devonshire Hundreds cited, a few in set form and the bulk incidentally, are: Laston, Wyrig, Buddelegh, Stanburgh, Haytor, Erminthon, Harrig, Tiverton, Alb'ton, Clifton, Axeminstr', Exeminstr', Tennebrug, Staneburg, Corig', Blaketorrinton, Seftbere, Braunton.

For the purpose of comparison, I have selected from the half-dozen Hundreds given *in extenso* in this record, that of Ermington, as being the one of which I have the most local knowledge. The letters *p* and *r* indicate the

occurrence of a name in either the Pole or Risdon list. It will be seen that of the 48 names—assuming that the doubtful equivalents are rightly placed—15 occur in both lists, 14 are found in Pole alone, 10 only in Risdon, while 9 can be traced in neither. On the other hand, 19 names in Pole cannot be found in *Testa de Nevill*—Wonewell, Carswell, Revelstoke, Penquit, Oldport, Colemore, Painston, Trewin, Boyshele, Fowelscomb, Fileham, Stone, Woodland, Strechlegh, Ivebrigge, Strode, Stowford, Slade, Hele; while 2 in the Risdon set are in the same category—Painston and Esse Abbas.

Ermington Hundred—Testa de Nevill.

p r Langeford
r Baterford
r Lupering
p r Auethon [Giffard]
p r Bykebyr
p r Hugheton [Holbeton]
Halevill
Notterdon
p Cumb
p r Ridmore
p Orcherdton
p Cumb Spridel
p Wymundeston
r Ludbrook
p Baricumb [Bawcumb]
r Dyventon [Dunston ?]
p Yedmareston
p r Flethe
Bikecumb'
r Wardeslegh [Morley ?]
r Lamside
p Alvedeston [Adeston]
p Mymyland
p r Modbyre
p Pva Modbyr
Kalsington
p r Niweton [Ferrers]
p r Poselinch
p Worthyhole
p Legh [Durrant]
p r Cornwood
Luttathon
p r Hereford
Bradeford
Fenthon
p Pak' [Torrepeak]
p r Ferthedel
p r Erminton
p r Kingeston
Habothun
r Killebyre
p r Uggabergh
Nythereblachesworth
r Stodbyr
p Brunardeston [Brownston]
p Silvertone [Shilston]
r Hethfeldtone
r Battekesbergh

Make whatever allowance, then, we please for subdivision and change of name, is it not equally evident that other causes of change have been at work: that there exists no ancient Hundred list that can be regarded as infallible, and that the list in Risdon is the least complete and trustworthy of them all?

It is quite unnecessary to go further. Change and enormous change in the Hundreds has been proved, and the causes and method of the change do not concern us here, either by way of fact or of liberal speculation. Enough has been said to show that instead of an infallible court of appeal in the matter of Domesday identifications the Geld

Inquest is the most untrustworthy of broken reeds, in its relation to continuous conditions.

It now remains to consider the identifications approved by Mr. Reichel. So far as I can see, these are just under two hundred in number, not a fifth of the full total for Devon. Of this two hundred, two-thirds, or thereabouts, are in agreement between Mr. Reichel and myself. Sixty-four are in difference; and of these sixteen are in my doubtful, and twenty-two in my probable class; twenty-six only being in my opinion definitely recognizable. Were Mr. Reichel right in every one of these cases, and I wrong, I should still be well within my limits of cautionary error. In my view, however, the actual corrections and improved suggestions form a much smaller total. After what I have said touching the untenability of deductions founded on the Hundred hypothesis, it will not be needful for me to go into full detail, where Mr. Reichel's conclusions have no better foundation; and before proceeding with my comments, it is only necessary further to add that in all cases of difference between Mr. Reichel and myself, to which I do not now refer, I adhere to my own view.

Addebirie (945), given by me as probably Oldbury, Morchard Bishop, Mr. Reichel claims as Yardbury, Budleigh. But it lies in the list between the two Cridies, all three being held by William.

Alforde (711) is suggested as Halford, S. Tawton, instead of Alfordon, Okehampton. The order helps neither view, but Alford has Mildedone added to it, and it does not appear to be questioned that this is Meldon, in Okehampton.

Alreford (553), placed by Mr. Reichel in Axminster Hundred, instead of in Marystow. This may be. It lies between Ford (Abbey) and Smælecome (Smallacombe, Ilsington). The chief evidence in favour of the Axminster assignation is that both Ford and Alreford were held by Rannulf.

Alwinestone (355) occurs as added to Donicestone, a very doubtful manor. My suggestion was that Donicestone might be Datton, and Alwinestone Austin in Otterton adjoining. Mr. Reichel makes Donicestone South Zeal, in South Tawton, and Alwinestone Allison in the same parish.

