

12th-century records', *Personnamnsstudier 1964, tillägnade minnet av Ivar Modéer (1904-1960)*, *Anthroponymica Suecana VI* (Stockholm, 1965), 52-68, esp. 64-6. J. Insley, 'Some Scandinavian personal names from south-west England', *Namn och Bygd LXX* (1982), 77-93, esp. 88 and n.44. *Idem*, 'The names of the tenants of the Bishop of Ely in 1251: a conflict of onomastic systems', *Ortnamnsällskapets i Uppsala Årsskrift* (1985), 58-78, esp. 62.

¹⁴ F. Liebermann, ed., *Die Heiligen Englands* (Hanover, 1889).

¹⁵ Kökeritz, *op. cit.*, 233; there is some doubt about the precise date of this record of *terram cultibilem lateris montis sancti Bonifatii*.

¹⁶ The assessment of Boniface is by his approximate contemporary Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury; for the synod, see A.W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, eds, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1871), 390-4.

¹⁷ A medieval gild of Boniface existed at Brixworth, and the reliquary found in the church has been thought, by association, to be of the saint: see *VCH Nthants.*, IV, 157, n.2. Parts of the present church of Brixworth existed at the time when Boniface (under that name) and his memory were most conspicuous in England (c.718-54 *et subseq.*): see H.M. and J. Taylor, *Anglo-Saxon Architecture*, 3 vols continuously paginated (Cambridge, 1965-78), (1), 108-14, where the original structure, much of which survives, is dated to the seventh century.

Place-Naming in Domesday Book: Settlements, Estates, and Communities

David Roffe

DOMESDAY BOOK furnishes the first record of the majority of English place-names, and it is therefore not surprising that the study of those therein has been preoccupied with their etymology and identity. Their applications and referents have received less attention. There have always been names, such as those in *-tūn* with the root meaning of 'fence', 'enclosure', or 'homestead', which identify places in the strictest sense, but in the earliest period of English toponymy there were some, like *-feld* names, which referred to regions rather than specific settlements. By the eleventh century, however, almost all had become names of habitative nuclei.¹ With the limited exception of river names and the like which were employed in the West Country to identify holdings, it is therefore axiomatic that Domesday provides a minimum account of existing or former settlement-sites in the country at the time. This, however, is saying less than it seems. Until recently, it was generally assumed that Domesday place-names could be directly identified with the nucleated villages which subsequently bore the names; and, since it was believed that Domesday was compiled from the testimony of representatives from the community, the distribution was thus, barring omission and error, an accurate reflection of eleventh-century settlement patterns.²

This view is no longer tenable. Archaeological fieldwork has suggested that, at this time, there was often dispersed settlement which only later agglomerated.³ Further, it is clear that Domesday Book was not a survey of villages. The men of individual settlements did occasionally provide information, but it was the vill which was regularly consulted through the priest, the reeve, and six of its members. This institution is not to be confused with the economic entity which was the township; from the late tenth century the vill was the basic unit of local government which often comprised a number of estates, settlements, and field systems.⁴ The structure of the network was largely a matter of public record; the regular sequences of vills and hundreds in the text show that juries were called from a geld list which recorded the name of each community. Their testimony, however, was limited to details of tenure, assessment to the geld, and possibly value of land. From its inception at Gloucester in 1085 Domesday Book was perceived as a survey of estates, and it is clear that it was tenants-in-chief or their

agents who provided most of the information in oral or written returns compiled independently of communal presentations.⁵

The use of a number of sources in the compilation of Domesday Book complicates the study of its place-names. The influence of seigneurial returns on the nomenclature of the text is now fully recognized. Both historical and archaeological evidence demonstrates the existence in 1086 of many villages, hamlets, and farms which are not mentioned in the text, and it is thus evident that one Domesday name often stands for a number of settlements. Where a place-name does not appear in the Domesday text, the presumption must often be (in the absence of evidence for a later origin) that the settlement to which it refers was a subsidiary element in a larger whole. The contribution of settlement and vill presentations to Domesday names is more difficult to identify since the structure of local government, and the communities that it organized, is largely unknown. A peculiar system of administration in Lincolnshire, however, illustrates the importance of such sources to Domesday nomenclature. Estate names are widely represented in the Lincolnshire folios, but a number of place-name anomalies suggests that the identifying names of entries are frequently drawn directly from such sources.

