



DOMESDAY STUDIES:

AN ANALYSIS AND DIGEST

OF

THE STAFFORDSHIRE SURVEY.

TREATING OF THE MENSURATION, TECHNICALITIES, PHRASEOLOGY, AND
METHOD OF DOMESDAY, IN ITS RELATION TO STAFFORDSHIRE,
AND TO OTHER COUNTIES OF THE SAME CIRCUIT.

WITH TABLES AND NOTES RE-PRODUCING THE MAIN FEATURES OF THE
DOMESDAY SURVEY OF THE COUNTY, AND COMPARING THE
SAME WITH EXISTING CONDITIONS.

BY

THE REV. ROBERT W. EYTON,

LATE RECTOR OF RYTON, SALOP,

AUTHOR OF "THE ANTIQUITIES OF SHROPSHIRE;" "A KEY TO DOMESDAY, EXEMPLIFIED BY THE DORSET
SURVEY;" "DOMESDAY STUDIES, AN ANALYSIS AND DIGEST OF THE SOMERSET SURVEY;" AND
"THE COURT HOUSEHOLD, AND ITINERARY OF KING HENRY II."

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY TRUBNER & CO., 57 AND 59, LUDGATE HILL.

PRINTED AND SOLD BY JOS. HALDEN, STAFFORD.

MDCCCLXXXI.

DA
670
SHEET

631333
23.3.56

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

	Copies.
His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, K.G., Chatsworth . . .	1
Right Hon. the Earl of Harrowby, K.G., Sandon Hall . . .	1
Right Hon. Lord Wrottesley, Lord Lieutenant of the County	1
Col. the Hon. Geo. Wrottesley, Hampton Court Palace . . .	1
W. A. Adderley, Esq., The Beeches, Florence, Longton . . .	1
H. W. Adnitt, Esq., Shrewsbury	1
John N. Bagnall, Esq., Shenstone Moss, near Lichfield . . .	1
Alan Bagot, Esq., 49, Cadogan Place, London	1
Arthur Barnes, Esq., Solicitor, Lichfield	1
C. H. Bayley, Esq., Westbromwich	1
Rev. Henry Beckwith, Eaton Constantine, Ironbridge, Salop	1
Edwd. Bickersteth, D.D., the Very Rev. the Dean of } Lichfield, the Deanery, Lichfield }	1
Boston Public Library. Boston, Massachusetts, U.S. . . .	1
Rev. and Hon John Bridgman, Weston Rectory, Shiffnal . .	1
The Rev. and Hon. Canon Bridgman, The Hall, Wigan . . .	1
Rev. John Brooke, Haughton Hall, Shiffnal	1
Rev. C. Brooke, Haughton Hall, Shiffnal	1
E. Brunt, Esq., F.G.S., F.R.A.S., Hanley	1
Messrs. Bunny and Davis, Booksellers, Shrewsbury	1
Mrs. C. A. Burne, Pye Birch, Eccleshall	1
Edward Caddick, Esq., Wellington Road, Edgbaston	1
Arthur Cates, Esq., 7, Whitehall Yard, London	1
John Yates Carryer, Esq., The Mount, Stone	1
W. Challinor, Esq., Leek	2
Geo. T. Clark, Esq., Dowlais House, Dowlais	1
Capt. W. Congreve, Stafford	1
Rev. Canon Cooke, F.S.A., Hill House, Wimbledon, Surrey	1
Sir V. R. Corbét, Bart., Acton Reynald, Shrewsbury	1
John Corbett, Esq., M.P., Droitwich	1
J. Charles Cox, Esq., Christ Church Vicarage, Lichfield . .	1
Messrs. Cornish Brothers, Birmingham	2
N. C. Curzon, Esq., Lockington, Derby	1

	Copies.
Rev. T.W. Daltry, M.A., F.L.S., Madeley Vicarage, Newcastle	1
Wm. Downing, Esq., Olton, Acock's Green	1
W. H. Duignan, Esq., Rushall Hall, Walsall	1
Joseph Edge, Esq., Elder House, Cobridge	1
Rev. Prebendary Edwards, M.A., Trentham	1
Sir H. Edwards, Bart., Wootton Hall, Ashbourne	1
T. C. Eyton, Esq., F.Z.S., Eyton, Wellington, Salop	1
Rev. H. J. Ferrier, M.A., King Edward VI. School, Stafford	1
H. W. Foley, Esq., Prestwood, Stourbridge	1
Wm. O. Foster, Esq., Apley Park, Bridgnorth	1
Free Library, Stoke-on-Trent (per Mr. W. Bagnall)	1
R. W. Gillespie, Esq., Walsall	1
R. D. Gough, Esq., Willenhall	1
G. Grazebrook, Esq., F.S.A., Oak Hill Park, Liverpool	1
H. Sydney Grazebrook, Esq., Middleton Villa, Grove Park } Chiswick, Middlesex }	1
Hand & Co., Solicitors, Stafford	1
Ed. Hardwicke, Esq., Upper Arley, Bewdley	1
J. T. Harland, Esq., M.D., Tixall Lodge, Stafford	1
A. P. Heywood-Lonsdale, Esq., Gredington, Whitechurch	1
A. S. Hill, Esq., Q.C., M.P., Oxley Manor, W'hampton	1
Jas. Hixmith, Esq., Dawseroft, Brewood	1
Mrs. Elizabeth Holmes, Gayton Vicarage, near Stafford	1
Lieut.-Col. Gould Hunter-Weston, F.S.A., Hunterston, } West Kilbride, Ayrshire }	2
S. Heywood, Esq., 171, Stanhope st., Hampton road, London	1
Hon. Mrs. Meynell Ingram, Hoarcross, Burton-on-Trent	1
Rev. J. T. Jeffcock, M.A., F.S.A., Rectory, Wolverhampton	2
E. Jones, Esq., Chetwynd End, Newport	1
Jos. Jones, Esq., Wolverhampton	1
Rev. Thos. B. Lloyd, White Hall, Shrewsbury	1
Wilson Lloyd, Esq., Meiffod, Wood Green, Wednesbury	1
T.C.Sneyd Kynnersley, Esq., Moor green, Moseley, Birmingham	1
Stanley Leighton, Esq., M.P., Sweeney Hall, Oswestry	1
James Loxdale, Esq., Castle Hill, Aberystwith	1
Chas. Lynam, Esq., Stoke-on-Trent	1
Charles J. Morris, Esq., Wood Eaton Manor	1
F. Newdigate, Esq., West Hallam, Derby	1

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

v.

	Copies.
F. Ouvry, Esq., 12, Queen Anne Street, London, W.	1
Rev. F. Parker, Colton Rectory, Rugeley	1
Sir Horace St. Paul, The Ellowes, Dudley	2
Hugh Penfold, Esq., Rustington, Sussex.	1
Chas. Perks, Esq., 181, High Street, Burton-on-Trent	1
F. C. Perry, Esq., Dunston Hall, Penkridge	1
Thomas Redfern, Esq., Daisy Bank, Leek	1
Thos. Lloyd Roberts, Esq., Corfton Manor, Craven Arms, } Salop	1
Brooke Robinson, Esq., Barford House, Warwick	1
James Slater, Esq., Bescot Hall.	1
B. B. Smith, Esq., Bank, Wolverhampton	1
Hubert Smith, Esq., St. Leonard's, Bridgnorth	1
Dryden H. Sneyd, Esq., Ashcombe Park, Leek	1
Rev. Walter Sneyd, Keele Hall, Newcastle, Staffordshire . .	1
W. Sneyd, Esq., Basford Hall, Leek	1
Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London	1
Fras. R. Southern, Esq., Ludlow	1
Arthur Sparrow, Esq., Preen Manor, Shrewsbury	1
J. H. Stone, Esq., St. Paul's Square, Birmingham	1
Sydney, N.S.W., Free Public Library	1
Hamon Le Strange, Esq., Hunstanton Hall, King's Lynn . .	1
Ed. J. Taylor, F.S.A. (Newc.), Bishopwearmouth.	1
S. Timmins, Esq., Elvetham Lodge, Birmingham	1
Messrs. Trubner & Co., 57, 59, Ludgate Hill	1
Thomas F. Twemlow, Esq., Betley Court, Crewe	1
A. O. Twentyman, Esq., Castlecroft, Wolverhampton	1
E. T. Tylecote, Esq., M.D., Great Haywood, Stafford	1
Chas. C. Walker, Esq., Lilleshall Old Hall, Newport, Salop . .	1
Robt. P. Walker, Esq., Wolverhampton	1
Henry Ward, Esq., Rodbaston, Penkridge	1
Henry Wiggin, Esq., M.P., Metchley Grange, Harborne . . .	1
William Salt Library, Stafford	3
James Wilson, Esq., 35, Bull Street, Birmingham	1
Thos. Wood, Esq., Midland Bank, Stafford.	1
Mr. Henry Young, Bookseller, 12, South Castle Street, } Liverpool	1

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

- Limits of the Domesday County. Circuits of Domesday-Commissioners. The Record, as codified, confuses Staffordshire with other Counties of the same Circuit. The Commissioners' notes, originally taken in the country, were afterwards codified and finally rubricated. Errors and omissions in the two latter processes. 1 to 5
- Post Domesday. Changes of the Boundaries of Staffordshire. Certain Staffordshire Manors omitted in Domesday—Tamworth, Burton-on-Trent, Rowley Regis. Similar omissions in the Survey of other Counties 6 to 12
- Staffordshire Estates apparently excluded from the Survey, virtually included therein—Stoke-upon-Trent, Stone, Colwich and Stowe, Newcastle-under-Lyme 13 to 14
- The Domesday County and the present County compared as to areas. Table of the present County so far as it was prefigured in Domesday. A third of the superficial area of the land ignored in Domesday. Ratio of this phenomenon. The Staffordshire pasturage and uplands : the woodlands . 15 to 16

CHAPTER II.

- Internal state of Staffordshire A.D. 1086. *Terræ Vastæ*. The Burgh of Stafford. Stafford Castle. Abnormal proportions of the hide. Inadequate team-power. Population. Condition and value of Staffordshire Manors annexed after Domesday to Shropshire. Staffordshire Mills. Parish Churches. *Carucatæ terræ*. Allusions of Chronicles to events connected with Staffordshire in the æra preceding Domesday. 17 to 33

CHAPTER III.

- Domesday Hundreds of Staffordshire. Sites of Manors often traceable, where Domesday names are obsolete. Enumeration of Staffordshire estates whose Domesday names are obsolete 34 to 37

CHAPTER IV.

The Domesday Fiefs of Staffordshire. The King's Fief—as King—as Earl—as in possession of escheated Tainlands. The Bishop of Chester's Fief. Abbot of Westminster's Fief. Abbot of Burton's Fief. Abbot of St. Remige's Fief. Fief of the Canons of Stafford. Fief of Sampson, the King's Chaplain—of the Clerks of Wolverhampton—of the Clerks of Penkridge. Fief of Roger, Earl of Shrewsbury and Arundel—of Hugh de Montgomery, his son. Fief of Henry de Ferrers. Fief of Robert de Stafford, and of William Fitz Ansculf. William fitz Corbucion's Manor of Sibeford. Turstin's Manor of Drayton. Fief of Richard Forester—of Rainald Baliol—of Ralph fitz Hubert—of Nigel de Stafford. Lands of Chenuin, and other Thanes of King William.	38 to 56
---	----------

CHAPTER V.

Tables of the five Staffordshire Hundreds explained. Construction of the said Tables explained	57—58
Table of Offlow Hundred, including Edingale, added thereto since Domesday. Notes on the said Table.	58 to 66
Table of Seisdon Hundred, and of Manors severed therefrom since Domesday, and annexed to Shropshire. Notes on the said Table	66 to 69
Table of Cuddlestone Hundred, including three Estates erroneously codified in Domesday under Warwickshire and Northamptonshire. Notes on the said Table	70 to 74
Table on Pirchill Hundred, including Tirley, added thereto since Domesday. Notes on the said Table.	75 to 95
Table of Totmonslow Hundred. Notes on the said Table	96 to 108

CHAPTER VI.

The Staffordshire Domesday arranged according to Fiefs	109
Staffordshire and Dorset contrasted.	111

Index of Places	113
Index of Persons	124
Errata and Addenda	132

THE STAFFORDSHIRE DOMESDAY.

CHAPTER I.

LIMITS OF THE DOMESDAY COUNTY. CIRCUITS OF DOMESDAY COMMISSIONERS. THE RECORD, AS CODIFIED, CONFUSES STAFFORDSHIRE WITH OTHER COUNTIES OF THE SAME CIRCUIT. THE COMMISSIONERS' NOTES, ORIGINALLY TAKEN IN THE COUNTRY, WERE AFTERWARDS CODIFIED AND FINALLY RUBRICATED. ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN THE TWO LATTER PROCESSES.

POST DOMESDAY CHANGES OF THE BOUNDARIES OF STAFFORDSHIRE. CERTAIN STAFFORDSHIRE MANORS OMITTED IN DOMESDAY—TAMWORTH, BURTON-ON-TRENT, ROWLEY REGIS. SIMILAR OMISSIONS IN THE SURVEY OF OTHER COUNTIES.

STAFFORDSHIRE ESTATES APPARENTLY EXCLUDED FROM THE SURVEY, VIRTUALLY INCLUDED THEREIN—STOKE-UPON-TRENT, STONE, COLWICH AND STOWE, NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME.

THE DOMESDAY COUNTY AND THE PRESENT COUNTY COMPARED AS TO AREAS. TABLE OF THE PRESENT COUNTY SO FAR AS IT WAS PREFIGURED IN DOMESDAY. A THIRD OF THE SUPERFICIAL AREA OF THE LAND IGNORED IN DOMESDAY. RATIO OF THIS PHENOMENON. THE STAFFORDSHIRE PASTURAGE AND UPLANDS. THE STAFFORDSHIRE WOODLANDS.

THE 'Statfordscire' which we see surveyed in Domesday is far from being identical with the Staffordshire of the present day; nay, in some particulars, the written Survey fails to embody the exact report of the Domesday Commissioners themselves. To establish this latter paradox it will first be necessary to prove, by the internal evidence of the codex, what other counties fell under the purview of the same Commission as that which visited Staffordshire.

There were three peculiarities in the method of the Staffordshire Commissioners which distinguish their work from that of the Commissions which visited the adjacent counties of Worcestershire, Shropshire, Cheshire, and Derbyshire.—

I. The Staffordshire Commissioners, in dealing with the plough-lands and the teams of any given manor, adopted a

formula different to the formulæ which more or less obtained with the other aforesaid Commissioners.

II. The Staffordshire Commissioners, in reporting the condition of any parish church, never used the word 'Ecclesia', but typified the institution by mere mention of a resident Presbyter. But the other Commissions aforesaid constantly registered 'Ecclesiæ', which can have been nothing more than mere parish churches.

III. The Staffordshire Commissioners never made verbal allusion to the geldability or non-geldability of an estate. They spoke of *una hida*, of *una virgata terræ*, of *una carucata terre*, but such expressions as *una hida geldabilis*, or *hida non-geldabilis*, or *hida ad geldum*, or *Hoc Mancrimum se defendit pro una hida* were not in their vocabulary. But the other Commissioners aforesaid made it their business to record all they knew about the geld-rate of estates.

WARWICKSHIRE, the fifth county adjacent to Staffordshire, remains to be spoken of in this diagnosis. The Warwickshire Survey embodies all the three specialities which mark the survey of Staffordshire; and beyond Warwickshire there was OXFORDSHIRE, the Survey of which has precisely the same characteristics.

So then, Oxfordshire, Warwickshire, and Staffordshire were in one and the same Domesday Circuit. The point is established by the internal evidence of the Record.

And now for the use of this ascertainment. It will be no *petitio principii* to state that Roger Earl of Shrewsbury had at the date of Domesday a considerable Fief in Staffordshire, a much smaller Fief in Warwickshire, and no Fief at all in Oxfordshire. But it is (for the present) an hypothesis that the Earl's four Manors of Quat, Romesley, Rudge, and Shipley were at that date in Staffordshire. Yet being so in Staffordshire, by hypothesis, it is a clear fact that the written Domesday registers them as in Warwickshire. It has been further stated (*Antiquities of Shropshire*, II. 259) that Domesday specifies 'Stanlei Hundred' as the whereabouts of these four manors. This is not absolutely the case. The Domesday Rubricator has not written 'Stanlei Hundred' opposite any one of the four manors in question, but opposite the manor (Ulvestone) which immediately precedes the four. It is reasonable and usual to suppose that a Rubric, thus written, governed, and was intended to govern, all succeeding

entries of manors till a fresh Rubric were introduced, but, in practice, no such rule was adhered to; indeed, the Rubricators of this portion of Domesday, neglecting the due insertion of a proper Rubric, often threw whole series of manors into a false aspect. Summarily, though the Clerk who transcribed this portion of Domesday took the above four manors of Earl Roger to have been in Warwickshire, it does not follow that the Clerk who afterwards rubricated the codex intended to fix them in 'Stanlei Hundred'. My hypothesis is that they were in Staffordshire, my further hypothesis is that they were in the Staffordshire Hundred of 'Saisdon.'

These hypotheses will become the more plausible, the more we study the written Domesday.—

William fitz Corbucion had according to the Record (fo. 243.a) nineteen estates in Warwickshire. The nineteenth and last of these estates is *Cillentone*. It is specially rubricated as in *Colvestan Hundred*, and it is told how the Bishop of Chester was then claiming the estate ("Episcopus de Cestre calumniatur hanc terram").

Now there was no such Hundred as 'Colvestan' in Warwickshire. It was a Staffordshire Hundred. It remains so to this day. It is now spelt as "Cuddlestone Hundred", and in Cuddlestone Hundred, Staffordshire, is still to be found that Manor of Chillington which ultimately descended from William fitz Corbucion to his Giffard successors. Moreover the Manor of Chillington is flanked on its northern border by the Bishop of Chester's Domesday Manor of Brewood, and the Bishop eventually got seignery over Chillington. That Chillington was in Staffordshire, and not in Warwickshire, at the date of Domesday, I take to be a fact rather than a theory.

Again, the Staffordshire Domesday (as codified), though it neglects to give William fitz Corbucion his Staffordshire Manor of Chillington, gives him a manor of ten hides, written as 'Sibeford.' Sibeford has not the appearance of a Staffordshire manor, for King William himself had no estate in Staffordshire of so vast a volume as would be implied by ten Staffordshire hides. Neither is there any such manor as Sibeford named in the topography of modern Staffordshire; for Erdeswick's identification thereof with Seighford has no etymological fitness, and is utterly at variance with all that we learn about the genuine Seighford, from Domesday, and from subsequent evidences.

Having shown that William Corbucion's Manor of 'Sibeford' was not in Staffordshire,¹ I am not here concerned to prove where it was. By way of a hint to more exhaustive enquirers, I would just point out that the Oxfordshire Feodaries of the 13th century speak of one or more such manors as Sibeford, while the Oxfordshire Domesday, as written, is deficient in the same respect.

Once again,—The Staffordshire Domesday gives to William fitz Ansculf a manor written as "Eseningetone." It is rubricated specially as in "Cudulvestan Hundred." There is no suspicion of inaccuracy here: it is the Staffordshire Manor of Essington. It is known to have remained in the Barony of fitz Ansculf's heirs. It is still in the Staffordshire Hundred of Cuddlestone. How does it awaken our surprise, and quicken our perceptions, to find this entry of the Staffordshire Domesday repeated, *verbatim et literatim*, in the Warwickshire Survey. (See Domesday, fo. 243.a).

The theory which reconciles all these contradictions, and resolves all these difficulties, I have already set forth in other works. The Domesday Commissions made their primary reports on loose leaves, or rotulets, and the work was arranged according to counties and hundreds. In due course these leaves, or rotulets, were sent *en masse* to the King's Exchequer, there to be transcribed, condensed, or paraphrased; there also to be codified, not in a sequence of hundreds, but in a sequence of tenures. In their passage to, or on their arrival at the Exchequer, some of the rotulets of a particular county became confused with the rotulets of another county of the same circuit; other rotulets were mislaid for the moment, so as to appear in the codex in a postscriptive form; other rotulets again were absolutely lost, or purposely suppressed, or authoritatively weeded. The Exchequer Clerks, not being the same clerks as had worked under the Commissioners in the country, made mistakes (it is wonderful how few) in their codification of the survey. Their want of topographical knowledge, their unacquaintance with the condition and interests of particular landholders, will have disabled them from correcting or solving the errors or doubts

1. The Domesday Transcriber seems to have made this entry about Sibeford post-scriptively, on a half filled page, where there was plenty of room, the scribe himself not appearing to have known where he ought to put it. I say that it was done post-scriptively because the Elenchus of the Staffordshire Survey does not name William Corbucion among the landholders of the county (Domesday, fo. 246.a.1).

engendered by confused or imperfect texts. And when the codified work came into the hands of the rubricators, these clerks were still less likely to have uniformly and correctly restored the rubrics, suggested by rotulets of hundreds, to a record arranged in order of fiefs. As a rule these scribes cared more for their own calligraphy than for the accuracy and completeness of the record. There are some rubrics of Hundreds in the Staffordshire Survey which will have been inserted by guess, and are in opposition to ascertained fact. There are other cases where the transcript clerk not having left room for the names of a hundred in its proper place, the rubricator has found room for the said name in a wrong place. Lastly, there are a plurality of cases where the rubrication of a new hundred having been necessary and proper, the scribe has omitted it altogether.

The foregoing observations on the peculiarities of method adopted by certain Domesday Commissioners are capable of still further illustration, development, and use. The Northamptonshire survey exhibits the same three features as we have seen to mark the Surveys of Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and Oxfordshire.¹ Presumably then, Northamptonshire belonged to the same Domesday Circuit. We have seen, too, that the notes taken in some parts of this circuit happened to be so mistakenly codified by the Clerks of the Exchequer as that some manors of one county of the circuit appear among the manors of another county. The Northamptonshire Survey embodies two remarkable instances of this same confusion. Under the title "Terra Sancti Remigii Remis," and with the rubric of "Codwestan Hundred," it describes the two manors of "Lepelic" and "Mersetone."² Now, Northamptonshire contained no such

¹ There is one exception to this. In the Northamptonshire Survey (fo. 229, a, 1), it is said :—"Nigellus tenet in eadem villâ ii. hidas, *et pro tanto se defendit.*" The expression is an indirect allusion to the geldability of an estate. As a rule, the Commissioners of this circuit expressed hidage without such allusions.

² See Domesday, fo. 222, b, 2, Norhantescire.—The possibility of defining the Domesday Circuits by tests of this kind has long engaged the writer's attention. He has already committed to print some too hasty conclusions on the subject (Notes on Domesday, p.p. 9, 10.) The tests which he then used were not narrow enough for the purpose. Identity in the formalism, sameness in the method and scope of the Commissioners' enquiries are excellent tests. Negative tests, always of much import, are supplied by the blunders of transcript clerks, codifiers, and rubricators. For instance, it is on the very face of Domesday that some clerk made a blunder when he put one manor into two counties. The presumption at once arises that he may have made other less transparent blunders.

On the other hand, if, in studying Domesday, we find the same tenures, the same customs, the same agricultural terms, the same topographical peculiarities,

hundred as Codwestan ; and Lapley and Marston, two manors which remained for ages in possession of the French Abbey of S. Remigius, at Rheims, were Staffordshire manors, in the Staffordshire Hundred of "Cudolvestan" (as Domesday elsewhere writes the name) ; nay, they still remain in the same Staffordshire Hundred,—now written, or rather miswritten, as "Cuttlestone."

It has now been shown how far the "Statfordscire" of the Domesday codex differed from the county surveyed by the Domesday Commissioners. My next proposition is to show how far the county surveyed by the Domesday Commissioners differed from the county of the present day.—

Three manors of Roger de Montgomery, Earl of Shrewsbury, (to wit Alveley, Norley, and Claverley), and one manor of his son, Hugh, (Worfield to wit), were unquestionably in Staffordshire at the date of the Survey. They are none of them rubricated as to their Hundred in the Staffordshire codex, but analogies of various kinds point to Seisdon as the Hundred of all four. Within fifty years of Domesday, that is, before the death of King Henry I., these four manors, as well as Earl Roger's previously noticed manors of Quat, Romesley, Rudge,

common to two counties, or alike absent from both, these are neither tests nor signs that those two counties were in the same Domesday Circuit. The writer's exact meaning in disowning this latter class of evidences will best be shown by instance.—

The *Ancilla*, or female serf, is never spoken of in the Somerset Survey, only once in the Dorset Survey, only once in the Survey of Staffordshire.

What follows? Surely not that the two last counties were surveyed by one Domesday Commission;—but that in certain counties the serf-wife was hardly ever reckoned among the agricultural staff of an estate.

In the Northamptonshire Survey the *Ancilla*, or serf-wife, is frequently introduced, obviously because she was frequently employed in like work with that of the serf ; which work, by the way, was usually associated with the teams employed on the manor-lord's demesnes.

Again, among the sub-tenants and occupants of the Staffordshire Survey, the Sokeman is never mentioned. In the Northamptonshire Survey many sokemen are introduced. This does not prove any duality of Domesday Commissions. It merely shows that the tenure-by-socage, non-existent in Staffordshire, was well known in Northamptonshire. And, as regards local customs generally, we must remember that Staffordshire and Northamptonshire were *a priori* likely to differ, inasmuch as they had been in different earldoms of the Anglo-Saxon period.

And as to clerical expressions and eccentricities—implying nothing about circuits—in the survey of the aforementioned manor of Lapley the scribe substituted the word *nemus* for *silva*. This was quite exceptional. In no other manor of Staffordshire, in no other manor of Northamptonshire, so far as I have cared to search, is woodland expressed by the word *nemus*. But the scribe who codified the Exon version of the Somerset Survey always wrote *nemus* instead of *silva*, and *nemusculus* instead of *silva minuta*, while the Exchequer scribe, codifying the same Domesday notes, always used the alternative phraseology.

In the Northamptonshire Domesday the bovate, or eighth part of a hide, is occasionally introduced, but never in the Staffordshire Survey. This arose in a circumstance, not in the Commissioners' method. They found the hides of Northamptonshire much more fractionally divided than those of Staffordshire, and so they acquiesced in the local system.

and Shipley, were *mised* (as the term was) into Shropshire, and there they now remain, viz., Norley Regis, Alveley, Quat, Romesley, and Rudge, in the Shropshire Hundred of Stottesden, —Claverley, Worfield, and Shipley in the Shropshire Hundred of Brimstree. Thus were sixty-three hides of land lost to Staffordshire and annexed to Shropshire.

Robert de Stafford's Domesday Manor of Bobbington (Bubintone) was correctly rubricated in Domesday as in the Staffordshire Hundred of Saisdone. A part of Bobbington has been since annexed, by what process I know not, to the Shropshire Hundred of Brimstree. The same Robert de Stafford's Domesday Manor of *Ciseworde* (Cheswardine) and *Ceppecanole* (Chipnall) was found by the Domesday Commissioners in Staffordshire, and was correctly rubricated by the Domesday scribes as in *Pireholle* (Pirehill) Hundred. In the time of King Henry II., John le Strange, a Shropshire baron, wrested Cheswardine and its member, Chipnall, from the Baron Stafford of the day, and claimed to hold it *sine medio* of the Crown. The king allowed this *difforciament*, and forthwith Cheswardine and Chipnall were *mised* into the Shropshire Hundred of Bradford-North, where they now remain.

Another Post-Domesday change of county boundaries was on this wise:—The Staffordshire Manor of Almentone, falling rightly under a rubric of Pireholle Hundred, was held at the date of Domesday under the Earl of Shrewsbury by "Wil-lielmus." The place was Almington, and its Domesday tenant was William Pantulf, Baron of Wem. This same William Pantulf held under the same earl, at the same date, the Shropshire Manor of *Tirelire* in Odenet Hundred. I think it was in the time of King Henry I. that Tirley was *mised* by Pantulf into the Staffordshire Hundred of Pirehill. The object of the change was probably to associate the two manors under one Hundredal jurisdiction. The change continues in force at the present day.

Similarly, since Domesday, Edingale, a Derbyshire estate, then divided between Henry de Ferrars and certain villeint-tenants of King William, has been *mised* into Staffordshire.

There have been other changes of county boundaries since Domesday, but whereas I do not find that any of them have endured, I shall refer to two of them only, and to those with great brevity.—

At the date of Domesday King William held the Worcester-shire Manors of Terdeberie, in Came Hundred, and of Clent (which included Brome), in Clent Hundred. The fee-farm rents of these two Royal Manors were payable at that date to the Sheriff of Staffordshire, and the payment was returnable at the king's Staffordshire Manor of Suinesford, since called Kingswinford. This incident it was, perhaps, that led to Tarbeck, Clent, and Brome being subsequently annexed to Staffordshire. The change endured longer in one case than in the other. These estates are now *re-mised* into Worcestershire.

In the foregoing observations I have aimed at a comparison of the boundaries of Staffordshire, as it now is, with the boundaries of Staffordshire as they may be read in, or deduced from, the Domesday Survey. But the county, read of or to be discovered in the Domesday Survey, was not the whole county of the Domesday period: in other words, some parts of the county of the eleventh century were either left untouched by the Domesday enquiry, or the Record of such enquiry was coevally suppressed or coevally lost. These blanks of the Great Record, often obscuring places of wealth and importance, were a marvel to Sir William Dugdale in his day. Far be it from me to suppose that I can discover the ratio of phænomena which perplexed the Prince of Antiquaries.

All that I propose to do, in the present instance, is to parade the omitted, or seemingly omitted, places of Staffordshire, and then to cite, in each genuine case of omission, what appear to be analogous cases of omission in the survey of other counties.

TAMWORTH is not in Domesday. Our knowledge of Tamworth during the period antecedent to Domesday marks it as a place of great importance. Offa and other Mercian Kings, his successors, seem to have occasionally resided at Tamworth. It was here that Ethelfreda, the great daughter of Alfred, what time she governed Mercia on behalf of her brother, King Edward the Elder,—it was here that Ethelfreda founded one of her remarkable castles. At all periods of its better known history, Tamworth, whether as a burgh, a chatellany, a manor, or a parish, has been divided between Staffordshire and Warwickshire. The extant Domesday surveys it under neither county. All that I have been able to gather from Domesday is this,—That King Edward the Confessor, and King William, in

virtue of their successive possession of the Warwickshire Manor of Coleshill, had ten Burgages in 'Tameworde', and that the same Kings, holding in turn the Staffordshire Manor of Wiginton, had, as a correlative of such tenure, four Burgages in 'Tamworde !'

This is scant information in itself, but important inferences may be drawn therefrom. It shows, to me at least, that Tamworth itself had not been in the hand of King Edward, and, if not, then that it must have been in the seignury of the Mercian Earls contemporary with King Edward, to wit of Eari Leofric, Earl Ælfgar, and Earl Edwin, in succession.

At this rate Tamworth will have passed to the hands of the Conqueror as an eschcat, not earlier than the year 1071, when the last Mercian Earl lost both his heritage and his life. A tradition, such as it is, is clear on the point that Tamworth did sometime come into the hands of the Conqueror. The Staffordshire historian (Shaw, i., 416) either relying upon, or amplifying, this tradition, intimates that the King gave Tamworth to Robert Marmion, of Fontenaye, "hereditary champion" to the Dukes of Normandy. I more than suspect the truth of this. Certainly the Marmion who was contemporary with the Conqueror was of Fontenaye, and his name was Robert, but I do not know or believe that he ever set foot in England. He is nowhere in Domesday. The first Marmion who appears in England was his son, Roger.

In such questions a date is invaluable. I say with confidence that, in the year 1103, Robert Marmion, the father, was in the Court of Robert Duke of Normandy, that he was deceased in 1106, that before the year 1115 one of his sons, Roger, appeared in England, not, that I know of, in any manner of succession to his father, Robert, but, as I have ascertained, in very frequent succession to Robert le Despencer, a Domesday Baron, who had figured in Warwickshire, Lincolnshire, and other counties.

In such sort did Roger Marmion inherit the Lincolnshire Manor of Scrivelesbie, and it was to Scrivelesbie, and not to any Norman tenement, that the hereditary championship, dreamt of by so many antiquaries, was afterwards attached.

When I add that, on indisputable evidence, Robert le Despencer, the Domesday Baron, was some time seized of the 'castle and honour' of Tamworth, and that Robert Marmion (II.), son of Roger Marmion, aforesaid, was in turn seized of the same castle

and honour, I have established a fair presumption that if William the Conqueror ever bestowed Tamworth on any subject, it was on an ancestor of the afterwards combined races of Marmion and Le Despeneer, and that the ancestor in question was not Robert Marmion but Robert Le Despeneer.

After all, the enigma remains unsolved, almost untouched.—Why was not the state of Tamworth reported by the Domesday Commissioners, who visited both Staffordshire and Warwickshire? Or, if they did survey and report, how came their record to be lost, or why was it suppressed?

I can quote no instance of Domesday reticence in strict parallelism with this case of Tamworth. The nearest cases are these.—In Lincolnshire the Royal Manor of Washingborough does not appear in the extant survey. It was surveyed nevertheless! We cannot be sure that Tamworth was.

In Somerset the Royal Estates of Wellow and Kilmersdon, each the caput of a Hundred, are absent from the survey. There is a bare possibility that their territory may be implied in a very perfunctory notice which Domesday takes of the burgh of Bath. Bath itself is slurred, rather than surveyed. Tamworth is not even slurred.

The Royal cities of London and Winchester are absent from Domesday. Who can suppose that they were surveyed, and the record lost? Who can venture to say that they were surveyed, and the record, for state reasons, suppressed? It is more consistent with the genius and foresight of Norman William that he should have prevented, rather than suppressed, impolitic inquests.

BURTON-UPON-TRENT is not in Domesday Book, that is, the whole, or at least the bulk of the territory which then constituted the Manor and Parish of Burton is not in the extant survey. And this suppressed territory, amounting to at least 6,500 acres, was then a possession of, and contained the site of, Burton Abbey. Perhaps it will be more definite and more intelligible to say that what the Abbot of Burton had in Burton at the date of Domesday was co-extensive with the present parish, and that the Staffordshire portion of such parish, amounting to 6,580 acres, as well as the Derbyshire portion of the same, are absent from the Domesday record.

Here we have some sort of guide—or at least there is some fair room for speculation—as to which out of several possible causes may have induced the Domesday silence.

Staffordshire and Derbyshire may be proved, by the internal evidence of Domesday, to have been visited by two distinct corps of Domesday Commissioners. The Abbatial Manor of Burton lay partly in one circuit, partly in the other. No report of either Commission says a word about the estate. One possible cause of Domesday silence, viz., accidental loss of a leaf, or rotulet, is thus eliminated. If each Commission made an independent report of that section of Burton which lay within its purview, it is incredible that both reports should have been lost by concurrent accidents. If the reports were both made they were afterwards suppressed, — designedly suppressed, — but, whether by authority or contrivance, we have yet to learn.

