CHAPTER I

WILTSHIRE

BY R. WELLDON FINN, M.A.

Wiltshire and the four south-western counties seem to have comprised one circuit, examined by one body of Commissioners. Unfortunately, only a single Wiltshire entry—that relating to a holding in Sutton Veny—has survived in the Exeter Domesday, and the two versions are set out on p. 3 below. A comparison of them shows not only the usual differences of phrasing and content between Exchequer and Exeter entries, but also a difference in the amount of pasture recorded: half a league by one in the Exchequer version, and half a league by one furlong in that of the Exeter text. We are at once prepared for the fact that the Wiltshire folios have their full share of the doubts and difficulties common to the Domesday Book as a whole.

The Exeter Domesday is only a part of the Liber Exoniensis, which also includes Summaries of the Wiltshire possessions of Glastonbury Abbey and five lay magnates.¹ A comparison of the information in these Summaries with the corresponding details in the Exchequer Domesday Book is indicated in the table on p. 2. The large discrepancy in the figures for the hidage of the abbey’s holdings ‘seems inexplicable’.² The other differences are of the order commonly encountered when the Exchequer entries are compared with those of associated documents.

The Liber Exoniensis also includes three differing copies of the record of the payment of a geld levied at a time near that of the Inquest. These accounts give information about the fiefs within each hundred, but they rarely mention place-names. In spite of the latter fact, however, the information is of great service in allocating the place-names of the Domesday Book to their correct settlements, all the more so because the Domesday text does not contain hundredal rubrics.³ The differences between the

¹ For the contents of the Liber Exoniensis, see Appendix 1, p. 393 below.
³ Three hundreds are mentioned incidentally in the Wiltshire text. The firma of Malmesbury (64b) is said to include the profits of the courts of the hundreds of Cicometone (later called Chedglove) and Sutelesberg (later called Startley). The third hundred is that of Wrderusteselle, which seems to imply the hundred of Wrede (Highworth) in which the manor of Rusteselle (Lus Hill) lay (69).
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Some Wiltshire Fiefs

Comparison of the Exchequer Domesday

with the Summaries of the Liber Exoniensis

Note: (1) The information for Glastonbury Abbey and its knights is more detailed than that for the other fiefs.

(2) The value of the land of the knights cannot be calculated because subtenancies of manors are involved.


(4) Some of the cossets and cottars of the Domesday entries are called bordars in the Summary for Glastonbury Abbey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glastonbury Abbey</th>
<th>Knights of Glastonbury Abbey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(527b, 66b)</td>
<td>(527b, 66b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>D.B.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>111½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villeins</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordars, etc.</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliberts</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serfs</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgesses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>£169. 10s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combined plough-land figures for the Abbey and its knights are as follows: Summary, 156; Domesday, 1614.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ralph de Mortemer</th>
<th>Miles Crispin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(530b, 72–72b)</td>
<td>(530b, 71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>D.B.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>46½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough-lands</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>£38. 9s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Durand of Gloucester</th>
<th>Gilbert de Bretteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(531, 71b)</td>
<td>(531, 71–71b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>D.B.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides</td>
<td>32½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough-lands</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>£26. 17s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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William de Mohun’s holding in Sutton Veny

Exater Domesday (47)


Exchequer Domesday (72)


details of the Geld Accounts and those of the Domesday folios are very many, and may testify to the imperfection of the Domesday record as well as to our lack of knowledge. They confirm, for example, the suspicion that there must be many virtual duplications in the text.