In 1086 the county of Lincoln consisted of the two parts of Lindsey and *Sudlincolia*, that is, South Lincolnshire, which encompasses the divisions of Kesteven and Holland. These parts had only recently been constituted as a single administrative entity, but both had a similar machinery of government. They were divided into a number of wapentakes which functioned in much the same way as hundreds in hidated England. However, they were subdivided into hundreds of twelve carucates which are not directly paralleled outside of the Danelaw. Every estate, with the sole exception of those of the king, was incorporated into a hundred of this kind. Nevertheless, the unit was essentially independent of estate structure; it might encompass part of a manor, an estate in its entirety, or a whole complex of different fees or parts thereof. The Lincolnshire hundred was a communal institution which, deriving its name from the fine of a long hundred (120) of Danish *oras*, each worth sixteen pence, imposed upon its members for breach of the peace, was probably introduced in the late tenth century when the Northern Danelaw was first integrated into the kingdom of England. Identified by the principal settlement within its bounds, it seems to have represented the community in all matters which touched its interests and duties in 1086. Its testimony is found in the Domesday text, and, like the leet of East Anglia with which it is

most nearly comparable, it would appear that it functioned in the survey in much the same way as the vill elsewhere in the country.⁶

The Lincolnshire hundred's contribution to the Domesday process, and the impact of its evidence on the form of the text which emerged therefrom, is largely obscured by the seigneurial arrangement of the survey. The resolution of claims hundred by hundred in the *clamores*⁷ in an order which corresponds to that of the earlier or independently-compiled text suggests a central role for such hundreds, but no documentation survives to illustrate it before the text was cast into *breves*. However, it can be reconstructed from two geographically-arranged sections of the folios of the northern circuit in which Lincolnshire was surveyed. The accounts of both *Roteland* (figure 1), the two wapentakes administered from Nottingham which were joined to two Northamptonshire (hidated) hundreds in the twelfth century to form the county of Rutland, and of the Isle of Axholme (figure 2) in Lincolnshire proceed by hundred. All the hundreds of each area can be reconstructed by adding up the assessments of consecutive entries,⁸ and the account of estates is directly related to them. In *Roteland* all notice of manorial appurtenances in berewicks and sokeland is a postscriptal gloss, while in Axholme they are all assigned to hundreds different from the *caput* to which their dues were rendered. Both are thus entirely hundredal in form, and it would appear that hundred juries were called from a hundredally-arranged geld list and, reflecting their competence, Domesday entries were formulated by reference to the area of the hundred they represented.

Vestiges of the same process in the Lincolnshire folios indicate that this procedure was employed throughout the county. The testimony of the hundred is sporadically found throughout the text, albeit sometimes postscriptally, and in areas of the county in which hundredal structure can be reconstructed from the Domesday geld assessments, it is clear that, barring exceptional circumstances of tenure, manorial appurtenances are invariably located in a hundred other than that of the estate centre. The wapentake of Elloe, for example, was divided into seven hundreds and the description of manors conforms rigidly to the same pattern, apart from a berewick of the king's manor of Fleet in Holbeach and Whaplode which was exceptionally held by Count Alan.⁹ The entries of the text are essentially Domesday artefacts and therefore do not necessarily have analogues in economic, social, or settlement structures.¹⁰ Nevertheless, their identifying names often have such referents. In *Roteland*, where there were only three hundreds but ten names, they must generally be estate names derived from toponyms which indicate

the estate centre. In many parts of Lincolnshire the names of manorial entries were evidently of the same type, for, where a hundred name is given in a rubric, it is usually different from that of the manor it qualifies. By contrast, the names of berewicks and of sokeland, which as loose collections of tributary tenements probably did not have centres outside of the *caput* to which they owed service, may often directly refer to settlements.