Bihede (813, 815). North and South Buda, Langtree, seemed suggested, but I believe Mr. Reichel is right in identifying the Buehills in Burlescombe, the wider nominal divergence notwithstanding. The historical evidence seems conclusive.

Bradelie (1132). Mr. Reichel assigns this to Tiverton instead of Newton. It is one of four manors held by Haimeric—in order: Rovecome, Hille, Cumbe, and Bradelie; the three last having been held by Edmar. Now, Mr. Reichel puts Rovecome in Wonford Hundred, while I suggest Ruckham in Cruwys Morchard, as probable. The fact that it follows Poltimore, in Clyston, gives no help. As, however, Hill and Cumbe are probably in Christow, it does seem more likely that Edmar's Bradelie was in their vicinity, at Newton, than at Tiverton.

Bvrietescome (161). Mr. Reichel makes this Burnscombe, Challacombe, while I thought Buriet, Atherington, probable. The fact, however, that it follows Witefelle, which is clearly in Challacombe, seems to fix it rather in that parish; and Burnscombe is within reasonable limits of nominal deviation.

Cadeledone (1051). I fail to see that Collinsdown, Bulkworthy, is more probable than Chaldon, Martinhoe. There is really no definite clue.

Cedelintone (47). Mr. Reichel gives this as Chillington, instead of Chittlehampton. Order renders little help, since it lies between Woodbury and Tiverton. As part of the land of Gytha, the north rather than the south of Devon is, however, indicated; and the only link with the south of Devon is the fact that Sireford, or Sherford, is appendant. It does not, however, by any means follow that a dependent manor is of necessity contiguous. Moreover, Cheletone (615) is Chillington. Finally, the area of Cedelintone is conclusive —to wit, fifty-three plough lands, twelve acres of meadow, 150 of pasture, and wood twenty furlongs long by half a lenga broad. Chittlehampton parish is 8720 acres; and Cedelintone accounts in round numbers for 6500, an excellent proportion. Indeed, if Cedelintone is not Chittlehampton, I cannot find this important parish in *Domesday* at all.[3]

Cheneoltone (161). The evidence is about equally good for this being Knowltone in Braunton, as Mr. Reichel says, or Chilton, Thorverton, which I think probable.

Chetelescome (545). Why with Chettelscombe in Tiverton, or Down St. Mary, waiting claimants; and the next manor,

[3] I reckon the plough-lands on the old 120-acre basis, which has the great merit of getting rid of all troublesome arbitrary deductions for balks, waste, and the like. I find that by adding Mr. Reichel's deductions to his plough-land estimates, his own figures average very reasonably near this amount—in some cases, indeed, exceeding it!

Chiveorne, clearly Chivenor, either in Tiverton or Heanton Punchardon, we are asked to accept Gallowscombe, Marldon, I cannot conceive. There can hardly be a shadow of doubt that both are in the former parish.

Chisewic (939). All I have to say here is that with such a common place-particle as wick, I cannot accept its presence as indicating the Saxon ownership of Wichin.

Cridie (943, 945). Mr. Reichel claims these as Creedy Helion and Pictavin, instead of Lower Creedy, Upton Helion; but the second is only a ferling *in* Credie, which it seems quite too much to regard as a potential manor. Beside, they are held by the same lord as Addeberie, in Morchard Bishop.

Ferse (725). Though this may be Furze in Chittlehampton, named as probable, the fact that it lies in the list between Combe Martin and Parracombe gives greater weight to Mr. Reichel's identification of Foss, Braunton.

Gretedone (167). I do not think we can do more than add Mr. Reichel's Granton, Braunton, to the other doubtful claimants.

Heirde (1107) is regarded by Mr. Reichel as Hackworthy, or Hayworthy, in Tedburn St. Mary, instead of Hachevrde (1091), which he places in Whitstone, while, to me, Yard in Clisthydon seems more probably indicated. This series turns mainly upon whether we are to regard the final "d" as the Saxon "th," for which I can see no shadow of reason. There are no other clear clues. But *Testa de Nevill* shows that Baldwin's Heirde is Yarde!

Heppastebe (943). I quite fail to follow the process by which Heppastebe becomes Haske, in Upton Hellion. Henstell, in Sandford, though not free from doubt, is surely nearer the mark. Radulf had seisin of it with Hanc (Anke), in Clisthydon. It lies between Danescome (which I place in Crediton, and not in Cheriton-Fitzpaine with Mr. Reichel) and Cridie (Lower Creedy). Topographical arrangement, therefore, fails to decide between Upton Helion and Sandford, and I think it wisest to fall back on the principle of least corruption.