The Geld Accounts also reinforce the view that the Inquest officials usually presented their material in terms not of a vill but of a manor. The Domesday totals for men, teams, mills and so on in some entries are suspiciously large, and the existence of sub-tenancies is sometimes indicated. We are, however, not only unable to apportion these totals, but also unable even to tell whether or not the unnamed holdings were at places described elsewhere in the Wiltshire folios. Thus Brokenborough (67) was a manor of 50 hides, 60 plough-lands, 64 teams, 102 recorded people and 8 mills. Separate details are given for one of its components, Corston; reference is also made to three sub-tenancies, but where they were, or what each contained, we cannot say. The same was true of the four large manors of the bishop of Salisbury, described on fo. 66: Potterne, Bishop’s Cannings, Ramsbury and Salisbury. The entries for
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some large manors do not even mention the existence of sub-tenancies, although the large quantities involved lead us to suppose them to have existed.1 Thirty entries tell us in each case of 75 or more recorded inhabitants; it is highly unlikely that any of these entries referred to a single village. The entries for some manors refer to appendicium, but without telling us where they were.2

The Domesday folios themselves often provide evidence of virtual duplication in their treatment of holdings in dispute.3 This especially affects lidage totals, but occasionally other information as well. Thus the description of Calne ends with a reference to the 5 hides held by Alfred d’Epaignes but claimed by Nigel the Physician (64b); this may refer to Alfred’s holding at Yatesbury described in detail on a later folio (73). Or, again, the account of Chalke (68) records a sub-tenancy of 7½ hides (with 5 teams and worth £7) which was claimed by the abbess of Wilton and which is described in detail under the name of Trow on fo. 73; but the 5 teams of fo. 68 appear on fo. 73 as only 4.

The present-day county of Wiltshire in terms of which this study is written is not exactly the same as the Domesday county. Kilmington (91, 453b, 520; 86b, 98) and Yarnfield (447, 95), the latter in Maiden Bradley, formed part of Somerset and were not transferred to Wiltshire until 1895–6. There has also been gain from Berkshire. The folios of both counties contain entries for the Wiltshire village of Shalbourne (57b, 73, 74bis, 74b) and the Berkshire portion was not transferred to Wiltshire until 1895. In the same year the nearby Bagshot, described only in the Berkshire folios (60b), also became part of Wiltshire. There have been losses as well as gains. In the north, the following four areas were transferred between 1897 and 1930 to Gloucestershire: (1) Kemble (67), Poole Keynes (69b) and Somerford Keynes (66) together with its hamlet Shorne-cote (73); (2) Ashley (71b) and Long Newton (67); (3) Poulton (68b), hitherto a detached portion of Wiltshire; (4) Minety, not named in Domes-

1 Such, for example, were Aldbourne (65) with 150 recorded inhabitants, Coombe Bissett (65) with 85, and Hedington (69) with 39.
2 ‘Appendages’ (appendicium) are mentioned in entries relating to the following: Amesbury (64b), Bradford on Avon (67b), Chippenham (64b), Corsham (65), Melksham (65), Netheravon (65), Rushall (65) and Stert (70b). One ‘appendage’ of Bradford on Avon and one of Corsham are named, but to the others, and to those of other manors, we are given no clue.
Fig. 2. Wiltshire: Relief.

Domesday boroughs are indicated by initials: B, Bedwyn; Br, Bradford on Avon; C, Calne; Cr, Cricklade; M, Malmesbury; Mb, Marlborough; S, Salisbury; T, Tilshead; W, Warminster; Wi, Wilton.
day Book. The following were transferred to Hampshire in 1895: Bramshaw (74 bis), Damerham (66b, 67b), and Plaitford (74), together with Martin, Melchet Park and Whitsbury, the last three not named in the Domesday Book. Tytherley was described under both counties (42, 48, 48b, 50 bis, 74), although it lay in Hampshire. There have also been losses to Berkshire. Standen (72) and Charlton (71b) became part of Hungerford in 1895. A postscriptual entry at the foot of fo. 72b in the Wiltshire folios contains a reference to one hide in Coleshill, the remaining 24 hides of which are described under Berkshire (59b, 61, 63), to which the village still belongs.

There are also other complications. A Wiltshire folio (66b) says that one of Idmiston’s 10 hides ‘lies in Hampshire’ (iacet in Hantescire). Conversely, a Hampshire folio (50) says that 1½ virgates at Wellow were ‘put outside the county and put in Wiltshire’ (misit foras comitatam et misit in Wiltesire). Finally, the Wiltshire folios mistakenly include Gussage St Michael (69) and one holding in Gillingham (73b), both in Dorset.