This pattern, however, is by no means invariable. Parcels of land in Threekingham, Blankney, and Howell are identified simply as lying in the hundreds of the same name,¹¹ and Anglo-fr *HUNDRET* (or *hd* or *HUND*, for the same, or for Latin *HUNDREDUM* or OE *HUNDRED*) is interlined above a further thirty-six place-names in *breves* nos 3, 12, 30, and 31 to indicate a hundred name in the same way. Further, it must be doubted whether hundred names are confined to these explicit instances. Hundred rubrication is regular only in the four chapters noted, and even then but from the point at which the account of Kesteven and Holland commences. Much of the information is postscriptal and it must therefore be concluded that it is partial and incomplete; it is not clear why the scribe accorded these folios special treatment, but it is evident that he did so. Indeed, there are indications that other identifying names are also those of hundreds. In at least seventeen entries a settlement name is used to identify an estate which had no tenurial connection with it.¹² For example, a manor in South Rauceby is later represented by *Hanbeck* and four of the six manors known as Bourne had no connection with the main fee in that vill either *TRE* or subsequently and can be shown to have actually been situated in the hamlet of *Austerby*.¹³

This phenomenon has attracted little attention, but the actual nucleus is usually unnamed in Domesday, and consequently it has been tacitly assumed either that there was an expansion of settlement after the Domesday Inquest or that the scribe was in error. Both processes can be illustrated: Rigbolt seems to have been a post-Domesday creation with the various interests appearing in the text as Cheal, while a fee in Gate Burton is mistakenly identified as Broughton.¹⁴ But internal and independent evidence frequently indicates that the hidden settlements were already in existence. Thus, Ramsey Abbey's land identified as Dunsby St Andrew in Domesday was called 'Cranwell' in 1051 when it was granted and in all subsequent documentation, while two fees known as Tydd but later situated in Long Sutton must have already been located there since the church of the settlement, which belonged to one of the fees, is noticed in the *clamores*.¹⁵ Neither Dunsby nor Tydd is

explicitly said to be a hundred, but both Rauceby and Bourne were such, and it seems clear that the names employed in this type of context must be those of hundreds.

The reason for the use of such names varies. On occasion it may have been a deliberate choice, for it is sometimes apparent that the scribe was aware of the different connotations. Three parcels of Count Alan's land in Drayton, for example, are consecutively identified as 'in Drayton hundred', 'in the same Drayton', and 'in Drayton itself (*in Draitone ipsa*)'.¹⁶ Here hundred is opposed to settlement, and, in an area characterized by dispersed patterns of settlement, it must be assumed that a scattering of farms and hamlets, probably too numerous to name, is contrasted with a central, possibly nucleated, place where the lord's hall was situated. Hundred names continued to be used in this way until the fourteenth century on the fen-edge in Kesteven and well into the eighteenth century in Kirton Wapentake in Holland.¹⁷ More often the fact may merely connote an absence of information. In some entries a second name has been interlined above the original which seems to identify the tenement more precisely within the hundred. In the account of Drew de Beurere's manor of Keelby, for example, *vel Cotes*, 'or *Coton*', has been interlined above the place-name where the former seems to represent the hundred and the latter the settlement nucleus of the fee.¹⁸