Herlescome (1001) may, as Mr. Reichel suggests, stand for parts of Yarnscombe; but the variation is hardly greater to Holcombe, added to which is the significant fact that its Domesday owner is Tetbald, son of Berners, so that we have not far to look for the distinctive Burnell.

Hewise (697). Whether we are to find this in Huish, Tedburn St. Mary, which I suggest as probable, or in Wichenshays, Collumpton, with Mr. Reichel, very much depends upon whether Colebrooke, its successor, is in Bradninch—as I think—or in Collumpton, though the two are too close together to be absolutely certain. However, as Wichin held Hewise, that should be conclusive.

Hochesile (983). Suggested by me as probably Oxhays, Honiton Clist; given by Mr. Reichel to Haskhill, Frithelstock. This seems very tempting; but when we find that the preceding manor is Were, at Topsham, and the succeeding Hulham, in Littleham—Ruald holding both—very serious doubts arise.

Holecome (921). This was a manor which I could not clearly distinguish; but Mr. Reichel may well be right in identifying it with the Dawlish Holcombe.

Magnelege (857). West Manley, Tiverton, has about equal claims with Manlegh, Halberton; but it is impossible to decide.

Mannecheve (1191) is placed by Mr. Reichel in Exminster Hundred; but the proof of its being Mayne, in Dunsford, is conclusive. It follows Dunsford, and is held by the same lord, Saulf.

Milchewis (1191), the next in order, is also placed by Mr. Reichel in Exminster Hundred; but hitherto it has not been certainly identified.

Merton (499). This suggested itself as part of the parish of that name. Mr. Reichel's identification as Mardon, in South Tawton, is confirmed by its position between Hitterleigh and Melhuish, in Tedburn St. Mary, and, moreover, turns the latter from a probability into a certainty.

Notone (257). I cannot conceive how this can be suggested as being in Crediton, when the monks of Buckfast continued to hold their manor of Norton, in Churchstow, so many centuries after the Conquest.

Ogewillee (935, 937). Taking these with Wogwill (1117, 1161), I said that the Ogwilles were too large for East Ogwill, while, if Wogwill with its mill represented East Ogwill, then the two Ogwilles were too large for West. And I thought, therefore, that the Ogwilles might be the two parishes of that name; and that Wogwel (1117) might be sought elsewhere—there being a Vogwell, for example, in

Manaton. Wogewille (1161) I thought more likely to be Vagglefield, in Cookbury. The whole of the difficulty, with me, lay in the areas. Mr. Reichel, dealing only with East Ogwell, sees none; and assumes, because there were two manors in East Ogwell, *temp.* Edward I., both held of Pomeroy, that they must have been two at the time of the Survey, whereas nothing is more common than division. East Ogwell is 1249 acres, West Ogwell 683. Of the two Ogwells in *Domesday*, one is 493 acres, the other 377. Of the two Wogwells, one is 619 acres, the other 246. Thus the totals of the Ogwell parishes are 1932 acres; those of the Ogwell and Wogwell manors 1735, which does not leave sufficient margin. It is clear, too, that the bigger Wogwell cannot be West Ogwell, though it may be East; nor would there be room for the Ogwells and Wogewill in East. However, as I have already said, that the two Ogwells are connected with the modern parishes of that name, seems clear, whatever else may be in question.

Otritone (277). I am unable to conceive why this should be regarded as part of Yattington. It is a very important manor, with 3 mills, 33 salt-works, 25 plough lands, 45 acres of meadow, 150 of wood, and a leuca and a-half of pasture—the total of which corresponds very closely with the 3479 acres of modern Otterton parish. It is hardly possible to imagine a stronger case.

Pantesford (481). Poundsford, Collumpton, seems a more likely suggestion than Painsford, Ashprington, though only of equal claims with Passford, Otterton.

Raordin (695) might possibly be read Radworthy, as Mr. Reichel suggests, but one of the Rowdens of Witheridge or Shebbear still seems, to me, preferable, the former for choice. Are we dealing in the "din" with a *d* or a *th*? I confess I think the former.

Rinestandone (221). This, Mr. Reichel thinks, is Rousdon. It is a very small holding, only one plough-land and six acres of meadow. Of course Rousdon, or St. Pancras, is very small also; and that, to me, seems about the only ground for the suggestion, while I do not think the corruption involved at all likely, though possible. It lies between Cravelech (Creely), in Farringdon, and Cheletone, or Charlton, which rendered to Axminster; probably Charlton, in Comb Pyne; and Kingston, in Colaton Ralegh, seemed a fair query.

Sotebroch (293) is claimed, by Mr. Reichel, for Shobrooke (Schipebroc), but I cannot think the identification of the latter admits of a doubt; and Southbrook is assuredly a more likely variant of Sotebroch than Shobrooke. It is a small manor—only two plough-lands, and an acre each of meadow and pasture.