A strictly analogous case was that of the Home Estate of the Lincolnshire Abbey of Croyland. This estate is not in the extant Domesday. It was surveyed by the Domesday Commissioners of that circuit. Ingulphus, the then Abbot of Croyland, seems, either by lawful diplomacy or some more tortuous process, to have procured the suppression; at all events, after the survey was codified, Ingulphus produced an alleged Domesday survey of the estate. He professed to have copied it from the Exchequer Codex; but whereas it is not there, and there is no symptom or probability that it ever was there, this profession of Ingulphus was obviously mendacious. The broad inference is that Ingulphus had a genuine copy of the actual survey of Croyland; that he procured, by interest or contrivance, the exclusion of this item from the official codex; that afterwards, regretting his policy, or repenting of his fraud, he reproduced and, as far as he was able, advertised the original clause.¹

All that I care to establish by this case of Croyland is, that the survey was taken. That it was suppressed, the extant codex proves without further argument.

Now, is it not credible that the Abbot of Burton procured a suppression of some items of a bona-fide survey of his Abbatial

¹ Formerly I took a somewhat different view of Ingulphus's exploit. (See Notes on Domesday, p.p. 11, 12). His after-boast that the Domesday Commissioners were to be "treated with" suggests a probability that his personal action was not dangerously or overtly fraudulent.

In speaking thus seriously of Ingulphus, his testimony and his mendacity, I am quite aware that the genuineness of the work attributed to him is, to a large extent, impossible. But I must still believe that Ingulphus was a writer, and that he wrote many things, both true and false. The record which still bears his name is, I would suggest, the work of some monk, who got possession of Ingulphus's writings and interpolated them freely, adding largely, as might be expected, to the mendacious element.

estate in two counties? We need not suppose any fraud or underhand dealing on the Abbot's part. The suppression may have been licensed by the Crown, or by the authorities of the Exchequer, not brought about by tampering with two Domesday Commissioners.

As to what may have been the Abbot's motive, it would be vain to discuss. The same considerations which dictated the supposed action of the Abbot, may well be concluded to have won the assent of the King and his officers.

ROWLEY REGIS.—Erdeswick wrote about this place as follows:—"Rowley, at the conquest, remained of the king's demesne, and so continued till the 20th of his reign." Probably this was the case, but Erdeswick did not learn it from the letter of Domesday. The written record names no place that can possibly be identified with Rowley Regis.

At the date of Domesday, Rowley Regis was but a peninsula of Staffordshire, a peninsula attached to that county by a very narrow isthmus. On all sides, both peninsula and isthmus were girt by manors, then reputed to be in Worcestershire, viz., by Dudley, Cradley, and Hales Owen. Ecclesiastically, too, Rowley Regis was rather associated with Worcestershire than with Staffordshire, for it was in the diocese and archdeaconry of Worcester, and such is its status at this day.

It is a mere guess that the Domesday Commissioners who visited Staffordshire may not have been informed of this outlying appendage of the county. It is certain that the Worcestershire Commissioners did not adopt the manor which the others left unsurveyed. At all events Rowley Regis is not in Domesday.

STOKE-UPON-TRENT is not expressed as a Domesday manor. It is clear that a great part of the parish (of 12,406 acres) was implied in the "II. hidæ cum appendiciis," which the Domesday Surveyors attributed to the King's Manor of Pinchetel (now Penkhull). Penkhull remains to this day one of the largest of the townships which constitute the town and civil parish of Stoke.

The name of Stoke seems to me to have superseded that of Penkhull because Stoke was the site of an ancient and well-endowed Church. The Domesday Commissioners said nothing about this Church or its possessions when they were dealing with Penkhull and with Pirehill Hundred; but when they got

into Totmanslow Hundred they found that the Lord of Caverswall had a moiety of the Advowson of Stoches, and that half-a-carucate of land was annexed thereto. Now half-a-carucate of land in Pirehill Hundred might contain anything up to a thousand acres. If we add another half-carucate as the presumed glebe of the unsurveyed moiety of Stoke Church, we get a tolerable idea of the proportion which the King's Manor of Penkhill bore to the Church Manor of Stoke, and of the proportion which the surveyed territory bore to the unsurveyed. I cannot suggest why the Domesday Commissioners pretermitted the Church Estate of Stoke, or at least a half thereof, in their Survey. It was their method to ignore all particulars about parish churches. Perhaps it may be thought by some that Stoke Church, being bipartite, was also collegiate. I find no subsequent evidence of such a fact. The benefice remains one of the richest in the Diocese. In Erdeswick's time, the Rector of Stoke Church was also sole Lord of Stoke Manor.

Domesday, I should observe, probably gives other elements of the above-measured Parish of Stoke;—for instance the small Manor of Fenton. Fenton was one virgate, and contained 3 plough-lands. It was waste. The present acreage of Fenton is 1352 acres. These are included in the 12,406 acres of the Civil Parish of Stoke: nevertheless, they give an idea of what a waste virgate might contain. An area of 1920 acres is assigned to Fenton as an Ecclesiastical Parish. Such assignments, not bearing exact relation to civil boundaries, are beside the purpose of our enquiries.

STONE does not appear to be surveyed by name in Domesday. The original or civil parish of Stone, I understand to have comprehended 20,030 acres, and such a parish will have comprehended many manors, which were undoubtedly surveyed in Domesday. Such were two Manors of Aston-in-Stone, the Manors of Walton (in Stone), Stoke (in Stone), Tittensor, Normacott, and Fulford; two Manors of Hilderston, two Manors of Cotwalton, two Manors of Meaford, and the Manors of Moddershall, and Kibblestone.

It is probable that Stone itself,—its territory as a mere vill,—was comprehended in one or more of these Domesday-named manors, and that the vill of Stone gave name to a composite parish, as becoming subsequent to Domesday, the site of a Church, and of a Priory, which either absorbed or re-founded the said Church.

If this theory be accepted, it follows that Stone was surveyed in Domesday—not absolutely but virtually. It was not pretermitted by the Staffordshire Commissioners.

COLWICH and STOW. The same thing may be presumed of these places. Their names arose, or rather came into notoriety, by ecclesiastical arrangements made subsequent to Domesday. The manors or territories which were thrown into and formed these parishes were all probably surveyed in Domesday. Their number and their names will appear in a future Table of the Domesday Hundred of Pirehill.

NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME is not surveyed by name in Domesday, and for the simple reason that, as a town, or vill, or castle, or distinct manor, it had no existence at the Domesday period. Its territory (only 614 acres at the present date) was possibly surveyed under the King's Manor of Trentham; or, as Erdeswick suggests, under the King's manor of Wlstanetone (Wolstanton). In one or other of these Newcastle was founded within 70 years, at most, after Domesday.

Having now cleared the way, let us compare the present County of Stafford with the County of Domesday. And first let us find how far the present County was prefigured by Domesday antecedents.—

The area of the present County is said to be 728,468 acres. Though I suspect that a diligent collection of details would establish a somewhat larger area,¹ this area of 728,468 acres will serve our present purpose as an hypothesis. We are to find this acreage in Domesday, or else show approximately what portion thereof cannot be looked for in Domesday.—In Tamworth some 5580 acres, in Burton-upon-Trent some 5370 acres, in Rowley Regis 3670 acres (total 14,620 acres) were not prefigured by any

¹ Larger, I imagine, by nearly eight thousand acres; but modern directories so confuse the civil and ecclesiastical boundaries of parishes, that it is impossible to verify, or correct my idea by any survey drawn up on one constant principle.

So far as I can gather from the best authorities available, the acreage of modern Staffordshire is about 736,463 acres, viz :—

In Offlow Hundred, including most parts of Tamworth and Burton-upon-Trent, and including Edingale	}	165,880 acres.
In Seisdon Hundred, including Rowley Regis	77,367 ..
In Cuddlestone Hundred	139,870 ..
In Pirehill Hundred, including Tirley	212,388 ..
In Totmonslow Hundred	140,958 ..
Total	<u>736,463 ..</u>

The result of this independent computation is 7,995 acres over the reputed area of 728,468 acres.

clause or expression of the Staffordshire Domesday. These collective acreages then will have to be deducted from the present area of the County before we can compare it with its Domesday antecedent;—

And 728,468 acres—14,620 acres=713,848 acres.

The various measures and estimates, by which this area of 713,848 statute acres was prefigured in Domesday, will appear in the subjoined Table.

Hundreds and Manors.	Hides.	Virg.	Caru- cates.	Plough Lands.	Acre of Wood.	Acre of Meadow.	Teams em- ployed.	Villeins.	Boors.	Serfs.	Annual Value.
Offlow Hundred	119	0	11	262½	135810	634	254	434	171	33	£ s. d. 133 0 4
Edingale	3	4	60	4	9	16	0	0	2 0 0
Seisdon Hundred	103	2	0	161½	16910	88	146	231	129	57	59 17 0
Cuddleston Hundred	113	2½	2	254	58425	172½	204½	328	211	60	62 19 4
Chillington	3	0	0	6	1440	2	6	13	6	9	1 10 0
Lapley	3	0	0	6	90	15	11	18	9	5	2 10 0
Marston	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 5 0
Pirehill Hundred	92	3½	7	379½	57003	413	267½	435	268	68	126 18 3
In Stafford 179 Burgages...
Tirley	1	0	0	2	1	4	0	1	1 0 0
Totmonslow Hundred	19	1½	8	148½	49200	107	93	182	108	13	45 7 0
Total—179 Burgages	456	24½	31	1225½	319538	1436½	992½	1661	902	246	435 6 11

A reduction of six items in the above Table to two denominations will show proximately the relation between hidage and the exacter measurements of Domesday.

	Hides.	Acreages.
Hides instanced in Domesday...	456½	
Quasi-hides or Carucates	31	Plough-lands 1225½, at 120 acres each = 147030
Supposed hidage of 179 } Borough tenements in } Stafford	2½	Woodland measures reduced to } acreage } = 319538
		Meadow-land as stated in Domes- } day } = 1436
	490	468004

Hence there will result the following calculations and conclusions:—

- I.—The average Staffordshire hide corresponded with ($\frac{468004}{319} =$) about 955 acres of Domesday measurement and Registration.
- II.—The modern acreage of the areas which correlate with the above 490 hides, being 713,848 statute acres, it follows that the Domesday hide corresponds with ($\frac{713848}{319} =$) nearly 1457 acres of modern ascertainment.
- III.—The Domesday Commissioners, surveying a district, which is now ascertained to have contained 713,848 acres, registered only 468,004 acres thereof: that is, they pretermitted or ignored 245,844 acres, or considerably more than one-third of the territory with which they were dealing, and somewhat more than one-third of the County, such as it was, had they dealt with all its manors.

It is easy to suggest what this omitted territory of the Staffordshire Domesday was. It was probably that which in some other counties was registered by the Commissioners as *pascua* or *pastura*. We will assume then that the 245,844 omitted acres represent the treeless uplands and moorlands of the county, all in fact that was utterly profitless and at the same time was not afforested, neither by King nor Baron.

This is perhaps a fit place to take a passing notice of—THE STAFFORDSHIRE WOODLANDS,—of such as were measured, appropriated, and, perhaps, in some cases, valued in Domesday.

Considerably more than half of the whole registered territory was woodland,—woodland ordinarily of no profit whatever, save for purposes of exclusive chase and warren. This we judge from the few instances where woodland is spoken of with any distinctive characteristic.

In other words, the Staffordshire Surveyors were not particular to note these varieties of woodland which we find more carefully marked in the survey of other counties. But in those other surveys we get hold of cognate terms, which show the meaning of the terms so accidentally introduced in the Staffordshire Domesday.

SILVA MINUTA was 'dwarf wood,' not 'a small parcel of wood.' This we learn from the Dorset Survey, which had an intermediate term between Silva and Silva minuta, viz., Silva modica.

UNA QUARENTINA QUERCUM IN LONGITUDINE ET LATITUDINE.—This, the only oak-wood particularized in the Staffordshire Domesday, was but ten acres in extent. Such a thing was rare, and probably valuable. These oaks, perhaps, bore abundance of acorns. This was Earl Roger's wood at Shipley. It would be termed a *Silva ad pasnagium* in the Survey of some counties.

SILVA PASTILIS, an item in some of Henry de Ferrers' Staffordshire manors, was not necessarily a wood of oaks or mast-bearing trees. It was a wood where all sorts of stock might graze and feed.—

The *Silva ad pasturam* and the *Silva ad herbagium* of the Hampshire Survey were the same in essence as the *Silva pastilis* of Staffordshire.

CHAPTER II.

INTERNAL STATE OF STAFFORDSHIRE A.D. 1086. TERRÆ VASTÆ. THE BURGH OF STAFFORD. STAFFORD CASTLE. ABNORMAL PROPORTIONS OF THE HIDE. INADEQUATE TEAM-POWER. POPULATION. CONDITION AND VALUE OF STAFFORDSHIRE MANORS ANNEXED AFTER DOMESDAY TO SHROPSHIRE. STAFFORDSHIRE MILLS. PARISH CHURCHES. CARUCATÆ TERRÆ. ALLUSIONS OF CHRONICLES TO EVENTS CONNECTED WITH STAFFORDSHIRE IN THE ÆRA PRECEDING DOMESDAY.

The objects of those mighty ministers who conducted the Domesday Survey were of a statistical, financial, practical, character. They were instructed to ascertain facts; not to illustrate those facts by any views or opinions of their own, still less to dwell on facts which, being already notorious, needed no ascertainment. The facts which they had to ascertain were only *per accidens* of an historical type. They were compelled occasionally to give scraps of history; but they never adulterated their record with scraps of philosophy.

Such history as we gain from Domesday is the more reliable in that it was quite unpremeditated.

The Commissioners who visited Staffordshire did not say that it was a county inadequately populated, inadequately stocked, incapable of ordinary taxation, normally poor. Nor yet did they state that, since the conquest, the county had been visited by extraordinary troubles and depressions, from which it was partially recovering. Nevertheless, some of these things are deducible from what they did say, others from what they left unsaid.

Of nearly all settled and occupied estates the Staffordshire Commissioners were enabled to ascertain the current annual value. Their instructions were further to ascertain the correlative values in the time of King Edward, and at any intermediate period. Their enquiries as to the values of King Edward's time were very partially successful. As to intermediate values, they found them in respect of a few estates of the Abbot of Burton, whose proprietorship had never been disturbed. In one or two of these cases, such intermediate value was reported as just one-third what it had been in the Confessor's time, in another case it was only one-fourth.

Rainald Bailgole, sheriff of Shropshire, and the Earl of Shrewsbury's tenant in the Manor of Cobintone (*postea* Kibble-

stone) had come into an estate yielding three shillings per annum. In King Edward's time it had realised £2, and Rainald had restored it to that same figure of annual value.

Where what was ascertained indicated a state of great recent depression, what was not found, and perhaps could not be found, was a token of wider and, indeed, of general disorganization. All over Staffordshire the Domesday Commissioners reported isolated estates, which they called "*Terræ vastæ*." The Seigneurial lord of all such estates was well ascertained. Occupiers, in the shape of villeins, boors, or serfs, were not counted, simply because there were none. The ancient hidage of these isolated manors was not always discoverable, but their relative proportions of arable land were so. How one of these estates (Loynton in Norbury) could be worth three shillings per annum to Gilbertus, Robert de Stafford's Feoffee there, is a problem; a problem capable of so many conjectural solutions, that I will not pursue the matter here. There are similar passages in the surveys of other and distant counties.

In Pirehill (falsely rubricated as Cudolvestan) Hundred, King William had fifteen waste estates. The former Saxon owners of all these estates were named to, and recorded by, the Domesday Commissioners. They were Thanes of greater or less degree. The hidage, or the correlative carucutage of these estates, and their respective quantities of plough-land were also known; but their quantities of wood-land and meadow were not determinable. The king had no sub-tenants therein, neither freeman, villein, nor serf. Of course there were no teams thereon; equally of course, they returned not a farthing to the king's revenue.

In Totmonslow (falsely rubricated as Pereolle) Hundred, King William had seventeen waste estates. Here there was more than the former vacuity of evidence. The hidage of these estates was unknown. In three cases the Commissioners reported a *carucutage*, which seems to have been, in Staffordshire, a figure for unverified hidage. In the other fourteen cases they reported only the arable element of each estate, and about this they were not sure. "*Terra est l. carucæ*" was, in several instances, their original report; but they had the expression interlined with figures implying "*vel ij*." The meaning of the thus amended clause would be,—*Terra est uni vel duabus carucis*; and the meaning of that would be that the Commissioners could not get precise information.

Again, in the very neighbourhood of Lichfield, and actually appurtenant to that great episcopal manor, were five estates, including seven so-called villis, all utterly "waste." These doubtless had been, from time immemorial, possessions of the Church of St. Chad. The Domesday Commissioners did not say so. What they said about them was "*Hæ terræ omnes sunt vastæ.*" They estimated the area of three estates in terms of *carucatage*, that is, I suppose, of presumptive hidage. They measured the other two in terms of *carucage*, which implied only the extent of their arable portions.

As the two groups of the king's wasted estates were in the ruder Hundreds of Pirehill and Totmanslow, so the one group of episcopal estates was in the better circumstanced Hundred of Offlow.

Other evidence of the recent disorganization of Staffordshire consists in what Domesday says about the county town and castle of Stafford.

In King Edward's time the Burgage-rents and customs had amounted to £9 per annum, whereof £6 went to the King, £3 to the Earl (of Mercia.) At the date of Domesday the gross income was £7, instead of £9. The whole went to the King, who was both King and Earl. The half of his share as King, which half I take to have been £2 6s. 8d., was now receivable by Robert (de Stafford), who alleged a crown grant thereof.¹

The reason of this fall in the annual revenue of the burgh of Stafford evidently was, that out of 179 burgage-houses, which composed the town, 51 lay waste (*vastæ*).

At this period Stafford was a walled town, but there is no appearance in Domesday Book that within the wall, nor yet without, was there any castle standing. The Domesday Commissioners had quite a different state of things to report. In virtue of his tenure of the Manor of Chebsey, Henry de Ferrers had held some land in Stafford. On this land King William had some time ordered a castle to be erected, which castle had been built, and at the date of Domesday it lay in ruins. "*Ad hoc Manerium (Cebessio) pertinuit terra de Stadford in quâ Rex precepit fieri castellum quod modo est destructum.*"

¹ In an arithmetical point of view, it was immaterial whether the king made over half his own share of this revenue, or the whole of the earl's share. But William, I opine, was careful to give to Robert de Stafford nothing that savoured of earldom. The king did not so much as appoint Robert de Stafford to be his vicecomes. The name of the Domesday Sheriff of Staffordshire was Nicholas.

I am not clear about the site of this castle, but think it probable that, before the survey, the land had been restored to Henry de Ferrers. In 1086 he held one Burgage in the Burgh of Stafford, and it was waste.¹ In the vill of Burtone, which I take to be Burton-juxta-Stafford, a knight of Henry de Ferrers, Radulfus by name, held a non-hidated estate, whereon were two ploughs agait, one plough being on the the said knight's demesne, the other worked by three boors. Here, too, were twenty acres of meadow-land, and a parcel of wood-land which measured four quarentines by four quarentines, that is, to my reckoning, 160 acres.

Among the various sites which tradition or opinion have bespoken for castles in or near Stafford, Burton has no place. The alternative is that, if the Conqueror's castle were not built on Henry de Ferrers' estate at Burton, it was built on Henry de Ferrers' land within the Burgh of Stafford. And still within the burgh there are vestiges, verbal and material,—there are names and traditions,—enough to suggest the sometime existence of more than one castle.

At the cost of a digression, I will here add what should be said somewhere about the Præ-Domesday castles of Stafford.

In A.D. 913, Ethelfleda, Lady of the Mercians, built a castle at Stafford. Ethelfleda's castles were usually combined with burghs. We infer that her castle at Stafford was within the burgh.

About a year after Ethelfleda's foundation, her brother, Edward the elder, built a "tower" at Stafford, "on the north bank of the river." Camden, the authority for this, alluded to the River Sow.

Next, in point of time, came the Conqueror's abortive castle, built, as we know, early in 1070. That none other had been substituted for it up to the date of Domesday, we infer from the negative silence of that record.

But within sixteen years after Domesday, there was a castle called Stafford Castle, and if, as seems evident, it was founded by, and held by, the Crown, then we must needs accept William Rufus as its founder. In the year 1102, and on the outbreak of Belesme's rebellion, Stafford Castle, being in the hands of King Henry I., William Pantulf, of Wem, was appointed governor thereof. The garrison provided for the occasion numbered 200 men at arms. For the success which resulted from King

¹ "Waste" merely means "unoccupied." The Domesday contrast to a "*Mansio vasta*" was a "*Mansio Hospitata*," a house occupied by dwellers.

Henry's measure we refer elsewhere. (Antiquities of Shropshire, ix.-160.) Stafford Castle was, as it were, the basis of Pantulf's operations against Belesme.

"Old Stafford Castle," a mile without the town, and on the southern bank of the Sow, demands a passing notice. It was this castle, doubtless, that gave its name to the parish of Castle-Church, and to the "Castle farm," near to the said church. No good evidence has ever been collected about the date or founder of this castle. Its site having been within the old Liberties, though not within the Burgh of Stafford, would suggest that it was of Royal foundation. The Pipe-Rolls of Henry II. say nothing about any castle, Royal or otherwise, at Stafford; but the king had a residence within the borough or its liberties, and that residence was furnished with one of the luxuries of the day,—a *Vivarium*.

The "Castrum juxta Stafford," as the old castle was called in an ancient deed, seen by Erdeswick, is found eventually in the Barons, or rather Earls, of Stafford, but Erdeswick disclaims the idea of Earl Ralph having founded it.¹

We return to our proper subject,—the symptoms of poverty and disorganization in the state of Staffordshire, as revealed by Domesday.—

Some of the symptoms were of chronic poverty; they belonged to an earlier æra than the Conquest. The original hidation of Staffordshire bespeaks an extraordinary ineptitude for taxation. We have already seen that the average Staffordshire hide covered as much as 955 acres of such land as the Domesday Commissioners thought worthy of subsequent measurement and registration (*Supra* p. 15). The same Staffordshire hide corresponds, on an average, with no less than 1456 acres of modern ascertainment.

I have examined the statistics of many Domesday Counties (See Domesday Studies. Somerset Survey, I., pp. 23, 24) East, West, and South of Staffordshire, but have found no parallel for

¹ The above premises are insufficient to establish any conclusive theory about "Old Stafford Castle." My opinion is that it was the castle built next after Domesday; that it was the castle garrisoned by King Henry in the year 1102, and that King Henry II., preferring to maintain a garrison at Newcastle to one at Stafford, was nevertheless occasionally resident at Old Stafford Castle, and there had his *Vivarium*. So chary was the king of his *Vivarium* at Stafford that he constituted the custody thereof a Serjeantry. This Serjeantry will have been endowed with land, or with considerable perquisites of another kind, for the Custos, instead of receiving a salary, was, in the reign of John, expected to pay half a mark yearly to the king's exchequer.

that chronic state of poverty and unproductiveness which is indicated by this test of hidation. It was not that Staffordshire was a part of Mercia, and that Mercia was favorably hidated in the first instance. The case of Shropshire annihilates such a theory at once.

Another symptom of poverty, existing though perhaps decreasing, at the date of Domesday is that the Commissioners reported arable land in the County sufficient to employ 1225½ teams, yet there were only 992½ teams in stock. (See p. 15).

Again, the aggregate rents, values, and returns of Staffordshire, excepting the Burgh of Stafford and the manors since annexed to Shropshire, are reported in Domesday as £435 6s. 11d. per annum. This revenue arising from 490 hides gives to the average hide an annual value of 17s. 9¼d. It is a meagre return, especially meagre when we reflect what acreage the said average hide contained.—

In the one case, that of Domesday acreage, the return was less than a farthing per acre, in the other case, where the hide is compared with modern acreage, the return would be less than one sixth of a penny.

And now about agrarian population.—The Villeins, Boors and Serfs enumerated, in the same Domesday area as that of which we have been investigating the annual value, are about 2809 in number

In other words, there was but one labourer in proportion to 167 acres of registered land, but one in proportion to 255 acres of actual surface.

Such figures are startling till we reflect that out of the 468,004 acres registered in Domesday 319,538 acres were woods and forests. As to the residue of registered land, viz., as to 148,466 acres of corn and meadow land there was a labourer for every 53 acres; and, confining our scope to land actually ploughed that is (as we reckon the ploughed lands) to 119,100 acres, the single labourer correlates with 42 acres.

These last statistics may be compared with those of another abnormal county. (See Somerset Survey, I., 224).

We will next take a statistical view of those eight Staffordshire Manors which, having been held by the Earl of Shrewsbury and his Son, at the date of Domesday, have since been annexed to Shropshire.—

The latest returns which I have been able to procure fix the

collective area of these eight manors as 28,985 statute acres.—

Domesday gives an hidation to this district of 63 hides. It registers plough-land equal to 13,440 acres, woodland equal to 11,890 acres and of meadow-land 35 acres;—altogether 25,365 acres. Here then the original hide correlates with about 402 acres of Domesday registration, and with about 460 acres of modern ascertainment.

As regards value in 1086, the average annual returns showed an increase of one third within the preceding twenty years. Yet still the value per hide was no more than 14s. 8½d. The value, per acre of Domesday registration, was less than one half-penny, and per acre of actual surface less than two-fifths of a penny.

The Villeins, Boors and Serfs, enumerated by Domesday for the same area were 235 in number; that is, there was but one labourer in proportion to 108 acres of registered land, one in proportion to 123 acres of actual surface, one in proportion to every 57 acres of corn and meadow-land, and one in proportion to every 50 acres of land actually ploughed.

These observations show that the eight border estates of Earl Roger and his Son, though situated in a quarter of Staffordshire where there was more than an average proportion of registered land, and less of profitless moorlands and downs than in other districts, partook nevertheless in the general depression of the county.

MILLS.—In some respects there is no better test of the condition of a county at the date of Domesday than the number and value of its Mills, for, as I have intimated elsewhere, (Dorset p., 41) Mill-value means population quite as much as water-power.—

In all Staffordshire I count but 64 Mills of Domesday registration. Their annual value generally ranged between one shilling and five shillings. At Tittensor there was a Mill worth only eight pence per annum. At Drayton (now Drayton Bassett) the King had 2 Mills realizing twenty-one shillings per annum, and at Worfield Hugh de Montgomery had 3 Mills realizing forty shillings. At Hopwas the King had a Mill of 13s. 4d. annual value.

In Dorset, which A.D. 1086, was, by some 120,000 acres, a less county than Staffordshire, there were 272 Mills at the same date. The best yielded twenty-five shillings per annum, the worst only three pence.

PARISH CHURCHES.—Though the Domesday mention of a Priest, occupying land in any Staffordshire Manor, may be taken as indicative of a Parish Church,¹ I do not say or suppose that where no Priest is mentioned there was no Church. At that rate there would have been but 26 or 27 non-collegiate Parish Churches in all Staffordshire.

The Dorset Domesday, whether alluding to Parish Churches or Priests, leaves us with a strong impression as to the paucity of both in that county. In each case something may be attributed to the reticence of two distinct corps of Commissioners in regard to Parish Churches; but doubtless both counties were in this respect somewhat destitute.

THE CARUCATE.—The introduction of the carucate in the survey of a county, normally divided into hides, is one of the curiosities of Domesday. I have elsewhere discoursed on the phenomenon in the cases of Dorset and Somerset. In Staffordshire it seems to tell something as to the state of the county at the period of the Survey.—

The number of carucates expressed in the Staffordshire Survey is $37\frac{1}{2}$. Of these $16\frac{1}{2}$ carucates are attributed to wasted estates in the Hundreds of Offlow, Pirehill, and Totmanslow, viz., 11 in Offlow Hundred, $1\frac{1}{2}$ in Pirehill Hundred, and 4 in Totmanslow Hundred. There were no waste carucates in Culvestan Hundred, no carucates at all in Seisdon Hundred. We have yet to speak of ($27\frac{1}{2} - 16\frac{1}{2}$) 11 carucates. Among these—A half carucate, attached to a moiety of the Church of Stoke, has no Domesday valuation; 4 carucates are valued at 15 shillings, 1 carucate at 5 shillings, 1 carucate at 2 shillings per annum. A carucate complemented with 3 hides shares in an annual value of 16 shillings; $1\frac{1}{2}$ carucates complemented with 2 hides realize together £4; and 2 carucates combined with one virgate are, the three together, valued at 5 shillings per annum.

There is no invariable relation between the “carucata terræ” and the “Terra ad unam carucam.” Only two carucates of the above eleven are associated with as many “Terræ ad singulas carucas,” and only one of these has an actual team at work. The half-carucate which has no valuation is accompanied by no

¹ We can absolutely show in one instance that a Domesday Priest meant a Præ-Domesday Church. Warin, Sheriff of Shropshire, deceased before Domesday, gave to St. Evroul of Uticum “the Church of Hales.” Domesday says nothing about a Church at Hales, but it names a resident Priest. *Ex uno disce omnes.*—*Quot presbyteri, tot ecclesie.*

team in posse, no team in esse. Four carucates, though they are complemented with no stated plough-lands, have $3\frac{1}{2}$ teams in operation. One carucate and its complement of three hides are associated with a capacity for 6 teams, a reality of only three. One and a half carucates, and the two hides complemented therewith, have no stated capacity of plough-land, and employ only one team. Two carucates, associated with one virgate, have similarly no stated capacity, and employ only one actual team.

I should here state or repeat what I consider to have been the meaning of the term *carucata terræ* in the Staffordshire Survey. I think it was a conceptional hide.¹

The Norman surveyors used it for land which had never been hidated, or whose hidation they could not fix or discover. So they used it as an alternative for the Saxon hide; not as having any other than an etymological association with the *Terra ad unam carucam* or plough-land, from which they always distinguished it.

I have now set forth all the features of the Staffordshire Survey, which belong to the internal and social condition of the county at the date of Domesday. Let us now examine the chronicles of the preceding thirty years, and see if they tell us of anything likely to have led up to a depression so general and so great.

Leofric, Earl of the Mercians, died at Bromley, Staffordshire, 31st August, 1057. His son, Ælfgar, then succeeding to the rule of Mercia, had four years previously been invested with the Earldom of Godwin, two years previously had treasonably allied

¹ The Leicestershire Domesday contains a remarkable entry, militating apparently against my theory as to the *carucata terræ*. First I should observe that the Leicestershire Survey treats the *carucate* generally as representing the hide, and hardly ever uses the word hide. We are the more surprised at the following exception :—

TERRA OGERII BRITONIS.—In Gutlagestan Wapentac. Ogerus Brito tenet in Cilebi de Rege ii. partes unius hidæ id est xii. carucatas terræ. Ibi fuerunt (T. R. E.) viii. carucæ. In dominio sunt ij carucæ et ij servi; et ix. Villani cum vii. Bordariis et x. Sochmannis habent iiij carucas, &c. Valuit et valet xl. solidos. Here the startling deduction would be that one hide and eighteen carucates were convertible terms. And so indeed they were in this instance. The only reason the surveyors had for naming a hide at all was because it was a hide of such extraordinary proportions. The Commissioners of the South-Western Circuit were wont to express like discrepancies in other formulas, such as “Rex tenet Henlistone. Ibi sunt vi. hidæ et dimidia, ex quibus duæ tantum hidæ geldabant T. R. E.” (Domesday, fo. 120, a. 1); or (fo. 124, a. 2)—“Odo tenet de comite Trelvge. Brismar tenebat T. R. E. et geldabat pro uno ferling” (i.e., the sixteenth part of a hide). “Ibi tamen est i. hida.”

The Survey of Hampshire, where privileged hidation was frequent, exhibits a plurality of such contrasts between the nominal and the real.

himself with Gruffydd of North Wales, and gained signal success against the English.

The men of Staffordshire who detailed their recollections or traditions to the Domesday Commissioners only spoke once of Earl Leofric. But they spoke rather of Earl Ælfgar and his mother Godiva than of Earl Edwin, grandson of the latter, and son and successor of the former in the rule of Mercia.

Godiva had survived the Conquest; Ælfgar had not been secularly known since the year 1062. The year and circumstances of his death are nowhere recorded. They are only presumed by the first appearance of his son Edwin in the year 1063. Ælfgar died in seclusion. His treasonable alliance with Wales in 1055, and his opposition to Harold at a later date, had for years neutralized the weight of the Mercian Earl in the court and government of the Confessor.

At his death he left three children, Edwin, Morcar, and Ealdgyth, the latter already a widow,—the childless widow of Gruffydd, King of North Wales, who had fallen when Harold invaded Wales, and whose widow aforesaid became the wife of the said Harold probably before the death of Edward, but not so probably before the death of Ælfgar.

Earl Harold's attitude towards the sons of Ælfgar was pacific, if not friendly. It was while Harold's influence with King Edward was at its height that his brother Tostig, Earl of the Northumbrians, was banished, and Morcar, the younger of Ælfgar's sons, was promoted to Tostig's Earldom.

Earl Edwin was present at that Christmas Court of 1065, which on December 28 witnessed the dedication of Westminster Abbey, and on January 5, 1066, the death of King Edward.

On Jan. 6 Harold was crowned. As King, it was Harold's manifest policy to bar the return of his brother Tostig.

Whether from policy or affection he deputed the Earls Edwin and Morcar to the command of the North, he himself watching the South under the moral certainty that danger was to be apprehended rather from the might and wisdom of Duke William than the reckless daring of Tostig.

I must not stop to discuss vexed questions of chronology, or to expatiate on the impossible movements which have been attributed to Tostig by writers whom Mr. Freeman has duly corrected. In the summer of 1066 the Earls Edwin and Morcar compelled Tostig to retire from a raid on the coast of Lincoln-

shire. In due course Tostig returned, associated with Harold Hadrada. The battle of Fulford, which resulted in the defeat of the brother Earls and the capitulation of York, was unquestionably fought on September 20. The battle of Stamford-Bridge, whereby Harold in person redeemed the disaster of Fulford, was fought on September 25.

Eighteen days later (viz., on October 13) Harold mustered his forces at Senlac for the battle of the morrow. Neither at the muster nor in the fight did the brother Earls make any appearance.

So, then, we may not assume that in this first phase of the conquest there was anything to cause depopulation of the fields of Staffordshire, or to provoke the anger of William against that county or its Earl.

Before October expired, Edwin and Morcar appeared in London. They gave a formal assent to the election of Eadgar, but refusing all active co-operation with the opponents of William, withdrew their forces into Northumberland (Freeman III., 531-2).

On Christmas-day, 1066, William was crowned King in Westminster Abbey. In January, 1067, the Earls Edwin and Morear tendered submission to the King, and did homage at Barking.

Within the first three months of the year 1067, if we could trust to dates supplied by Monastic chroniclers, but at all events before the summer of 1068 was ended, King William issued a Writ, which, while it shows much of the contemporary order of things in Staffordshire, clears and corrects many points of more general history. The Writ is in support of the Abbot of Westminster's title to the Staffordshire Manor of Perton, which had been bestowed upon his House by Edward the Confessor. King Edward's gift had been certified in its day to "Leofwine, Bishop, and to Edwine, Earl." King William certifies his confirmation to Leofwine, Bishop;¹ Edwine, Earl; and all the

¹ Leofwine, Bishop of Lichfield, is stated in the *Fasti* (Hardy I., 543) to have died in 1066. His successor, Peter, is stated in the *Annals of Burton* to have been consecrated in 1067. Both dates are palpably wrong. The first is disproved by this very Writ, the second by the fact that Peter was consecrated by Lanfranc, who was not himself consecrated till 29th August, 1070.