SETTLEMENTS AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION

The total number of separate places mentioned in the Domesday Book for the area now forming Wiltshire is approximately 335, including the ten places which had or seem to have had burgesses—Bedwyn, Bradford on Avon, Calne, Cricklade, Malmesbury, Marlborough, Salisbury, Tilshead, Warminster and Wilton. This figure, for a variety of reasons, cannot accurately reflect the total number of settlements in 1086. In the first place, there are ten entries in which no place-names appear, and it is possible that some of these may refer to holdings at places not named

---

1. Witberge (72b), in the Wiltshire folios, has sometimes been identified with Whitsbury, but it has here been identified with Woodborough.

2. For references to Standen, Charlton and Coleshill, see H. C. Darby and Eila M. J. Campbell (eds.), The Domesday Geography of South-east England (Cambridge, 1962), p. 240.

3. Ibid. p. 295 n. Before 1895, West Wellow was in Wiltshire and East Wellow in Hampshire. They have been counted as one Hampshire village in this analysis.

4. See p. 71 below.

5. The total of 335 does not include the two unidentified places of Quintone (64b) and Scepleia (66) which are named incidentally in entries relating to other places. They are omitted because we do not even know whether they were in Wiltshire. The Dorset folios also mention a Scepleia (77) which appears to refer to the latter place, but we cannot tell whether it was in either county or neither.
Fig. 3. Wiltshire: Surface geology.
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evertheless elsewhere in the text.¹ In the second place, as we have seen, the entries for some large manors cover not only the caput itself but also unnamed dependencies, and again we have no means of telling whether these are named elsewhere in the text.²

In the third place, when two or more adjoining villages bear the same basic name today, it is not always clear whether more than one unit existed in the eleventh century. There is no indication in the Domesday text that, say, the East Overton and West Overton of today existed as separate villages; the Domesday information about them is entered under only one name (Ovretone, 65b, 68), though they may well have been separate in the eleventh century as they certainly were by the thirteenth.³

In the same way it is impossible to distinguish between the three units of Manningford Abbots, Bohun and Bruce (Manesforde, Maniford, 67, 73b, 74).⁴ The components of each such group almost invariably belong to the same hundred as deduced from the Geld Accounts, so that any attempt to separate them on this basis (as for some counties) does not greatly help. For some counties, the Domesday text occasionally differentiates the units of these groups by designating one unit by such a term as alia or altera, but none of the Wiltshire groups is distinguished in this way. Winterbourne Stoke (69), however, is separated from the other Winterbournes, and the Geld Accounts also distinguish East Knoyle (Chenuuel Regis, 7, 65) from West Knoyle (Chenvel, 68).

The problem is acute in three groups of places which took their respective Domesday names from the streams along which they were aligned. The table on p. 10 shows how these three groups of entries have been allocated on the basis of their respective hundreds as indicated by the Geld Accounts. Taken as a whole, these complications, unfortunate though they are, hardly invalidate the general pattern of the distributions.

¹ The relevant entries are: Bishop Osmund, dimidia ecclesia with ½ hide (65b); Arnulf of Hesdin, unum manerium of 1 hide (70); Durand of Gloucester, ½ virgate (70b); Durand of Gloucester, ½ virgate (71); Godescal, ½ hide (73); Stephen the carpenter, 3 hides (73b); Alveric of Melksham, 2 hides less ½ virgate (73b); Edmund, 1 virgate (74); Saivea, ½ virgate (74); Rainsburgis, unum manerium of 5 hides (74).
² See p. 3 above.
³ For the history of these, and of all other names mentioned in this chapter, see J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, The Place-Names of Wiltshire (Cambridge, 1939).
⁴ The adjacent parishes of Kington Langley, Kington St Michael and Langley Burrell have been treated as three because: (i) the first appears as Langhelei (66b) and the second as Chintone (72b), both in Thorngrove hundred; (ii) the third appears as Langefel (69b) in Chippenham hundred.
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Quite different are those groups of places bearing the same Domesday name but not lying adjacent. Here are some examples: Barford in Downton (Bereford, 72) and Barford St Martin (Bereford, 72 b, 74, 74 b); Charlton now in Hungerford in Berkshire (Cerletone, 71 b), Charlton near Malmesbury (Cerletone, 67), and another parish of Charlton (near Pewsey) not described in the Domesday Book; Draycot Cerne (Draicote, 74 b), Draycot Fitz Payne in Wilcot (Draicote, 66), and Draycot Foliat in Chiseldon (Draicote, 71); Easton Grey (Estone, 72 b) and Easton Piercy in Kington St Michael (Estone, 70, 73); Littleton Drew (Liteltone, 66, 66 b) and Littleton Pannell in West Lavington (Liteltone, 71 b). The absence of hundredal rubrication increases the difficulty of identifying each holding, but the Geld Accounts and later manorial history help to show which holding belongs to which village.

