

Mr Padel is to be not only thanked but congratulated upon having devised so splendid a programme, catering for all tastes and interweaving several leitmotifs. Articles based upon the papers by Dr Camsell, Frances Griffith, Mr Freeman, Dr Morgan, M. Tanguy, 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 (GDB) 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 series¹ 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,² 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;³ Hutchins, then Eyton, for Dorset;⁴ Collinson, then Eyton and Whale, for Somerset;⁵ Worth, then Reichel and Whale, for Devon;⁶ Couch, then Carne, for Cornwall.⁷ These pioneers tended to use a small number of documents, some inadequately edited even by the standards of their time;⁸ 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,⁹ 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 Domesday 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 Domesday Geography series¹⁰ is based has not been published; that DG has a number of startling and unsupported identifications; that the modern VCH volumes for Dorset and Wilts.¹¹ 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.¹² It is too easy to give to a Domesday 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 'Exworthy' (ExonDB Esseorda) near Silverton and DG maps them, yet no evidence has been found for their post-Domesday existence or for their location.¹³ In the first example, the GDB name-form is Standone, 'Stony Down', and the ExonDB form Estandona¹⁴ 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, Caffyns Heanton, that was in Lynton parish; that it can be identified in the Tax Return for the combined hundred of Braunton and Shirwell; and that the name contains OE dūn 'hill'. In the second example, Esseorda¹⁵ 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 æsc 'ash-tree'. DG maps it where there is now a place called Exeland.¹⁶ This may be the result of an equally dubious form of identification which consists of being content to identify only one element in a compound name, providing the place appears to be in the required geographical area. In this way, GDB Panteshede in Somerset (21/80), containing the element hēafod 'head', is assumed to be near Towerhead in Banwell. Similarly, in Devon, according to VCH or DG, or both, GDB Lidemore (17/18) is More in Pyworthy; Landeshers (14/4) is Hawkerland; Sutreworde (23/15) is Southbrook; Ulwardesdone (1/72) is Wolfin;¹⁷ Fereurde (19/2) and Fereordin (24/32) are Alfordisworthy; Hame (52/7) is Embury; and Herstanhaia (25/28) is Cliston Hayes. Of course, other evidence sometimes shows that a Domesday place-name loses, gains or substitutes an element during its evolution,¹⁸ but such reliance on form alone for identification is hazardous. This technique can be lent a spurious scholarly

appearance when it is coupled with an unscientific idea of the evolution of forms or with the notion that the names of places change capriciously. Thus in VCH Devon, GDB Smidelic (16/88) is given as Snedleigh alias Stoodleigh in West Buckland; Waliforde (17/93) as 'Walford' alias Collaford or Collard; and Nohecote (46/2) as Noggacott alias Northcote. This provides a convenient, even alluring, slide from the DB form to a modern village. The elderly EPNS volumes for Wilts. and for Devon compounded the problem by uncritically reproducing Domesday identifications even when they were formally impossible or unlikely and by being less than careful in allotting a particular Domesday name-form to a particular modern village, when several places of the same name lie within the county.¹⁹

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 GDB 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, GDB Hewise (19/22) is said to be Orway's Hays (VCH) or Hays Park (DG); Bere (24/17) is said to be Netherton (VCH and DG); Otri (34/47) is said to be Hembury Fort (VCH and DG); and another Otrie (34/45) is identified as Deer Park (DG).

So long as the Domesday text was studied for its bearing on historical, constitutional, legal, fiscal 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 extents and resources to reality on the ground, values are being studied estate by estate, the teamland formula is being explored by looking at the hidage of individual estates and their potential for exploitation, and the DB material is being put on computer so that large-scale studies become possible.²⁰ 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, Crewkerne or 'Crook'. Somerset also contains five Contones, 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 'Caundles', ten 'Fromes', twelve 'Piddles' 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 'Piddle' and two called 'Frome'. Devon is particularly rich in places named from the rivers Clyst, Teign, Culm and Otter; and in places called Bere, Buckland, Leigh, Combe, Hele, 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 Yeo (a tributary of the Taw) is represented by ten entries in DB whose modern equivalents are Broadnymett, Nichols Nymett, Nymet Rowland, Nymet Tracey (or Bow), Burston, Hampson, Natson, Walson, Wolfen 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 Nortcuri (1/19) alongside Churi and Curi;²² and Ubcedene, Opededre and Sucedene which represent Upper and Lower Cheddon (the latter now Cheddon Fitzpaine).²³ There is also Sudcadeberie;²⁴ and Nortperet, Nordperet, Nordpereth and Sudperet, Sudperetone.²⁵ But the usage is not consistent: Cheddon Fitzpaine appears also as plain Cedre;²⁶ the modern North Cadbury is simply Cadeberie;²⁷ and North Petherton is also Peretune and Peret.²⁸ Although, in Dorset, GDB has Litelpidele, Litelpidre for one place on the river Piddle,²⁹ another entry simply named Pidre³⁰ can be shown to have