The source of the more precise location must have often come from seigneurial returns. A hundred name may therefore indicate that such detailed information was absent; Domesday Book occasionally notes that a tenant '*non fecit returnum*'.¹⁹ Often, however, hundred, estate, and settlement names are used interchangeably without any apparent rationale. The lost *Bredestorp* to the north of Stamford provides a good example. The name seems to represent 'Breiðr's thorp', and it has been identified with Bowthorpe (*Buretorp* 1201, *Beirethorp* 1316, *Bourthorp* 1323) in Witham on the Hill parish.²⁰ The etymological argument that has been adduced is, however, essentially circular, and indeed the tenurial evidence confirms that there is no connection between the names. Bowthorpe belonged to the abbot of Crowland throughout the Middle Ages, and it seems likely that the estate was granted under the name of Manthorpe by Ulf Topesune shortly before the Conquest and that it was either omitted from Domesday or was subsumed in the entry for Langtoft from which it was administered.²¹ *Bredestorp* has an entirely different context. In Great Domesday Book the name primarily identifies a manor held by Drew de Beurere which was subsequently known as Holywell and

included the settlement of Aunby.²² But it is also found in the *Descriptio Terrarum*, a Domesday satellite which emanated from Peterborough Abbey, where it refers to the estate known as *Adewelle* in Great Domesday Book and as *Careby* in thirteenth-century and later sources, and it is consequently clear that the *Bergestorp* to which a berewick in Little Bytham is said to belong in Domesday refers to the same manor.²³ *Bredestorp*, then, is the name of a settlement, probably an early or alternative name for Holywell, which is also that of a hundred and as such, in the deviant form *Bergestorp*, identifies a manor with its *caput* in a place called *Adewelle*.

Lincolnshire is unusual in the geography of its local government system, and there can be few instances in Great Domesday Book in which such a complex of names can be found. Elsewhere in the account of the North, however, identifying names are drawn from a similar variety of sources. In Nottinghamshire twelve-carucate hundreds are also found. Those which are named cannot be reconstructed from the available data, but two in the wapentake of Broxtow are identified by the exceptional parity of teamland quotas with assessment to the geld, and from their structure it is clear that Domesday entries were formulated by reference to their area (figure 3). Thus, for example, tenements in Basford and dependent manors with their respective sokelands in Watnall and Bulwell were enrolled separately from the manorial *capita* to which they belonged, since they were situated in different hundreds.²⁴ But local government nomenclature can rarely have been used in the text, for hundreds here were larger than in Lincolnshire and their names were consequently of little use in identifying land. Most names seem to have more specific referents. Thus, 'Southwell' refers to a large estate which encompassed not only Southwell itself but also Normanton, Upton, Fiskerton, Gibsmere, Bleasby, Goverton, Halloughton, Halam, Farnsfield, and probably Easthorpe, Westhorpe, and Morton.²⁵ By contrast, the constituent elements of the soke of Mansfield were minutely detailed, and all of the identifying names appear to be those of townships or even settlements.²⁶

The Derbyshire Domesday folios generally exhibit the same patterns as the Nottinghamshire text; twelve-carucate hundreds were a characteristic of the county, but Domesday names are those of estates and settlements. However, in the north of the shire a different system of nomenclature can be perceived. The wapentakes of High Peak and Wirksworth are dominated by a small number of large estates which consist of duodecimal groups of vills. Longdendale and Ashford each had twelve elements in 1086, Darley,

Bakewell, and Hope had three, eight and seven respectively, but interlocking patterns and parochial structure point to the former existence of three further groups of twelve (figure 4). The arrangement evidently pre-dates Domesday tenurial patterns, and it therefore seems likely that all sixty vills represent the sixty *manentes* 'in Hope and Ashford' which were confirmed to Uhtred in 926.²⁶ It would appear that the whole structure relates to a system of royal or comital government which is anterior to the institution of the twelve-carucate hundred and wapentake, and as such the names which appear in Domesday are probably a vestige of an antique system of estate management which may well have been remote from settlement and manorial reality in the eleventh century.