Aglwi, Abbot,—called in Domesday "Elwi" and "Alwin,"—called elsewhere "Ægelwin" and "Æthelwig," was Abbot of Evesham. King William is said by the Evesham Chronicle to have entrusted him with the "care" of seven counties, viz., Worcestershire, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Shropshire, Oxfordshire, Warwickshire, and Staffordshire. The context of this exaggerated statement suggests that

King's Thanes of Staffordshire ; also to Aglwi, Abbot ; and Thurkil, Sheriff.

These then were William's ministers in the administration of that part of the Mereian Earldom with which we are concerned. They were all Saxons, be it observed, unless indeed we prefer to call Thurkil an Anglo-Dane.

In March, 1067, William, about to visit Normandy, summoned, or invited, the Earls Edwin, Morecar, and Waltheof to attend him. Whether they went as captives, hostages, or honoured guests, they went. The King did not return to England till December 7th. Besides the three Earls, he brought with him Roger de Montgomery, Vicomte of the Oximin, whom he forthwith invested with the Earldom of Chiehester and Arundel, and who was afterwards to gain a still greater ascendancy in the province of the Mereian Earls.

On Christmas-day, 1067, King William, being in London or at Westminster, may be said to have founded the great Collegiate Church of St. Martin's le Grand. On Whitsunday, May 11, 1068, the King, being at Westminster, and celebrating the coronation of Queen Matilda, had the terms of the said foundation and endowment embodied in a charter. Among the witnesses of the foundation, or of the charter, or, more probably still, of both, were Edwin, Morcar, Waltheof, and Roger de Montgomery, all four with the title of Earls. "Algewinus Abbas" was also a witness ; but among the attesting Bishops no possible name of a Bishop of Lichfield is to be found. Another Royal charter in favour of Giso, Bishop of Wells, though self-dated (A.D., 1067), has been proved by an able critic to have passed at Whitsuntide, 1068. It has the attestations of Queen Matilda, of Earl Edwin, Earl Waltheof, and of Roger de Montgomery, in this instance styled, not 'Comes,' but 'Princeps.'

It next appears that Earl Edwin had formed an attachment to one of William's daughters, and it is said that William, having at one time promised assent to the Earl's suit, now hesitated to

Abbot Æthelwig's functions were judicial as well as political. His knowledge of law and reputation for justice enlisted the respect both of Normans and English for his secular decisions.

Thurkil, Sheriff, often called Thurkil of Warwick, was perhaps Sheriff both of Staffordshire and Warwickshire at the date of this Writ. As he was Earl Edwin's officer more than the King's, it is quite possible that the two counties may have been thus combined. However, Thurkil's father, Ailwin, clearly retained the shrievalty of Warwickshire in 1067, and if he were living and holding office at the date of this Writ, then his son, Thurkil, will have been Sheriff of Staffordshire only, at the same date.

fulfil the promise. The brother Earls, always in sympathy, quitted the Court, and betaking themselves to their own provinces, armed their vassals for rebellion. There had been already, and were yet to be within this year (1068), other signs and acts of disaffection or rebellion in various quarters of the kingdom. I have seen no evidence that the Earls' outbreak was concerted with the plans of any other anti-Norman party. It cannot have been later than June when William marched upon Warwick, and, clearly with special eye to the future control of Mercia, commenced the building of Warwick Castle. He had not completed the work, or at least had not left the place, when the Earls were reported to be advancing with an army. The Earls, too, learnt by report of the attitude of William. They at once threw down their arms, and were again received into apparent favour. Again they took up with a residence in William's Court. William, retiring from Warwick, does not appear to have taken any further thought about Mercia. Instead of entering Staffordshire he marched eastward, and found work first at Nottingham, and then at York. It will keep our chronology consistent if we observe that the Queen accompanied him, and while he was yet in Yorkshirc gave birth to Prince Henry. This was at Selby ; and though the date of Henry's birth was stated in a legend to have been A.D. 1070, there are good reasons for concluding that it could not have been later than September, 1068.¹ If we look no further than chronicles, the first eight months of the year 1069 passed away without a single allusion to Staffordshire affairs, or the position of Earl Edwin. However, we hear of the Earl in a charter expressly dated in 1069. It is King William's charter to the See of Exeter. It has the attestation of Earl Edwin. In September, William, ostensibly hunting in Dean Forest, was yet cognizant of danger threatening him in several directions. It would seem as if he were awaiting fuller information to determine him where he should strike in person. The Danes had sailed up the Humber and Ouse ; and being joined by Eadgar, Walthcof, Cospatrick, and Marlesweyn, had stormed York Castle. This was on September 21st. The news

¹ When the same Legend stated that Henry was born at *Selby Abbey*, that reveals the purpose of the anachronism. The King founded an Abbey at Selby in 1069, said the same legend. Of course the foundation was commemorative of the auspicious event of the previous year. The Monks manipulated the legend, so as to make it seem that the Queen in her travail had been received by their society ; and so, to be consistent, they must make Henry's birth to have been later than the foundation of the Abbey.

of so terrible a disaster at once set William in motion. Commanding a force, composed wholly of cavalry, he will have made rapid progress towards the North-East; but, strange to say, York was not his present object. His object was the Danish fleet, which had fallen from York down the Ouse and the Humber, and been drawn ashore on the Lincolnshire side of the last-named river. It was to this point that William rode. The Danish marauders were already scouring the inland. These, taking shelter in the marshes, perished by the swords of Norman horsemen; but the fleet, sailing again on the Humber, escaped to the northern shore of that æstuary. William, without ships, could not follow. There was an insurrection in Staffordshire, as formidable perhaps as any which distinguished this fateful year. William now marched upon Staffordshire. Here he found nothing but anarchy, the people, armed and unarmed, split into factions; impiety rampant; discipline, whether civil or religious, utterly set at naught. Such is the most that can be made of the words used by Ordericus, the only chronicler of the period who has left a single allusion to the Staffordshire rebellion. In still fewer words he tells us how William dealt with the occasion—"Rex interim apud Estafort quam plurimos factiosarum partium facili proventu deleavit."

The town of Stafford then was the seat of the disturbance. It was torn by factions. Was William's remedy mediation or slaughter? The words of Ordericus may mean either or both. The words of Domesday sixteen years later, point, as I shall show in due course, to slaughter, subjugation, and eviction.

It is strange that the Staffordshire rebellion of 1069, deemed so momentous by William, should have had but one chronicler. It is stranger still that that one, a native of Mercia, though born six years later, should have heard or said nothing about the contemporary attitude of Earl Edwin. I doubt not that the Earl was complicated, but for the proof of that I must follow the march of William.

The King, having settled Staffordshire turned again to the north-east, and visited his own castle of Nottingham. Thence he set out for York. There are all sorts of conflicting statements about William's visit to York. One is that the Danes, crossing and recrossing the Humber, one while associated with the English malcontents of Lincolnshire but intended to hold Christmas carousal with their sympathizers at York. The line of

William's march too, if settled at all, has been settled by a writer of our own times. But, the great discrepancy of statement is in regard to the attitude of York itself on William's arrival. One writer, and one only (he whom Mr. Freeman suggests to be improperly styled "Matthew of Westminster"), calls York "a receptacle of Danes," says that William "reduced York and its occupants and there put to death many thousands of men." The other deponent,—Ordericus,—says that William "approaching York, received tidings of its evacuation by the Danes."

Here, and in monumental rectification of the statements of chroniclers, comes in a charter which proves two things, first that Earl Edwin had been complicated in the Staffordshire rebellion of 1069, secondly that William won York by a siege.

"Data obsidione eorum civitate Eboraci" is the date of this charter. Thereby "Ego Guillelmus cognomento Bastardus, Rex Angliæ, do et concedo tibi nepoti meo,—Alano Britannicæ Comiti et heredibus omnes villas, et terras quæ nuper fuerunt Comitis Eadwini in Eboraschira¹ eum feodis militum et aliis libertatibus et consuetudinibus ita libere et honorifice sicut idem Eadwinus eadem tenuit."

I cannot say, even in a note, all I would venture to say about this charter were I dealing with a wider subject. The main point here (in the text) is its genuineness. I submit that there can have been no object in forging a territorial charter, the lands conferred whereby, and the terms expressed wherein, are warranted and verified by Domesday and by the subsequent evidence and fulfilment of fact.²

King William as a precaution against future visitations from Denmark proceeded from York to that work of desolation which we are told extended from York to Durham. He returned to keep Christmas at York. It was still winter, (February, 1070, suggests Mr. Freeman) when he invaded Cheshire and after

¹ The King's gift of Earl Edwin's Yorkshire land, is expressed in the charter to be "auxilio Matildis Reginæ." I will not pretend to understand this now, though I hope to do so some day. To guard against misconception, I would merely remark that the Queen was at the moment acting as Regent of Normandy.

Neither can I show how or why Comte Alan should be called *nepos* of King William. I know only that he was the King's second cousin, that is, that the Comte and the King were descendants in the third degree from Richard I. Duke of Normandy.

That William should mention his own notorious soubriquet in a charter, is, compared with kindred phenomena, rather an indication of the genuineness of that charter.

² For instance, Earl Edwin's Yorkshire Manor of Ghellinges appears in Domesday as Comte Alan's. It was in Ghellinges that Alan founded the historic castle of Richmond. It descended not to his son, for he had none; but to his "heirs" as the charter limits it. His next heir was his brother, another Alan.

subduing all opposition in that province, and building a castle at Chester, passed again to Stafford, and built a castle there. I have treated already of the foundation of Stafford Castle. It is here fitting to point out that William's dealings with Cheshire and Staffordshire must be considered as dealings with the escheated Earldom of Edwin.

As to the ulterior and personal history of Earl Edwin himself, a full year seems to have elapsed after William's second visit to Stafford without anything transpiring, either in Writ or Chronicle, about the Mercian Earl. Mr. Freeman, who has collected all the facts and done all that was possible towards arranging the chronology of the period, makes observations and quotations, which suggest that till April, 1071, Edwin and Morecar lived in the Court of William, and under a kind of surveillance which at the latter period William was advised by his evil counsellors to convert into actual imprisonment. Both fled the Court, Edwin to seek aid, in his proposed revolt, from disaffected Englishmen, from the Welsh, and from Scotland, while Morecar, sooner or later, joined the party of Hereward and the occupation of the Isle of Ely.

It is just supposable that Earl Edwin's attitude at this period resulted in the destruction of Stafford Castle, built by the King in the previous year. At all events, there must have been some Staffordshire outbreak after the King's Castle was built, and before Domesday was written.

Edwin himself, after some months of wandering, was assassinated by his own followers while journeying to the Court of Scotland. The day and the place of this tragedy are unknown. It happened before the surrender of Ely (in October, 1071); it happened near the coast, and on the bank of some tidal river.

Meantime the demesne estates of Earl Edwin had gone, or were going, in various directions. The King retained the Lion's share. Large portions went to found and endow the twin Palatinates of Chester and Shrewsbury. Many a Midland Baron got a share of the gain which resulted from the escheat of the Mercian Earldom.

We now pass over fourteen years, during which history tells us nothing of Staffordshire,—we pass to Domesday. The general picture of the Borough and the County is that of a partial recovery from the supposable or presumed desolations of 1070 and 1071. But let us not be mistaken about the nature of these

desolations. Let Domesday be its own interpreter as to the meaning of such expressions as "mansiones vastæ" in the town, and "terræ vastæ" in the country. When Domesday would indicate the destruction of a fabric, whether a Burgage, a homestead, or a castle, it writes *mansio destructa*, *domus penitus destructa*, *castellum destructum*, or *castellum ruptum*, when, as at York, the fortress had been successfully assaulted. But when Domesday, the Staffordshire Domesday at least, speaks of "mansiones vastæ" and "terræ vastæ" it means empty houses, unoccupied and depopulated estates. The context sometimes, if not always, indicates this. The contrast to a "mansio vasta" is "mansio hospitata," an empty house, and an inhabited house.

So then the desolation of Stafford and Staffordshire, which largely endured to the year of Domesday, was simply depopulation, the slaughter of the inhabitants, or their emigration elsewhere. And in point of fact, history generally speaks rather of migration than slaughter as the outcome of William's visitations of rebellious districts; of wilful destruction of property or houses we hear nothing, nothing at least that takes hold of the student's memory. And further, whatever slaughter there was,—whatever destruction of property,—it is nowhere clear that both were not rather the result of intestine feuds and the hatred of antagonistic races than of the sword and the alleged savagery of William.¹

Mr. Freeman's general reprobation of the character and conduct of William is in many points just; in some points his fixed opinions have perhaps led him into mistakes as to the magnitude and quality of facts. For instance (Vol. IV., p. 151), he connects the "fearful harrying" of four Dorset towns with William's march upon Exeter early in A.D., 1068, and appeals to Domesday for record of the fact.

Domesday tells of nothing more than destitution in one of these Dorset towns; and it tells of the utter destruction of houses, mostly the King's, in three.

So then William is pictured as turning aside from the war-path,—deviating at least from any possible line of direct march,—and for the sake of what?—of destroying his own property.

Domesday further dates the three "destructions" (not the "destitution") from the shrievalty of "Hugh." This suggests that the Sheriff had more to do with the matter than the King. And, indeed, there is strong presumption that Hugh fitz Grip had not become Sheriff of Dorset so early as the date of William's march upon Exeter.

CHAPTER III.

DOMESDAY HUNDREDS OF STAFFORDSHIRE. SITES OF MANORS OFTEN TRACEABLE,
WHERE DOMESDAY NAMES ARE OBSOLETE. ENUMERATION OF STAFFORDSHIRE
ESTATES WHOSE DOMESDAY NAMES ARE OBSOLETE.

Enough having been said as to how far the Staffordshire of the Domesday Codex differed from the actual Staffordshire of A.D. 1086, and as to how far that earlier county differed from the county that now is, we pass to the Hundreds, of which there were five at the date of Domesday, and at all subsequent dates. These Hundreds were Offlow, Seisdon, Cuddlestone, Pirehill, and Totmonslow; each spelt in several ways by the Rubricator of the Record, but each clearly represented by one of the said modern names.

The errors and omissions of Domesday Scribes and Rubricators serve rather to establish the fact that,—with the exception of manors altogether omitted in Domesday, and with the exception of manors either added to Staffordshire out of other counties, or *miscd* out of Staffordshire into other counties since Domesday, and with the further exception of a Post-Domesday change of boundary between the Hundreds of Offlow and Cuddlestone,¹—that, with these exceptions, the present Hundreds of Staffordshire are precisely identical in boundary with the Hundreds of the eleventh century. The great use of this ascertainment and canon is, that though I cannot always reproduce a Domesday manor-name in any later form, I can always tell the Hundred in which an obsolete manor lay, and in which some more persevering enquirer should look for it.

In Offlow Hundred were two Domesday estates, of which I fail to find the modern representatives. These were *Burouestone* and *Litelbeck*. These twain were coupled with Weeford in the Record, and were probably adjacent thereto.

In Seisdon Hundred were four Domesday estates which I fail to find in the modern nomenclature of the district.—

Two of these were in the same locality, both of them being

¹ The change was probably caused by the formation, or rather enlargement, of the Royal Forest of Cannock. A large tract of forest land, originally appurtenant to Lichfield, or to such outlying members of Lichfield as Norton Canes and Little Wirley, seems to have been absorbed in Cannock Forest, and so transferred from Offlow Hundred, in which were Lichfield and its members, to Cuddlestone Hundred, in which was the vill of Cannock.

called "Cocretone" in the Record. One was an appurtenance of Kingswinford, and was, I presume, nigh thereto. The same presumption extends to the other. Both were waste and valueless. Their status as villas was perhaps never restored, and so the name was lost. The territory of one would, of course, accrue to Kingswinford, of the other to one of Fitz Ansculf's adjacent manors, such as Himley. Erdeswick seems to have known where Cocretone was.

Cippemore, another of Fitz Ansculf's Domesday manors, I cannot now apprehend. It was of some extent (3 hides), but of low value (10 shillings per annum). Its extensive wood (1,440 acres) had been appropriated by the King, and added to his forest. That forest will have been the forest of Kinver. We thus get an idea of the site of "Cippemore," a site from which it has surely disappeared. The King or his successors possibly appropriated and afforested the whole manor after Domesday, and so the vill and its name vanished.

Cote, an estate of one virgate, was held under the Canons of Wolverhampton by a single freeman. All that he had there was the half team, for which the estate was adapted. I cannot trace it. It is named between Bushbury and Tettenhall in the Record. The rent or annual value was only one shilling. Possibly on the lapse of the tenancy the Canons annexed Cote to their estate in Tettenhall, and there its name was lost.¹

In Cuddleston Hundred are six Domesday names which I fail to identify with any assured modern form. These are Hocintune, Bernertone, Ruscote, Monetvile, Estendone, and Anne.

Hocintune was waste, unoccupied, and valueless, according to Domesday. Its subsequent obscurity is not to be wondered at. The record names it between Hilton and Hatherton, both of which estates were in the Parish of Wolverhampton. I suppose "Hocintune" to have been in the same parish. Bernertone was one of the ten appendages of Robert de Stafford's vast Manor of Bradley. All the other appendages can be identified. They are situated either in the parish of Bradley, or of Castle-Church, or of Penkridge. Bernertone, from its position on the Domesday list, I should judge to have been nearest to Bradley of any.

Ruscote was an appurtenance of Robert de Stafford's Manor

¹ Since writing the above, the research of Colonel Wrottesley has enabled me more nearly to determine the situation of Cote. A Fine of King John's time speaks of "Cotes" and the "Haye of Cotes" as on the boundary of Penn.

of Blymhill. Though probably adjacent to Blymhill, I cannot trace the name ; neither can those more intimately acquainted with the topography of the neighbourhood.

Monetville follows Rickerscote in Domesday, and was possibly in the vicinity of Castle-Church.

Estendone was waste, unoccupied, and unvalued at the date of Domesday. It may have been a part of Essington, but I incline rather to think that the name has vanished in an obscurity consequential on the Domesday state of the vill. A Domesday Estendone is like enough to be now represented by some such name as Stendon or Standon ; but there is no such vill in Cuddestone Hundred.

About Anne, I guess it to have been either High Onn or Little Onn, the latter if it were High Onn that is written Otne in Domesday, and that was then held by the Abbot of St. Evroul of Uticum. Otne, be it observed, was a larger estate than Anne in Domesday ; but Little Onn is a greater estate than High Onn at the present date.

In Pirehill Hundred there are some six Domesday names of villis, the application of which to as many modern localities is, more or less, problematical.

Of Hetone, a piece of waste Tainland in manu Regis, I will speak in a future note.

Dorveslau, a member of Eccleshall, and surely in (old) Eccleshall parish, was waste. If waste then, it is now obsolete. It is followed in the Record by—

Cerveledone ; and Cerveledone is followed by Cerletone. The latter is now represented in Chapel Chorlton. Erdeswick evidently thought that Cerveledone was only another form of Cerletone, so that, at that rate, Chapel Chorlton was forefigured in two Domesday villis. The change of orthography in two successive lines of Domesday is no argument against Erdeswick's idea. Both villis, or the one vill, were, or was, in Eccleshall manor and parish, and both were waste.

Haswic is now obsolete. The name seems to have been known to Erdeswick, and the locality to have been near Newcastle. Though a large manor (5 hides), the Domesday Commissioners reported it as unoccupied and waste. Once, that is in King Edward's time, half a wood, which was in 1086 wholly in the King's Forest, had pertained to Haswic. Indeed the wasted state of the whole manor was *propter forestam Regis*.

The Royal Forest of this district never attained any great breadth or notoriety. In King John's time it was known as the "Haye of Clive."

Colt, an old appurtenance of Colton, and involved therewith at the date of Domesday, cannot now be distinguished therefrom. The distinctive name of Colt is, in other words, obsolete.

Scoteslei, a manor held by Nigellus of the See of Lichfield, I cannot find. Erdeswick seems to have known enough about it to call it Seotesley. I think it was in or near Colwich, a place not itself named in Domesday, but which became the parochial centre of many estates of the Episcopal Fief.

In Totmonslow Hundred were three Domesday estates which cannot, so far as I know, be now identified. Of seventeen small tenements which were waste, and which had fallen to King William by eviction of their former owners, all Saxon Thaness, two, viz.—

"Niwetone" and "Lufamesles," have not reappeared, except that Erdeswick called the former Newton, and one of his annotators has corrected Newton to Newtown. This is less pertinent to the occasion than even Domesday. The Record names both places together between "Cedla" (which is part of Checkley), and "Fotesbroc" (which is Forsbrook, in Dilhorne parish). The neighbourhood of Cheadle would thus seem a likely quarter wherein to search for some possible relics of these local names. Of "Bughale," an estate of one virgate, whereon two of Robert de Stafford's villeins had a full team, and which was worth five shillings per annum, I find no mention later than Domesday. Domesday says that Bughale pertained to "Halstone," but, in Totmonslow Hundred, Robert de Stafford had no such manor as Halstone, unless it were Ellastone, which Domesday writes elsewhere as "Edelachestone" and as "Elachestone."

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOMESDAY FIEFS OF STAFFORDSHIRE. THE KING'S FIEF—AS KING—AS EARL—AS IN POSSESSION OF ESCHEATED TAINLANDS. THE BISHOP OF CHESTER'S FIEF. ABBOT OF WESTMINSTER'S FIEF. ABBOT OF BURTON'S FIEF. ABBOT OF ST. REMIGE'S FIEF. FIEF OF THE CANONS OF STAFFORD. FIEF OF SAMPSON, THE KING'S CHAPLAIN—OF THE CLERKS OF WOLVERHAMPTON—OF THE CLERKS OF PENKRIDGE. FIEF OF ROGER, EARL OF SHREWSBURY AND ARUNDEL—OF HUGH DE MONTGOMERY, HIS SON. FIEF OF HENRY DE FERRERS. FIEF OF ROBERT DE STAFFORD, AND OF WILLIAM FITZ ANSCULF. WILLIAM FITZ CORBUCION'S MANOR OF SIBEFORD. TURSTIN'S MANOR OF DRAYTON. FIEF OF RICHARD FORESTER—OF RAINALD BAILIOL—OF RALPH FITZ HUBERT—OF NIGEL DE STAFFORD. LANDS OF CHENUIN, AND OTHER THANES OF KING WILLIAM.

Having spoken of Staffordshire as a whole, and as divided into Hundreds, we will now review it as divided into Fiefs.—

I. TERRA REGIS WILLIELMI.

The Conqueror's share of the lands of Staffordshire were of three classes, and were so distinguished in Domesday with evident intention and great exactness. This exactness was due to the clerks who arranged and compiled the original notes. The rubrication of the hundreds in which the respective manors were situate is inadequate and misleading. In some cases it is absolutely false.¹

The first class of the Terra Regis consisted of what was afterwards termed the "*Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*." It comprised all estates in which the Conqueror's possession had been preceded by King Edward's. Two-thirds of the Burgh of Stafford; the Manors of Kingswinford, Tettenhall, Bilston, Wednesbury, Penkridge, Trentham, Wigginton and Willenhall, with the relative appendeciæ of each, complete the series.²

¹ In the Rubrication of the Staffordshire Domesday, the Scribe, neglecting a host of proper insertions, also made four direct mis-statements.—

I. In the Terra Regis (p. ii., col. 2), where he rubricated fifteen waste manors as in "*Cudolvestan Hundred*," whereas they were all in *Pirehill Hundred*.

II. In the Terra Regis (p. ii., col. 2), where he rubricated seventeen waste manors as in "*Pereolle Hundred*," whereas they were all in *Totmonslow Hundred*.

III. In the Terra Episcopi de Cestre (p. iii., col. 1), where he rubricated "*Broctone and Bedehala*" as in "*Pereholle*" Hundred, whereas they were in *Culvestan Hundred*, which was the preceding Rubric. N.B.—This was done merely because there was more room to insert the Rubric in the wrong place than in the right place, which right place was against *Haiwode*, the manor succeeding to *Broctone*.

IV. In the Terra Henrici de Ferrieres (p. vi., col. 1), where he rubricated *Tutbury* as in *Pireholle Hundred*, *Tutbury* being surely in *Offelau Hundred*.

² Thus there were parts of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ* in each of the five Hundreds of Staffordshire, except *Totmanslow*. *Saisdon Hundred* is properly rubricated in one place, *Pirehill* in another; but the Rubrics of *Offlow Hundred*, due to four manors, and of *Culvestan Hundred*, due to one, are omitted.

The second class of the Terra Regis consisted of what King William held by escheat of Edwin, the last Earl of Mercia, and of his brother-in-law Earl Harold. In this right the King held one-third of the Burgh of Stafford, and the several Manors of Alrewas, King's Bromley,¹ Sandon, Chartley, Wolstanton, Penk-hull, Rocester, Crakemarsch, Uttoxeter, Barton-under-Needwood, Leek, Rugeley, Mayfield, Meertown, Cannock, (written "Chcnet" in Domesday) Elford, Kinver, Pattingham, Clifton, Drayton, (afterwards Drayton Bassett), Hopwas, and Harlaston.²

The third class of the Terra Regis consisted of estates, uniformly waste, which were in the Crown by forfeiture or eviction of Saxon Thanes. Fifteen of these estates were grouped as being in one hundred:—Cudolvestan says the Rubric, but they were all in Pirehill Hundred. The hidage of all, save one of the fifteen, was known and recorded; the extent of carucage was known in all. In one case a carucate and virgate, combined, contained only one plough-land.

Seventeen others of this class of estates were all in Totmonslow Hundred, though rubricated as in Pereolle (Pirehill) Hundred. The hidage of all and each was unknown or unrecorded. Some were measured by the carucate, or conceptional hide of the surveyors, others by carucage or extent of plough-land; but in six cases that extent was doubtful and was stated alternatively e.g. "In Fernelege terra j vel ij carucis"

II. TERRA EPISCOPI DE CESTRE.

The Bishop of Chester's Fief follows the King's territory. The whole seems to have belonged to his Church (*Ecclesiæ Sancti Cedde*) before the Conquest. The Bishop had no manor in Seisdon Hundred, only one (Ellastone) in Totmonslow Hundred. His four principal manors were Brewood in Culvestan Hundred, Haywood and Eccleshall in Pirehill Hundred, Lichfield in Offlow Hundred. Lichfield and Eccleshall had considerable appendages, but in each case Domesday cuts the list of such appendages in twain, so that the Rubricator's work, full of difficulties, was accomplished with many omissions and many errors.

¹ Now called King's Bromley. This had been Earl Harold's only Staffordshire Manor. Doubtless it came to Harold on his marriage with Earl Edwin's sister. It was certainly in possession of the Mercian Earls as late as A.D. 1057, when Earl Leofric died there.

² The Rubrics of this series are (with the exception of "Offelau Hundred," annexed to Alrewas) wholly omitted in Domesday. The compilers of the Schedule had taken no pains to arrange the manors in groups of hundreds.

Among the members of Eccleshall was a batch of eleven wasted estates of which neither the hidage was known nor the *carucatage* substituted. The *carucage*, or extent of plough-land in each, is all that Domesday reports.

At the Domesday period there were only five Canonries in Lichfield Cathedral. The great feature in the Bishop's Fief was the enormous forest-areas attached to his Manors of Brewood, Eccleshall and Lichfield. According to my interpretation of Domesday measurements, there were 4,320 acres of wood in Brewood and Baswich, 11,520 acres were appurtenant to Eccleshall, and to Lichfield no less than 93,740 acres. Contrasting this with the then Royal forests of Staffordshire, the Bishopric will appear to have been better endowed than the Crown. There are only 3,600 acres of woodland in Alrewas and Barton which we can suppose to have been Domesday constituents of the Royal forest of Needwood. Kinver forest has no Domesday representative, save 4,320 acres of wood in Kinver. Cannock forest had indeed a broader type in 34,560 acres of wood, bespoken by Domesday measurements for the King's Manor of "Chenet," and 8,640 acres of wood in Rugeley, were likely enough to have constituted the northern limb of the same forest.

There were 5,760 acres of wood in the King's Manor of Uttoxeter, and 23,040 in his Manor of Leek, but I do not find that either area afterwards developed into a Royal forest. In any event or calculation, the Bishop of Chester was the greatest forest-lord of Staffordshire at the date of Domesday. His woods though less concentrated than the King's were more than double in extent.

This state of things did not endure. The Royal forests increased after Domesday; the Bishop's woods diminished. I have already pointed out that Cannock forest was enlarged at the Bishop's expense, and how the change eventually augmented the parochial area of Culvestan Hundred, and contracted that of Offlow.

III. TERRA SANCTI PETRI WESTMONASTERIENSIS.

Westminster Abbey had one estate in Staffordshire, viz., Perton. Domesday says nothing as to the ownership of Perton in Saxon times. It was King Edward's, and was probably a member of the King's Manor of Tettenhall. The charter whereby the King gave Perton to the Abbey is extant. Inasmuch as it

is addressed to Edwin as Earl, it will have passed in the last four years of the King's life (1062-1065).

Perton remained with the Abbey at least till (4 Henry II.) 1158. Subsequently it was resumed by the Crown, and in King John's time had been converted into a Serjeantry.

IV. TERRA SANCTÆ MARIE DE BERTONE.

Staffordshire had only one Monastic establishment at the date of Domesday, viz., Burton Abbey. Of the ten Abbatial estates surveyed in Domesday probably nine had been acquired, if not at its foundation, yet long before the Conquest. Of the tenth, viz., Branstone, Domesday says that the Countess Godeva held it in King Edward's time.

How Branstone came to the Countess, or how it passed to Burton Abbey, I have not enquired. Shaw's statement that the Countess on her death left it to her son, Algar, involves a curious anachronism. The Countess not only outlived her son, but outlived the Conquest. If she gave Branstone to the Abbey the gift may have dated either before or after the Conquest. If King William gave it, as Shaw asserts, the gift will have been after the fall of Earl Edwin (A.D. 1071).

The Domesday Rubricator does not denote the Hundred of any of the above ten estates. It is easily ascertained in each case. We thus discover that the arrangement of the manors is nearly, but not quite, according to Hundreds. Had the fifth manor on the list been placed second, the order would have been perfect, for the first and fifth manors were in Pirehill Hundred. As it is, the fifth manor interrupts a group of four manors which were in Offlow Hundred.

V. TERRA SANCTI REMIGII.

The French Abbey of St. Remigius at Rheims had, at the date of Domesday, four manors in Staffordshire. These were Meaford, in Pirehill Hundred; Ridware, in Offlow Hundred; Lapley (which included Wheaton Aston) and Marston, all in Cuddlestone Hundred. A proper Rubric of the Hundred was annexed in each case; but, as has been before observed, Lapley and Marston were transferred by coeval error from the Staffordshire to the Northamptonshire schedules of survey. Of Meaford and Ridware, Domesday says, "Has duas terras dedit Algar Comes Sancto Remigio." Of Lapley and Marston, Domesday

says, or implies, that the Abbey of Rheims had them before the Conquest.

At Lapley was eventually established a Cell, or Priory, of the Church of Rheims. What the Annals of the said Church say about Lapley as an estate may be surely taken to comprehend all the above estates, as subject to the Priory. The story is on this wise.

Edward the Confessor had promised to visit Rome. Instead of going, he sent Aldred, Archbishop of York, who took with him several English Nobles. Among others went Burchard, the youthful and promising son of Algar, Earl of the Mercians. The embassy, on its return, having reached France, and Burchard being seized with fever, took up his lodging at Rheims. Death impending, the youth made out of his patrimony liberal grants of villas and farms to the Abbey, which grants had the (subsequent) approval of Earl Algar and of King Edward. Before he expired, Burchard asked for burial at the Abbey of St. Remigius, and was in due course interred in the *polyandrium*¹ of the Church. Such was the origin of Lapley Priory (*unde erectus Prioratus de Lapeleia*), says the French annalist; and if Domesday does not tell the whole story, it stamps it with unequivocal marks of truth. Chronology also is in support of this story, and the story thus supported corrects a hitherto defective chronology. Archbishop Aldred's return from Rome was in the summer of 1061. Algar, Earl of Mercia, said by the old genealogists to have died in 1059, has been shown by high authority (Mr. Freeman) to have been living much later, and probably to have died in 1062.

VI. TERRA CANONICORUM DE STATFORD.

Such should have been the heading of Schedule VI. of the Staffordshire Survey, but the Rubricator omits all title whatever, and in the Table of Contents the entry is "VI. Canonici de Statford et de Handone," which was confusing the proper title of the sixth Schedule with a title which belonged to the seventh.

Though Staffordshire had but one Abbey at the date of Domesday it had at least four Collegiate Churches, independently of that which was proper to the Episcopal Cathedral at Lichfield. Domesday tells of the constitution of the Church at Stafford more than we are likely to learn from any other source. "In

¹ *Polyandrium*. That part of a church wherein Seculars or others, not being members of a Monastery, were interred.

Statford Civitate (*sic*) habet Rex xiii. Canonicos Prebendarios et tenent iij hidas de Rege in elemosynâ. Terra est ix. carucis. Ibi sunt iiij Villani et viii. Bordarii et iiij servi habentes ij carucas. Ibi Molinus de iiij solidis et ij quarentinæ prati in longitudine et una quarentina (in) latitudine.¹ Valuit xx. solidos T.R.E.; modo (valet) lx solidos."

In its Survey of the Burgh of Stafford the Record further says—"Presbyteri de Burgo habent xiiij (mansiones). Hi omnes (the Priests and other Lords of the Burgh) habent sacham et socham. Rex habet de omnibus geldum per annum."

It is presumed that the Borough-Priests of Stafford were the same with the Canon Prebendaries. At that rate, each of them had a Mansio or Burgage, and one, perhaps the Præpositus Canonicorum, as a Dean would then be styled, had two. The College shared in the Corporate rights of the other Borough Lords. The formula about sac and soc implies the existence of a local court, not of a plurality of courts divided between the Borough Lords.²

The Canons of St. Mary's, as I may as well call them, went scot-and-lot with other Burgesses in providing the King's Borough-tax (geldum Regis).

VII. TERRA CLERICORUM DE HANDONE.

This again is an inappropriate title to Schedule VII. of the Staffordshire Survey. The title given in the Table of Contents (Domesday, fo. 246, a. 1) is "VII. Sanson Clericus," which is more correct in a list which purports to be one of tenants in capite. However, as we shall see, Sampson's Tenure in capite did not pervade the whole Schedule.—

¹ This meadow land was twenty acres. It was unusual to express meadow acreage in terms of the quarentine, but the very exception has its use.—

I have sometimes doubted whether the meadow acres of Domesday were not geld-acres rather than statute acres. In the former case, and where the hide happened to be 240 acres, the geld-acre, being $\frac{1}{4\frac{1}{2}}$ th part of a hide, would contain 5 statute acres; or if the hide happened to be 960 acres, the geld-acre would contain 20 statute acres. At that rate the Domesday meadows would have been measured by an ever-varying scale, which was obviously not the case.

As to measuring meadows by the quarentine, it was a rare, but perfectly consistent, process. For the quarentine and the statute acre belonged to the same unvarying system of mensuration; but the hide, the virgate, and the geld-acre belonged to another system, which perpetually varied in application according to the contents of the hide.

² *Sac* was the power of determining or punishing in a local court the disputes or misdemeanours of the members of a community. In a borough the burgesses and their households were the community; in manors the community consisted of tenants and dependents. *Soc*, as here used, was the power of compelling the suit or resort of all members of a community to such local court.

This Schedule contains, in another point of view, the Domesday account of three Collegiate Churches, and, if it contains the elements of a fourth, all I can say is that that fourth institution was never practically developed. Its proposed endowments were eventually added to those of the first College.