also lain there.³¹ Similarly, one place occurs in the GDB text of Wilts. as both Wintreburne and Wintreburnestoch.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 20 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 Danelaw counties where a clear distinction is made between the main manor and its named sokes and berewicks. 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 Gotshelm 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 thanes at Bridestowe in Devon lay at Kersford, Battishill, Combebowe, Ebsworthy, Fernworthy 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

headings, places are perceptibly arranged in close geographical, and therefore probably in hundredal, groups within fiefs and generally in the same hundredal order. A study of this order and a comparison of it with that in the 'Tax Returns' or 'Geld Rolls' and in certain lists of hundreds all now bound up with ExonDB enables a reasonably complete picture of the SW. hundreds to be constructed.

In the case of Cornwall, Devon and Somerset the basic structure of ExonDB is fief, county, hundred: that is, all the lands of one holder are given within those three counties before the document moves on to the next holder. Within the county the hundred is paramount, with the hundreds in Devon and Somerset entered in a regular order which corresponds to lists of hundred names which now accompany ExonDB in the *Liber Exoniensis*. Devon, Cornwall and Somerset each have two lists of these names.⁴⁰ In the case of Cornwall neither list corresponds to any order within the text, but for Devon and Somerset the second list in each case serves as an 'index' to the order of the appearance of hundreds in each fief.⁴¹ The congruity of list and order is quite remarkable within individual fiefs and the order applies in most cases to every fief within the county. Thus, in Devon, places appear in the order: Lifton, Black Torrington, Hartland, Merton, Fremington, North Tawton, and so on. Moreover, a change of hundred often corresponds with a change of hand in ExonDB. No such lists have survived for Wilts. and Dorset and in both cases this makes the hundredal structure of these counties much more difficult to work out in detail, though clear hundredal groupings exist within the text.

While the relation of these lists to the structure of the ExonDB text is certain, their exact purpose is unknown. They may be copies of schedules sent to tenants-in-chief asking them to arrange their own returns in a particular order; more likely they were a reminder to the scribes to ensure that material hundredally arranged was transferred to a fief in a particular order and without ignoring any hundred. In these lists, and so in the text of Somerset and Devon, the sequence of place-names is not arbitrary, but hundreds in the same corner of the county are generally placed near to each other as if the material had at one time been in regional form, possibly collected at regional centres. Such groupings are also clear in Dorset. Moreover, in individual chapters some hundreds are treated as groups, their order intermingled, yet these groups are always fully entered before passing on to the next hundred or group. Thus, Braunton, Shirwell, Bampton, Uffculme, South Molton and Cliston hundreds form a group in Devon, while Frome, Wellow and Kilmersdon hundreds are intermixed

in Somerset, as are Bruton, Wincanton and 'Blackthorn'.⁴²

The hundredal sequence of ExonDB is valuable for place-name identification because this order differs from that of GDB. The latter often puts at the head of each chapter the fief-holder's principal manor in the county, drawing it out of hundred order.⁴³ GDB frequently deals with the holding of each subtenant separately: thus, in the count of Mortain's Devon fief the order of the two books is utterly different.⁴⁴ Moreover, GDB treats royal land differently.⁴⁵ Most important of all, ExonDB often groups together what in GDB became separate, and often very short, chapters from which no hundredal information can be gained. Thus, ExonDB has a Somerset chapter oddly entitled 'Lands of the French Thanes', which is then split into three chapters in GDB.⁴⁶ The corresponding Devon schedule, 'Lands of the French Men-at-Arms', emerges as eleven chapters in GDB.⁴⁷ In Somerset, ExonDB groups a few churches which have small fiefs together with the holders of alms-land,⁴⁸ and for Dorset it includes with the *Terra Regis* itself those lands given to churches out of royal holdings.⁴⁹ In Devon, the lands of Walter of Claville and his brother Gotshelm form a single schedule in ExonDB but are separated in GDB.⁵⁰ Not only is the ExonDB order invaluable in recovering the hundreds of the SW,⁵¹ it is also a pointer to resolving difficulties in other counties,⁵² since the process by which a circuit return was converted into the GDB text can be more fully understood.