Similar structures can be identified in Yorkshire and have clearly influenced Domesday nomenclature.²⁸ Most names, however, probably refer to vills. Although seigneurial returns were made in the North, no consistent attempt seems to have been made to group manorial *caput* with appurtenances in the Yorkshire folios. The order of the text was derived from the Summary, in essence the record of the first open-court session of the Domesday inquiry in the county enrolled after the Lincolnshire folios in Great Domesday Book, or its archetype. By and large this is geographically arranged within three sections and seems to have been largely based upon a geld list.²⁹ The place-names of the text, then, are evidently those of local government units, and indeed they have their township counterparts in the later Middle Ages.³⁰

Little attention has been paid to the referents of place-names and Domesday entry formation in hidated counties. The same processes can be found in Huntingdonshire, which was surveyed in Circuit VI with the North. Where manors were confined to a part of a vill, it is the latter's name which appears in the text. For example, the abbot of Ramsey and Countess Judith held estates which are simply called *Stivecle*, that is, Stukeley, but the subsequent histories of the two estates suggest that the one was situated in Little Stukeley and the other in Great Stukeley.³¹ By contrast, estate names were often used for large compact manors which encompassed a number of vills and settlements. Thus, the king had a manor of fifteen hides which is identified as Hartford, but it is clear from the record of two churches that it also included the settlement of King's Ripton, while the estate identified as *Slepe* evidently included Old Hurst where the Domesday tenant Ingelrann held land.³² Many subsidiary elements in such estates were apparently recorded at an early stage in the survey but were edited out of the final version, or, as in Paxton, merely enumerated:³³

the *Inquisitio Eliensis* account of Spaldwick notices the three berewicks of Barham, Long Stow, and Easton, although only the estate name appears in the Great Domesday text.³⁴ It is only in the larger dispersed estates that the structure of the manor is preserved. Thus, the soke of Kimbolton extended into four villis outside of the estate centre in Huntingdonshire and is therefore described in four entries.³⁵

A similar usage has been observed in Worcestershire and in Gloucestershire. Contemporary charters and leases indicate that large demesne estates, like the church of Worcester's manors of Fladbury and Bibury, consisted of numerous townships and villis, but either the estate name alone is used in Great Domesday Book or the various elements are noticed only incidentally in the same entry. Smaller fees, by contrast, such as the Worcester monks' demesne and enfeoffed land which encompassed whole villis or part thereof are identified by vill names or probably, in some cases where they were different, by township names.³⁶ Throughout the text the differentiation of places with the same names, or lack of it, may be directly related to the underlying structure of local government where villis were divided between a number of tenants-in-chief.

Elsewhere, the referents of Domesday place-names have not been explored. However, throughout the country the same types of sources were used by the commissioners, and it must be supposed that names frequently refer to different entities. It is not always necessary to identify them. The exercise is of little moment in those areas in which settlement and vill, community and manor are coterminous. But, where there is no such coincidence, an understanding of the nature of Domesday place-names is a prerequisite of any attempt to reconstruct the eleventh-century landscape, economy, and society.

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

Figure 1: the *Roteland* Domesday, GDB 293a-b.

HUNDRED	MANOR	LORD IN 1086	ASSESSMENT car. bov.		TOTAL
Alstoe (1)	Greetham	the king	3	0	
	Cottesmore	the king	3	0	
	Mk. Overton	C. Judith			
	Stretton		3	4	
	Thistleton	C. Judith	0	4	
	<i>ibidem</i>	Alfred of Lincoln	0	4	
	the same hundred [Teigh]	Robert Malet	1	4	12 car.
Alstoe (2)	Whissendine	C. Judith	4	0	
	Exton	C. Judith	2	0	
	Whitwell	C. Judith	1	0	
	<i>Awsthorp</i>	Oger s. Ungomar	1	0	
	Burley	Gilb. de Gant	2	0	
	Ashwell	Earl Hugh	2	0	12 car.
Martinsley	Oakham				
	[5 berewicks]	the king	4	0	
	<i>ibidem</i>	Fulchere Malsor	1	0	
	Hambleton				
	[7 berewicks]	the king	4	0	
Ridlington					
[7 berewicks]	the king	4	0	13 car.	

NB: words in square brackets [] have been interlined and are therefore later additions to the text.

Figure 2: DB estates in the Isle of Axholme, GDB 369b-c.