The ancient estates of the Collegiate Church of Wolverhampton were not all secured to the Canons by King William. What he allowed to remain with the Saxon Church, dedicated to St. Mary, was not held by the Canons *in capite sine medio*. Sampson, a Royal Chaplain, was then tenant-in-capite. The Canons held under Sampson. Sampson, in this relation, has been called "the first Dean of Wolverhampton." The title is anachronous, but it probably represents the essence of his position as well as any other.

An analysis of the above Schedule, probably, but not conclusively, indicates that ten estates were held by the Canons of Wolverhampton under Sampson. If I may presume further to interpret what Domesday has left somewhat obscure, I should fix and identify these ten estates as Wolverhampton, Arley (part of), Bushbury (part of), Cote, Haswic, Wednesfield, Willenhall (part of), Pelsall, Hilton (part of), and Hoeintune (now obsolete).

So far the Domesday Record. But it is impossible to appreciate the Domesday allusions to Wolverhampton Church without reference to documents and records of both earlier and later date.

In the days of King Ethelred, and in the year 996, the noble and pious Lady Wulfrena founded, or designed to found, a monastery at Hamtune. Among her proposed endowments were lands at Hamtune, Arley, Willenhall, Wednesfield, Hilton, Hatherton, Kinvaston, Featherstone, and a second Hilton. In Edward the Confessor's time (1042-1066), Wulfrena's Monastery had become a Collegiate Church. This Church, with all its possessions, was given by William the Conqueror to his chaplain, Sampson; on what trusts or conditions we know not. The grant implied, and resulted in, no alienation of church property, no sacrilege, no suppression of the College of Canons.

Sampson, seized at the date of Domesday, was a Canon of Bayeux. Though a Canon, a Quasi-Dean, a Clerk, and a King's Chaplain, he was not ordained Priest until Saturday, June 14th, 1096, that is nearly nine years after the Conqueror's death. William Rufus had appointed him to the See of Worcester, and

on Sunday, June 15, 1096, Archbishop Anselm consecrated Bishop Sampson at St. Paul's, London.¹

Sampson's consecration by no means caused him to vacate his Staffordshire preferment. It was shortly after the accession of King Henry (I.), and with that King's assent, that Bishop Sampson gave the Church of Wolverhampton, with its lands and possessions, to his own Cathedral Monastery of Worcester, to Thomas the Prior, and his brethren the Monks, all of whom the Bishop styles "his sons."

In the same spiritual sense, we may presume, Prior Thomas afterwards spake of Bishop Sampson as his "father": but when Prior Thomas used this language, he had himself become an Archbishop.

Thomas (II.) Archbishop of York, was consecrated June 27, 1109, and died Feb. 24, 1114. Meantime, that is on May 5, 1112, died Sampson, Bishop of Worcester. His successor, Theulph, or Theobald, another Canon of Bayeux, and a Chaplain of Henry I., was nominated by the King to the See of Worcester, on Dec. 28, 1113.

December 28, 1113, and February 24, 1114, therefore, limit the date of a deed whereby Thomas Archbishop of York, greeting T. (*sic*) Elect of Worcester, confirms for the second time the almoign of his (the Archbishop's) father, whereby he (the father) gave to the Church of Worcester "his fee of Wulrunantun," which almoign he (the present grantor, to whom his father had given the aforesaid fee) had already confirmed by his seal and assent.

A further and most interesting series of charters is extant on this subject. I have told that which directly related to the life and acts of a Domesday character, and which has hitherto been sadly mis-stated and sorely misunderstood. I now return to Domesday.—

Two estates, viz., Tettenhall and Bilbrook, are evidently intended by the Record to be members of Sampson's spiritual fief. But his tenants here were not the Canons of Hampton, but the Priests of Tettenhall, to whom the King had, it seems, assigned this particular almoign. The words of the Record are

¹ "The Chaplain Sampson" occurs in the Somerset Domesday in a position very apropos to the Canonry of Bayeux. He had held the manor of "Come" (now Templecombe) under Bishop Odo, of Bayeux. Though at the date of Domesday that Prelate was incarcerated at Rouen, Sampson still held the manor under King William.

as follows. They involve a primary mis-statement and its correction. "In Totenhale habent (Canonici de Hantone) j hidam. Terra est ij carucis et dimidiæ, et ibi sunt iij carucæ cum j villano et iij Bordariis. Hæc terra non pertinet ad Hantone (that is, not to the Canons of Hampton) sed est elemosina Regis ad ecclesiam ejusdem villæ (the Church of Tettenhall is meant).—De eadem elemosina habent Presbyteri de Totinhale hidam in Bilrebroch. Ibi sunt ij liberi homines, cum j villano et ij Bordariis, habentes ij carucas et dimidiam."

Both estates may, or may not, have been held T.R.E. by the Canons of Hampton. In 1086 they were held by the Priests of Tettenhall under Sampson. Such were the primordia of the Collegiate Church of Tettenhall, and such the reason why one of two manors in Tettenhall is to this day called the Manor of "Tettenhall Clericorum."

Again, in the Schedule entitled "Terra Clericorum de Handone," and which ought to have been entitled "Terra Sansonis Clerici," Domesday gives a group of four manors, written Hargedone, Chenwardestone, Haltone, and Ferdestan.

These represent the "Haginthornduna, Kinwaldestuna, Altera Hiltuna,¹ and Feortheastuna" of Wulfrena's original endowment of Hampton Monastery. They are now represented by Hatherton, Kinvaston, part of Hilton, and Featherston. Domesday says expressly of the two first—"Has duas terras tenuit Sancta Maria de Hantone T.R.E." And unquestionably the same thing was true of the two last. But at the date of Domesday these four estates were held by two Priests, Edwin and Alrie, under Sampson, who held them in capite of the King. I should suppose that the design, never fulfilled, was to provide an endowment for another Collegiate Church. Eventually all four estates were restored to the Dean and Canons of Hampton, and formed four distinct Prebends of the Church of St. Mary.

It was in or before King Henry the Third's time that the Church of St. Mary was put under the tutelage of St. Peter.

The two last entries of this seventh Schedule of the Staffordshire Domesday do not in any manner of propriety belong to the said Schedule. The estates of Penkridge and Gnosall had never

¹ Hilton in Wulfrena's time, and probably at the date of Domesday, was divided into two estates, such as Upper and Lower, or Great and Little, or East and West, &c. They have long since been united, and are now, I believe, indistinguishable. It is in some such sense, I imagine, that Wulfrena's Charter speaks of two Hiltons, and Domesday of Ilton and Haltone.

belonged to the Clerks of Hampton, neither were they then (A.D. 1086) any part of Sampson's fief. Nine Clerks held them *sine medio* of King William. Here then was the germ of the Collegiate Church of Penkridge.

VIII. TERRA COMITIS ROGERII.

I include what is entered by mistake in the Warwickshire Domesday in what I say both generally and particularly about the Staffordshire Fief of the Earl of Shrewsbury.

In Seisdon Hundred the Earl had seven manors. Four of these had been held T.R.E. by, or under, the Mercian Earls, three by Outi, Achi, and Alsi, Saxon Thanes.

In his seven manors in Culvestan Hundred, the Earl had been anteceded only in one instance by Earl Algar. The Saxon Thanes, Alti, Almund, Alvict, Bernulf, Suain, and Ulgar, were his antecessors in the others.

In fourteen estates of Pirchill Hundred, one only had T.R.E. been of the demesne of the Mercian Countess Godeva. The Thanes, Almund *alias* Elmund, Suain, and Ulmar, are in this case among the Earl's predecessors. Other Thanes, viz., Almar, Alric, Goduin, and Edmund, are also introduced in the same category.

In Offlow Hundred the Earl of Shrewsbury had but three estates, and in Totmonslow Hundred he had five. The Thanes, Edmund and Goduin, and they only, are named among his antecessors.

The Domesday Rubrics are a guide to the situation of only a few of Earl Roger's manors. Only three Hundreds are named, and those only once each. The object of the compiler was not to arrange the manors in sequence of Hundreds; but, having given the Earl's demesne manors first, he grouped manors which were in several Hundreds accordingly as they were held by one or other of the Earl's greater tenants.

VIII. (*continued*) or IX. TERRA HUGONIS DE MONTGUMERI.

Here is a symptom that the Clerk who wrote the index or elenchus of the Staffordshire Domesday was not the same Clerk as he who rubricated the text.

The latter gives to Hugh de Montgomery's tenure the same number (viii.) as he had affixed to his father's. The index has number ix. as that of the son's fief. The latter consisted of the

single Manor of Worfield. It was one of the Comital Manors. Earl Algar is, as usual in the Staffordshire Domesday, mentioned as the Earl of King Edward's time. Yet his father, Earl Leofric, and his son, Earl Edwin, belonged to the same æra.

Hugh de Montgomery's tenure of Worfield entitled him to five of the Comital Burgages (*mansiones de comitatu*) in the Burgh of Stafford.

IX. or X. TERRA HENRICI DE FERIERES.

Henry de Ferrers himself served on a Domesday Commission,—on that which visited Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and other counties. His Staffordshire manors were few in number, but to three of the principal ones was attached a large arable acreage, and of forests more than 19,000 acres. To Rolleston alone were attached 8,640 acres of these wood acres, and its arable land,—part of it unwontedly measured by the league,¹—I account to have been 2,880 acres. This Manor of Rolleston is also unique as having been of the seignury of Earl Morcar before the Conquest, and as containing at the date of Domesday the only *Ancilla* registered in Staffordshire.

Henry de Ferrers's occupation of the double Manor of Fauld has a sacrilegious aspect. In King Edward's day both estates had belonged to the Church of St. Werbergh, at Chester. Traditions of that holy lady's personal converse with the vicinity of Fauld have survived the spoliation both of conquest and of time.

I have a strong impression that before the full and final escheat of the Mercian Earldom, Hugh de Abrincis, not as yet designated to the Earldom of Chester, obtained a footing in Staffordshire, a footing which, as Earl, and before the date of Domesday, he had totally relinquished.—

¹ Domesday says under "Rolvestone"—"Ibi ii. hidæ et dimidia. Terra est viii carucis. In dominio sunt iiij carucæ et j ancilla; et (sunt) xviii Villani et xvi Bordarii cum presbytero habentes xiiij carucas," &c., &c., and then there is assigned to the manor, "Terra arabilis ij leuua longa et una (leuua) lata."

The latter quantity (as I hold) is equivalent to 2,880 acres. I take it to be inclusive of, not additional to, the previously suggested quantity of plough land. The words "Terra est viii carucis" seem to have involved a misconception, and the other terms to have been corrective thereof. Thus the 18 teams actually employed by the Lord and his dependents were competent (according to my oft-repeated theory) to till 2,160 acres. Domesday virtually says that there were 720 acres more fit for the plough. Such is my idea about this unusual entry. But if anyone more anxious for absolute symmetry should hold that these 18 teams, instead of dealing with 120 acres each, dealt with 160 acres, the symmetry (18 by 160 equalizing 2,880) will be specious indeed. But I question whether any such theory of mensuration can be supported by any other passage in Domesday.

Those who profited by the change were probably the Earl of Shrewsbury and Henry de Ferrers. Domesday scarcely ever speaks of any changes of fief which may thus have taken place, nor indeed of any changes between the Conquest (A.D. 1066) and the Survey (A.D. 1085-6).

But in the interval between 1070 and 1086, I deem that the site at least of Tutbury passed from Earl Hugh to Henry de Ferrers, and the seignery over Alstonfield, Warslow, Cheddleton, and Basford, to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

It is again remarkable and most interesting that after Domesday the Chester Earls were ever seeking a re-ascendancy in Staffordshire. Earl Hugh himself, if a tradition may be trusted, introduced in the time of William Rufus (1087-1100) a monastic establishment into Trentham, which in 1086 had been a Royal manor of ancient demesne, and without a symptom of disintegration.

This ambition of the Chester Earls seemed to culminate in 1153, when, by the Treaty of Devizes, Henry, Duke of Normandy, actually guaranteed the county, that is the Earldom, of Stafford, to Raoul le Meschin (II.), then Earl of Chester.

But these things belong to another chapter of my treatise. Let us confine ourselves to Henry de Ferrers, and his acquisition of Tutbury.

TUTBURY.

A great deal has been made of the few words written by Ordericus, viz., that there was a Saxon Castle there, and that William the Conqueror gave Tutbury to Hugh de Abrincis immediately after the Conquest.

Ordericus' words are—"Gulielmus primus, anno 1070, Henrico, Gualchelini de Ferrariis filio, castrum Stutesburie, quod Hugo de Abrincis primus tenuerat, concessit."

It is quite credible that when William appointed Hugh de Abrincis to the Palatinate of Chester, he may have given to Henry de Ferrers the estate afterwards known as Stutesbury, the Palatine Earl resigning it. But about the castle, Ordericus probably drew on his knowledge of a later period than 1070. Domesday suggests a very different view of the subject.—

At the date of the Conquest, Burton was a district as well as a town. The town and most of the district belonged to Burton Abbey, and of this particular possession of the Abbey Domes-

day (the extant Domesday) says not a word. But a part of this district, on which no less than twelve ox teams were at work in the Confessor's time, and which is probably represented by about 4,000 acres of land, was given,—Domesday does not record, and would not be likely to record, any primary grant to Hugh de Abrincis,—was given to Henry de Ferrers. Thereon, in a spot called Toteberie, or which came to be called Toteberie, within the next 16 years, Henry de Ferrers founded a castle and a borough. At the date of Domesday the castle was complete, but there was no agrarian estate called Toteberie, neither had the Burghers of Tutbury any means of living but what they acquired in the way of trade (*In Burgo circa castellum sunt xliij homines de mercato suo tantum viventes*).

The adjacent agrarian estate, also given by the Conqueror to Henry de Ferrers, became a chatclany; but not losing its name of Burton till after Domesday, did so lose it at length, and got the name of Tutbury or Stutsbury. This section of Burton was, we have suggested, about 4,000 acres, and is now represented by the Parish of Tutbury.

I should note that Henry de Ferrers' castle of Toteberie, and inferentially his estate of Bertone, are rubricated by Domesday as in Pireholle Hundred. This is against all analogy with the more correct Domesday Rubrics. Tutbury was cut off from Pirehill Hundred by Needwood Forest, and by a whole cordon of manors which were confessedly in Offlow Hundred. Never since Domesday have Tutbury or Burton been spoken of as in Pirehill Hundred, nor otherwise than in Offlow Hundred. I venture to say that that was their status then, and that the aforesaid Rubric was a mere mistake.

On Henry de Ferrers' connexion with the Burgh and neighbourhood of Stafford I will speak elsewhere.

XI. TERRA ROBERTI DE STATFORD.

Next to the Bishop of Chester, Robert de Stafford was the greatest territorialist of Staffordshire at the æra of Domesday.

Among other things, the King had given him Bradley and all its members, implying a vast area in the vicinity of Stafford. He had two other estates of the Saxon Earls, one certainly, and both probably, in the same quarter. In Stafford itself, and as appendages of Bradley, Robert de Stafford had thirteen *man-siones de honore Comitum*, as Domesday phrases it. Forty-one

more *mansiones* were attached to his general fief. He had two, probably five, estates erst held by the Mercian Countess, Godeva. The King had given him a moiety of the King's own share of the revenue derivable from the Burgh of Stafford. The King's own share being two-thirds, Robert de Stafford will have thus acquired the *tertium denarium* of the aforesaid revenue.

These, and perhaps other less material, facts sometime induced an assertion that King William made Robert de Stafford Earl of the county.¹ But the King kept the Earldom to himself. (*Vide supra*, p. 19, note.) From other authority I learn that Robert de Stafford was a scion of the great Norman House of De Toni, otherwise styled De Conchis.

I have read, too, and have found good reason to believe, that Nigellus, the undoubted ancestor of De Gresley, was a younger brother of Robert de Stafford. Nigellus was a tenant-in-capite at the date of the Survey, both in Staffordshire and Derbyshire. In the latter county, Domesday styles him Nigellus de Statford, and exhibits him as Lord, inter alia, of Drakelow. In Staffordshire again, Nigellus appears as holding lands under the Bishop of Chester, and under Richard Forester, but he is nowhere enfeoffed by his reputed brother. This is only a negative circumstance, easily accounted for by an inventive mind. Nigel's being called "De Stafford" is a fact, and a strong one too, in favour of the alleged relationship.

XII. TERRA WILLELMI FILII ANSCULFI.

Of William fitz Ansculf himself, and of his tenures in other counties, I shall attempt to say nothing in addition to what has been said by Dugdale and other writers.

In Staffordshire I see William fitz Ansculf to have succeeded to four estates of the Mercian Countess, Godeva, and to two of Earl Algar.

The large woodland (5,760) annexed to William fitz Ansculf's Manor of Morfe ("Morve") cannot but make one think of Morfe Forest. But Morfe Wood was at any rate but a fragment of the ancient forest. The bulk thereof at the date of Domesday was annexed to Claverley, Norley, Alveley, and Worfield, manors of the Earl of Shrewsbury and his son, Hugh.

¹ See Harwood's Erdeswick, p. 2, note. Erdeswick himself, more inaccurate than his Annotator, tells us that King William created Henry de Ferrers, first Earl of Derby, anno 1090!!!

Similarly, the wood (720 acres) mentioned by Domesday under Fitz Ansculf's Manor of Efnefeld was doubtless the germ of "Enville Chase." But of this wood Domesday expressly says—"Rex tenet eam in forestâ." The King had annexed it to his forest,—of Kinver, we presume.

Fitz Ansculf's manors, lying chiefly in the Hundreds of Seisdon and Offlow, caused the Rubricator of the Survey but little trouble. He appears to have discharged his function without error or omission.

WILLELMUS FILIUS CORBUCTION.

After William fitz Ansculf's Schedule of Manors, Domesday notices William fitz Corbucion's Manor of Sibeford. We have already intimated that there was no such manor in Staffordshire, and that the entry was improper to the Staffordshire Survey. In further proof of this error, or rather gloss, we turn to the coeval index or elenchus of Staffordshire Fiefs. It contains no entry whatever of William fitz Corbucion or his fief.

Where the text is unsupported by the elenchus the text is probably a gloss. But, as we shall see, a gloss may be expressive of a coeval fact as well as of a coeval error.

TURSTINUS.

The next Domesday entry is of Turstin's Manor of Draiton, worth £5 per annum T.R.E. and £8 in 1086. This entry is a gloss, for it is not in the elenchus. Nevertheless, it implies a coeval fact, and supplies an omission in the more authentic Record.

The manor itself was five-sevenths of Drayton, since called Drayton Bassett. Other two-sevenths were in the Terra Regis by escheat of the Mercian Earldom. Turstin, the King's tenant in five hides of Draiton, is credibly said to have been ancestor of the House of Bassett. His family achieved neither wealth nor notoriety till the reign of Henry I., when two of them, father and son, were successively Chief Justices of England.

In default of a Domesday Rubric, it may be added that Drayton was manifestly in the Hundred of Offlow.

Drayton was one of the estates which, after Domesday, were subjected to the Honour of Chester. This involved the feudal service of Turstin or his heirs. Herein, perhaps, arose a subsequent event, viz., that Richard Basset, presumed grandson of

Turstin, married Matilda Ridel, grand-daughter of Earl Hugh de Abrincis, whose illegitimate daughter, Geva, was Matilda's mother.

XIII. TERRA RICARDI FORESTARII.

The Warwickshire Domesday tells of six manors held by Richard Forester in capite of the King. The elenehus of the same Survey classes him with the Taini et Servientes Regis,—the King's tenants "in thenagio" and "per serjantiam."¹ Perhaps Richard Forester was one of the King's serjeants, and his service was connected with the Royal Forests, perhaps he was also a tenant by thenage.

Of Richard Forester's ten Staffordshire estates, I would observe, first, that they seem to have been correctly rubricated in Domesday; next, that four of them, viz., Thursfield, Whitmore Hanford, and Clayton, were held under Richard by Nigellus. That this Nigel was identical with Nigel de Stafford, and was progenitor of the House of Gresley, I cannot doubt. According to Erdeswick, Ingenulf de Gresley, a younger grandson of Nigel, married Alina, daughter and eventual heir of Robert, son of Ormus, son of Richard Forester. Other evidences bring certain of Richard Forester's estates into a combination which illustrates Domesday, and does not invalidate Erdeswick's statements. Of this matter of descent I shall speak in the sequel.

But in the reign of John there was one Randulf de Cnoton who held 36 virgates of land in soeage of the Crown, at a rent of £4 11s. 6d. per annum. This tenure was said (by a local jury, probably) to be "De antiquo jure seilicet de conquestu Angliæ." (Testa de Nevill, p. 55.)

Now these 36 virgates, so held by Ralph de Knutton, were in Knutton, Dimsdale, Hanford, Clayton, Hanchurch, and Whitmore,—all veritable members of Richard Forester's Domesday Fief. I cannot doubt then that Ralph de Knutton was lineal heir or co-heir of Richard Forester, and I suggest that Richard Forester's tenure by serjeantry, or by thenage, if such it was, had been commuted into the tenure by socage of his descendant.

But there was a service *per serjantiam* attached to this estate. The occupant was bound to provide forty days' ward at New-

¹ The two tenures, *per thenagium* and *per serjantiam*, were not unfrequently commuted, or rather combined. Robert de Auberville, a King's serjeant and forester of Somerset, certainly claimed to hold his lands *per thenagium*.

castle in each year at the King's cost. This was an institution of King Henry II., as I shall show when I come to speak of Fenton. It was complicated with the rent. A Record of 1220-1240 says of Ralph de Knutton's successor that "John de Cnocton" holds the vill of "Cnocton" at fee farm, rendering yearly at Newcastle £4 11s. 6d.,—performing also wardenry at the said castle for forty days at the King's charges.

XIV. TERRA RAINALDI BAILGIOLE.

I need not repeat aught that I collected years ago about the Domesday Sheriff of Shropshire. (See *Antiquities of Shropshire*, Vol. VII., pp. 206-211.)

In the time of Henry I. the numberless estates which he held of the Earls of Shrewsbury and of the Crown, in Shropshire, Staffordshire, and Warwickshire, passed to the progenitor of the House of Fitz Alan. Trace them when or where you will, in any year of three centuries, or in any of three counties, you will find record and proof of the continuous seignury of that house.

XV. TERRA RADULFI FILII HUBERTI.

Ralph fitz Hubert was a Derbyshire rather than a Staffordshire Baron. He was one of those sons of Hubert de Rye who, 39 years before Domesday was written, had combined with their father to save the life of Duke William of Normandy, when the latter, flying from Valognes and from the conspirators of the Cotentin, passed through Rye, and gained the stronghold of Falaise. Hence the Duke went for succour to Henry of France. The episode concluded in the decisive victory of Val-es-Dunes.

William, when King of England, forgot none of the benefactors of his youth. He was not twenty years of age when, aided by the King of France, he smote the chiefs of the Cotentin at Val-es-Dunes. We may almost infer the age of Ralph fitz Hubert at the date of Domesday.

Adam fitz Hubert, a Kentish Baron, who was a Commissioner on that Domesday Circuit which included Worcestershire, was a brother of Ralph fitz Hubert. Eudo Dapifer, seneschal to King William, was a third brother.

XVI. TERRA NIGELLI.

Of Nigel de Stafford I have already said much that I need not repeat here. His Staffordshire Fief, held of the Crown, was inconsiderable. Under his Manor of Torp (*postea* Thorpe Con-

stantine) Domesday says—"Hanc terram calumniatur Nicolaus ad firmam Regis de Clistone." Thus we get hold of the name of the Domesday Sheriff of Staffordshire!¹ Clifton (*postea* Clifton Campville) was a King's Manor adjacent to Thorpe. It was, in absence of any hint to the contrary, in the usual custody,—that of the Sheriff. In other words, Clifton being a comital manor, the King had it as Comes. His deputy-in-charge would ordinarily be the Vice-comes.

XVII. TERRA TAINORUM REGIS.

"CHENUIN ET ALII TAINI."

In this final Schedule, the Staffordshire Domesday enumerates the estates of thirteen or fourteen Thanes who, whether Saxon or Norman, had saved or gained something from the wreck of conquest. Their names were Alric, Almar, Alward, Alwold, Chenuin, Dunning, Gamel, Levild, Leving, Otha, Richard, Sperri, Udi, and Ulwin.

Sir William Dugdale, when giving account of the Warwickshire Manor of Chesterton, seems to suggest that Richard and Chenuin were two names of one person, and that that person was Richard Forester, also called Richard Venator in the Warwickshire Survey. I bow to so great an authority.

At this rate, two Warwickshire estates (Chesterton was one of them), which Domesday attributes to Richard Venator, and six Warwickshire estates, which Domesday attributes to Richard Forester, were all in one man's fief.

Erdeswick, after some little assumption as to the Domesday position of the person whom he calls "Chenene," says—"Which Chenene had issue, Richard de Chenene, I think, who had issue Margery, married to William Croke (*sic*), who had issue William that was hanged, and Margery, married to Robert Broche (*sic*), who had issue Margery, married to Hugh de Leges (*sic*), who had issue Hugh de Leges, that lived in Henry the Third's time."

The curious and seemingly well-preserved traditions which guided both Dugdale and Erdeswick were rehearsed at an inquest on Warwickshire Serjeantries, held, if I mistake not, at least 160 years after Domesday. It was distinctly pointed out

¹ There are many allusions after Domesday to a Sheriff, Nicholas. Genealogists should enquire about him. I will here say that he is evidently the same with "Nicholas," who at the date of Domesday was King William's Fermor of Coventry, and five other Warwickshire estates late the Countess Godeva's.

Domesday Sheriffs are elsewhere found farming Crown estates at a still greater distance from their sphere of office.

that "Richard Cheven" was a serviens (or serjeant) of William the Conqueror, to whom the King gave lands in Chesterton and elsewhere for the service of keeping (custodiendi) the Forest of "Kanoc" (Cannock). The descent of estate from Cheven to "Croc," and from "Croc" to "Broc," and so on to "De Loges," is well and circumstantially made out. (See Testa de Nevill, pp. 86, 87, &c.) In another Record I find Hugh de Loges holding Rodbaston as part of the same serjeantry.

Now, whereas Rodbaston was of the Domesday Fief of Richard Forcster, and Chesterton of the Domesday Fief of Richard Venator, it seems clear that there were not two Domesday Serjeants, but one, and that his name was Richard Cheven.

This matter may seem irrelevant to Domesday, but it was necessary to give some detailed proof of coincidences which exhibit the Great Record as speaking of the same person under so many aspects and so many names.

I ought to add that Codsall, the only Staffordshire estate expressly given to Chenuin in Domesday, remained in no such succession as Chesterton and Rodbaston. In Henry II.'s time it had passed to Stephen de Beauchamp.

CHAPTER V.

TABLES OF THE FIVE STAFFORDSHIRE HUNDREDS. CONSTRUCTION OF THE SAID TABLES EXPLAINED.
TABLE OF OFFLOW HUNDRED, INCLUDING EDINGALE, ADDED THERETO SINCE DOMESDAY. NOTES ON THE SAID TABLE.
TABLE OF SEISDON HUNDRED, AND OF MANORS SEVERED THEREFROM SINCE DOMESDAY, AND ANNEXED TO SHROPSHIRE. NOTES ON THE SAID TABLE.
TABLE OF CUDDLESTONE HUNDRED, INCLUDING THREE ESTATES ERRONEOUSLY CODIFIED IN DOMESDAY UNDER WARWICKSHIRE AND NORTHAMPTONSHIRE. NOTES ON THE SAID TABLE.
TABLE OF PIREHILL HUNDRED, INCLUDING TIRLEY, ADDED THERETO SINCE DOMESDAY. NOTES ON THE SAID TABLE.
TABLE OF TOTMONSLOW HUNDRED. NOTES ON THE SAID TABLE.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE TABLES OF HUNDREDS.

I. The first columns will give the Domesday name of every Staffordshire estate mentioned in the Survey.

When no sign is prefixed to such name, the Rubrication of Domesday as to the Hundred of the manor or estate is correct.

* This sign, prefixed to any such name, signifies that the Hundred of the manor or estate does not purport in any way to have been rubricated by the Domesday Scribes.

† This sign, prefixed to any such name, implies that the Hundred of the manor or estate was erroneously rubricated by the Domesday Scribes.

§ This sign, prefixed to any such name, implies that the Hundred of a manor or estate is not determinable by the last preceding Domesday Rubric, and was in fact omitted by the Rubricator.

II. The second columns of the Tables will give the ownership of each estate in King Edward's time. Where such ownership is inferred from, rather than expressed in, Domesday, it is marked by brackets.

III. The third columns of the Tables will give the Superior Lords of each estate, whether the King or his immediate tenants.

IV. The fourth columns of the Tables will give the tenure, in fee and possession, of each estate.

V. The fifth columns of the Tables will instance any such free sub-tenants or part-occupants of estates as may be mentioned in Domesday.

VI. The sixth columns of the Tables will give the hidation (hides and virgates) of each estate; but where an estate is measured in Domesday by the carucate, the sixth columns will preserve the distinction.

VII. The seventh columns of the Tables will give the number of plough-lands estimated by Domesday to be contained in each estate; but where plough-lands, specified in detail, are only items of a prestated total, such items will be bracketed, in token that they are not to be recalculated in the sum at the foot of the columns, e.g., Domesday gives the total number of plough-lands attaching to the great Manor of Lichfield (Table I.) as seventy-three, and then it individualizes fifty-one of these plough-lands as proper to specific members of Lichfield. The latter should be bracketed.

VIII. The eighth columns of the Tables will give the acreage of all meadow lands supplied by Domesday.

IX. The ninth columns of the Tables will give the areas of all wood-lands in the terms of Domesday mensuration.

X. The tenth columns will reduce those areas to terms of statute acreage.

XI. The eleventh columns of the Tables will give the annual values of all estates at the date of the Domesday Survey.

XII. The twelfth columns of the Tables will supply various features and particulars instanced by Domesday in the survey of any estate.

XIII. The thirteenth columns of the Tables will denote the modern Hundred in which every Domesday estate may be found, or is to be looked for.

XIV. The fourteenth columns of the Tables will denote the modern name or situation of every Domesday manor now traceable.

If the Domesday name be obsolete, the fact will be noted by the abbreviation *Obs.*

XV. The fifteenth columns of the Tables will give the existing acreages of all such civil parishes as may, more or less nearly, represent certain Domesday manors.—

But if, instead of a numerical acreage the term *alibi* is inserted in this column, the meaning is that the parochial area of such and such a manor or estate is reckoned in the acreage of some other and more comprehensive parish, or else is entered in line with some other section of the same estate. For instance (Table I.), both parts of Packington are marked “Alibi,” as being included in the four thousand acres of Weeford; also, the first part of Hamstall Ridware is marked “Alibi,” because its acreage is included in the 2,959 acres which are in line with the second mention of Hamstall Ridware.

NOTES ON THE TABLES (I. AND II.) OF OFFLOW HUNDRED.

BRESMUNDESCOTE (Bescot, in Walsall). All that Domesday said of this estate of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ* was “In Bresmundescote est una carucata terræ vasta.” And yet this doubly vague expression probably contained whatever was known or unknown to the Domesday Surveyors about the estate of Walsall.

WALSALL, unnamed anywhere in Domesday, existed as a manor long before. It was one of the estates which the Lady Wulfrena designed to bestow on her intended Monastery of Hampton. It was one of the estates which, not falling to the Collegiate Church in which the said Monastery merged, was in the Crown at the date of Domesday, and remained for ages an estate of the *Vetus Dominicum Coronæ*. Thus we see how much may underlie the terms “carucata” and “vasta” of the Staffordshire Domesday.

Though Bescot at the date of the Survey may thus be reckoned to have absorbed Walsall, Walsall is now the prominent name, and it includes not only Bescot, but two other estates which were then reputed to be members of Wednesbury. The

TABLE I. The Domesday Hundred of Offelau, constituting, together with parts of

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures.			Terra quot Carucis.	Acra prati.	
					Hides.	Virgates.	Carucates.			
§ In Bresnundescote.....	(Rex Edwardus).....	Rex Willelmus.	(In dominio Regis)	0	0	1	0	0	
§ Wadnesberie cum appendiciis.....	(Rex Edwardus).....		(In dominio Regis)	3	0	0	9	1	
§ Blocheswic, membrum ejusdem Manerii.....	(Rex Edwardus).....		(In dominio Regis)	0	0	0	0	0	
§ In Seelfeld pertinente eidem Manerio.....	(Rex Edwardus).....		(In dominio Regis)	1	0	0	0	0	
§ Wigetone	(Rex Edwardus).....	Rex Willelmus.	(In dominio Regis) ...	IV. Burgenses in Tamworde	2	0	0	6	120	
§ Winchala	(Rex Edwardus).....		In dominio Regis	3	0	0	4	1	
Alrewas	Algar Comes		In dominio Regis	I. Presbyter ...	3	0	0	8	24	
Bromelci	Heraldus Comes		In dominio Regis	3	0	0	5	25	
Bertone	Algar Comes	Rex Willelmus.	In dominio Regis	3	0	0	18	20	
Eleford	Algar Comes		In dominio Regis	3	0	0	11	24	
Clistone	Algar Comes		In dominio Regis	I. Presbyter ...	8	0	0	4	50	
Draitone	Algar Comes		In dominio Regis	2	0	0	4	20	
Opewas	Algar Comes	Episcopus de Castro.	In dominio Regis	3	0	0	6	30	
Hornvestone	Algar Comes		In dominio Regis	4	0	0	8	0	
Lecefele cum appendiciis suis	Ecclesia Sti Ceddæ ...		Episcopus in dominio ...	5 Canonici ...	25	3	0	73	25	
					0	0	0	0	0	
Padintone.....	(Eadem Ecclesia).....	Episcopus de Castro.	(Unoccupied)	0	0	0	(4)	0	
Due Hamerwich	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		(Unoccupied)	0	0	5	0	0	
Tichebroc.....	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		(Unoccupied)	0	0	0	(1)	0	
Nortone et	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		(Unoccupied)	0	0	4	0	0	
Wireleia	(Eadem Ecclesia).....	Episcopus de Castro.	(Unoccupied)	0	0	1	0	0	
Roweleia	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		(Unoccupied)	0	0	0	(2)	0	
Hortone.....	Ecclesia Sti Ceddæ ...		Alwin	0	0	0			
Pagintone.....	(Eadem Ecclesia).....	Episcopus de Castro.	Ulchetel	0	0	0	(4)	0	
Tamahore.....	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Nigelus	0	0	0	(4)	0	
Hadesacre	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Robertus	0	0	0	(5)	0	
Hutes	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Oswold	0	0	0	(7)	0	
Loeshale.....	(Eadem Ecclesia).....	Episcopus de Castro.	Raven et Alwin	0	0	0	(4)	0	
Ridware.....	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Alric	0	0	0	(1)	0	
Weforde et	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Radulfus	0	0	0	(4)	0	
§ Buronestone et	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Rannulf	0	0	0	(6)	0	
§ Litlebech	(Eadem Ecclesia).....	Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Bertone.	Rannulf	0	0	0	(1)	0	
§ Fraiforde	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Robertus	0	0	0	(1)	0	
§ Timmor	(Eadem Ecclesia).....		Willelmus	0	0	0	(2)	0	
§ Horeborne	(Eadem Ecclesia).....				0	0	0	(5)	0	
§ Smedewich	(Eadem Ecclesia).....	Episcopia Sancti Remigii.								
§ Tibintone.....	(Eadem Ecclesia).....									
* Brantestone	Godeva Comitissa.....	Abbatia Sanctæ Mariæ de Bertone.	(Abbas in dominio)	1	2	0	5	24	
* Witmere	(Abbas de Bertone) ...		(Abbas in dominio)	1	2	0	7	4	
* Stratone	(Idem Abbas)		(Abbas in dominio)	1	2	0	2	23	
* In Wodnesfeld	(Canonici de Hanton)	Sanctus Sancti Hogoratus.	Canouici de Hanton	5	0	0	3	0	
* In Winenbale.....	(Idem Canonici)		Canonici de Hanton	2	0	0	1	0	
* In Peleshale	(Idem Canonici)		Canouici de Hanton	2	0	0	1	0	
In Ridware	Algar Comes	Episcopia Sancti Remigii.	Godric	0	1	0	1	2	
§ Ridware	5 Angli		Azelinus	1	2	0	4	16	
§ Ridware	Edmundus		Walter	0	1	0	1½	4	
Seneste	Goduin		Robertus Oilgi	3	0	0	12	1	
					82	1	11	193½	419	

Tamworth and of Burton-upon-Trent, and with Edingale, the present Hundred of Offlow.