The second source of information on the SW. hundreds are the so-called 'Geld Rolls' or 'Tax Returns', probably close to ExonDB in date, but not necessarily for that reason to be considered part of the same survey.⁵³ They exist for all five counties and are probably based on lost lists of tax liability which also contributed to the structure of the Domesday Survey. They record the result of one tax levy, a collection at six shillings to the hide, and each hundredal return begins with the total hidage of that hundred and with the amount of tax paid; then there is a list of exempt land (usually the total of an individual's demesne in that hundred); then of tax not paid, together with occasional other details such as tax paid in another hundred. They include a very few place-names, some of which are not in DB,⁵⁴ but their value lies in the fact that a comparison of holders and hidage⁵⁵ with DB entries often allows particular estates to be allotted to particular Tax Return hundreds. In a few cases all the individual hidages can be confidently identified, while even in the worst cases some evidence is recoverable.⁵⁶ The Tax Returns are a valuable supplement to the order of ExonDB as evidence for assigning

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 hidage 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 hidage between DB and the Tax Returns, especially in the case of royal land, and demesne hidage 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 ExonDB 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 ExonDB 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 ExonDB 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 manorial 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-pans 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 hidage of a place may find a partner elsewhere in the text;⁶² and the sum of the hidage 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 Bridgwater 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 Cruce (24/7) is unlikely to be Crosse (DG) when a 'Crook' is available; Hetsecome (8/38) is 'Hiscombe' rather than Ashcombe (VCH); and Honecote (16/13) is Holnicote rather than Huntscott (VCH). GDB Gildencote (21/64) can hardly be Golsoncott (DG) when there is a Gilcott known locally, and Sordemaneford (25/42) must be 'Shortmansford' not Stelford (DG). VCH Devon and DG are especially full of such cases: for example, GDB Beldrendiland (3/15) is identified as Brandize (DG), when it should be connected with Barlington; and Madescame (19/36) is identified as Woodscombe (VCH, DG), when it should be Mackham. GDB Alfelmestone (35/27) is not Yealmpstone (VCH, DG), but a lost place, now represented by Train in Wembury parish; Cacheberge

(16/22) is not Kigbear (VCH), but Cookbury; Nohecote (46/2) is not Noggacott 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 Brentemerse 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 Sudbrenta and the holding also included the parish of Lympsham: 'Brent' or 'Brentmarsh' 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 'Worlington' in Devon can be shown to be represented by East Worlington and West Worlington 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 tenorial complexity in 1086: vills split by hundreds; manors with outlying 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, Goodameavy, Gratton, Cadover, Brisworthy and Lovaton.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 DG 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 Burrington and Churchill parishes in Somerset, with which the VCH identifies GDB Langford (1/16), seem in fact to be accounted for as unnamed members of the manors of Wrington (8/27) and Banwell (6/9). Langford 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 GDB). 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;⁷⁵ and that Milton Abbey's Ower (12/13) contained Green Island and 'Fromemouth'.⁷⁶ A charter will sometimes allow an understanding of the larger units that preceded Domesday. The 30 hides of Ditchat in Somerset (8/30) were a grant of Æthelwulf, king of the West Saxons, to Eanulf his princeps of 25 cassati at Ditchat and five at Lottisham; in DB it was already breaking up.⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸

Equally important is the later history of the Domesday holding. If it is followed for the next 250 years in various Inquisitions, 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 Hurberton; and those of William Capra and Ralph of Limésy 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; Ansgar 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 43 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 fished 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 Inquest allow no place for itinerant 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.⁷⁹

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'.

BATH, Avon

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 Inquest. DG ... H. C. Darby and G. R. Versey, eds., Domesday Gazetteer (Cambridge, 1975). ECW ... H. P. R. Finberg, The Early Charters of Wessex (Leicester, 1964); quoted by document number. EHR ... English Historical Review. EPNS ... English Place-Name Society. ExonDB ... Exeter Domesday Book, text printed in vol. IV of the Record Commission edition, Libri Censualis Vocati 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 paragraphos. Fees ... Book of Fees (Testa de Nevill), 3 vols. (HMSO, 1920-31). GDB ... Great Domesday Book; references are to the chapter and section numbers of the Phillimore volumes (see n.2, below). JRIC ... Journal of the Royal Institution of Cornwall. PN + County Abbreviation ... County volumes of the EPNS Survey of English Place-Names. PSANHS ... 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. TDA ... Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art. VCH ... The Victoria History of the Counties of England.