VILL	ASSESSMENT car. bov.		STATUS	TOTAL
Epworth	8	0	manor	
Owston	4	0	manor	12 car.
Haxey	3	0	manor	
Eastlound and Graizelound	1	6	two manors	
<i>ibidem</i>	1	1	soke of Epworth	
<i>ibidem</i>	0	1	berewick of Belton	
The Burnhams	6	0	soke of Epworth	12 car.
Belton	5	0	two manors	
Beltoft	1	0	soke, unspecified	
Althorpe	1	0	soke, addition	
Crowle	5	7	manor	
	0	1	inland of Upper-thorpe	13 car.
Ancotts	2	0	soke of Crowle	
<i>ibidem</i>	0	3	inland of Westwood	
<i>ibidem</i>	0	5	soke of Garthorpe	
Garthorpe and Luddington	4	4	soke of Crowle	
<i>ibidem</i>	1	0	manor	
<i>ibidem</i>	0	4	soke of Belton	
Butterwick	3	0	soke and inland of Owston	12 car.

Figure 3: two hundreds in the wapentake of Broxtow.

HUNDRED A				HUNDRED B			
VILL	c.	b.	t. o.	VILL	c.	b.	t. o.
Newthorpe	0	2	0 2	Bulwell	2	0	2 0
Watnall	1	0	1 0	Arnold	3	0	3 0
Kimberley	1	0	1 0	Basford	2	3	2 3
Nuthall	0	4½	0 4½	Basford	0	1	
Nuthall	0	3½	0 3½	Basford	0	4	0 4
Cossall	0	6	0 6	Radford	3	0	3 0
Cossall	0	6	0 6	Lenton	0	4	
Strelley	0	6	0 6	Lenton	2	0	2 0
Strelley	0	3		Lenton	0	4	0 4
Strelley	0	3	0 3	Morton	1	4	1 4
Bilborough	0	1		Nottingham	6	0	
Bilborough	0	7	0 7				
Broxtow	0	1					
Broxtow	0	3	0 3				
Trowell	1	4	1 4				
Trowell	0	4	0 4				
Trowell	0	4	0 4				
Trowell	0	4	0 4				
Trowell	0	4	0 4				
Wollaton	1	0	1 0				
Wollaton	1	4	1 4				
Total	13	2			21	4	
King's land	1	2			9	4	
TOTAL GELDABLE	12	0			12	0	

NB: assessments of royal estates are italicized; c = carucate, b = bovate, t = teams, o = oxen.

Figure 4: groups of vills in north Derbyshire.

Darley:	3 berewicks and Middleton, Youlgreave, Gratton, Elton, Harthill, Stanton, Winster, Cowley, Birchover.	TOTAL 12 vills.
Bakewell:	8 berewicks and Pilsley, Edensor, Chatsworth Beeley.	TOTAL 12 vills.
Ashford	12 berewicks	TOTAL 12 vills.
Hope:	7 berewicks and Hathersage, Bamford, Hurst, Stoney Middleton, Eyam.	TOTAL 12 vills.
Longdendale	Twelve manors.	TOTAL 12 vills.

NOTES

- ¹ M. Gelling, *Signposts to the Past* (London, 1978), 126-9.
- ² See, for example, J.H. Round, *Feudal England* (London, 1895), 3-27.
- ³ T. Rowley, *Villages in the English Landscape* (London, 1978), 81-103; B.K. Roberts, *Rural Settlement in Britain* (London, 1977), 52-81.
- ⁴ Township and vill were often coterminous (B.K. Roberts, 'Medieval settlement: topography and documents', in H. Reed, ed., *Discovering Past Landscapes* [London, 1984], 244-5), but frankpledge, which created the legal framework, was based upon a hidation independent of agricultural exploitation (D.R. Roffe, 'Brought to book: lordship and land in Anglo-Saxon England', forthcoming). It is therefore dangerous to assume that the vill of Domesday is anything other than co-incidentally co-extensive with basic units of production (J.D. Hamshere, 'The structure and exploitation of the Domesday Book estate of the church of Worcester', *Landscape History* VII [1985], 41-2).
- ⁵ V.H. Galbraith, *The Making of Domesday Book* (Oxford, 1961), 28-44.
- ⁶ D.R. Roffe, 'The Lincolnshire hundred', *Landscape History* III (1981), 27-36.
- ⁷ GDB 375a-377d; C.W. Foster and T. Longley, eds, *The Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey* (Lincoln, 1924), 206-35.
- ⁸ One carucate in Oakham (Rutland) held by Fulchere Malsor appears to be duplicated in the account of the king's manor in the same vill and must therefore be subtracted leaving a total of 12 carucates for Martinsley (D.R. Roffe,