Silva of Domesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Hundred.	Modern Name, or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
...	£ s. d.	In Bresmundescote est una carucata terræ vasta ...	Offlow Hundred.	Bescot and Walsall	3897
2 leu. × 1 leu.	2880	(Value omitted)	Ibi Molinus de 2 solidis		Wednesbury	2130
3 quar. × 1 quar.	30		Blocheswic est membrum ejusdem Manerii. Ibi silva 3 quarentin. × 1 quarentin.		Bloxwich in Walsall	3000
...		In Seelfeld est hida vasta pertinens eidem Manerio		Shelfield in Walsall	985
...	4 0 0	Ibi 6 quarentinæ, prati in long' et 2 quarentinæ lat'	Offlow Hundred.	Wigginton } in Tamworth } & Hopwas } Parish	3470
...	1 0 0	Ibi 1 acra prati		Willenhall	2168
1 leu. × ½ leu.	720	11 0 0	Ibi Piscaria reddens 1500 anguillas		Alrewas	4329
1 leu. × ½ leu.	720	5 0 0	Ibi iii. hid. cum append. Ibi molinus de 6 sol.		Bromley Regis	3863
2 leu. × 1 leu.	2880	7 0 0	Ibi ii. Molini de 20 sol.	Offlow Hundred.	Barton-under-Needwood	3798
...	12 0 0	Ibi vii. hida eum append. Ibi ii. Molini de 10 sol.		Elford	2070
2 leu. × ½ leu.	1440	12 0 0	Ibi ii. hida eum append. Ibi ii. Molini de 21 sol.		Clifton Campville	3248
...	4 0 0	Pertinent viii. Burgenses de Tamworde et ibi operantur sicut alii Villani.		Drayton Basset, Part of	3315
6 quar. × 3 quar.	180	2 0 0	In dominio est Molinus de xiii. sol. et iiiij. denariis	Offlow Hundred.	Hopwas in Tamworth	(Alibi.)
...	6 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 4 solidis		Harlaston	1431
9 leu. 1 quar. } (× 7 leu. 2 quar. }	93760	15 0 0	Ibi ii. Molini de 4 solidis		Lichfield	8482
...	[Ad hoc Manerium (Licefelle) pertinent hæc membra.—Padintone, terra 4 carucis; Dne Hamerwich terræ 5 carucate; et Tichebroc, terra 1 carucæ; et Nortone et Wireleia, 4 carucate terre; et Rowleia 1 carucata terre Hæc terræ omnes sunt wastæ		Packington, Part of	(Alibi.)
...	Offlow Hundred.	Hammerwich, Nether & Over Stichbrock, in St. Chad's, } Lichfield	1986
...		Norton Canes and Little Wirley	(Alibi.)
...		Rowley, nr. Hamstall Ridware	4077
...		Horton in St. Michael's parish, Lichfield, and in Fisherwick	(Alibi.)
...	Offlow Hundred.	Packington in Weeford (Part)	(Alibi.)
...		Tamhorn, now in Whittington	770
...		Handsacre, near Armitage ...	1888
...		Hints	1849
...	Offlow Hundred.	Yoxall	4795
...		Pipe Ridware, Part of	816
...		Weeford	4000
...		(Obs. near to Weeford)	(Alibi.)
...	Offlow Hundred.	(Obs. near to Weeford)	(Alibi.)
...		Freeford	(Alibi.)
...		Tymmore	(Alibi.)
...		Harborne	1412
...	Offlow Hundred.	Smethwick	1886
...		Tipton	2697
½ leu. × ½ leu.	360	2 0 0	...		Branstone	2469
...	2 10 0	[Ibi 1 hid. et dim. cum appendiciis suis	Offlow Hundred.	Wetmoor in Burton	1210
...	2 0 0	[T.R.E. valebat £4, post 25s., modo 50s.		Stretton in Burton	
...	2 0 0	T.R.E. valebat 60s., et post 20s., modo 40s.			
½ leu. × 3 quar.	180	(alibi)	Silva Pastilis (Value included in the £6 per annum, which was arising from Estates in Scisdon and Culvestan Hundreds		(Wednesfield	2200
...	(alibi)	Hæc vasta est	Offlow Hundred.	Willenhall, Part of	(Supra.)
...	(alibi)			Pelsall	1194
...	Algar Comes dedit Sto Remigio. Ibi molinus de 2 sol.		Hamstall Ridware, Part of ...	(Alibi.)
1½ leu. × 1½ leu.	3240	2 0 0	[Quinque Angli tenuerunt T.R.E. et adhuc habent] terram 2½ carucis		Mavesyn Ridware	2476
1 leu. × ½ leu.	720	0 5 0	...	Offlow Hundred.	Hamstall Ridware, Part of ...	2959
3 leu. × 1½ leu.	6480	5 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 5s. 6d.		Shenstone	8451
113590	92 15 0					93261

TABLE II. The Domesday Hundred of Offelau, constituting, together with parts of

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures.			Terra quot Carnis.	Acres prati.	
					Hides.	Virgates.	Carucates.			
Toteberie, Castellum et Burgum	(Not stated)	Henricus de Ferreres.	In dominio	42 homines	
In Burtone	(Not stated)	0	2	0	12	...	
Rolvestunc	Morcar Comes		In dominio	I Presbyter ...	2	2	0	8	50	
Marchametone, et	Uluric.....		2	0	}	0	7	40
In Edgareslege	0	1		0	1	12
Draicote	0	2	0	1	12	
Felede.....	{ Sancta Wereberga ... de Cestre.....		Hubert	0	2	0	1	...	
Felede.....			Rogierus	I Presbyter ...	0	2	0	1	50	
Mortunc.....	III liberi homines.....		Alcher.....	...	0	1	0	1	12	
§In Aele	Ulwin		Helio	2	0	0	4	4	
§In Fricescote	IV Taini	Robertus de Statorl.	Turchil	II Angli	2	0	0	(bl.)	...	
§In Wicnore	IV Taini		Robert	2	0	0	4	20	
§In Rideware.....	III Taini		Hermann	{ I Liber homo } cum 1 virgat. }	0	3	0	4	8	
In Bradeleg.....	Untan.....	Willelmus filius Anscuth.	Walbertus	1	0	0	2	2	
In Alrewie	II Taini		Robertus	3	0	0	3	1	
In Barra	Waga		Robertus	3	0	0	3	...	
In Rischale	Winara cum sac et soc		Turchil	1	0	0	2	1	
In Pirio	Lunare cum sac et soc		Drogo	3	0	0	3	4	
In Barre	Alured cum sac et soc		Drogo	3	0	0	1	1	
In Honesword.....	{ Ailverd et Alwin } cum saca et soca }		Drogo	1	0	0	2	2	
*In Draiton	(omitted)	Turs- tin.	In dominio	5	0	0	5	...	
*Torp	Uluin	Nigel- lus.	In dominio	3	0	0	6	8	
					36	3	0	69	215	
					82	1	11	193½	419	
Broughtover ...					119	0	11	262½	634	

Part of Walecros Wapentac, Derbyshire, now

In Ednunghalle	(Siward).....	Henricus de Ferreres	0	0	1	1	...
In Ednungale.....	Algar	Rex.	xii. Villani	0	0	2	3	4

Tamworth and of Burton-on-Trent, and with Edingale, the present Hundred of Offlow.

Silva of Domesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Hundred.	Modern Name or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
		£ s. d.				
...	...	4 10 0	{ Henricus de Ferreres habet Castellum de Toterie. In Burgo circa Castellum sunt 42 homines de Mercato suo tantum viventes et reddunt cum foro £4 10s.	Offlow Hundred.	Tutbury.....	3997
...	...	1 4 0	{ In Burton habet (Henricus) dimidium hidam in qua sedet ejus Castellum. In qua erant T.R.E. XII Carnce. Ibi sunt modo 4 Carnce in dominio In d'no 1 ancilla. Ibi Molinus de 5 sol. Silva (est) pastilis. Terra arabilis 2 lenne long. et una lat.		Formerly in Burton-on-Trent } now constituting Tutbury } as above	supra
3 leu. x 2 leu.	8640	10 0 0	Silva (est) pastilis.....		Rolleston	2159
3 leu. x 1½ leu.	6480	5 0 0	Silva (est) pastilis.....		{ Marchington..... } { Marchington Woodlands ... } { Newborough in Hanbury ... } { Draycott in the Clay in do. ... }	2463 2710 2762 1829
½ leu. x ½ leu.	360	0 15 0	Silva (est) pastilis. Ibi est 1 hida quam isti dno tenent. Totam hanc villam Felede tenuit T.R.E. Sta Wareburg de Cestre	Offlow Hundred.	{ Fauld in Hanbury Parish } { Fauld in Hanbury Parish }	3620
3 leu. x 1 leu.	4320	0 15 0	(No Rubric of "Offelau Hund." annexed).		Moreton in Hanbury Parish } { Oakley, near Elford—in } { Croxall Parish, Derbyshire }	supra 735
1 leu. in l'g et lat.	120	1 0 0	Hec terra fuit consuetudinaria solummodo de thelonco Regis sed aliam socam habebat et quo volebant ire cum terris suis poterant		Sirescote in Tamworth	950
...	...	0 16 0	Ibi Molinus de 1s denariis		Wielnor	1690
½ leu. x 5 quar.	300	0 15 0	{ Ibi minus liber homo tenet unam virgatum de hac terra et ibi habet 2 villanos cum dimidia caruca. Ibi Molinus de 2 solidis	Offlow Hundred.	{ Partly in Hamstall Ridware } { Partly in Pipe Ridware ... }	supra
3 qu. x 1 quar.	30	0 5 4	Untan tennit cum soca et soca		Bradley in Bilston	alibi
5 qu. x 3 qu.	150	0 15 0	{ Duo Taini libere tenuerunt et Rex (habebat) Socam. Silva pastilis (est)		Aldridge	2718
1 leu. x 4 qu.	480	0 5 0	{ Ibi nil est in dominio, sed tantum i. Villanus ibi est cum i. Bordario. Silva (est) pastilis..... }		Bar Magna	4960
5 qu. x 2 qu.	100	0 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 4 den. Silva (est) pastilis	Offlow Hundred.	Rushall	1921
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	1 0 0	...		Perry Bar in Handsworth ...	supra
4 qu. x 4 qu.	160	0 5 0	Ibi Molinus de 2 solidis		Bar Magna, Part of	supra
½ leu. x ½ leu.	360	1 0 0	...		Handsworth	7680
...	...	8 0 0	Ibi molinum (sic) 4 solidorum	Offlow Hundred.	Drayton Bassett, Part of	supra
...	...	2 0 0	Hanc terram calumniatur Nicolans ad firmam Regis in Cliftone		Thorpe Constantine	953
	22,220	40 5 4				41000
	113,590	92 15 0				93251
	135,810	133 0 4				134201

annexed to Offlow Hundred, Staffordshire.

3 qu. x 1 qu.	30	...	{ Surveyed subjectively to the Manor of Croche-shalle (Croxall) in Walecros Wapentac, Derbyshire. (Domesday, fo. 274, a. 2.) }	Offlow Hundred.	Edingale, Part of	866
3 qu. x 1 qu.	30	2 0 0	{ In Ednughall habebat Algar (Tainus Regis) ii. carucatas terre ad geldum. Terra 3 carncis. Ibi modo xii. villani habent viii. carneas et iiii. acras prati. Silva minuta iij. quar. long. et j. lat. T.R.E. (valebat) et modo valet xl. solidos..... }		Edingale, Part of	

whole of Walsall is now measured as 7,882 acres. Of these, 3,897 acres may be taken to represent Walsall and Bescot, as combined in the eleventh century.

BLOCHESWIC (Bloxwich). Bloxwich is set down in Domesday as a member of the Royal Manor of Wednesbury. This, I take it, was owing to the then obscurity and wasted condition of Walsall. On the restoration of Walsall, Bloxwich became a member, both manorial and parochial, thereof, just as a nearer proximity thereto would suggest. Of the 7,882 acres which now compose the parish of Walsall, 3,000 acres, or thereabouts, are furnished by Bloxwich.

SCELFELD. Shelfield again is set down in Domesday as a member of Wednesbury. It is further from Walsall than Bloxwich is, but it is also further from Wednesbury. Doubtless its normal condition was as a member of Walsall, rather than of Wednesbury. It is now a township of "Walsall-Foreign." Probably its Domesday extent is represented by the 985 acres which now compose the Chapelry of Walsall Wood, in which it is situate.

All that Domesday says about Shelfield is, "In Scelfeld est una hida vasta. Pertinet eidem Manerio" (Wadnesberie).

WIGETONE (Wigginton) now forms a common parish with Hopwas; but the manors, though both in the Crown, were distinct. In fact Wigginton was *Ancient Demesne*, Hopwas was *Ancient Escheat*.

WINEHALA (Willenhall). Three hides of Willenhall were in the Crown as *Vetus Dominicum*. Two hides given by the Lady Wulfrena to her Monastery of Hampton were among the estates of the Collegiate Church, at Domesday, and for ages after. The King's Manor possibly involved Bentley (1650 acres), an estate which has no distinctive mention in Domesday.

ALREWAS came to the hands of King Henry II., as a manor contributing £10 per annum to the Ferm of the county. King John granted it to Roger de Somervill (deceased 1212,) to hold by an annual rent of £15 payable to the Crown, and by service of ¼th of a Knight's fee.

ELEFORD (Elford) remained not in the Crown long after Domesday. It was one of the many Staffordshire estates which eventually were subjected to the Honour of Chester. On the partition of that Honour among co-heiresses, Elford was given to none of them. The seignury reverted to the Crown. About

1240-2 Waleheline de Ardern is said to hold one fee in Eleford "of the King, of the Honour of Chester." The fee was of "old feoffment," that is, had been created more than a hundred years previous. There is further evidence as to Waleheline de Ardern paying, as tenant-in-fee, the scutages thereon. But a tenure-roll of 1255, intimates that Sir Roger de Meaud was mesne-lord of Eleford, and Waleheline de Ardern was his tenant.

CLISTONE (Clifton Campville). Onecote in Derbyshire was a berewick of Clifton. The Staffordshire Commissioners evidently knew nothing about it. It is entered in the Derbyshire Survey, where its three hides are of course called carucates.¹ Clifton was alienated by the Crown, I think, within fifty years after Domesday. It was annexed to the Honour of Tutbury.

HORULVESTONE (Harlaston) was also alienated by the Crown, but at what period, and to what Grantee, I am doubtful. The seignury was, in the 13th century, in the Earl Ferrers. I have a suspicion that intermediately it had been a fee in the Honour of Chester.

LECEFELLE CUM APPENDICIIS SUIS. Domesday enumerates two-and-twenty villis among the appendiciæ of Lichfield. There were other villis, perhaps not then settled or occupied, but whose acreages were doubtless included in the Domesday measurements,—in the forest measurements I should incline to believe. Such were Haselour (584 acres), Statfold (450 acres), Whittington (2,921 acres), Farewell and Chorley (1,049 acres), and Longden (4,511 acres.)

When it is said of Lichfield that the manor *cum appendiciis* contained arable land adapted to 73 plough-teams, this estimate was inclusive of all those 51 plough-lands which were, lower down, bespoken by Domesday for the Appendiciæ of Lichfield. (In Table I., col. 7, these details of plough-lands are bracketted. They are contributory to, and not supplementary of, the 73 plough-lands of the preamble. Therefore they are not to be reckoned in the total of 193½ plough-lands which stand at the foot of the column.)

Of the actual teams supplied to this sphere for 73 teams we find (10+7=) 17 in the Bishop's demesne, and (21+3+25=)

¹ The Carucate of some Counties, such as Derbyshire, Notts, Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, &c., was absolutely identical with the Hide of others. Both were, when thus generally used, geld-measures, that is, the carucate indicated the same degree of geldability as did the hide.

49 among his Canons, his tenants, and their subordinate villeins. The actual teams, therefore, were 66; so that 7 were wanting to the full complement of capabilities. Seeing that there were five possible plough-lands and ten carucates lying waste, this deficiency is more than accounted for. In fact we may reckon that the settled and occupied portions of the episcopal estate had $(15-7=)$ eight teams more thereon than were normally necessary.

SENESTE [Shenstone.] That Robert D'Oily should hold a Staffordshire Manor under the Earl of Shrewsbury is in keeping with the ubiquitous interests of that mighty Baron. The Barons D'Oily, the eventual heirs of Robert, transmitted Shenstone, as a tenure in capite, to their heirs, the Earls of Warwick. In the 13th century Shenstone was thus held for $\frac{3}{4}$ ths of a Knight's fee. The Capital Manor was held of the Earl of Warwick for a fee-farm rent of 4s. 5d.; but Upper and Lower Stonnall (Stanhale), originally a member of Shenstone, had been given in almoign, by a D'Oily tenant, to Oscney Abbey. (See Testa de Nevill, p. 52.) This is one of those interesting cases where Domesday mysteries are solved by genealogical evidences.—“Seneste” could hardly be taken to mean Shenstone unless we had happened to find in other records that it must have meant Shenstone.

TUTBURY has already been noticed in speaking of Henry de Ferrers (*supra* pp. 49-50.)

HANBURY is not mentioned in Domesday. Its manorial contents were involved in Edgareslege (*postea* Agardsley (Erdes. 518), now Newborough), in Draicote and Mortune (now Draycott-in-the-Clay and Moreton), and in Felede (now Fauld.)

The later parish of Hanbury involved all the same elements, viz.:—In Hanbury and Fauld, 3,620 acres; in Newborough, 2,762 acres; and in Draycott and Moreton, 1,829 acres. Total 8,211 acres. The whole is covered by two Domesday hides. So the hide here equals $4,105\frac{1}{2}$ statute acres. The carucage, being $3\frac{7}{9}$ plough-lands, supposed to contain 120 acres each, is $(120 \text{ acres} + 3\frac{7}{9} =)$ $453\frac{1}{3}$ acres. The Wood measured in Domesday, is $(720 + 360 + 4320 + 120 =)$ 5,520 acres. The meadow measured in Domesday is $78\frac{4}{9}$ acres. Total 6,051 $\frac{7}{9}$ acres.

Here the actual measures (8,211 acres) are one-third more than the Domesday indicia, leaving 2,159 for pasture and moorland, not computed in Domesday estimates.

But, as a whole, the Domesday measures of Offlow Hundred exceed in acreage the measures of the present parishes of that Hundred. This is because Domesday ascribed to manors of Offlow Hundred accessories of forest-land which lay, or now lie, in the parishes of other hundreds.

FRICESCOTE (Sirescote). The identity of Fricescote with Sirescote cannot be established by any etymological affinity. It was denied by the Staffordshire Historian, Shaw (Vol. I., 430). Nevertheless, the identity is undoubted. When Dugdale, speaking of Sirescote, said that it was Robert de Stafford's at Domesday, he, of course, was thinking of Fricescote. Shaw denies that Sirescote is in Domesday at all. It remained in the fief of the Barons Stafford for ages. What Shaw knew on the subject concerned the tenaney, not the seignury. He shows how Osbern de Ardern (who in fact was Stafford's tenant at Sirescote) gave the manor to Walter de Somerville (who was already Stafford's tenant at Wichnor). Shaw says that this transfer was in Henry the Second's time. Probably it was earlier, certainly it was earlier than 1166, when we are sure that Somerville held both manors under De Stafford. However, there was at one time a claim of the Earls Ferrers on the seignury of Wichnor, and it seems to have partially succeeded.

A nameless, but not unlearned, annotator on Erdeswick suggests Treseott as the representative of Fricescote. This is one of those guesses which seem plausible enough till they are checked by better evidences. Treseott was not in the same Hundred as Fricescote, neither had it any connexion with the fief of Stafford.

What Domesday says of the four Thanes who, T.R.E., held Fricescote amounts to this,—that they were free to place themselves and their land under whatever suzerainty or advowry they pleased; that they had all manner of *soke*, except *tol*.

The term "*Soc*" is here used in an extended sense. It involves the term "*Sac*." The combined terms are usually introduced in cognate clauses of the Staffordshire Domesday. Singly, *Sac* was the Manor-Lord's right to adjudicate between, to fine, or to punish, the men of his manor in his own court. *Soc* was the power to compel the men of his manor to do suit and service at such court. *Tol* was the right of a Manor-Lord and his vassals to buy or sell in other markets free from toll. The Saxon Lords of Fricescote had no such privilege in the King's market.—

The proximity of Sirescote to King Edward's Manor of Wigginton perhaps induced this limitation.

RIDEWARE. Ridware, as I take it, was at the date of Domesday a district containing five manors. The district happened to be subsequently divided into three parishes. Thus Robert de Stafford's single manor falling partly into the Parish of Hamstall Ridware and partly into that of Pipe Ridware, and being coincidentally divided as to sub-tenure, became two manors with two distinct names.

BARRA (now Barr Magna). There were two Domesday Manors of Barra. One was associated, as to sub-tenure, with Aldridge, the other with Perry and Handsworth. The latter seems subsequently to Domesday to have been called "Parva Barr," a name now disused, or at least no longer applied to any portion of Great Barr.

A full comprehension of the ratio of these changes is perhaps obtainable by minute research. In the table of Offlow Hundred I am obliged to give Magna Barr as representing the two Domesday manors.

The point for distinct notice here is that either one of these Domesday manors of Barra, or else some other manor of Fitz Ansculf's Seignury, involved the territory (5,719 acres) now known as West Bromwich.

DRAITON (*postea* Drayton Bassett). The Saxon Lord of this second and larger Manor of Drayton is not recorded in Domesday. We suppose that Earl Algar, Lord of the manor which the King retained, had been Lord of the manor which the King bestowed on Turstin. The contrast between the two manors is curious. The King's manor was two hides, Turstin's was five. The King's manor contained four plough-lands, Turstin's five. The King's manor was stocked with $4\frac{1}{2}$ teams, Turstin's with six. The villeins and boors on the King's manor were twelve in number; on Turstin's, sixteen. The King's manor included 20 acres of meadow and (as I compute the measurements) 1,440 acres of wood; Turstin's manor had neither meadow nor wood. There were three mills in Drayton; the King had two, valued at 21 shillings, Turstin had one, valued at 4 shillings, per annum. The King's manor yielded £4 per annum to Earl Algar, and the same to King William. Turstin's manor, worth £5, T.R.E., was now yielding £8 per annum. The King's manor gave him eight burgages in Tamworth, the occu-

pants rendering no other service than to work in the fields at Drayton "like other villeins."¹ Turstin's manor had no such advantages.

The Domesday measures of the two manors of Drayton imply 338 acres more than the 3,315 acres which the table assigns to Drayton Bassett. These 338 acres were in Canwell, which was severed from Drayton in the 12th century.

Not long after Domesday, the seignury of both manors was given to an Earl of Chester. On the eventualities of Turstin's tenure I have already spoken. It would seem that his grandson, Richard Bassett, married the heiress of the Earl of Chester's grantee and feoffee in the King's manor.

EDINGALE. To the tables of Offelau Hundred I have appended the Domesday notices of the two Derbyshire Manors of Edingale. It is merely that the latter have, since Domesday, been *misel* into Offlow Hundred, and into Staffordshire.

OFFLOW HUNDRED. The present Hundred of Offlow, exclusive of Edingale, which had been added to it since Domesday, appears to contain more than a fifth, though less than a quarter, of the whole county of Stafford. In more precise terms, it appears to contain 165,014 acres.—

Of this area, 10,950 acres, in Tamworth and in Burton-upon-Trent, were not prefigured by any extant expression or constructive intention of the Domesday Commissioners.	10,950
The Tables of Offlow Hundred (Tables I. and II.) will further show how 134,291 acres of the said area were prefigured by Domesday under definite and still assignable localities.	134,291
And there are 19,773 acres which cannot be definitely assigned to this or that Domesday manor, but which must be taken individually and wholly to have been prefigured in some or other Domesday measurements of the table. ²	19,773
	<hr/> 154,064
Total	<hr/> 165,014 <hr/>

¹ In the eleventh century, the lower class of Burgesses ranked no higher than Villeins. The above is one illustration of the fact. It is further supposable that the same class was largely composed of runaway Villeins. The manorial privilege of *Tam* entitled any Manor-Lord to enter a town and recover a runaway Villein.

² These 19,773 acres consist of the following, viz., Haselour (584 acres), Statfold (450 acres), Whittington (2,921 acres), Farewell and Chorley (1,049 acres), Longdon (4,511 acres), all probably reckoned as appurtenant to Lichfield in Domesday estimates; also Bentley (1,650 acres), probably reckoned as appurtenant to Willenhall, or some other Royal manor of Offlow Hundred; Canwell (338 acres), probably reckoned with Turstin's manor of Drayton; West Bromwich (5,719 acres), probably reckoned with one or other of Fitz Anseulf's manors; and Darlaston (2,551 acres), whose Domesday status is very uncertain.

We have two distinct methods of Domesday estimate and measurement, wherewith we now proceed to compare this apparently correlative area of 154,064 statute acres.—

Under the old or hidational system, Domesday registers, or is construed to register, in Offlow Hundred 119 hides and 11 carucates of land. In these cases the carucate stands for a conceptional hide, so that the gross hidation of Offlow Hundred, as suggested by Domesday, was 130 hides.

Here, therefore, the Domesday hide is found to be in proximate and apparent correlevance with 1,185 acres of modern ascertainment.

The exacter measures assigned by Domesday for the same area are—

262½ Plough-lands, which, at the rate of 120 acres each, gives of }	31,500 acres
arable land }	
Of Wood-land, measured by the league or quarentine, but reducible }	135,810 acres
to acreage }	
Of Meadow-land, actually measured by the acre in Domesday ..	634 acres
	<hr/> 167,944 acres <hr/>

Here then the Domesday hide correlated with about 1,292 acres of contemporary and exacter measurement.

The striking phenomenon here is not so much the greatness of the Staffordshire hide as that the Domesday exact measures (167,944 acres) should exceed the 165,014 acres of modern verification by 2,930 acres.

The solution is conjectural. Probably a far greater excess than this was in Episcopal Forests, nominally attached to Lichfield by Domesday, but which did not lie in any of the present parishes or vills of Offlow Hundred. To the west and north-west of Little Wirley and Norton Canes there were probably Episcopal forest-lands which were either in Cuddlestone Hundred at the date of Domesday, or have since been annexed to parishes of that Hundred. A kindred probability is that this Episcopal territory afterwards went in augmentation of the King's Forest of Cannock. Probably, too, the wood acreage assigned by Domesday to Earl Roger's Manor of Ridware, and to certain manors of Henry de Ferrers, was not within the present limits of Offlow Hundred.¹

¹ In the Somerset Survey many forest areas were similarly removed from their topographical site and concentrated on distant manors, with which they can have had none other than a technical association. The same phenomenon occurs, though not so frequently, in the Dorset Domesday.

Another possible solution is that in computing, or describing in technical terms, a forest area so large as that annexed to Lichfield (viz., 93,740 acres) the Commissioners may have been furnished with inaccurate data, or their clerks may have inaccurately reckoned the total. The wild method of computation (viz., by the league) would be open to such errors, and if a single league, for instance, were taken from the stated width, it would make a difference of more than fifteen thousand acres in the result.

It is further remarkable that while Domesday registers the arable capabilities of Offlow Hundred as 262½ plough lands, it also reports 254 teams as in actual employment. In this respect no other Staffordshire Hundred was so well circumstanced.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (No. III.) OF SEISDON HUNDRED.

SUINESFORD (King-Swinford). This manor was ancient demesne of the Crown. It had an importance at the date of Domesday with which the Staffordshire Survey does not acquaint us. It is from the Worcestershire Survey (Domesday, fo. 172, b. 1) that we get further particulars. It there appears that the Sheriff of Staffordshire had custody of King-Swinford, and that in virtue of that trust he received at King-Swinford the Royal revenues arising from the Staffordshire Manor of Kinfare, and the two Worcestershire Manors of Tarbeck and Clent, all three being farmed by the Sheriff of Worcestershire (Urso de Abetot). There is a slight discrepancy in the particulars furnished by the Worcestershire Record, which I will endeavour to correct. The entries run as follows:—

“De Chenefare reddit (Vice-comes de Wirecestrescire) centum solidos de viginti in orâ. Hæc terra est in Stadfordscire. Similiter est et Suinesforde. De isto manerio (Chenefare) et aliis duobus qui (*sic*) sunt in Wirecestrescire;—hoc est Terdeberie de ix. hidis et Clent de ix hidis,—de his III Maneriis reddit Vice-comes (de Wirecestrescire) xv libras denariorum de viginti in orâ” (where the reading ought to be either “II. Maneriis,” or else “xx libras denariorum”).

The Record then proceeds—

“Rex Willelmus tenet Terdeberie (in Came Hundred). Rex Edwardus tenuit. Ibi ix hidæ. Indominio est 1 caruca et alia potest fieri, &c., &c. Vice-comes de Stadfordscire recipit et

TABLE III. The Domesday Hundred of Saisdone, so

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures. Hides. Virgates.	Terra quot Carnis.	Acrae prati.
Suinesford	Rex Edwardus	Rex Willelmus.	Rex in dominio	5 0	6	4
In Cocretone	(Idem Rex)		(Rex)	0 2
Totehala	(Rex Edwardus)		Rex in dominio	1 0	2	...
In Contone	(Idem Rex)		(Rex ipse)	1 0
Iu Wistewic	(Idem Rex)		(Rex ipse)	0 2
In Billestune	(Rex Edwardus)		(Rex ipse)	2 0	4	1
§Chenevaro	Algar Comos	Rex Wills.	Rex in dominio	I Presbyter	5 2	16	6
§Patingeham	Algar Comes		Rex in dominio	I Presbyter	2 0	8	...
*Pertone	(Rex Edwardus)	Abbatia Sti Petri West- monasteri- ensis.	Abbas in d'nio (part)	I Liber homo	3 0	6	8
*Hantone or Handone	(Canonici de Hanton)	Sanctus (Regis Willelmi Capellanus).	Canonici de Hantoue.	1 0	3	2
*In Ernlege	(Canonici de Hanton)		Ipsi Canonici	Ibi III lib'i ho'ies	2 0	6	...
*In alia Ernlege	(Canonici de Hanton)		Osbern fil. Ricardi	0 2	1	...
*In Biscopesperie	(Canonici de Hanton)		Ipsi Canonici	Ibi I Liber homo cum l ear.	0 1	½	...
*Iu Cote	(Canonici de Hanton)		Ipsi Canonici	I Liber homo	0 1	½	...
*In Toteuhale	(Rex Edwardus)	Regis Willelmi	Ipsi Canonici sive potius Presbyteri de Toteuhale	Presbyteri de Toteuhale	1 0	2½	...
*In Bilrebroch	(Rex Edwardus)		Presbyteri de To- tenhale	II Liberi homines	1 0	(om.)	...
...
In Bubintone	Wifare cum sac et soc	Robertus de Stafford.	Helgot	5 0	6	...
In Peclshella	Brodor cum sac et soc		Hugo	3 0	6	...
Iu Ache	Brodor, et liber fuit.		Hugo	5 0	3	...
Iu Wrotolei	Hunta		Glodoen	2 0	2	...
Segleslei	Algar Comes	Willelmus filius Ansulfi.	In dominio	I Presbyter	6 0	12	16
Morve	II Liberi homines		(Vasta est)	5 0	6	...
In Catspelle	(Not stated)		(Vasta est)	1 0	2	...
In Segeslei	(Not stated)		Goiffrid	2 0	(om.)	2
Iu Penne	Godeva Comitissa		Gislebertus	Unus Liber homo	3 0	6	4
In Peune	Algar Comes	Willelmus filius Ansulfi.	Robertus	5 0	6	...
In Overtone	Ultan		Walbert	3 0	4	4
In Wamburne	Turstin cum sac et soc		Radulfus	I Presbyter	7 0	8	4
In Oxelie	Goduin et Alrie		Robertus	1 0	2	2
In Enefeld	Alurie Teinus R.E. cu. soc		Gislebertus	3 0	4	4
In Cypemore	Eduin	Willelmus filius Ansulfi.	Roger	3 0	4	0
In Himelei	Ultan et Ronechetel		Arni	1 3½	3	2
Iu Eadem Villa	Lnuet		Gislebertus	1 0	2	1
In Elmelecote	(II homines Algari Co- mitis sine soca		Pagen	1 0	2	4
In Treslei	Turgot cum sac et soca		Balduin	2 2	3	4
In Cocortone	III Liberi homines	Chenuin Regis	Balduin	1 0	2	...
In Scisdone	IV Liberi homines		Walbert	II Servientes ibi...	5 0	6	4
In Etinghale	Turstan cum sac et soc		Robert	2 0	4	5
In Biscopesperie	Ulric cum sac et soc		Robert	2 2½	5	6
In Pendeford	Ulstan et Goduin		Almar	2 0	3	4
In Moleslei	Godeva Comitissa		Roger	1 0	2	1
In Codeshale	Chenuin		In dominio	3 0	3	...
					103 2	161½	88

The Domesday Hundred of Saisdone, so far as it is represented by parts of

Claverlege	Algar Comes	Comes Rogerius.	Comes in dominio	20	0	32	12
Nordlege	Algar Comes		Comes in dominio	2	0	12	...
Avidelege	Algar Comes		Comes in dominio ..	I. Presbyter	1	0	9	6
In Quatone	Outi		Outi	3	0	12	1
In Rameslege	Achl		Walterius	1	0	7	...
In Rigge	{ Edrie libero tenuit de { Leurico Comite		{ Radulfus (de Mor- { timer)	5	0	7	...
In Sciplei	Alsi		Radulfus (idem)	1	0	3	...
Wrfeld	Algar Comes	Hugh de Mont- gumeri	In dominio	{ I. Presbyter	30	0	30	16
				{ III. Angli
					63	0	112	35

far as it is represented by the Modern Hundred of Seisdon.