1. VCH, Cornwall, II, pt. 8 (1924), translation by T. Taylor; Devon, I (1906), trans. O. J. Reichel; Dorset, III (1968), trans. Ann Williams; Somerset, I (1906), trans. E. H. Bates; Wilts., II (1955), trans. R. R. Darlington.
2. Domesday Book, 6: Wiltshire (Chichester, 1979), ... 7: Dorset (1983), ... 8: Somerset (1980), ... 9: Devon, pts. I and II (1985), ... 10: Cornwall (1979), all edited by C. and F. Thorn. The place-name identifications in Cornwall were provided by Mr O. J. Padel. Preparation of the Cornwall and Wilts. volumes was supervised by the late Dr Morris as General Editor who had a policy of minimal annotation. Later volumes appearing under the guidance of Professor Dodgson have been allowed fuller notes. Most of the place-name cases cited in this article are more fully discussed in the relevant Phillimore volumes.
3. W. H. Jones, Domesday for Wiltshire (London and Bath, 1865).
4. J. Hutchins, The History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset ... with a Copy of Domesday Book and the Inquisitio Gheldi for the County, 2 vols. (London, 1774); R. W. Eyton, A Key to Domesday ... Analysis and Digest of the Dorset Survey (London, 1878).
5. J. Collinson, The History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset, 3 vols. (Bath, 1791); R. W. Eyton, Domesday Studies: An Analysis and Digest of the Somerset Survey (London and Bristol, 1880); T. W. Whale, Analysis of the Somerset Domesday, Principles of the Somerset Domesday (Bath, 1902).
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 Phillimore, DB Devon, pt. I. T. W. Whale and O. J. Reichel, 'Analysis of the Exon. Domesday', TDA XXVIII (1896), 391-463. T. W. Whale, 'Analysis of the Exon. Domesday in hundreds' TDA XXXV (1903),

7. J. Couch, 'Translations from Domesday', Transactions of the Natural History and Antiquarian Society of Penzance II (1851-5), 110-25, 167-85, 244-69; J. Carne, 'An attempt to identify the Domesday manors', JRIC I (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 Inquisitiones 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.
10. Eds. H. C. Darby et alii (7 vols., Cambridge, 1952-77). The south-western volume was edited by H. C. Darby and R. Welldon Finn: The Domesday Geography of South-West England (Cambridge, 1967).
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, 1986), lacks supporting evidence.
13. VCH Devon, 481, n.1., 543, n.11; see DB Devon, General Notes 1/7. 34/17 and cap. 44.
14. ExonDB 337b 1.
15. ExonDB 501b 1.
16. Grid reference SS 9508.
17. Wolfin is a post-Conquest name, found as Wolvysnymet in 1359, deriving from a family called Lupus 'wolf' in Latin, Le Lou in OFr; see PN Devon, II, 368.
18. Examples from Devon are GDB Liteltorelande (15/16) for Little Torrington (identified by O. J. Reichel in VCH Devon as ?Woodland in Little Torrington); Birland (15/46) for Bere Ferrers; and Hertitone (1/30) for Hartland.
19. PN Devon, I, 51, following Reichel, accepted GDB Hagintone as a predecessor of Kings Heanton despite the fact that other forms of Heanton in GDB and elsewhere point to OE hēah and tūn 'high farm', while Hagintone points to Hagginton 'Hæcga's farm' (PN Devon, I, 28). PN Wilts. only allocated the GDB form Newe(n)tone (13/2) to North Newton (p.322), although South Newton is a DB place (DB Wilts., Places Notes 13/10). It similarly omitted Allington near Amesbury and Middleton near Warminster by allowing only Allington in Chippenham (p.90) and Milton Lilborne (p.349); see DB Wilts., 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, 1985) and in Domesday Studies (Proceedings of the Winchester Domesday Conference, 1986; forthcoming). Examples of detailed estate studies are: S. Everett, 'The Domesday geography of three Exmoor parishes', PSANHS CXII (1968), 54-9, and M. C. Hill, 'The demesne

and the waste: a study of medieval inclosure on the manor of High Ercall 1086-1399', Transactions of the Shropshire Archaeological Society LXII (1979-80).