'Domesday Book and northern society: a reassessment', *English Historical Review* CV [1990], 318n). Likewise, an additional carucate in Althorpe, a postscriptal addition to the text, is probably duplicated elsewhere in the account of Axholme.

- ⁹ Roffe, 'Lincolnshire hundred', 30-32.
- ¹⁰ Roffe, 'Lincolnshire hundred', 27-35.
- ¹¹ GDB 341d, 357b, 361b.
- ¹² GDB 351c, 358c, 368c, 370b Bourne = *Austerby*; 360d *Bredestorp* = Holywell; 344a Burton by Lincoln = Riseholme; 340b Colsterworth = Woolsthorpe; 346c Dunsby St Andrew = Cranwell; 354b Ingleby = Saxilby; 360b Keelby = Coton; 371a *Little Lavington* = Hanby; 363b Rauceby = *Hanbeck*; 369a Surfleet = Risegate; 351d, 368a Tydd St Mary = Long Sutton; 367d Wyberton = Tytton.
- ¹³ [H.C. Maxwell-Lyte *et alii*, eds.], *The Book of Fees commonly known as Testa de Nevill* (London, 1926); *Pipe Roll 13 Henry II*, 49; *Calendar of Charter Rolls* (London, 1903-27), iv, 29, 34; D.M. Stenton, ed., *The Earliest Lincolnshire Assize Rolls 1202-1209* (Lincoln, 1926), no 1400.
- ¹⁴ GDB 344c, 376b; H.E. Hallam, *Settlement and Society: a Study of the Early Agrarian History of South Lincolnshire* (Cambridge, 1965), 53.
- ¹⁵ C.R. Hart, ed., *The Early Charters of Eastern England* (Leicester, 1966), 242; GDB 377d.
- ¹⁶ GDB 348a-b.
- ¹⁷ Roffe, 'Lincolnshire hundred', 36.
- ¹⁸ GDB 360b.
- ¹⁹ Galbraith, 82-3; R. Welldon Finn, *The Domesday Inquest* (London, 1961), 85-8.
- ²⁰ *Lincolnshire Domesday*, 1-ii; G. Fellows Jensen, *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands* (Copenhagen, 1978), 104-5.
- ²¹ *Lincolnshire Domesday*, lxxxviii; D. Whitelock, ed., *Anglo-Saxon Wills* (Cambridge, 1930), no. 39. The grant was originally made to Peterborough but seems to have been ineffective.
- ²² *Book of Fees*, 182, 1050; *Feudal Aids* iii, 151.
- ²³ London Society of Antiquaries MS 60, fo. 23; D.R. Roffe, 'The Descriptio Terrarum of Peterborough Abbey', *Historical Research* LXV (1992), 15; GDB 345c; *Book of Fees*, 1822.
- ²⁴ GDB 287c, 288a, 292d, 293a; 291d; 287d, 288a; 288b; D.R. Roffe, 'Nottinghamshire and the North: a Domesday study', unpublished PhD thesis (Leicester, 1987), 68-72.
- ²⁵ GDB 283a; P. Lyth, 'The Southwell charter of 956 AD: an exploration of its boundaries', *Transactions of the Thorton Society* LXXXVI (1982), 60.
- ²⁶ GDB 281b.
- ²⁷ D.R. Roffe, 'The origins of Derbyshire', *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal* CVI (1986), 120-1; R.H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated Handlist and Bibliography* (London, 1968), no 397; C. Hart, ed., *The Early Charters of Northern England and the East Midlands* (Leicester, 1975), 103. Most Northern