Silva of Demesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Hundred.	Modern Name, or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. \times 3 quar.	180	£ s. d. 3 10 0	Ibi Melius de 2 solidis..... { Huic manerio (Suinesford) pertinet dimidia hida vasta in Cocretene..... }	Seisdon Hundred.	Kingswinford..... Obsolete (near Trysull).....	7315 ...
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. in lg. et lat	60	1 10 0	{ Terra est ij carucis. Ibi sunt in dominio..... In Contone est i bida pertinens ad Totehala..... }		Tettenhall, Part of..... Compton in Tettenhall.....	7600
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	360	1 10 0	In Wistwic est dimidia hida et ptinet ad Totehala.....		Wightwick in Tettenhall... }	1845
3 leu. \times j leu.	4320	5 0 0	{ Ibi sunt 5 hidæ et dim. cum appendiciis Ibi II Molini de 20 solidis }		Kinfare <i>al.</i> Kinver	8790
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	3 0 0		Pattingham.....	2502
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	360	2 0 0	{ Ibi xlii. vill. et II. Bord. et unus liber homo cum V. carucis }		Perton in Tettenhall	supra
6 quar. \times 4 quar.	240	0 10 0	{ Canonici de Hantone tenent I hidam de Sansone. T.R.E. fuerunt ibi viii. car. Modo sunt x. et xiv. (Servi; et vi. villani et xxx Bordarii cum ix. carucis Ad hanc terram (Ernlege) pertinet dim. hida in alia Ernlege quam Osbernus fil. Ricardi vi tollit Canonici. Terra est i car. Ibi est cum iv. villanis. Valet x. sol. }		Wolverhampton Upper Arley Ditto, Part of	3396 3912
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	1 10 0	Terra est dim. car. Hanc habet ibi unus liber homo		Bushbury, Part of	6377
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. \times 3 quar.	180	1 10 0	{ Hæc terra non pertinet ad Hantone, sed est ele- mosina Regis ad ecclesiam ejusdem villæ (scilicet Tottenhale)..... }		Cote, Obsolete (near Penn) ...	alibi
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. \times 2 quar.	120	0 8 0	{ D. eadem elemosinā habent Presbyteri de Toten- hale i hidam in Bilrebrotch }		Tettenhall, Part of	supra
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. \times 2 quar.	120	0 4 0	{ Tota hæc Canonicoꝝ terra (including Haswic, Wednesfelde, Winehale, Peleshale, Ilton, Ho- cintune) valet per annum vi. Libras }	Seisdon Hundred.	Bilbrook in Tettenhall	supra
21 leu. \times 1 leu.	2880	10 0 0	Silva (est) pastilis.....		Bobbington	2676
21 leu. \times 2 leu.	5760	...	Ibi Molinus de 12 denariis		Patshull	1830
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	1 10 0	{ Partem silvæ hujus Mancii calumniatur Pres- byteri de Hantone }		Oaken in Tettenhall	supra
1 leu. in lg. et lat	120	0 10 0	Terra est vi. carucis. Vasta est		Wrottesley in Tettenhall.....	supra
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	1 10 0	Terra est II. carucis. In foresta Regis est. Vasta est		Sedgeley	7743
1 leu. in lg. et lat	120	1 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 2 solidis		Morfe in Enville	infra
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	1 0 0	Ibi II. Molini de 4 solidis		Gospel End in Sedgeley	supra
1 leu. in lg. et lat	120	1 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 4 solidis		Sedgeley, Part of	supra
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	1 0 0	Ibi II. Molini de 4 solidis		Penn, Upper and Lower ..	3986
1 leu. in lg. et lat	120	1 0 0	Rex tenet cum (silvam) in foresta	Seisdon Hundred.	Orton in Wombourne.....	infra
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	1 0 0	Rex habet (silvam) in foresta		Wombourne	1328
1 leu. in lg. et lat	120	1 4 0	Ibi 2 acra prati et Silva		Oxley in Bushbury	supra
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	0 15 0	Ibi 4 acra prati et Silva		Enville	1925
1 leu. in lg. et lat	120	0 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 4 solidis		{ Himley, Part of Himley, Part of Ambecote in Old Swin- ford, Worcestershire..... }	1185 689
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	1 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 4 solidis		Trysull and Seisdon	3110
1 leu. in lg. et lat	120	0 10 0	{ III. liberi homines tenuerunt (T.R.E.) sed Socæ erat Regis. Vasta est }		Obsolete (near Trysull).....	...
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	0 8 0	Socæ eorum (iv hominum) Regis erat.....		Trysull and Seisdon	supra
3 qu. in lg. et lat	30	1 10 0	Silva habet 3 quarentinas in long. et lat.		{ Kingshall in Sedgeley and (Bilston)..... }	supra
2 quar. \times 1 quar.	20	1 0 0		Bushbury Part of	supra
2 quar. \times 1 quar.	20	1 0 0	Pendeford in Tettenhall	supra	
2 quar. \times 1 quar.	20	0 8 0	Moseley in Bushbury	supra	
16910	55 17 0				Codsall	1288
						73517

the Modern Hundreds of Brimstree and Stottesden, both in Shropshire.

2 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	1440	10 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 5 solidis.....	Claverley in Brimstree Hd....	8000
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	1080	4 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 2 solidis.....	Norley Regis in Stottesden Hd }	6435
2 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	1440	5 0 0	Alveley in Stottesden Hd.	2674
2 leu. \times 1 leu.	2880	5 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 2 solidis.....	Quat in Stottesden Hd.	supra
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	2 0 0	Romesley in Alveley Parish..	1570
1 leu. \times $\frac{1}{2}$ leu.	720	2 0 0	Rudge in Stottesden Hd.	1570
1 qu. \times 1 qu.	10	0 5 0	Edrie liboro tenuit de Leurico Conito.....	Shipley in Brimstree Hd.....	alibi
3 leu. \times 1 leu.	4320	18 0 0	Ibi una quarentina quereuum in long. et lat.	Werfield in Brimstree Hd. ...	10306
3 leu. \times 1 leu.	4320	18 0 0	{ Ibi III. Molini de xi. solidis et pisearia de xv. solidis..... De hac terra sunt III. hide vaste..... Hugo filius Rogerii Conitis tenet (in Stafford) de Ce- mitatu, v. mansiones et pertinent ad Gurlvelo..... }		
11890	46 5 0				28985

reddit firmam hujus Manerii in Suinesford, id est xi libras denariorum de viginti in orâ."

"Rex Willelmus tenet Clent (in Clent Hundred). Rex Edwardus tenuit. Ibi ix. hidæ. In dominio est 1 caruca et dimidia, &c., &c. Hujus Manerii firma iiij librarum redditur in Suinesford in Stadfordscire."

Here, by the way, is further evidence of what has been already concluded from other premises, viz., that Staffordshire and Worcestershire were not visited by the same Domesday Commissioners. The whole of the above Worcestershire extracts tend to that conclusion. Moreover, the expression "alia caruca potest fieri" was not in the dictionary of the Midland Commissioners. They often expressed the same thing, but always in a different form.

ALIA ERNLEGE. Lower Arley it was formerly called. Now it is indistinctively buried in Arley, though the latter retains a record of the old distinction, in that it is usually called Upper Arley.

Osbern fitz Richard and his father, Richard Serupe, being Normans, had nevertheless, before the Conquest, been considerable land-holders in Worcestershire. The Staffordshire Commissioners made presentment of the violence done by Osbern to the Canons of Wolverhampton. I cannot say what the immediate result was. Ultimately the Canons were rejected from Upper Arley, and the Barons of Richard's Castle lost their hold on Lower Arley. The whole of Arley escheated to the Crown. In or before Henry the Second's time it was given to Adam de Port, on whose forfeiture in 1172 it again escheated to the Crown.

COTE. The name is obsolete. A fine of King John's time (communicated by Colonel Wrottesley) indicates that the estate of Cote was bounded in one direction by the Manor of Penn.

IN TOTENHALE "habent" (ipsi Canonici de Hantone) "unam hidam, &c., &c. Hæc terra non pertinet ad Hantone," &c., &c. The last statement is corrective of the inference naturally resulting from the first. I have alluded to the subject before (*supra* pp. 45, 46).

The ambiguities of this part of Domesday arose in the compilers of the Record setting out with the idea that a schedule entitled "Terra Sansonis Clerici" might with equal propriety be entitled "Terra Clericorum de Hanton." Neither title was applicable to the whole Schedule. In this case the Chaplain,

Sampson, held an estate in Tettenhall, and another, at Bilbrook in Tettenhall, over the Priests of Tettenhall, and under the King. It remains a question whether King William, finding these estates in the occupation of the Clerks of Hampton, had appointed them rather to the use of the Priests of Tettenhall, or whether, finding them members of King Edward's demesne, William had been the first so to dedicate them. In the table I have adopted the latter idea.

CATSPELLE (Gospel End). It was Erdeswick himself who thus translated "Catspelle." We should not marvel at such a corruption or perversion having arisen in the district, and in the 18th century. But the 16th century seems an early day for the nomenclature of any part of England to have been changed by puritanical affectation. However, Erdeswick found a place then called "Gospel End." He was neither a Puritan nor a Prophet. The place still retains the name. Its identity with the Domesday "Catspelle" is exceedingly probable, and the more remarkable.

ELMELECOTE (Amblecote). Amblecote being in the parish of Old Swinford is in the Diocese of Worcester, but manorially Amblecote belongs to Staffordshire, Old Swinford to Worcestershire. Both were Fitz Ansculf's at Domesday. Before the Conquest a Thane, Ulwin, had been Lord of Old Swinford, but two lesser Thanes had held Amblecote of the Mercian Earls. And this is what Domesday means by saying that "two homagers of Earl Algar held it sine socâ." Whoever had the soke of a manor had the rights and profits incidental to the Manorial Court.

COCORTONE. This vill is obsolete. Its three holders T.R.E. had been free, but their soke was in the Crown. They had evidently owed suit to King Edward's Manor Court of Swinford-Regis, of which manor another and smaller part of Cocorton was a mere appendage down to the date of Domesday. At the same date, all Cocorton, whether the King's or Fitz Ansculf's, share, was "waste." Hence possibly the ulterior suppression of the name of the vill.

SEISDON HUNDRED.—The Staffordshire Hundred of Seisdon, shorn of eight manors, which, since Domesday, have been *misèd* into Shropshire, appears at the present day to contain 77,367 acres.

Of this area 3670 acres in Rowley Regis were not prefigured }
by any extant expression or constructive intention of the Domes- } 3,670
day commissioners.

The Table (No. III.) of Seisdon Hundred will further shew }
how 73,517 acres of the said area were prefigured by Domesday } 73,517
under still assignable manors or situations.

And there are 180 acres in Woodford Grange of which the }
Domesday antecedent cannot so certainly be predicated, but } 180
which were doubtless involved in some Manor of Seisdon }
Hundred. 73,697 73,697

77,367

§ We have two distinct methods of Domesday estimate and measurement with which we compare this apparently correlative area of 73,697 acres.

§ Under the old or hidational system, Domesday registers 103½ hides as in that portion of Seisdon Hundred which is now under notice. Here therefore the Domesday hide is found to be in correlative with 712 acres of modern ascertainment.

§ The exacter measures assigned by Domesday for the same area are—

161½ Plough-lands which, at the rate of 120 acres each, give, of	}	19,380 acres
arable land		
Of Wood-land, measured by the league or quarentine, but reducible	}	16,910 acres
to acreage		
Of Meadow-land actually measured by the acre in Domesday ..		88 acres
		<u>36,378 acres</u>

In this case then, the Domesday hide correlated with 351½ acres of contemporary and exacter measurement.

§ Here the now ascertained acreage of the Hundred exceeds the Domesday exact measures by 40,989 acres. The difference probably consisted of pasture-land, moors and downs, which, unless they were forestal, were not reckoned nor valued by the Midland Commissioners.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (NO. III.) OF THAT PART OF SEISDON HUNDRED WHICH, SINCE DOMESDAY, HAS BEEN ANNEXED TO SHROPSHIRE

A summary of the territorial statistics of this district has been already given (*supra* pp. 22, 23.)

Each of its 63 hides correlated on an average with 460 acres of modern ascertainment or with 402 acres of Domesday registration.

The difference between modern measurement (28,985 acres) and Domesday exact measurements (25,365 acres) was only 3,620 acres. This may be taken as so much pasture-land not included under any forestal denomination, and therefore disregarded by the Midland Commissioners.

NOTES ON THE TABLES (Nos. IV. AND V.) OF CUDDLESTONE HUNDRED.

The tables themselves supply such notes on this Hundred as were reducible to the capacity of such tables.

CHENET (Cannock). The identification of Chenet with Cannock is no new assumption. It is indubitable, and yet Erdeswick did not apprehend it. The Pipe-Roll of King Henry II. spells Cannock as "Chenot," which is very near to the Domesday form. The great forest area attributed by Domesday to Chenet is quite decisive of the identity with Cannock. The Domesday Scribe, having inadvertently given the breadth of this forest before the length, corrected himself by superscribing the letters *b* and *a* over the respective quantities, thus indicating the requisite transposition, much as a scribe of the nineteenth century would do it.—
"Silva ^biiij leuwas lata et ^avi. leuwas longa."

ACTONE (Acton Trussell). The hidage of Acton is omitted in Domesday. Contemporary note of the said omission was made by affixing the letter *r* in the margin. The said letter in such cases stands for "require" ("look again" at the original note). The clerks to whom such orders may have been addressed never seem to have executed them.

WITESTONE. This estate of Burton Abbey, being named immediately before Beddinton, would seem to be Whiston in Penkridge rather than Whiston in Totmonslow Hundred. The chartulary of Burton Abbey will probably contain some solution of the question.

BEDDINTONE. Bedinton in Penkridge is now obsolete. Erdeswick couples it with Pillaton Hall, as of the fee of Burton Abbey (see Harwood's Erdeswick, p. 179). Bishop Lyttelton, identifying Beddintone with Beddenhall, was surely in error.

HOCINTUNE seems to be obsolete. Its Domesday position between Hilton and Hatherton suggests its whereabouts. Its waste state in A.D. 1086 possibly accounts for the non-reappearance of the name.

TABLE IV. The Domesday Hundred of Culvestan,

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures. Hides. gates.	Terra quot Carnis.	Acres prati.
§Pancriz	Rex Edwardus	Rex Wilhelmus.	Rox in dominio	1 0	4	16
Ad hoc Manerium pertinent hæc membra—							
§In Turgarestone	(Idem Rex)	1 0	3	...
§In Draitone	(Idem Rex)	1 0
§In Comegrave	(Idem Rex)		Rex in domiuiio, part	Unus Tainus ...	1 0	3	18
§In Dunestone	(Idem Rex)	2 0	4	...
§In Covellau et	(Idem Rex)	1 2	3	...
§Beficote	Algar Comes		Rex in domiuiio	0 ½	5	3
§Mera	Algar Comes		Rox in domiuiio	4 0	10	...
§Chenet	Algar Comes		Rex in domiuiio	1 0	15	...
Breude	Ecclesia Sti Ceddæ	Episcopus de Cestre.	Episcopus in dominio	I Presbyter	5 0	20	4
Bercheswic	Ecclesia Sti Ceddæ		Episcopus in dominio	I Presbyter	5 0	4	...
Waletone (pertinens ibidem)	Ecclesia Sti Ceddæ		Episcopus in dominio	{ 4 Bord'ii cum } { 2 earuels	4
Aetono	Ecclesia Sti Ceddæ		Robertus de Ep'o.....	...	(omitted)	4	8
§Broctone et	Ecclesia Sti Ceddæ	Abbatia de Bertone.	"Sunt wasta"
§Bedehala							
*Witestone.....	(Sta Maria de Bertono) ...	Abbatia de Bertone.	Nauuen	1 0	1	...
*Beddintone	(Sta Maria de Bertone) ...		Ibi est unus Villanus.	...	0 2	2	...
*In Ilitone	(Sta Maria de Hautono)...	Sancton. Sancton.	Canonici de Hantone	II liberi homines.	0 3	1	...
*In Hocintune	(Sta Maria de Hantono)...		Canonici de Hantone	...	1 0
In Hargedone.....	Sta Maria de Hantono ...		Eduin et Alric Pr'b'ri	I Miles	3 0	2	...
In Chenwardestone.....	Sta Maria de Hautone ...		Eduin et Alric Pr'b'ri	...	1 0	1	8
In Haltone	(No record)		Eduin et Alric Pr'b'ri	Unus liber homo.	2 0	2	...
In Ferdestan	(No record)		Eduin et Alric Pr'b'ri	(Wasta)	1 0
In Pancriz	(Rex Edwardus).....	Clerici de Regis.	Clerici in dominio	...	1 0	4	...
In Genesbalo	(Rex Edwardus).....		Clerici in dominio	...	2 3	2	...
Halas	Algar Comes	Rogerius Comes.	Rainald (Bailgole) ...	{ Unus Miles..... } { I Presbyter..... }	2 0	15	8
In hac villâ							
Chenistelei	Bernulf		Rainald (Bailgole)	1 0	4	...
Mortone.....	Aluic sine sac et soc		Benedictus	I Miles. I Anglicus	2 0	3	...
Otne	Suain, liber homo.....		Ecclesia Sti Ebrulfi.....	...	2 0	5	1
Nortberie	Alti		Rogerius de Comito ...	II Presbyteri	2 2	8	1
Waltone	Ahnund		Rogorius (de Lacy)	2 0	3	½
In villâ de Burtone	(No record)	Henricus de Ferrers.	{ Radulfus, Miles ... } { Henrici de Ferrers }	...	(omitted)	...	20
					48 0½	128	91½

precisely represented in the existing Hundred of Cuddlestone.

Silva of Domesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Name or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
1 leu. × 1 leu ...	1440	£ s. d. 2 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 5 sol.	Penkridge.....	40506
...	In Draitone una hida vasta est. Terra est (blank)...	(Wolgarston in Penkridge ...	supra
1 leu. × 3 quar.	180	5 0 0	...	(Drayton in Penkridge	supra
...	(Congreve in Penkridge	1420
3 leu. × 2 leu. ...	8640	1 10 0	Molinus de 30 denariis	(Dunston	alibi
1 leu. × 2 quar.	120	4 10 0	{ Molinus de 3 sol. et 4000 anguillis. Ibi 4 hidae cum	{ Befeote in Guosall.....	alibi
6 leu. × 4 leu. ...	34560	1 0 0	{ appendiciis	Rugeley	3411
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	2160	5 0 0	Silva (see note). Cheuet T.R.E. nil reddebat.....	Meertown and Forton	3718
...	Ibi II "Molini" de 4 solidis	Cannock	10775
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	2160	0 15 0	{ "Terra est iij carucis." In dominio est una et II	Brewood	11832
3 quar. × 2 quar.	60	1 0 0	{ Villani cum Presbytero (blank)	Baswich.....	6608
...	{ Ad hoc M "(Bercheswic)" pertinet Waletoe.	Walton in Baswich	supra
...	{ Ibi sunt 4 Bordarii, &c.	Acton Trussell in Baswich ...	supra
...	{ Ibi Molinus de 2 sol. The sign r in margin (see	{ Brockton in Baswich	supra
...	{ note)	{ Bednall in Baswich	supra
...	{ "Ipse Episcopus tenet Broctone et Bedehala ...	Whistou in Peukridge	supra
...	{ Ad Bercheswic pertineat, et sunt Wasta "	Bedintou in Peukridge	supra
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	360	0 4 0	(See note as to this locality)	Hilton in Wolverhampton
...	...	0 7 4	(See note as to this locality)	Obs. (? in Wolverhampton)...	alibi
...	{ Ibi 2 liberi homines et 4 Bordarii habent 2 carucas.	Hatherton in Wolverham'ton	...
...	{ "In Hocintune 1 hida wasta "	Kinvastou in Wolverham'ton	...
...	{ Tota hæc canonicorum terra valet per	Hilton, Part of	supra
...	{ annui £6	{ Featherstone in Wolver-	alibi
1 leu. × 4 quar.	240	0 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 3 solidis	hampton.....	...
...	{ Terra est ij carucis. In d'no est una cum 1 servo;	Peukridge, Part of	supra
...	{ et unus liber homo cum 2 Bordariis habent 1½	Gnosall, Part of.....	10497
...	{ carucas; et 3 villani habent ibi 1 carucam	Sheriff Hales	5317
...	{ "Ipsi (Eduin et Alric) habent in Ferdestan ihidam	Knightley in Gnosall	supra
...	{ wastam"	Moreton in Gnosall.....	supra
...	In Pancriz tenent ix Clerici de Rege.....	High Onn in Church Eatou...	...
...	Ibi Molinus de xii denariis	Norbury.....	3313
...	{ Ibi Molinus de 3 solidis. In hac villâ habet S'tus	Waltou Grauge in Guosall ...	alibi
...	{ Ebrulfus 1 carucam cum Presbytero qui habet 2	Burton in Castle Church	alibi
...	{ boves. Hoc manerium calumniatur Vicecomes		
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	2160	8 0 0	{ ad firmam Regis et Comitatus testatur quod Ed-		
...	{ winus Comes tenuerit		
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	720	0 10 0	{ Unus Miles cum uno Anglico habent 1 carucam.		
...	{ Ibi Molinus de 16 denariis		
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	720	4 0 0	(See note as to the Domesday Tenure of Norbury) ...		
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	720	3 0 0	(See note as to this locality)		
...		
4 quar. × 4 quar.	160	(omitted)	{ In villâ de Burtone, habet Radulfus, Miles Henrici, }		
...	{ 1 carucam in dominio et iij Bordarios cum 1 ear. }		
54400	40 1 4				97397

TABLE V. The Domesday Hundred of Culvestan (*continued*),

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures.			Terra quot Carucis.	Acres prati.
					Hides.	Virgates.	Carucates.		
§Bradelea cum append.	Robertus de Stafford.	1	0	12
§In Bernertone	1	0
§In Abetone	2	0
§In Lutiude	1	0
§In Belintone	2	0
§In Burtone	Eduinus Comes		Robertus de Stafford in dominio	...	2	2	...	44	...
§In Selchemore	1	0
§In Longenalre	1	0
§In Mutone	2	0
§In Alverdestone		Quidam Miles	...	1	0	15
§In Ullavestone		Rob's de Staff. in d'no	...	2	0
(Anonymous Manor)	Uluric	Robertus de Stafford.	Urfer	...	2	0	...	2	...
In Haltone	Uluric		Urfer	...	4	0	...	4	6
In Levintone	Ailric et Ormar		Gislebert	...	0	2	...	1	...
In Wilbrestone	III Taini		Laurencius	...	3	0	...	5	3
In Brumitone	V Taini		Warin	...	2	0	...	3	8
In Brumhelle	V Fratres		Warin	...	1	0	2
In Ruscote pertinente ibidem	(Idem)		(Idem Warin)	...	1	0
In Estretone	III Taini		Herveus	I Miles	3	0	1	6	6
In Etone	Ordmer		Herveus	...	1	0	...	3	...
In Gragelie	Bodin		Herveus	...	1	0	...	2	1
In Orretone	Ailric	Robertus de Stafford.	Clodoan	...	1	0	...	2	...
In Sardone	IV Taini		Herveus	...	2	0
In Cove	Ailric		Bueret	...	1	0	...	2	3
In Copchale	III liberi homines		Bueret	...	1	0	...	3	...
In Servosed	II liberi homines		Herveus	...	3	0	...	3	...
In Eitone	Wilegrip		Godrie	I Presbyter	3	0	...	7	4
In Levehale	III liberi homines		Briend et Drogo	...	3	0	...	7	2
In Ricardescote	Eduin Comes		Robertus	...	2	2	...	4	2
In Monetvile	Eduin Comes		Walter et Ansger	...	1	0	...	2	2
In Escningetone	Godeva Comitissa	Willelmus filius Ansculf.	Rogerius	...	2	0	...	6	...
In Biscopesherie pertinente ibidem	Eadem	...	(Idem)	...	0	1
In Redbaldestone	Alti	Ricardus Forsterius.	3	0	...	3	...
In Estendone	1	0
In Westone, et Bertone, et Broctone	{ IX Taini pro IX Maneris	Reinald Batifole.	In dominio 3 hid.	{ Amerland 1 hid. et ibi habet 3 serv et 1 Bord.	4	0	...	6	...
Scotestan	(not recorded)	Levild.	0	2	...	3	2
§In Seresdone	Gamel	Udi	1	0	...	2	1
§In Bigeford	Ailric Ipse	Ailric	Taini Regis Willelmi	...	0	3	...	1	...
§In Chenet	(not recorded)	Ailric.	I	1	...
§Anne	Ailric	Ricardus.	0	2	...	2	...
Cillentone (In Culvestan Hundred, Warwickshire. Domesday, fo. 243.a.2.)	(not stated)	Willelmus filius Corbucion.	3	0	...	6	2
Lepelie (In Codwestan Hun. Northamptonshire. Domesday, fo. 222.b.2.)	Ecclesia Sancti Remigii de Remis	Ecclesia Sti Remighi.	3	0	...	6	16
In Mersetone (ibidem)	Goduin cum sac et soc	...	{ II homines Sti Remigii	...	1	0	...	1	...
Brought over					72	2	2	139	87
					48	0½	0	128	91½
					120	2½	2	267	178½

precisely represented in the existing Hundred of Cuddlestone.

Silva of Domesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Hundred.	Modern Name, or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
1 leu. x dim. leu.	720	£ s. d.	Ibi Molinus de 5 solidis. Ipse Robertus (de Stafford) tenet Bradalea cum appendiciis Terra est xliij carucis inter omnes Berewichas. In Bradelle 1 hida tantum. Ibi est in domiuto 1 ear. &c., &c. In Bernertone 1 hida. In Abetone 2 hida, &c. &c., &c. In Ullavestone 2 hida Hæ terre pertinent ad Bradelle. In his sunt xlvij Villani et xxvi Bordarii habentes xvij caru- cas. In dominio est una (caruca) in Alverdestone et quidam Miles et xv acie prati Totum Manerium cum membris valet vii libras.	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Bradley, near Stafford..... Obsolete	5464 ...
1 quar. silvæ ...	10	0 16 0	Ipsi Robs (de Stafford) tenet ij hid et Urfer de co. Ibi Molinus de 12 denariis	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Apeton in Bradley..... Littywood in Bradley	supra supra
1 quar. x ½ quar.	5	1 10 0	Terra est 1 caruca. Vasta est. Valet 2 solidos	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Billington in Bradley	supra
½ leu. x ½ leu.	360	0 15 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Burton in Castle Church) Silkmore in Castle Church)	3774 supra
2 quar. x 2 quar.	40	0 10 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Longner in Bradley	supra
1 leu. x 1 quar.	120	1 0 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Mitton in Penkridge.....	...
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Alston in Bradley	supra
1 quar. silvæ ...	10	0 16 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Woollaston in Bradley.....	supra
1 quar. x ½ quar.	5	1 10 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Weston Jones in Norbury ...	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Haughton.....	1860
½ leu. x ½ leu.	360	0 15 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Lownton in Norbury	supra
2 quar. x 2 quar.	40	0 10 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Wilbroughton in Gnosall.....	supra
1 leu. x 1 quar.	120	1 0 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Brineton in Blynhill	infra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Blynhill	2925
½ leu. x 3 quar.	180	0 16 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Obsolete (near Blynhill)
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Stretton.....	1585
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Water Eaton in Penkridge ...	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Galley in Penkridge	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Otherton in Penkridge	supra
½ leu. x 1 quar.	60	0 16 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Saredon in Shareshill	infra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Coven in Brewwood
½ leu. x ½ leu.	360	0 10 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Coppenhall	963
1 quar. x 1 quar.	10	1 0 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Shareshill	1985
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Church Eaton	4201
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Levedale in Penkridge
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Rickerscote in Castle Church	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Obsolete	alibi
1 leu. x 1 leu.	1440	1 0 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Essington in Bushbury Parish	alibi in Salsdon Hundred
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Bushbury, Part of.....	...
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Rodbaston in Penkridge	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Obsolete (see note)	alibi
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Weston-under-Lyzeard	2398
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	2 0 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Beighterton in do.	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Brockton Grange in Sheriff) Hales Parish	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Shushions in Church Eaton..	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Little Saredon in Shareshill	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Bickford in Penkridge.....	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Cannock, Part of	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Little Oun in Church Eaton.	supra
2 leu. x ½ leu.	1440	1 10 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Chillington in Brewwood	supra
3 quar. x 3 quar.	90	2 10 0	...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Lapley	3450
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	Marston in Church Eaton,) Part of 864 acres	supra
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	...	28008
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	...	97397
...	Cuddlestone Hundred.	...	126005

The annual value of Hilton and Hocintune is included in the £6 which arose from the Chapter of Hampton's lands in four Hundreds. I have tabulated the revenue under Seisdon Hundred. (See Table III., columns 11 and 12.)

HALAS (Sheriff Hales.) The Priest, who held under the Abbot of St. Evroul, had two oxen, says Domesday. Two oxen indicated the fourth part of a plough-team (*caruca*.)

The Sheriff of Staffordshire, claiming Hales as the King's, was supported by the *Curia Comitatus*, both authorities opining that whatever had been Earl Edwin's must needs be the escheat of King William. They probably were not as yet informed of the King's grant thereof to the Earl of Shrewsbury. It is seldom that the Staffordshire Domesday takes any notice of the sometime seizure of Earl Edwin. His father, Algar, is the antecedent Earl usually spoken of.

The Priest who held under the Abbot of St. Evroul was the Parish Priest and Incumbent of Hales Church. His patrons, the Abbot and Convent of St. Evroul, had the advowson of Hales, by gift of Warin Calvus, the predecessor of Rainald Bailgiote in the Manor of Hales and in the Shrievalty of Shropshire.

NORTBERIE (Norbury). Earl Roger's tenant at Norbury, written "Regerus" in Domesday, is written "Rogerius" as his tenant at Walton. This Roger I long since discovered to have been either Roger Venator, or Roger de Lacy, both holders of Shropshire estates under the Norman Earl. The race of Kilpec, Royal Foresters of Herefordshire, afterwards held Norbury, and they were lineally descended from Roger Venator, but they held it, not in capite, as was the case with other estates which they derived from their said ancestor,—they held it under De Lacy of Ewyas. Now Roger de Lacy was the ancestor of De Lacy of Ewyas. He was therefore most probably the "Regerus" who, in 1086, held Norbury of the Earl of Shrewsbury.

WALTONE. My only authority for naming "Walton Grange, in Gnosall," as the later representative of Earl Roger's Manor, is an anonymous Annotator on Erdeswick, who is not often mistaken. The place is named in Domesday, next to Norbury evidently as being held by Rogerius, the Earl's tenant in both places. The Earl had two other manors, viz., Knightley and Moreton, in Gnosall parish, but under-held by other tenants; so that the non-mention of Waltone, consecutively with Knightley and Moreton, is no argument against its geographical proximity.

The way in which Walton became "Walton Grange" was because the manor, or at least a moiety thereof, was given, in the time of Henry II., to Buildwas Abbey. The giver was "Walter fitz Hereman." To connect him and his tenure of Walton with the Domesday tenure of the same, I shall have to say more under Blithfield.

BRADELEA. Only one of the Appendiciæ of Robert de Stafford's great Manor of Bradley remains unidentified. This is Bernertone. Erdeswick identified it with "Bernerton," a locality which, if known to him, has escaped my research.

It is remarkable that Domesday speaks of the Appendiciæ of Bradley as "Berewichæ." The term is very opposite, but it is oftener used in other counties of the Midland Circuit than in Staffordshire.

ANONYMOUS MANOR.—Robert de Stafford's anonymous Manor in Culvestan Hundred, was afterwards known as Weston Jones. Like HALTONE (Haughton) Weston was held by Urfer at Domesday, and like Haughton, Weston Jones was afterwards held by the knightly race of De Haughton, the undoubted descendants of Urfer. (See Antiquities of Shropshire, Vol. III., pp. 25, 26).

ESTRETONE (Stretton).—The Domesday orthography, is an instance of the Norman propensity, to prefix a vowel (usually E) to English names commencing with double or treble consonants. I have given many instances of this in my treatise on the Somerset Survey. (Vol. I., pp. 190). I observe in illustration of the same propensity that Ordericus wrote Stafford as *Estafort*.

Herveus, Domesday tenant of Stretton, was ancestor of the knightly race of De Stretton, of whom another Hervey was Sheriff of Staffordshire in the time of Henry II.

EITONE (Church Eaton), is distinguishable from **ETONE** (Water Eaton) in the same fief and hundred, by the Domesday mention of a resident Priest. The Priest implies that Parish Church which gave its distinctive name to Church Eaton.

RICARDESCOTE (Rickerscote) "jacet ad Bradclie,"—is an appendage of Bradley. The Domesday note was added because Robertus held Rickerscote in fee.

MONETVILE, now obsolete, follows. There is every symptom that its Domesday status and situation were proximately as those of Rickerscote; but the note as to its being an appendage of Bradley is wanting.

BISCOPEBERIE (Bushbury, Part of). Essington and a part of Bushbury, which pertained manorially to Essington, were in Bushbury Parish, though in Culvestan Hundred. The bulk of Bushbury Parish, and the Manor of Bushbury itself, were in Seisdon Hundred. The anomaly endures to this day,—a strong instance of the exactness with which the boundaries of Staffordshire Hundreds are presumed to have been maintained.

SERESDONE (Little Saredon), BIGEFORD (Bickford).—Tenures *in thenagio* were of various types in King Edward's time. After the Conquest few were allowed to remain, and those few were by no means of one complexion. Domesday says of the Thane, Gamel, that his soke was King Edward's. I suppose that to mean that the Suit of Little Saredon was due to the Manor-court of Penkridge. Of Alric, Domesday says that he was a free-man. I am left to conclude that Bickford was a manor with its own free court. Of the existing condition of the said Alric, and of Udi, the successor of Gamel, Domesday only says that with Chenuin (the Thane of Codsall, in Seisdon Hundred) they contributed to a rent of 12 shillings, payable to the Sheriff. This kind of thenage was of a very Norman type. Alric, thus mentioned as Thane of Bickford at two periods, was probably identical with Aluric, who held an estate in Cannock, in A.D. 1086; and with Alric who had ceased to hold ANNE at the same period. This seeming connexion induces me to identify the Domesday Manor of—

ANNE with the vill afterwards known as Little Onn. That Great Onne should be written Otne in Domesday is only another instance of the perversity or indifference with which the Norman scribes of Domesday treated English nomenclature.

CHILLINGTON.—LAPLEY.—MARSTON. Notes on the Domesday position of these three Manors have been already given.—(*Supra*, pp. 3, 5, 6, 15.)

CULVESTAN (now Cuddlestone) HUNDRED.—The Staffordshire Hundred of Cuddlestone (including three manors erroneously codified by Domesday Clerks as in Warwickshire or in Northamptonshire) appears now to contain 139,870 acres.—

The Tables of Culvestan Hundred (Nos. IV. and V.) will show how 126,005 acres of the said area were prefigured by Domesday in the situations which modern topography defines or suggests.

Further, there are 13,865 acres discovered by modern topography which cannot be so definitely assigned to this or that Domesday manor, but which must be taken, individually and wholly, to have been prefigured in some or other measurements of the Table¹

The two quantities combined give the gross area aforesaid, viz., 139,870 statute acres.

We have two distinct methods of Domesday estimate and measurement, with each of which we now proceed to compare this apparently correlative area of 139,870 statute acres:—

§ Under the old or hidational system, Domesday registers, or is construed to register, $120\frac{7}{10}$ hides and 2 carucates of land; say then $122\frac{7}{10}$ hides. Here, therefore, the Domesday hide is found to be in proximate and apparent correlevance with 1,158 acres of modern ascertainment.