21. Some place-names in Evesham A (see P. H. Sawyer, "'Evesham A", a Domesday text', Worcs. Hist. Soc. Miscellany I (1960), 3-36; Phillimore DB 16: Worcestershire (1982), eds. F. and C. Thorn, Appendix 4) have an explanatory addition, e.g. Croela Odonis, Croela Gualteri. The only instances are of pers.nn. 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.nn. were probably added in the 12th cent. when the original document was abstracted.
22. DB Somerset 1/5. 16/11. 19/17-18;23-5;27;29. 21/1-2. 47/5. Representing Curry Rivel and Curry Mallet.
23. DB Somerset 2/3. 22/21.
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 16/7. 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 hidages between 20 and 54. The largest is Taunton (2/1), many of whose members are specified.
37. DB Dorset, General Notes 8/1.
38. ExonDB 114a 1, see DB Somerset 1/28; ExonDB 288b 2, see DB Devon 16/7.
39. ExonDB 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 ExonDB 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. ExonDB 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 fiefs.
44. The order of the entries in ExonDB as compared to GDB is: 15/6-15;32-3;16; 47;54;39;55-6;40-1;57-60;2;61;34;62-3;17-19;3-5;48;21;20;22;31;42;23-5;43; 35;64-6;44;67;36-7;45;68-72;26-7;73;38;74-6;28;77;49-51;29-30;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, Sotrebroc (ExonDB 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, 'Lands of Colwin and others of the King's Thaners', consists of 53 small holdings whose descent is often difficult to trace; without the consistent hundredal order of ExonDB many would be unidentified.
52. E.g., in Northants., caps. 6, 6a were probably once a single schedule; on this assumption hundred headings can be restored systematically.
53. Wilts. (three versions) Liber Exoniensis, 1a-3b, 7a-9b, 13a-16a; Dorset 17a-24a; 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, III, 117-18. There appear to be too many discrepancies of hidage and holder for the Tax Returns to have formed a part of the Domesday Inquest, although this is the emphatic view of V. H. Galbraith, 'The date of the geld rolls in Exon. Domesday', EHR LXV (1950), 1-15 and idem, The Making of Domesday Book (Oxford, 1961), 223-30.
54. About twenty p.nn. in all are given in the Somerset Tax Returns, of which Woodadvent (Oda), Letfort and Pirtochesuorda in the Williton hundred return, Cranmore 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 pers.nn. and by-names.
55. ExonDB often supplies demesne hidage 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, 527-37. The Somerset Tax Returns are reconstructed in Eyton's Somerset; those for Devon in various articles by O. J. Reichel in TDA (for details see the Phillimore DB Devon, Bibliography). Both Eyton's and Reichel'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), 548-75.
57. Shaftesbury Abbey is shown to have held land in Bath hundred in Somerset. Hervey of Helléan held land in Budleigh and Colyton hundreds in Devon; see DB Devon, General Notes cap. 44.
58. E.g., the 12th cent. 'Northamptonshire Survey'; see J. H. Round, Feudal England (London, 1909), 215-24, and VCH Northamptonshire, I, 357-89; also C. R. Hart, The Hidation of Northamptonshire (Leicester, 1970), 16-20; and F. Thorn, 'The hundreds of Northamptonshire' in the Alecto Domesday County Volume (forthcoming).
59. Thurlbear 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.
63. See Round, Feudal England, 61-2; E. H. Bates, 'The five-hide unit in Somerset Domesday', PSANHS XLV (1899), 51-107; and VCH Somerset, I, 386-7.
64. VCH Dorset, III, 90, n.243 identifies Canford Magna; see DB Dorset 31/1.
65. VCH Somerset, I, 467 prints Brent, but DG 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.
66. DB Devon, General Notes 3/81. 42/21.
67. DB Dorset, General Notes 1/6. 26/50-1.
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 (1/63) had land in North Tawton 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 mansiones 'by Quantock Wood' corresponds to West Monkton and part of Creech St. Michael; ECW 371 (Sawyer 248) mentions 20 cassati by the river Tone; and the 12 hides at Sowy in ECW 379 (Sawyer 251) probably included Westonzoyland, Middlezoy and Othery

- (DB Somerset, Places Notes 8/6). These general 'book-names' may well have lingered on when estates were dismembered.
71. ECW 492 (Sawyer 740).
72. DB Devon 17/79-82. 29/9.
73. DB Devon 19,25-6;32. 25/14. 34/23;26.
74. The identification is due to Collinson, confirmed by S. C. Morland, 'Some Domesday Manors', PSANHS XCIX-C (1954-5), 45. There is similarly no room for DG's Wick in Brent Knoll in Somerset; it is probably Eckweek (DB Somerset, Places Notes 24/32; Morland, ibidem, 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).
78. H. P. R. Finberg, The Early Charters of Devon and Cornwall (Leicester, 1953), 20-31.
79. The members of some large manors, e.g. Leominster in DB Herefs., Montgomery in DB Salop, do seem to be arranged topographically.