Smidelie (471), Mr. Reichel claims for Cliston Hundred, and as being represented by Cromley. I have already said that it seems to be in East Devon (though we have Smithaleigh in Plympton), but if it is Cromley, where has the Smid or Smith gone?

St. Mary Clist (471, 473). Mr. Reichel remarks—"Following Polwhele and other earlier writers, Mr. Worth has suggested that both the Clists held by St. Mary of Rouen, are in St. Mary's Clist." *Post hoc*, in his view, evidently must be *propter hoc*. Yet, as a matter of fact, Mr. Worth came to that conclusion before he consulted any "authorities." Pending Mr. Reichel's handling of the whole Clist question further comment would be out of place. But with regard to his first argument against—that had the parish been called after the canons it would have been called Canons' Clist, or, I presume, Clist Canon, I may point out the plainest possible instance to the contrary, in the fact that Newton St. Petrock is so-called because in like manner it belonged to the canons of St. Petrock of Bodmin.

Sprei (1033). My suggestion is Spry in Lifton; Mr. Reichel's is Spry in Broadclist; and he identifies the preceding manor, Wiflevrde (1033), as Willards, in Broadclyst, while I claim it for Willsworthy, in Mary Tavy. Sprei follows either, almost as a matter of course. Here, it will be seen, Mr. Reichel reads the d in Wiflevrde as *d* and not *th*, instead of as usual the other way about. We are both agreed, however, that the next manor, Ferding, is Farthing in Broadclyst; and I think, therefore, the balance may be in Mr. Reichel's favour. Only if I give up the "worthy" here, and read Wiflevrde Willards, I am bound to press it as an additional reason for reading Heierde Yard, and not Hayworthy.

Staford (289). Mr. Reichel adds Stowford, Colaton Ralegh, to the Stowford competition, and I cannot pretend to decide.

Svtreworde (787). Given by me as probably Southward, Tiverton; but Mr. Reichel falls back on the *th* once more, and reads Sutherworthy. It occurs among several scattered holdings, so that topography gives no help. It is an important manor—12 plough-lands, 20 acres of meadow, 10 furlongs of pasture, and wood one leuca long, and half a leuca broad.

Torneberie (357). Far more probably in Cheriton Bishop, as Mr. Reichel says, than my doubtful planting in Egg Buckland.

Walderige (501). Placed by me as probably in Warkleigh; claimed by Mr. Reichel as Oldridge, St. Thomas Hayes, *i.e.*, St. Thomas. In the record Tedburne (St. Mary) follows, and one of the two Tedburnes was held by the same lord as Walderige. It is a fair-sized manor, 6 plough-lands, 6 acres of meadow, 100 of pasture, and 60 of wood.

Wasford (805). Claimed by Mr. Reichel as Washford Pyne, identified by me as Wifford or Wafford, Bovey Tracey. The preceding manor is Raddon, Thorverton, the succeeding Drayford, Witheridge. Apart from the spelling, the great difficulty to my mind in accepting it as Washford Pyne is the fact that there are also three Wesfords, whose identity with the parish does not seem to admit of doubt. Wasford had six plough-lands, five acres of meadow, pasture half a leuca long, and a furlong broad; wood, four furlongs by one furlong—altogether too big with the other Washfords for the parish—indeed, quite big enough of itself to represent 1140 acres. Bovey, however, with its 7262 acres affords plenty of room.

Wedicheswelle (165). In the Exon version this is seemingly spelt with an initial P instead of a W—Pedichewelle, and Mr. Reichel therefore identifies it with Pickwell. But this presumed P is only the usual Norman character for W—as on the coins of the Conqueror we read PILLEM REX. It comes between Welland, Churchstanton, and Aylscott, West Down; and seems to me to admit of no doubt.

Willedene (1065). Mr. Reichel gives this to Widdon, Sherwill; but why, when there is Willey in Sampford Courtenay, and we find both Willedene and Sampford belonging to the same lord, Norman, T.R.E., I cannot quite see. The Sirewelle which follows is probably Sherwill, in Dunterton—the parish will be found elsewhere.

It will be seen that I have accepted Mr. Reichel's suggestions, in some instances, as either certainties or probabilities, and that my list should be corrected accordingly. On my own account I also consider that my identification of Bicheordin as Bagsworthy, in Brendon, of Chenemetone as Kelmington, of Combe (725) as Combe Martin, of Disa as Ditchetts, Tiverton, of Molewis as Melhuish, Tedburne, and of Patecote as Patchcote, Beaworthy, may be regarded as certain rather than doubtful.