§ The exacter or non-hidational measures assigned by Domesday for the same area are—

267 plough-lands, which, at the rate of 120 acres each, give—					
Of Arable land	32,040 acres
Of wood-land, in terms reducible to acreage	59,955 acres
Of meadow-land, definitely measured by the acre in Domesday	..				178½ acres
					<hr/> 92,173½ acres <hr/>

Here then the Domesday hide correlated with 763 acres of contemporary and exacter measurement.

§ In Cuddlestone Hundred the now ascertained acreage (139,870) exceeds the registered acreage of Domesday (viz., 92,173½ acres) by 47,696½ acres. The difference consisted probably of pasturage, moors, and downs, which, unless they were afforested were not reckoned nor valued by the Domesday Commissioners. But we must remember that some part of this excess, being afforested, went perhaps to swell certain woodland areas appurtenant to manors of Offlow Hundred (*vide supra*, pp. 34, 62).

¹ These 13,865 acres consist of the following, viz.:—Tedesley Hay (2,430 acres), Cheslyn Hay (827 acres), both probably deemed appurtenant to Cannock in Domesday estimates; also 10,608 acres of the 17,449 acres which constitute the present parish of Wolverhampton.

The last item needs further explanation. Wolverhampton proper (3,396 acres), Bilston (1,845 acres), and Bentley (1,650 acres)—together, 6,891 acres—were in the Hundred of Seisdon. And 17,449 acres, less 6,891 acres, are 10,608 acres, which I presume to have been in Culvestan Hundred—viz., in Hilton (two manors), in Hatherton, Kinvaston, Featherstone, and Hocintune, or else in some other manors whose cognate parishes may be of less area than their Domesday originals.

TABLE VI. The Domesday Hundred of Pirehel, *alias* Pireholle,

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures.			Terra quot Garnis.	Acra prati
					Hides.	Virgates.	Carucates.		
Trenham	(Rox Edwardus).....	Rex Willelmus.	Rex in dominio	{ I Præpositus I Presbyter. I Liber Homo III Vill'i et vi Bordarii	1	0	...	3	...
§ Seandone cum append. ...	Algar Comes	Rex Willelmus.	Rex in dominio	1	0	...	15	8
§ Certelio	Algar Comes		Rex in dominio	I Presbyter	1	0	...	(om.)	10
§ Wistanetono	Algar Comes		Rex in dominio	2	0	...	(om.)	...
§ Pinchetel	Algar Comes		Rex in dominio	2	0	...	11	2
† In Bidolf	Griffin	1	0	...	3	...
† In Buchenole	Chetel	0	1½	...	3	...
† In Aelei	Achi	1	0	...	3	...
† In Heolla	Alward	0	½	...	1	...
† In Mess	Ulfere	(bl.)	2	...
† In Scelfitone	Alviet	0	1	...	2	...
† In Hetone	Alviet	0	2	...	2	...
† In Fuleford	Almar		{ Omnis hæc terra Regis Wasta est }	...	0	1	...	2	...
† In Melewieh	Rafwinus	0	1	...	2	...
† In Coto	Elving	0	1	...	1	...
† In Heutone	Ulfac	Episcopus de Cestre.	0	1	...	2	...
† In Hildulvestone	Uluric	0	½	...	2½	...
† In Cotewoldestune	Rafwinus et Alwiu	0	1	...	2	...
† In Helcote	Turbern	0	½	...	1	...
† In Estone	Oda	0	1	1	1	...
Haiwodo	Ecclesia Sti Cedde		Episcopus in dominio	I Presbyter	0	2	...	10	6
Hæ terra subscriptæ pertinent ad Haiwode.—	...		Picot de Episcopo	{ Nigellus de Pieoto	(bl.)	(bl.)	3
Hustedone		Nigellus de Episcopo	...	0	2	...	(bl.)	3
Ulseli		Alfelmus de Episcopo	...	(bl.)	5	...
Prodeswellc	Setus Cedde		Episcopus in dominio	I Presbyter	7	0	...	(om.)	4
Ecleshelle	Ad Eccleshelle pertinent hæc membra.—		Leuenot de Episcopo	...	(om.)	(om.)	...	(om.)	...
Offeleia	2	...
In Fletesbroc	1	...
In Cervernest	1	...
In Cetervillo	½	...
In Dorveslau	2	...
In Cerveledone		{ Omnes hæc terræ sunt Wastæ	1	...
In Cerleton	(Setus Cedde)	1	...
In Cota	2	...
In Mess	2½	...
In Bادهale	2	...
In Sliudone	1	...
In Broctone	Episcopus de Cestre.	Hæc vasta est	½
In Hereborgestoue	2	1
In Haspeleia	3	...
In Crochestone	2	...
§ Scotelslei	(Ecclesia Sti Cedde)		Nigellus	(om.)	1
§ Mortone	(Eadem Ecclesia)		Nigellus	(om.)	2
§ Dregetone	(Eadem Ecclesia)		Nigellus
§ Sotelhelle	(Eadem Ecclesia)		Frane et Fragrin	2	3
"Hæc membra pertiunt ad eundem Manerium."	ad eundem Manerium m."		3	...
§ In Brambi et		{ IV Taini	{ Alii bo- mines de eis }	2	12
§ Podemore		{ IV Francigenæ	4	...
§ In Tunestal	{ Ecclesia Sancti. Cedde	3	...
§ In Suesneshed	4	...
§ In Linehalle	2	...
§ In Waletone	3	...
§ In Edbaldestone	2	...
§ In Wodestone	3	...
§ In Chnitestone	2	...
§ Cesteforde et	Episcopus de Cestre.	3	...
§ Estone et	{ (Ecclesia Sancti) Cedde		{ II Francigenæ et	{ I Tainus de Ep'o	3	5
§ Doeheisig et	2	...
§ Brigeftort et	1	...
§ Cote
In villa de Stadford	Abbatia Stæ Mariæ de Bertone	1	2	...	2	16
Brunlege	Abbas de Bertone	I Presbyter	0	2	...	1	...
Derlavestone	II homines	0	3	...	2	6
Mepford		Nauuen, de Ecclesiâ	0	2	...	2	3
In Statford Civitate	(Not recorded)	xiiij Canonici Prebendarii (de Stafford)	{ Tenent de Rege in elemosina	3	0	...	9	20
*Haswic	(Canonici de Hantone)	Sansone.	Canonici de Hantone	...	5	0	...	8	...
					31	0½	5½	147½	105

mainly represented by the existing Hundred of Pirehill.

Silva of Domesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Name or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
1 leu. x $\frac{1}{2}$ leu. ...	720	5 15 0	{ Rex tenet Trenham. Ibi I hida. Terra est iij carucis. In dominio est una et v Villani cum I Bordario et Preposito habent ii carucas et dimidiam. Ibi Presbyter et unus liber homo habent II ear. Ibi III Villani et vi bordarii cum I caruca }	Trentham.....	6900
1 leu. x $\frac{1}{2}$ leu. ...	720	6 0 0	Ibi II hida cum appendiciis	Sandou	3640
1 leu. x $\frac{1}{2}$ leu. ...	720	5 10 0	Ibi II hida cum appendiciis	Chartley	1633
1 leu. x 1 quar.	120	6 0 0	In Bidolf est una hida cum appeudiciis	Wolstanton	10500
1 leu. x 2 quar.	240	6 0 0	Penkhull in Stoke-upon-Trent	infra
.....	Biddnall	5635
.....	Bucknall in Stoke-upon-Trent	alibi
.....	Oakley in Mucclestone	infra
.....	Heighley in Andley	alibi
.....	Mill Meese in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Shelton in Stoke-upon-Trent	alibi
.....	Obsolete	alibi
.....	Fulford in Stone	alibi
.....	Milwich, Part of
.....	Coton Hayes in Milwich	alibi
.....	{ In Cote est una virgata terra cum appendiciis. }	Enson in St. Mary's, Stafford	alibi
.....	{ Terra est I carucæ. }	Hilderstone in Stone, Part of	alibi
.....	{ (As to the identity of Hentone with Enson, see note) }	Cotwalton in Stone, Part of	alibi
.....	Hilcote in Cheshire	alibi
.....	{ In Estone et una Carnata terræ et una virgata terræ. Terra est I carucæ. }	Aston in Stone, Part of	alibi
2 leu. x 1 leu. ...	2880	2 0 0	Molinus de 5 solidis.	{ Great Haywood in Colwich }	alibi
.....	{ and Stowe Parishes }
.....	0 10 9	{ "Ibi" (blank as to hidage; and in margin) "r. q. t're" (meaning require quantum terræ) }	Hixon in Colwich and Stowe	alibi
.....	0 3 4	{ Ibi (blank as to hidage) pertinet ad Halwode. }	Wolsley in Colwich	alibi
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. x 2 quar.	120	0 13 4	{ Terra est v carucis. }	Fradsell in Colwich	alibi
4 leu. x 2 leu. ...	11520	4 0 0	Ibi ij Molini de 4 solidis.	Eccleshall	21460
.....
.....	0 10 0	Bishop's Offley and Adbaston	4560
.....	Flashbrook in Adbaston	alibi
.....	Charnes in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Chatcull in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Obsolete
.....	Chapel Chorlton, Part of (?)
.....	Chapel Chorlton in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Cotes Quarter in Eccleshall
.....	Cold Meese in Cotes Heath
.....	Badenhall in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Sindon in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Brockton in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Broughton in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	0 10 0	{ In Hereborgestone habet Episcopus dimidiam carucatam terræ. Hæc vasta est. Ipse Episcopus habet iij Villanos et iij bordarios in Haspeleia. Ibi est terra II carucis et pertinet ad Eccleshelle. }	Aspley in Cotes Heath	alibi
.....	1 0 0	{ In Crochestone est terra iij carucis. Ibi habet Episcopus 2 villanos, &c. Ad Eccleshelle pertinet (See page 37 as to this estate) }	Croxtou in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	0 10 0	Obsolete, near Colwich
.....	0 5 0	Moreton in Colwich, Part of	alibi
.....	0 2 6	Drointon in Stowe	alibi
.....	0 10 0	{ (As to the identity of Soteshelle see a future note). (The Manor of Eccleshall is meant as having these members following. (See note on the point) } }	Sugnall in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	{ (Has octo Berewichas tenent iij Taini et iij Francigenæ et alii homines de eis. Ibi sunt in dominio iij carucæ et xliij villani et xxxiij bordarii habentes x carucas inter omnes; et xii acras prati. Totum T.R.E. valebat lxiij solidos. Modo similiter inter omnes. }	Gerards Bromley in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	{ (As to Walestone, now Walton, see future note) }	Podmore in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Tunstall in Adbaston	alibi
.....	Swineshead in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Ellenhall	1750
.....	Walton, near Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Adbaston	4560
.....	Wootton in Eccleshall	alibi
.....	Knighou in Adbaston	alibi
.....	No value entered.	{ Idem Episcopus tenet Cesteforde.—Terra ibi 3 carucis; et Estone et Dochesig.—Ibi terra 3 carucis; et Brigefort.—Ibi terra 2 carucis; et Cote.—Ibi terra 2 bovinus. Has terras tenent II Francigenæ et Unus Tainus de Episcopo. Ad Eccleshelle pertinet.—Ibi sunt x villani et vi Bordarii cum v. carucis, et habent v acras prati. Silva hujus Manerii, Eccleshelle, habet iij leuvas longitudinis et ii leuvas latitudinis. Abbatis Stæ Mariæ de Bertone tenet in villâ Stadford I hidam et dimidiam. Abbatis tenet Brunlege. Ibi dimidia hida cum appendiciis. T.R.E. valebat 30s. et post 10s.; modo 27s. 4d. }	Seighford	4451
$\frac{1}{2}$ leu. x $\frac{1}{2}$ leu. ...	360	3 10 0	Aston in Seighford	supra
2 leu. x 1 leu.	2880	1 0 0	Doxey in Seighford	supra
2 quar. x 1 quar.	20	1 7 4	Bridgeford in Seighford	supra
3 quar. x 1 quar.	30	0 13 0	Coton Clanford in Seighford	supra
.....
.....	3 0 0	{ Ibi Molinus de iij solidis; et ij quarentinæ prati in longitudine et j quarentina in latitudine. }	Stafford, Part of	alibi
.....	{ Modo est wasta propter forestam Regis. Ibi pertinet medietas silvæ quæ est in forestâ. }	Abbot's Bromley	5278
.....	Darlaston in Stone	alibi
.....	Meaford in Stone	alibi
.....
.....	Stafford, Part of	alibi
.....	Near Newcastle	alibi
20330	52 12 3				70367

TABLE VII. The Domesday Hundred of Pireholle (*continued*),

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures.			Terra quot Cancels.	Acres prati.
					Hides.	Virgates.	Carucates.		
*Cobintone	Almundus	Comes Rogerius. Comes Rogerius.	Rainald (Bailgole)	II lib'i ho'ies	2	0	...	4	12
§Mertoue	Ulgar		Ecclesia Sti Ebrulfi	Quidam Walt's cum I car.	1	0	...	10	12
Erlide	(Not recorded)		Robertus	...	1	0	...	6	5
Gaitone et	Almar et		Ulric et	...	1	0	...	4	6
Mersetone	Alric		Goisbert	...	2	0	...	4	4
Cote	Almund		Azelin	Azelinus in d'io	1	0	...	4	19
Coltone	Almund		Azelin	I Presbyter	0	2	...	6	40
In Colt	Almar		Wills Pantul	...	1	0	...	6	2
Cressvale	Goduin		Will's (Pantul)	...	1	0	...	5	3
Dodintone	Suain		Will's (Pantul)	...	0	2	...	6	2
Modredeshale et	Godeva		Wills (Pantul)	...	0	2	...	4	2
In Codewalle	Goduin		Henricus Ferreres	...	0	2	...	4	2
Almentone	Ehmund		Helgot	...	2	0	...	3	...
Ticheshale	Suain		Goifrid	...	1	0	...	4	6
Metford	Ulmur		Rogerius (de Lacy)	I Presbyter	5	0	...	12	20
Essehe	Edmuud	Henricus de Ferrieres.	Humfridus	I Presbyter	3	0	...	4	4
Blidevelt	(Not recorded)	Robertus de Stafford.	Robertus in dominio	...	3	0	...	6	20
§Cebbesio	Tol		Ernald	I Presbyter	0	3	...	8	20
Tillintone	Achil		Cadio	...	0	1	...	4	14
Waletone	Sex Taiui		Cadio	...	2	0	...	6	4
In Estone et	{ Alwin. Alwin. ... }		Gislebert	...	2	0	...	4	12
Stoca	{ Wictric		Gislebert	...	(2	0)	...	(6)	(1)
In Parva Sandone	Alward		Gislebert	...	1	0	...	4	8
In Hotone	Lewinus Episcopus et Ornar		Briend	I Presbyter	2	0	...	6	2
In Selte	Godeva (Comitissa)		Briend	...	0	1	...	2	...
In Ciseworde et	Uluric		Uluiet ipse	...	0	1	...	2	...
In Cippecanole	Siward		Aslen	...	2	0	...	8	10
Offelle	Godric et Uluiet		Godric et Uluiet	...	2	0	...	4	...
In Stantoue et	Suain		Uluiet	...	1	0	...	4	...
In Westone	Uluiet ipse		Uluiet	...	0	1	...	3	...
In Mere	Alward	Robertus de Stafford.	Uluiet	...	0	1	...	2	...
In Sulvertone	Godeva et Edric, lib'i		Helgot	...	1	0	...	3	...
In Nortone et in append.	Augustinus		Helgot	...	0	2	...	6	6
In Madelle	Godric etiam tenuit		Godric	...	0	2	...	2	3
In Heltone et	Tochi et Aluric		Helio	...	0	2	...	2	5
In Risetone	Dunning et Uluric		Vitalis	...	0	2	...	3	1
In Barcardeslin	Ulwiet et Alward		Tanio	...	0	2	...	4	4
In Estone et appendiciis	Ode et Uluric		Goifrid	...	1	0	...	6	16
In Bernulvestone	Suain et Rafuin		Osbern	...	0	3	...	4	1
In Rantone	Alric et Ornar		Hugo	...	0	3	...	6	6
In Cucheland	Goduin et Widegrip		Hugo	...	3	0	...	4	9
In Hekulvestone	Uluiet et Godric		Stenulf	...	3	0	...	3	4
In Bradelle	Bernulf		Nigel	...	0	1	...	2	...
In Coltwe	Ulfac		Nigel	...	0	2	...	3	1
In Mulewiche	Umar		Almar et Uluric	...	0	1	...	1	...
In Tichesale	Toulf	Ricardus Forestarius.	Nigel	...	0	1	...	1	...
In Gestreon	Pata		Nigel	...	0	1	...	2	1
In Titosoure	Sagrin		Nigel	...	0	2	...	3	...
Turvoldesfeld	Gladuui et Goduin		Nigel	...	0	1	...	2	4
Witemore	Goduin		Nigel	...	0	1	...	2	4
Normanscote	Goduin		Rainald Bailgole.	Rainald in dominio	0	2	...	4	2
Heneford	Goduin		Dunning. Tainus Regis	...	(omitted)	1	2
Hancese	Alric et Edric		Leving.	...	1	0	...	3	1
Claitone	...		Leving.	...	0	1	...	1	2
Duhnesdene	Godric et Uluiet		Ulwin.	...	0	2	...	1	1
Ciotone	Goduin		Wlunus	...	0	2	...	1	2
Niwetone	Uluric		Gamel.	...	0	2	...	3	1
Chenistetone	Uluric et Godric		Gamel.	...	0	1	...	1	1
Moclestone	Godric		Gamel.	...	0	1	...	1	3
Wemitone	Ulfelm		Sperri.	...	0	1	...	3	...
Betelege	(Not recorded)	Willelmus Rex.	Alward.	...	0	1	...	3	...
Baltredelege	Wlfric		Nigellus.	...	1	0	...	2	...
Baltredelege	Ernu		Almarus.	1	1	3
Aktidelege	...		Robert de Stafford.	Ernulf (de Hesding)	1
Talc	...		(No notice.)	(No notice)	1
Westone
Fentone
In Mortone
In Bispestone
†Medietas Ecclesie de Stocha
†(Altera medietas ejusd'm)
Burgum de Stadford ...	Rex Edwardus et... Merciorum Comes		(Episcopus de Cestre. Abbatia de Bertona. Rogerius Comes. Hugo filius ejus. Robertus de Stadford. Wills filius Anselm. Henricus de Ferrieres. Presbyteri de Burgo ...)	179 Mansiones, de quibus 51 sunt vastæ et 128 hospitales	61	22 ² / ₃	1 ¹ / ₂	232	308
					31	0 ² / ₃	5 ¹ / ₂	147 ² / ₃	105
					92	3 ¹ / ₂	7	379 ² / ₃	413

Part of Odenet Hundred, Shropshire, now

Tirelire	{ Uluric et ... }	Rogerius Comes.	Wills Pantulf	...	1	0	...	2	...
	{ Rauesward ... }	Comes.							

mainly represented in the existing Hundred of Pirehill.

Silva of Domesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Hundred.	Modern Name, or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
...	£ s. d.	T.R.E. valebat xl solidos et post ij sol. Modo xl sol.	Pirehill Hundred.	Kibblestone in Stone	alibi
...	5 0 0	In Stadford xviii Burgenses pertinent huic Manerio		Marston, in Stafford Parish...	alibi
...	1 10 0	Ibi I hida cum appendiciis		Yarlett	590
1 leu. x dim. leu.	720	1 10 0		{ Gayton	1270
...	1 0 0	Ibi est 1 caruca et vi boves cum 1 servo et 1 Villano.		{ Marston, in Stafford, Part of	
1 leu. x dim. leu.	720	2 0 0		{ Coton, near Stafford	alibi
...	1 0 0		{ Colton	3665
4 quar. x 3 quar.	120	1 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 5 sol. et in Stadford una vasta masura		{ Obsolete:—near Colton	alibi
...	{ Terra est v carucis. Et in Codewalle, quæ ibi		{ Cresswell	800
...	{ pertinet, terra (blank)		{ Derrington in Seighford	alibi
2 leu. x 1 leu.	2880	1 10 0	Ibi iij hida cum appendiciis	Pirehill Hundred.	{ Moddershall in Stone	alibi
3 quar. x 2 quar.	60	0 10 0		{ Cotwalton in Stone, Part of	
...	1 10 0		{ Almincton in Market Dray-	c. 5018
1 leu. x dim. leu.	720	0 15 0		{ ton or in Drayton-in-Hales	
3 quar. x 1 quar.	30	1 0 0	(Ad hoc Manerium pertinuit terra de Stadford)		{ Tixall	2352
2 quar. x 1 quar.	20	4 0 0	in qua Rex precepit fieri Castellum quod modo		{ Meaford in Stone, Part of	alibi
...	1 10 0	(est destructum. (See pp. 19-21)		{ Ashley-on-Tern	2860
2 quar. x 1 quar.	20	3 0 0	{ Achil, liber homo, tenuit et unam carucatam		{ Blithfield	3194
2 quar. x 1 quar.	20	3 10 0	{ hujus terræ sorori sue dedit		Chebsey	4172
...	0 10 0	{ Silva 2 quarentin. long. et una quarentin. lat. et	Pirehill Hundred.	Tillington	947
2 qu. x dim. qu.	10	2 0 0	{ tantundem prati		Walton in Stone	alibi
4 acræ silvæ	4	0 10 0	{ Aluric et Alwin liberi fuerunt. Wiesticum terra		{ Aston in Stone, Part of	alibi
2 leu. x ½ leu.	(1440)	(2 0 0)	{ discedere non poterat		{ Stoke in Stone	alibi
1 leu. x dim. leu.	720	2 0 0	{ Ibi Silva modica		Sandon, Part of	supra
14 acræ gravæ ..	14	2 0 0	{ Sacam et Socan Ornari habuit Rex		Hopton in St. Mary's Stafford.	alibi
dim. leu. x 2 qu.	120	1 0 0	{ Ibi Molinus de 3 solidis		Salt, in St. Mary's, Stafford...	alibi
1 leu. x 1 leu.	1440	0 10 0	{ Godeva tenuit, sed de Ceppecanole reddebat 2 sol.	Shropshire.	{ Cheswardine	(5000)
1 leu. x 1 leu.	1440	2 0 0	{ Ecclesiæ Sti Cedde		{ Chipnall in Cheswardine..}	
3 leu. x 2 leu.	8640	2 0 0	Ibi Molinus de 5 solidis. Ibi xiiij acræ gravæ		{ High Offley	2727
1½ leu. x 1 leu.	2160	1 10 0		{ Standon	
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	0 10 0		{ The Ridge in Standon	2570
2 acræ alneti ..	2	0 10 0		{ Weston in Standon	
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	...	Ibi 2 acræ alneti (See note on alnetum.)		{ Maer	2736
3 acræ silvæ	3	2 0 0		{ Swynnerton	6529
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	1 0 0		{ Norton-in-the-Moors	1529
2 quar. x 1 quar.	20	0 6 0		{ Madeley	5670
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	0 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 12 denariis	Pirehill Hundred.	{ Abbey Hilton in Burslem..}	
2 leu. x 1 leu.	2880	2 0 0		{ Rushton Grange in Burslem	2940
1 leu. x 3 quar.	360	2 10 0		{ Burslem	
2 leu. x 1 leu.	720	1 0 0	Ibi ix acræ prati et de una parte Molini x denarii ..		{ Aston in Stone, Part of	
1 leu. x 3 quar.	360	1 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 8 denariis		{ Barlaston	2157
dim. leu. x 1 quar.	60	0 15 0		{ Ranton	1970
6 quar. x 6 quar.	360	1 10 0		{ Cooksland in Seighford	alibi
1 leu. x 1 leu.	1440	0 10 0		{ Hilderstone in Stone	alibi
1 leu. x dim. leu.	720	0 10 0		{ Bradley (Obsolete?)	alibi
3 quar. x 2 quar.	60	0 2 0	(Vasta est. Silva Modica xx perticæ in long. et	Pirehill Hundred.	{ Colton	3665
20 perticæ	½	...	{ lat. (= ½ acre)		{ Milwich	2987
2 quar. x 1 quar.	20	0 5 0		{ Tixall, Part of	supra
1 leu. x dim. leu.	720	0 10 0	Silva xii quarentin. long. et vi quarentin. lat.		{ Ingestre	1868
12 quar. x 6 quar.	720	0 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 4 solidis		{ Tittensor in Stone	alibi
...	0 5 0		{ Thurstield in Wolstanton ..	
1 quar. x 1 quar.	10	2 0 0		{ Whitmore	2623
2 quar. x 2 quar.	40	0 2 0	{ Alward (Tainus Regis) tenet, Fentone. Ibi una		{ Normacott in Stone Parish ..	
2 quar. x 2 quar.	40	0 5 0	{ virgata terræ. Terra est iij carucis. Wasta est...		Hanford in Trentham	
3 quar. x 2 quar.	60	0 2 0	(See pp. 12-13. Ibi (in Cavreswalle in Totmonslow	Pirehill Hundred.	Hanchurch in Trentham	alibi
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	0 4 0	{ Hundred) medietas Ecclesiæ de Stoeche cum		{ Clayton Griffith in Trentham	
1 leu. x ½ leu.	720	0 4 0	{ dim. carucatâ terræ. (See note.)		{ Dimsdale in Wolstanton	alibi
6 quar. x 3 quar.	180	0 4 0	Not alluded to in Domesday, but presumed.		{ Knutton in Wolstanton	
2 leu. x 1 leu.	2880	0 10 0		Newton in Blithfield	alibi
1 leu. x 1 leu.	1440	0 3 0		{ Knighton in Mucelestone..}	
...	0 2 0		{ Mucelestone	8531
...	0 10 0		{ Winnington in Mucelestone}	
...	0 2 0		{ Betley	1435
...		{ Balterley	1206
...		{ Balterley	
...		{ Audley	8530
...		{ Talke in Audley	
...		{ Weston-on-Trent	825
...		Fenton in Stoke-upon-Trent.	
...		Moreton in Colwich	alibi
...		Bishton in Colwich	alibi
...		{ Stoke-upon-Trent, Church-}	
...		{ Fee in	alibi
...		Stafford, The Burgh & Parish	
37273½	67 6 0					84766
20330	52 12 3					70367
57609½	119 18 3					155133
... ..	7 0 0					6373
126 18 3						161506

annexed to Pirehill Hundred, Staffordshire.

... ..	1 0 0	In Odenet Hundred Sciropescire fo. 257.a.2.)	Pirehill.	Tirley in Drayton-in-Hales ...	c. 1672
--------	-------	--	-----------	--------------------------------	---------

NOTES ON THE TABLES (Nos. VI. AND VII.) OF
PIREHILL HUNDRED.

TRENHAM (Trentham). This was the only manor of the *Vetus Dominicum, Coronæ* that was in Pirehill Hundred. Its importance is further shown in the Domesday mention of a resident Provost, or Reeve. This was a King's officer who governed the estate independently of the Sheriff.

SCANDONE cum appendiciis (Great Sandon). CERTELIE (Chartley). These two manors were granted by the Crown, after Domesday, to the Earl of Chester. Erdeswick says, "soon after Domesday," and to "Earl Hugh." At that rate, the grant will have been between 1086 and 1100, and the donor will have been the Conqueror or his son, Rufus.

The Earl enfeoffed one of his Barons, William Malbanc, in Sandon; but Chartley remained in the Honour of Chester till the dispersion of the said Honour among co-heiresses, one of whom carried it into the line of Ferrers.

Erdeswick, enumerating the hamlets of Great Sandon, mentions several, such as Little Sandon, Draycott, and Cresswell, which were distinct manors in Domesday. The appendiciæ of the Domesday Scandone were probably such places as Romer, Smallrise, Twirlow, and Hardewick, all within the present parish of Sandon.

WLSTANETONE (Wolstanton). In this Royal Manor some King, I think Henry II. or possibly his predecessor, Stephen, founded the Castle and Burgh, since known as Newcastle-under-Lyme. Both Wolstanton and Newcastle were afterwards annexed to the Honour of Lancaster, which moved Erdeswick to conjecture that Newcastle was built by an Earl or Duke of Lancaster! I defer an elucidation of this matter till it becomes complicated with the history of estates actually named in Domesday.

BIDOLF (Biddulph). It is impossible to identify all the Domesday Tainlands of Pirehill Hundred; but the analogies which we find in the subsequent history of many of them will help the purpose better than fanciful disquisitions about the spelling of names.

About Biddulph we have many lights.—Griffin, the Thane of Edward's time, on whose death or forfeiture, Biddulph became

waste and lapsed to the Crown, seems to have left a son, Gamel,¹ which Gamel was endowed by the Conqueror with three estates other than Biddulph, but in Pirehill Hundred. The Pipe Roll of 1130 shows Gamel to have been recently slain by Lyulph de Audley, whose posterity enjoyed Gamel's three estates. The same Roll speaks of a Vassal of Gamel fitz Griffin who had got into recent trouble about some matter of treasure-trove. Meantime Biddulph seems to have been bestowed by the Conqueror or by one of his sons, either on Richard Forester or on Ormus le Guidon, a son, I think, of Richard Forester.

With the posterity of Thomas, I believe a younger son of Ormus le Guidon, Biddulph remained for centuries.

BUCHENOLE (Bucknall, in Stoke-upon-Trent). This Tainland, escheated and waste at the date of Domesday, went afterwards to augment the Staffordshire Honour of De Verdon. This Baronial House gained its first footing in the county in the time of Henry I. and in the person of Norman de Verdon, who married Lescelina, daughter of the famous Justiciar, Geoffrey de Clinton. I suspect that De Verdon gained the earliest of his Staffordshire acquisitions by this match. Clinton had been a great seeker after petty escheats and in a plurality of counties. He had lands in Staffordshire in 1130, but none that remained to his male heirs.

ACLEI (Oakley in Mucclestone) probably became annexed to Mucclestone in the age following Domesday. (See a subsequent note on Mucclestone.)

HEOLLA (Heighley in Audley). This Tainland, escheated and waste at the date of Domesday, seems subsequently to have been annexed to Betley, an estate of which Ulwin, a Thane of King William, was then in possession. The next possessors of both estates, whether descended from Ulwin or not, assumed the name of De Betley. Between the years 1175 and 1227 these De Betleys sold Heighley and Betley to the great territorial acquisitionist of the district, Henry de Audley. At Heighley

*¹ Griffin, it would seem from the Cheshire Domesday, had held at least two estates in that county in King Edward's time. Wherever Griffin's name is expressly connected with a Cheshire estate his tenure had vanished before Domesday and the estate in question had been given to one or other of Earl Hugh's vassals. But in the List (fo. 267, b. 2) of such tenants of Earl Hugh as would usually be classified as "Taini" or "Servientes," I find Gamel holding the two estates of "Cedde" and "Motre" in the Border-Hundred of Hamestan; and in each case it is said "*Pater ejus tenuit.*"

Thus the name of Gamel's father does not actually transpire; but I can hardly doubt that it was Griffin.

Audley founded a Castle, apropos to which he obtained from Hervey de Stafford some adjacent part of De Stafford's Manor of Madeley.

MESS is supposed in the Table (No. VI.) to be Mill-Meese. Erdeswick so identified it. However, I do not know of any other manor in Eccleshall parish that was not, at the date of Domesday, of the Bishop's seignury. Noel's subsequent tenure of Mill-Meese was surely under the Bishop rather than the King: but many of these escheated Tainlands had been added to the greater fiefs soon after Domesday.

HILCOTE, another of these escheated Tainlands of Pirehill Hundred, also descended to Noel. Parochially and topographically Hilcote was allied to Chebsey; but I do not find that Noel ever held anything under the Earls Ferrers, the over-lords of Chebsey.

SCEILFITONE (Shelton in Stoke-upon-Trent, now in Hanley parish). This escheat of King William probably remained in the Crown till the time of Henry II. He, if it was he who founded Newcastle, annexed Shelton to that chatellany. It was then, or afterwards granted in serjeantry. In 1211-12, William Murel held a virgate of land within the manor (chatellany rather) of Newcastle, in the vill of Selton. His serjeantry was to keep the King's Haye (enclosed forest) in that quarter, which haye was called the "Haye of Clive."

HETONE. This name is perhaps obsolete. Erdeswick's suggestion of Heaton is quite beside the mark—Heaton was in Totmonslow Hundred.

FULIFORD (Fulford in Stone) became and remained a tenure-in-capite till at least the middle of the 13th century. The Crown-rent payable by the tenant, whose name I think was Lee, was one merk per annum.

MELEWICH (part of Milwich), COTE (Coton Hayes in Milwich). These two Tainlands, containing two virgates, were not ultimately retained *in manu Regis*. They were annexed to Robert de Stafford's fief, he having already, at the date of Domesday, the bulk of Milwich, viz., 3 virgates, in which he had encoffed his tenant Osbern. It is curious that Rafwin, the Thane, whose forfeiture had thrown a waste virgate in Milwich into the King's hand, is recorded in Domesday as one of Robert de Stafford's antecessors in the three virgates.

HENTONE. This parcel of Tainland was identified by

Erdeswick with Haunton. An anonymous Commentator adds "Q^r. Enstone?" Erdeswick's guess is untenable, for Haunton was in Totmonsloew Hundred. If by Enstone is meant Enson, I should think that to be the better guess. Enson was in the parish of St. Mary, Stafford.

HILDULVESTONE (part of Hilderstone in Stone). A waste half-virgate afterwards annexed, without doubt, to Robert de Stafford's greater tenement in Hilderstone—viz., to $\frac{3}{4}$ ths of a virgate held under him in 1086 by Vitalis. Ulric, the Thane, whose escheat resulted in the King's seizure of the half-virgate, stands in Domesday as one of Robert de Stafford's antecessors in the larger estate.

* COTEWOLDESTONE (part of Cotwalton in Stone).—A waste virgate and very near to Hilderstone; it may have been annexed to Robert de Stafford's fee. Rafwin and Alwin, the two Thanes by whose forfeiture the King had Cotwalton in hand, occur elsewhere in unwasted estates as antecessors of Robert de Stafford.

The alternative supposition is that the King annexed this part of Cotwalton to that other part which was before Domesday held by William Pantulf, under the Earl of Shrewsbury, in conjunction with Moddershall.

HELCOTE (Hilcote in Chelbsey), when it left the "King's hand" was clearly annexed to the Bishop's Honour of Eccleshall. Hence Fitz Noel, the Bishop's tenant elsewhere, obtained ingress at Hilcote.

ESTONE (part of Aston in Stone). King William's escheat in Aston was, I suppose, annexed eventually to one or other of Robert de Stafford's two manors in the same locality; but whether to the three virgates held under Stafford by Cadio, or to the hide held by Helgot, I do not venture to guess.

DORVESLAU has already (*supra* p. 36) been pointed out as obsolete. Erdeswick's finding it in Dodsley, was finding it in Totmonsloew Hundred, where Dorveslau was not.

SOTEHELLE is identified with Sugnall by Erdeswick. I have nothing to say in contradiction. Domesday changes the forms of English names yet more marvellously on some occasions. The Record seems to survey Sotehelle as an adjunct of Eccleshall. That would be just the position for an antecedent of Sugnall, which is still in Eccleshall parish.