of the tenth century with assessments in *manentes* can be identified with groups of tributary vills; the estate centre alone stands apart. The structure, however, may be even more ancient; the thirty-one *manentes* at *Hrepingas* granted to Breedon (Leics) in 675x691 (Sawyer, no 1805) can probably be identified with the thirty-one vills within the Domesday estates of Repton, Melbourne, and Derby/*Northworthy* which are otherwise tenurially linked (D.R. Roffe, 'An Introduction to the Derbyshire Domesday', in A. Williams and R.W.H. Erskine, eds, *The Derbyshire Domesday* (London, 1990), 24-6).

²⁸ W.E. Kappelle, *The Norman Conquest of the North* (London, 1979), 79-81; D. R. Roffe, 'Wharram Percy', forthcoming.

²⁹ GDB 379a-382b; D.R. Roffe, 'The Yorkshire Summary: a Domesday satellite', *Northern History* XXVII (1991), 242-60.

³⁰ D. Michelmore, M. L. Faull and S. Moorhouse, *West Yorkshire: an Archaeological Survey to AD 1500* (Wakefield, 1981), 232.

³¹ GDB 240b, 206d; *VCH Huntingdon* ii, 230, 234.

³² GDB 203c, 204b; *VCH Huntingdon* ii, 172, 210.

³³ GDB 207a.

³⁴ N.E.S.A. Hamilton, ed., *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis* (London, 1876), 166.

³⁵ GDB 250c-d.

³⁶ Hamshere, 'Structure and exploitation', 44-5.

The Medieval Exploitation and Division of Malham Moor

M.A. Atkin

MALHAM Moor is one of the townships which comprise the district of Craven in Yorkshire (see map). The medieval name *Malghemore* denoted a larger area than is Malham Moor today,¹ and I shall use this form to distinguish the greater area from the smaller, later township. It is a broad plateau (some 13 miles x 8 wide) lying at about 1200' (500m.) above sea level, with the flat-topped Fountains Fell rising above it to over 2000' (650m.). The plateau receives 50" of rain annually, the summits even more. Consequently it is, and was, dominantly a pastoral farming area, now part of the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

In examining the ways in which *Malghemore* was used in the medieval period, I want to raise again the question of what meaning the word *moor* had in the past for those who used it. On previous occasions I have suggested that *moor* might have had a meaning beyond a description of physical landscape, and that it may at one time have denoted a large area of land which was intercommoned.² I am also going to suggest that we tend to underestimate the value of moorland: although the quality of the land was usually low, and its use sometimes limited seasonally, it was nevertheless, for the communities around it, a highly valued resource.

Disputes over grazing rights on *Malghemore* are fairly frequent in twelfth- and thirteenth-century records. These disputes arose as a consequence of the grants of the pasture of *Malghemore*, and 'the pasture through all *Gnup* and *Dernbroc*' by William de Percy and his daughter Matilda in the second half of the twelfth century to the newly-founded Fountains Abbey.³ The disputants with Fountains were: first, the men of the surrounding vills who had long-established grazing rights on *Malghemore*; secondly, the canons of Bolton Priory; and thirdly, the monks of Sawley Abbey. Like Fountains, both these religious houses had acquired properties in vills around the Moor, and thereby also rights on the Moor itself. Before the twelfth century it may be that usage of the upland grazing was not sufficiently intensive to occasion serious dispute. The problems stemmed from the intensification of land use by the three religious houses in their development of large-scale sheep-farming here. As disputes were settled, areas of *Malghemore* were demarcated and 'granted' to the surrounding vills as their share of the once-open grazings, and gradually the vill boundaries on the upland became agreed and fixed to give us our present-day township