The total of 335 includes half a dozen or so places about which very little information is given. We are told nothing, for example, about Poulshot (65) except that it had a church which lay in (adjacent) the manor of Corsham and which was worth 5s.; the details of the holding have apparently been included in those of Corsham itself. Or, again, all that we hear of Gategram (74) is that it was rated at one hide, that it had half a plough-land and that its annual value was 10s. Hurdcott (in Winterbourne Earls), with half a hide and half a plough-land, was worth 20s. (72); it also had half a mill, but we hear nothing of the other half, or of the men who worked the mill, or of those who produced grain for it. All we hear of Avebury (65 b) is that it had a church to which belonged 2 hides, and that it was worth 40s. Teams and population are likewise not entered for any of the three holdings that comprised Buttermere (70, 72, 74 b), yet together they were rated at nearly 1½ hides and had 2½ plough-lands, and their combined annual value was 24s. 3d. Here might also be mentioned those other villages with no teams or no population or neither entered for them.¹

Not all the Domesday names appear on the present-day map of Wiltshire parishes. Over 110 out of a total of 335 Domesday place-names are represented today by the names of hamlets, or of individual houses and farms, or of topographical features. Thus Rochelle (69 b, 70 b) is now the hamlet of Rockley in Ogbourne; Fistesberie (72 b) is Fosbury House in Tidcombe; Trole (73 b) is Trowle farm, common and hill in Bradford on Avon. The parish of Hilmarton to the north of Calne has at least four

¹ See pp. 22–3 below.
Domesday names represented within its limits apart from its own. The name of Aldred’s holding of Ferstesfeld (73b) has changed to that of himself, and appears from the twelfth century onwards as variants of Alderstone, now represented by a farm of that name in Whiteparish. Some names

Three Groups of Wiltshire Settlements

**Deverill (now Upper Wyley)**
- Brixton Deverill, Hill
- Deverill and Longbridge Deverill
- Kingston Deverill and Monkton Deverill

**Winterbourne (now R. Bourne)**
- Winterbourne Dauntsey,
- Winterbourne Earls,
- Winterbourne Gunner, and Gomeldon (in Idmiston)

**Winterbourne (now R. Till)**
- Addeuston (in Madddington),
- Berwick St James,
- Elston (in Orcheston St George), Maddington,
- Rolleston and Shrewton
- Winterbourne Stoke

Note: (1) The holding on fo. 65 comprised 2 hides and 1 virgate, which appear in the Geld Accounts as Winterburnestoca (V.C.H. Wilts. ii, pp. 118 and 179).

(2) Quite separate from these two groups of Winterbournes are Winterbourne Bassett and Winterbourne Monkton to the north-west of Marlborough.

1 Hilmarton (70, 71b, 73b), Beversbrook (71b, 73), Highway (66b, 72), Littlecott (71) and Witcomb (70). There may also be two other Domesday names in the parish. W. H. Jones thought that Bichenehilde (70) is represented by Beacon hill (Domesday for Wiltshire, London and Bath, 1865, p. 198). The editors of The Place-Names of Wiltshire thought that Cowic (68b) is represented by Cowage farm (p. 269). In this analysis, Bichenehilde has been left unidentified, and Cowic has been identified with Conock.