BRAMELEI, &c. (Gerard's Bromley, &c.) Here we learn that

a single berewicke might embody two vills. Eight *berewickes* are named as held of the Bishop by 4 Thanes (*Taini*) and 4 Frenchmen (*Francigenæ*). The tenure of all was *per thenagium* as distinct from military service. Four of the Thanes were English-born, four were Normans. Domesday elsewhere distinguishes tenants of the latter class as "Franci taini."

Erdeswick (Harwood's Edition, p. 130) not perceiving the strange and parenthetic arrangement which Domesday here makes of the Bishop's fief, has misunderstood the superscription of these eight berewicks. By "*Hæc membra pertinent ad eundem manerium*" he supposed that the eight estates were members of the last preceding manor i.e., SOTEHELLE (Sugnall). The intended reference was to something further back in the Record. It was to the "Manor of Eceleshall."

WALETONE (Walton). WODESTONE (Wootton). Horseley, itself not mentioned in Domesday, is now a township of Eccleshall. It includes both the Walton and the Wootton of the Survey.

CESTEFORDE, as Erdeswick long ago perceived, is unquestionably represented by Seighford.¹ If Seighford were really called Cesteforde by other than Norman scribes at the date of Domesday, one would look for some encampment or other Roman remains in the neighbourhood.

In the sequel of this entry the text of Domesday again shows that the manor, or rather the barony, of Eceleshall was under survey.

DORLAVESTONE (Darlaston in Stone). The "two men" whom Domesday makes to hold Darlaston under Burton Abbey cannot by any possibility be "Ormus de Guldene and Robert his son," to whom Erdeswick says that Dorlaston was given by the Abbot of Burton.

Erdeswick represents the wife of Ormus and mother of Robert to have been a "daughter of Nicholas Beauchamp, Sheriff of Staffordshire." Here we touch on two subjects, each of which seems to claim a note. One is the early shrievalty of Staffordshire, the other is the Descent of Darlaston.

Nicholas was the name of the Domesday Sheriff of Staffordshire (A.D. 1086). The same or another Nicholas is addressed by Henry I. as Sheriff of Staffordshire in a deed, dated at

¹ In 1291 I find the place now called Seighford written "Cesford."

Tamworth, and which seems to me to have passed unquestionably in the autumn of the year 1109. At Michaelmas, 1123, Robert de Stanley became Sheriff. He was replaced by Milo de Gloucester at Michaelmas, 1128, which Milo was still in office at Michaelmas, 1130.

The Pipe Roll of the latter year, revealing thus much about the dates of Robert de Stanley's and Milo de Gloucester's shrievalties, gives, under Northamptonshire, the liquidation of a fine, or of the balance of a fine, proffered some time previous by Richard Bassett, the noted justiciar: "Idem Ricardus reddit compotum de xxxv marcis argenti pro terrâ Matris Nicolai Vicecomitis de Stafford. In thesauro 100 solidi, et debet £18 6s. 8d." I have never seen any evidence as to why Erdeswick called the Sheriff Nicholas by the name of Beauchamp, nor yet as to why he called Ormus de Darlaston "Ormus de Guldene."

Now as to the descent of Darlaston.—In the time of King Edward the estate had yielded to Burton Abbey a revenue of 30 shillings per annum. Between the years 1066 and 1085, Leofric being Abbot of Burton, this revenue had fallen to 10 shillings per annum. In 1086, when Domesday was written, and when Geoffrey de Mala Terra had been Abbot for more than a year, the estate was held of the Abbey by two Vassals (*homines*) and realized a rent of £1 7s. 4d. per annum.

Another Geoffrey, Abbot of Burton, succeeded Abbot Nigel, in 1114. Between the years 1114 and 1130, as I conclude, Abbot Geoffrey "conceded" Derlaveston to Ormus de Derlaveston and to his son, Robert by name, born of a daughter of Nicholas, Vicecomes, for an annual rent of 9 shillings" and other services of hospitality and aid, to be rendered to the Abbey. The lease be it observed was clearly for two lives only. It was attested by Swegen, Prior of Burton. This lease was doubtless current in the year 1130 when the Pipe-Roll presents Ormus de Derlaveston as paying 10 merks of an amercement of 40 merks, set upon him for a breach of the peace. After this date (1130) and before 1150 when Abbot Geoffrey resigned, two several contracts were made as to the lease of Darlaston.—

Presumably on the death of Ormus, Abbot Geoffrey "con-

¹ The word *concessit* is significative of a renewal of a previous gift as distinct from a gift *de novo*. In this case, the same inference results from the name given to the Grantee. He is already "De Derlaveston," and had therefore held the estate under some previous covenant. Life-leases like the above were much used by ecclesiastical persons and bodies, even before the Conquest.

cedes" Derlaveston in fee-farm to "Robert de Derlaveston and to his heir," at a rent of 30 shillings per annum and for the same services and accommodations (*bonitates*) as the grantee's father had been wont to exhibit. The lease is again for two lives; Swegen is still Prior of Burton; Edwin is sub-Prior; and a clause in the deed suggests that Robert de Darlaston was not as yet married.

The next lease is in similar terms as to rents and services, but it is to Radulf de Darlaveston, whom, whether son or brother of Robert, we must needs conclude to have been his heir. This deed passed before 1150, for it is by Abbot Geoffrey; but Edwin is now Prior of Burton and Jordan is sub-Prior.

The next lease is a simple renewal of the last to the same grantee, Radulf; but the grantor is Abbot Robert, who sat from 1150 to 1159, and Jordan has become Prior, his successor in the sub-priorate being "Brien."

We have no more leases for lives of Darlaston. But between the years 1159 and 1175, and late, as I think, in that interval, Bernard, Abbot of Burton granted Darlaston in fee and inheritance to Robert de Gresleye and his heirs, at a rent of 52 shillings yearly for the estate, and a rent of 5 shillings for the service of Robert de Caldewall.

Erdeswick had probably these Burton evidences before his eyes, and other evidences too, which he appears to have reconciled with these, when he wrote genealogically on the descendants of Ormus de Darlaston. In one place he calls Ormus, "Ormus de Guldene" in another "Ormus le Guidon" and he supposed him to have been son of Richard Forestarius of Domesday. This Ormus, says Erdeswick, "had issue Robert, Edward, Thomasin, and, I think, Alured."

"Robert married Mabilia de Perpant, and had issue Raufe that died, without issue, and Alina, married to Ingenulfus, son of William de Gresleye, who by him" (Ingenulf) "had issue Robert de Gresleye that died without issue."

Erdeswick here breaks into a statement, apparently about the sister and heir of "Robert de Gresleye," Petronillā by name. But he has another account, altogether different from this,¹ in which

¹ Erdeswick's palpable inconsistencies are, we are told by one of his Commentators, multiplied in different MSS. of his work. This is just what we would expect from the character of his published matter. Though conscientious and truthful, his memory was deficient;—he forgot at one time what he had written at another. Neither were his logical faculties of a very high order. From the same documents and premises he was prone to draw dissimilar conclusions.

— he speaks of *three co-heiress daughters* of "Ingenulf de Gresley."

Here then we pause, for we are getting far from our Domesday basis. We add that Ingenulf de Gresley was living in 1166 and 1167, and that his son's (Robert's) succession to Darlaston was therefore between 1167 and 1175; moreover that Henry de Verdon, the next Lord of Darlaston of whom we find mention, was descended from a daughter of Ingenulf de Gresley.

HASWIC. "Eswecha" was among the estates given by Wulfrena to Hampton Monastery. The name is now obsolete. Erdeswick knew of it (Harwood's Ed. p. 24) and thought it was in the Newcastle neighbourhood. He names it between Apedale and Clayton.

However, Erdeswick was quoting, from memory perhaps, a Record (Testa de Nevill p. 55) which names Hanchirche, and not Haswic; and Erdeswick increases the confusion by suggesting that Apedale is represented by Hanchirche, whereas the record names both Apedale and Hanchurch, and both were extant in Erdeswick's time, and are so still. Erdeswick's probable idea was that Haswic was represented by Hanchurch, and that may have been the fact as regards site. The names are less probably convertible. Haswic, Domesday implies, had been taken from the Canons of Hampton and annexed to the King's forest. Such a process often obliterated, and might equally change, a name.

COBINTONE, as a vill, is no longer extant. In the 12th and 13th centuries it was called Cublesdon. In Erdeswick's time, the vill of "Cubleston" stood east of Trent opposite Darlaston (See Harwood's Erdeswick, p. 36).

The only trace of the vill is in Kibblestone, one of the quarters of Stone parish. This places the site of "Cobintone" in Pirchill Hundred, and such doubtless was its Domesday position: but Earl Roger's Manors are insufficiently rubricated in that Record. They are grouped rather with reference to the tenants who held them, than to the Hundreds which contained them.

As an almost universal rule, any fee held by Rainald Bailgole in Domesday, should afterwards be looked for as held by Fitz Alan *in capite*. This was not the case with Cublesdon. In Henry II.'s time it came to be held by a scion of the house of Pantulf, who elsewhere, viz. at Sheriff-Hales, held under Fitz Alan. But I cannot learn that Fitz Alan was ever mesne-lord of Cublesdon.

MERTONE (Marston *juxta* Stafford). Domesday mentions

this manor between Otne (High Onn) and Nortberie (Norbury) and under an antecedent Rubric of "Colvestan Hundred," which certainly governed those two manors. One would think then that "Mertone," being thus apparently in Culvestan Hundred, must have been Marston in Church Eaton. But the truth is, that Mertone was thus misplaced, as to its Domesday Hundred, in order to get it next to Otne, the two manors being both held under Earl Roger by the same tenant,—the Abbot of St. Evroul of Uticum. Mertone was in Pirehill Hundred, and was represented afterwards by Marston in the Parish of St. Mary's, Stafford. Numbers of Post-Domesday Records verify this identification of Mertone. I do not here enter into the details of the monastic changes which, in the 13th century, caused the Prior of Ware to represent the Abbot of St. Evroul in the tenure of Marston; and in the 15th century caused the Carthusians of Sheen to stand in place of the Prior of Ware.

Suffice it here to set forth the grotesque but instructive entry about Marston which I find in a Pirehill tenure-roll of 1284:—

"Merston *juxta* Stafford. Prior de Whar tenet Merston ex dono Roberti de Belehem Comit'is Salop, pro I feodo, et est geldabilis,"—where of course Roger de Montgomery, Earl of Shrewsbury, who gave Marston and Onn to St. Evroul, was confused with his son, the notorious Robert de Belesme.

ERLIDE (Yarlett in Stone). I have no conception as to what "Robertus" it may have been who held Yarlett under Earl Roger at Domesday. The subsequent history of the Manor is fragmentary, and these fragments are mutually irreconcilable. In no aspect do they present any solution of the mystery about "Robertus."

GAITONE ET MERSETONE (Gayton and part of Marston *juxta* Stafford). Nothing seems to be known of the history of Gayton in the 12th century, and when, in the 13th, the name reappears, nothing transpires about its tenure which we can associate with its Domesday status.¹

Domesday associates with Gayton a part of Marston *juxta* Stafford, similarly untraceable in any subsequent terrier. It is nevertheless remarkable that while Domesday mis-spells and mis-rubricates the principal manor, it spells the lesser estate

¹ Colonel Wrottesley shows me that Gayton was eventually held under the Bishop of Lichfield. Doubtless it was added to the Episcopal Fief on the fall of the Earls of Shrewsbury (A.D. 1102).

intelligibly as Mersetone, and puts it, with Gayton, in its true Hundred of "Pireholle."

§ The identity, and the status of the manors which follow next in the Table are so certain as to need no exposition.

ALMINGTON, Tirley, and (Market) Drayton, only, are mentioned as Domesday Manors among the various villis which now or lately constituted the Parish of Market Drayton. Of these Market Drayton was and is in Shropshire; Almington was and is in Staffordshire; but Tirley was in Shropshire and is now in Staffordshire.

Blore and Hales two other elements of the old parish were not in Domesday, and Hales has lately become an ecclesiastical parish, which includes Almington, Tirley, Blore, and Hales, but does not include all the Staffordshire portion of Market Drayton. Hales parish is 6,690 acres. In the Table, it is a mere guess to take 1,672 acres of this parish as representing the Domesday manor of Tirley, and 5,018 acres as representing Almington.

TICHESHALL (Tixall). This was, I think, the only Staffordshire estate in which the Domesday interest of De Ferrers was combined with that of the Barons Stafford.

METFORD (Part of Meaford in Stone). Helgot was one of Earl Roger's Shropshire Barons, and builder of Castle Holgate, as it has since been called. I find nothing to connect any of Helgot's descendants with Meaford.

ESSELIE (Ashley-on-Tern.) In the time of Henry I. this estate of the Earls of Shrewsbury lapsed to the Crown, as an "Escheat of Belesme." The Domesday tenancy of Goiffred does not appear to have had any ulterior representation. The subsequent history of Ashley is sketched in the "Antiquities of Shropshire" (II. 8, 9, *et seqq.*)

BLIDEVELT (Blithfield.) In speaking of Norbury (*supra*, p. 71) I expressed a conviction that the Earl of Shrewsbury's Staffordshire tenant, Roger, was no other than Roger de Lacy of Ewyas. The conviction is wonderfully supported in the case of Blithfield. In the time of Henry I., De Lacy's escheated Barony of Ewyas was entrusted to, or conferred on, Pagan fitz John (Antiquities of Shropshire v. 241). In 1207, died Cicely, Countess of Hereford, without issue. She was eldest daughter and co-heir of Pagan fitz John. In 1207, the grandson of her sister Agnes, William de Munchensi, had livery of the fees of the Countess Cecilia, his great-aunt. William was at this time a

minor. He died soon afterwards, and was succeeded by his brother, Warin de Munchensi, also in minority. Each brother was given in turn to the wardship of the Earl of Arundel. Hence a Staffordshire Tenure-Roll of 1211-12 says, "Comes de Arundel tenet unum feodum quod habet in custodiâ cum herede Willelmi de Munchanesy."

Warin de Munchensi, the heir in question, had livery of his inheritance, December 13, 1213, and died in the year 1254. His Staffordshire fee was Blithfield.

A Tenure-Roll of about 1240-2, classes, or seems to class, Blithfield among the fees of Ferrers, Earl of Derby (Testa de Nevill, 47). The entry itself purports no such seignury. It runs as follows—"Jacobus de Blithfeud (tenet) dimidum feodum in Blithfeud de feodis Warini de Monte Kanisio."

I have now traced the Seignury of Blithfield through some 154 years, from Roger de Lacy, who held it of the Earl of Shrewsbury in 1086, to Warin de Munchensy, who held it in 1240. But until this record of 1240, we have heard nothing of any tenant-in-fee. The tenant of 1240 was James de Blithfield. To him Erdeswick has given a pedigree, not chronologically or strictly correct, but well worth attention.—Erdeswick wrote as follows.—

"Of Blidewell (*sic*) was owner at the Conquest (*sic*) one Heremanus, and he had issue Willelmus fil. Heremani, which William had issue Almaricus and Johannes, a younger son; to Johannes his father gave Blythfeild, whereupon he was called Johannes de Blufield. Almaricus had issue Willelmus filius Almarici, and he had issue Ricardus de Hulcombe. Johannes de Blithfeild had issue Sir Henry de Blythfeild, Knight, who had issue Sir James, who had issue Richard, who had issue Richard, who had issue Henry and John; Henry died without issue, John had issue, Richard, who married Catherine de Baliden, and by her had issue Elizabeth the wife of Sir Raufe Bagot de Bromley, Knight, whose posterity of the Bagots have been owners thereof ever since to this very day, and there have seated themselves."

To trace the fee and possession of a particular estate, hereditarily, back to the Conquest, or even to Domesday, is a high and most rare achievement: but we cannot allow to Erdeswick's "Heremanus" quite so great an antiquity. At the same time we must allow to Heremann another son, besides William. This

son, called Walter fitz Hermann, is he whom we have seen (*supra*, p. 72) giving, in the time of Henry II., half Walton (in Gnosall) to Buildwas Abbey.

The marvellous coincidence which is thus established carries us back to a Domesday text. Walton (in Gnosall) was held at Domesday under the Earl of Shrewsbury, by the same Roger (de Lacy) as held Blithfield of the Earl. It is almost obvious that Heremann was enfeoffed both in Walton and Blithfield, before the seignury of the last-named estate escheated to Henry I., and was bestowed on Pagan fitz John.

WALETONE (Walton in Stone). The carucate of land which Achil, the Saxon, had given to his sister, was probably a hide. Why Domesday should notice the gift is not apparent unless the state of tenure in 1086 were somehow affected thereby. The Priest, resident at Walton, had probably to do with a church or other religious foundation. After Domesday I find mention of Walton, as a member of the parish of Stone, and as held under the Barons Stafford by a remarkable succession of feoffees.

ESTONE et STOCA (Aston and Stoke, in Stone). The quarentine is seldom used as a measure of meadow-land in Domesday. Two quarentines by one quarentine indicate 20 statute acres.

PARVA SANDONE (Part of Sandon). Sandon is no longer divided into Little and Great, neither was the King's greater Manor of SCANDONE called "Great" in Domesday. The "freedom of two of the Saxon Thanes who T.R.E. held Parva Sandon is almost defined in Domesday as consisting of the liberty to put themselves and their land under what suzerain they pleased. Of the third Thane, Wiestric, it is said that *non poterat discedere cum terra*.—He had no such franchise.

HOTONE (Hopton in St. Mary's, Stafford). The wood here was only 10 acres. That was not the reason for calling it *modica*. It was not high wood (see Dorset Survey, page 36).

SELTE (Salt). Curiously divided T.R.E. between Leofwine Bishop of Lichfield, and a Thane, Ormar. "The King had the soke of Ormar," i.e., Ormar's suit and service were due to some Royal jurisdiction, probably that of Stafford. They were not due to the Bishop.

CISEWORDE ET CIPPECANOLE (Cheswardine and Chipnall) were held T.R.E. by Godeva (the Countess). She paid 2 shillings rent for Chipnall to the See of Lichfield, that is, she held this member of Cheswardine of that Church, not of the Earldom.

Both places having been *mised* into Shropshire, the particulars as to their acreage, value, &c., are to be excluded from the comparative calculations which we shall presently institute as to the Hundred of Pirehill.

STANTONE (Standon). "Ibi xiiij acræ gravæ." Grava is merely a Domesday Latinization of the English word "grove." I take it that the grove in this instance was of fruit-trees rather than forest-trees. In the Dorset Survey the manor called "Orchard" retains the name still. It got its name from a goodly orchard growing thereby, but Domesday writes the said orchard, not indeed as *grava*, but as *virgultum*.

MERE (Maer). I have somewhere adopted the idea that Robert de Stafford's Manor of "Mere" was Meer-town in Morton, and that the King's Manor of "Mera" was Maer. But the converse was the fact. The King's Manor being in Culvestan Hundred is sufficient to make it Meer-town, and De Stafford's being in Pirehill Hundred, to make it Maer. Some illustration supporting this amended theory may be found in Erdeswick (Harwood's edition, pp. 113, 116).

BARCARDESLIM (Burslem). "Ibi 2 acræ alneti." Alnetum, at a somewhat later period than Domesday, is used for "moorland," with more or less of alder growths. A grant of common pasture, in a charter of King Henry II., expresses the said pasturage to be *in bosco et in plano et in alneto*. It is not likely that the Staffordshire Domesday, which never says anything at all about pasturage, should mention so small a quantity as two acres of *alnetum*, if *alnetum* had anything to do with pasturage. I take it that the *alnetum* of Burslem consisted of alder or of willow-trees, grown for some special purpose of agricultural or domestic utility.

GESTREON (Ingestre). The divided mill of Ingestre is like the divided advowson of Stoke-upon-Trent. Domesday nowhere alludes to the other moiety.

TURVOLDESFELD (Thursfield, now New Chapel). This manor of Richard Forester, held in 1086 by Nigel (de Stafford), the presumed ancestor of Gresley, was in the parish of Wolstanton, but was no part of the Royal Manor of Wolstanton. Thursfield was one of the estates which were confirmed by Henry III. to Henry de Audley, and, according to Erdeswick's account, Henry de Audley's title to the fee was traceable up to Nigellus; for Erdeswick says or implies that Henry de Audley's

wife, Petronilla, was a daughter of Ingenulf de Gresley, who was son of William de Gresley, who was son and heir of Nigellus.

Erdeswick's idea was that Tunstall, not named in Domesday, was a member of Thursfield. Post-Domesday history suggests that not only Tunstall, but Chatterley, Chell, and Bradwall, all in the old parish of Wolstanton, were members of the Domesday Manor of Thursfield.

A Record which I know to be of date 1211 or 1212, classes Henry de Audley among the King's sokemen¹ of Staffordshire, and says:—"Henricus de Alditheleg, tenet quatuor virgatas terræ in Bradewell et Thurfredesfeld et reddit per annum xi solidos, et tenet de antiquo jure."²

The same Record says of another sokeman that:—"Henricus de Verdun, tenet xii virgatas terræ in Tunstal, et in Chaderleg, et Normancot, et reddit per annum xv solidos et iiij denarios, et tenet de jure uxoris suæ."³

Now, according to one, and that the most credible of Erdeswick's genealogies, the wife of Henry de Verdon was named Hawvisia or Avisia, and she was another of the daughters

¹ The Tenure by Socage precluded all obligation to perform knight's service. In this case the King's sokemen rendered their services in money. All or nearly all the estates named in the Staffordshire schedule of Richard Forestarius were held by the descendants of himself or his tenants by soke-service to the Crown. Many of them seem also to have been charged with a collateral rent-charge to the Earls of Chester. Ranulf Blundevill, Earl of Chester and Lincoln, gave to Henry, son of Adam de Audley, all the rent of Tunstall, Chatterley, Chell, Thursfield, Bradwell, and Normancote. King Henry III., on May 2, 1227, confirmed this grant, which I take to have been a release. How the Earls of Chester acquired such rights in Staffordshire is part of a larger question, untouched by any overt records.

² A Record or Inquest, made some ten or twenty years later than this of 1211-12, throws a new and strange light on Henry de Audley's tenure of Thursfield, &c. It says:—"Henricus de Auditheleg, tenet infra predictum Manerium (Newcastle-under-Lyne is meant) villatas de Tunstal, Chadderleg, Bradewell, Turnedesfeld, et Normancot per serjeantiam servientis peditis cum aren et sagittis infra predictum castrum per viii dies tempore guerræ ad custum proprium."—(Testa de Nevill, p. 52.)

The seeming of this is that Henry de Audley had, by purchase or negotiation, concentrated on himself all collateral and mesne interests in tenements previously held of the Crown by socage. He had then obtained the consent of the Crown to commute the socage-dues into the serjeantry above described.

The Record stating that these villas were within the *Manor* of Newcastle, intended nothing of territorial definition. They had become in some sort within the Chatellany of Newcastle; they never were within the manor, though, in one sense, they were sokes of the manor. The Royal Fortress of Newcastle had been maintained since the days of Henry II. by charging a series of socage-tenures with the petty serjeantry of providing a perennial garrison drawn from near localities. I will show more about this process under Fenton.

Henry de Audley's arrangement was different from all that had preceded it. It constituted a simple serjeantry, a service only in time of war, at Audley's personal cost, but relieving him of all other or previous dues in the way of socage.

Lands held by this kind of serjeantry were deemed in law to be *inalienable*; and with good reason, for every diminution of such an estate was, *pro tanto*, a diminution of the tenant's capacity to discharge a good and full service.

and co-heiresses of Ingenulf de Gresley, younger son of William, son and heir of Nigellus, the Domesday tenant of Thursfield.

In seeming, but not necessary opposition to these incontrovertible evidences, is a statement of Erdeswick, that Ingenulf de Gresley and Alina his wife gave Tunstall, Chatterley, Chell, and Normacott to Henry de Audley, husband of their daughter Petronilla. There were a plurality of transactions about these estates, or, perhaps, about the interests of several co-heiresses therein. It is clear that, eventually, two parts of Tunstall, with Chatterley and Little Chell, remained with the descendants of Henry de Audley.

WITEMORE (Whitmore). This estate was held, like Thursfield, in 1086, by Nigellus, under Richard Forester. Erdeswick seems to have found nothing in the subsequent history of Whitmore analogous to the history of other estates so held in A.D. 1086. I am by no means sure that such an analogy may not yet be found by diligent seeking.

NORMANESCOTE (Normacott, in Stone parish). We have seen Normanescote one-while given to Henry de Audley, one-while (1211-12) held by Henry de Verdon *in capite*. But it is evident that these interests, whether partitive or antagonistic, arose not in any co-heirship in Ingenulf de Gresley's estates, but in the estates of Ingenulf's wife, Alina de Darlaston.

For Nigellus, Gresley's ancestor, was not, at the date of Domesday, or at any other known date, seized of Normanescote. Richard Forester's Domesday tenants at Normanescote were Almar and Uluric. These tenants, like other Saxons, were probably superseded, and the estate reverted to Richard Forester or his heirs. How then could it reach Alina de Darlaston? She was the daughter of "Robert fitz Horm," and he was the son of Ormus le Guidon, and Ormus le Guidon—the fact once asserted by Erdeswick, but not widely known, nor supported by evidence, is established at last—Ormus le Guidon was the son of Richard Forester.

HENEFORD (Hanford in Trentham), HANCESE (Hanchurch in Trentham), CLAITONE (Clayton Griffith in Trentham), DULMESDENE (Dimsdale in Wolstanton), CLOTONE (Knutton in Wolstanton). Of these five estates of Richard Forester I have already spoken (*supra* p. 53). The document which I there quoted is of date 1211—1212. It runs as follows: "Isti sunt Sokemanni Domini Regis. Randulfus de Cnoton, tenet

xxxvi virgatas terræ in Cnoton et Dimesdal, et in Hanchirche, et in Claiton, et in Honeford, et in Witemor, et reddit per annum £4 11s. 6d., de antiquo jure, scilicet de conquestu Angliæ."

It has been already argued that this Randulf de Cnoton was lineally descended from Richard Forester. And, that Richard Forester, if he were identical with Chenuin, or if he were son of Chennin and identical with Richard Venator, was progenitor, through a daughter, of yet a third family of descendants, is further suggested by what Dugdale and Erdeswick have written about him.¹

It is remarkable that though Nigellus was Domesday tenant of Clayton, that estate is traceable to Richard Forester's Knutton descendants rather than to Gresley, descended from Nigellus.

CLOTONE (Knutton). Erdeswick in one place identifies both Claitone and Clotone with Clayton. The theory is improbable even if we look no further than the Domesday text. Both Clayton and Knutton are found in the 13th century to have been in the same descent as Hanford and Whitmore, both estates of Richard Forester. In another passage of his survey Erdeswick, writing "Knutton" as "Knotone," quite adopts the identity of Clotone with Knutton. (Harwood's edition, p. 24.)

I have said more about Knutton on a former page. (*Supra*, page 53.)

BALTREDELEG (Balterley) manorially in Staffordshire is, ecclesiastically, in the Cheshire parish of Barthomley.

BALTREDELEG (half Balterley), ALDIDELEGE (Audley), TALC (Talke in Audley), all held in 1086 by the Thane, Gamel, seem to have come early in the reign of Henry I. into the hands of the first Adam de Audley, who divided them between his sons, Lydulph and Adam. In 1130 "Liulf de Audley" lay under a heavy penalty for the murder of Gamel.

WESTONE (Weston-on-Trent). The Post-Domesday destination of this estate of the King's Thane, Sperri, was, that it became manorially a member of Chartley; but whether the annexation took place while Chartley was yet a Royal Manor

¹ *Vide supra* p. 55. My idea is that King William's Thane, Ricardus, and Richard Forester, and Richard Venator, and Richard Chenuin, were one person, and that the said individual, being son of Chenuin, was advanced, during his father's lifetime, by favour of the King.

or after Chartley was given to the Earl of Chester, I cannot ascertain.

FENTONE (Fenton in Stoke-upon-Trent). This estate, held of King William by the Thane, Alward, continued to be a *tenure-in-capite* for at least a century and half, but, as was often the case, the *tenure-per-thenagium* of Domesday became a *tenure-per-socagium* or *per serjantiam*, or a composite tenure, involving both elements.

I suppose the case with Fenton was that, till the King (Henry II., I think) founded the fortress of Newcastle-under-Lyme, Fenton was held, by whatever tenant, in mere socage, the tenant paying a certain rent in lieu of all services, not to the Sheriff, nor to the Exchequer, but to the Bailiff of some Royal Manor, such as Trentham, or, perhaps in this case, Wolstanton. On the foundation of Newcastle, the tenure of Fenton seems to have become composite. The socage-due assumed the form of a fee farm rent of 7s., or 7s. 4d., payable annually at Newcastle. The serjeantry, which was added, obliged the tenant of Fenton to serve as a guard at Newcastle for 40 days in each year, but his expenses were chargeable on the Crown. An inquest of 1211—1212, and another inquest between 1220—1240, gives William de Erdinton as holding Fenton (3 virgates) on these terms. It appears that Erdinton held the estate in right of one Philippa, who, holding by ancient right, was given to him for wife by King John.

I should here digress to say something chronological about the foundation and fortification of—

NEWCASTLE-UNDER-LYME. In his very first year (1154-5) King Henry II. committed his vast Manor of Trentham and something else, then yielding, together with Trentham, £30 4s. per annum, to the custody and temporary benefit of William de Beauchamp, of Elmley, then Sheriff of Worcestershire. The terms of the grant, instead of expressing Trentham as the name of the estate thus bestowed, specify 30 librates and four solidates of land *in Novo Castello*. My supposition is that the 30 librates were in Trentham, and the four solidates in Newcastle, which last was, as to territory, inconsiderable, and had been a mere parcel of the King's Manor, not of Trentham, but of Wolstanton. Be that as it may, Newcastle (the *castellum* or fortress, I mean) is proved, by the mere occurrence of the name, to have been founded previous to Michaelmas, 1155.

Next year, and for a continuation of years, the King's Manor of Trentham, valued at £30 per annum, was intrusted to William de Beauchamp and other succeeding Fermors, who account for the issues thereof to the King's exchequer.

In the fiscal year 1163-4, Walter Hose, then Fermor of Trentham, charges his account at the exchequer with a sum of £8 7s. 3d., which he had paid, by appointment, to ten men-at-arms (*servientibus*). A similar credit was taken by successive Fermors of Trentham for every year till the end of King Henry's reign, only that in 1170 the pay of the ten *servientes* began to be increased to £9 2s. 6d. per annum.

My position is that these *servientes* were the garrison of Newcastle, and that their pay (fivepence a head per week) was what the King provided for the maintenance of such deputies as the tenants of estates owing service at Newcastle were bound to provide.¹

Meanwhile we hear occasionally, of repairs to the castle, or of taxes laid upon the burgh, of Newcastle, in the reign of Henry II.; but these matters were in the purview, not of the Fermor of Trentham but of the Sheriff of Staffordshire.

MORTONE (Moreton in Colwich). Nigellus, holding one hide in Moreton of the King, held two carucates of the Bishop. The former tenement was worth 10s. per annum, the latter, though, perhaps, double in extent, was only worth 5s. There were two teams at work on the former, one and a half on the latter; four villeins and boors on the former, six on the latter. From phenomena thus equivocal, nothing follows as to the relations of the carucate and the hide.

MUDIETAS ECCLESIE DE STOCHES. This abnormal entry of Domesday has already been noticed. (*Supra pp. 13 and 24.*)

¹HANLEY, like Fenton in the parish of Stoke-upon-Trent, was unnamed in Domesday, being probably a member of the King's Manor of Wolstanton. When severed from its caput, it became a tenure by socage, and, when Newcastle was founded it was surcharged with precisely the same serjeantry as Fenton. Hence a list of the King's Staffordshire sokemen in 1211-1212 says:—"Willelmus de Henle tenet tres virgatas terræ in Henle et reddit per annum, vi solidos et tenet de antiquo jure." (*Testa de Nevill*, p. 55.) And an inquest of tenants by socage and by serjeantry, taken ten or twenty years later, says:—"Item Willelmus de Hanleg, tenet villatam de Hanleg ad feodi firmam, reddendo per annum ad predictum Castrum (Newcastle) vi solidos, faciendo etiam predictam custodiam (described under Fenton), per predictum terminum (40 days)." (*Testa de Nevill*, p. 52.)

LONGTON, in the same parish of Stoke, was another vill, involved probably in the Domesday manor of Wolstanton. The Record of 1220-1240 says of Longton:—"Item Ranulfus de Bevil, tenet villatam de Langeton ad feodi firmam, reddendo per annum v solidos ad predictum Castrum, faciendo etiam predictam custodiam ad predictum terminum."

BURGUM DE STADFORD.—The Burgh of Stafford must be reckoned as in Pirehill Hundred, just as it still remains. In other counties such burghs were usually accounted *extra-hundredal*.

At the date of Domesday the Parish of St. Mary's was apparently the only Parish of Stafford. It included several Domesday manors, such as Enson, Marston, Hopton and Salt. These again were and are in Pirehill Hundred.

I will now attempt to give a paraphrase or digest of what Domesday says about the Burgh of Stafford.—

In the year 1086, the Burgh of Stafford consisted of 179 burgages (Mansiones) within and without the wall.

§ Of these the King had, *jure coronæ*, twenty-six, eight of which were waste; and *jure Comitatus* ("de honore Comitum") twenty-two, five of which were waste.

§ The Bishop of Chester had fourteen burgages, one of which was waste.

§ The Abbot of Burton had five burgages. These seem to have been all occupied. They probably were attached to an estate containing two plough-lands (240 acres), meadow-land (16 acres), wood-land (360 acres), which the Abbot had in the very town of Stafford (in villâ Stadford). And these burgages, we may suppose, were extra-mural.

§ The Earl of Shrewsbury had three burgages without the walls. They were appurtenant to his Worcestershire Manor of Hales (*postea* Hales-Owen).

The same Earl had thirty-one burgages within the walls, of which ten were waste, while it seems that eighteen were annexed to the Earl's Manor of Marston, (*juxta* Stafford) which manor had already been given to the Abbey of St. Evroul at Uticum.

§ Hugh de Montgomery, the same Earl's son, had five burgages, all occupied apparently. They are expressed to be "de Comitatu" and "to pertain to Gurvelde"; that is they were comital burgages and belonged to Worfield, a manor of the successive Mercian Earls, Algar and Edwin, but now held by Hugh de Montgomery.

§ Robert de Stafford had thirteen burgages, six of which were waste. These again are expressed to be "de honore Comitum" and "to pertain to Bradelic." Robert de Stafford's great suburban Manor of Bradley had last been held, with these burgages, by Earl Edwin. Robert de Stafford had of his own fief ("de feodo suo") forty-one burgages, seventeen of which were

waste. By "his own fief" is implied the Barony which he received from the King in virtue of the Conquest, as distinct from what had been since added, on the escheat of Earl Edwin.

§ William fitz Ansculf had four burgages, only one of which was occupied (*hospitata*). These also were "de comitatu" and they pertained to his Manor of Penn, "a manor once Earl Edwin's."¹

§ Henry de Ferrers had but one burgage, and it was waste. We learn elsewhere that De Ferrers had held land in Stafford which once had pertained to his Manor of Chebsey. Whether the "burgage" and the "land" were identical or connected we have questioned above (p. 20).

§ "The Priests of the Burgh" that is, the thirteen Prebendary-Canons of St. Mary's, had fourteen burgages, all apparently occupied;—I should suppose by themselves.

"These all," continues Domesday, "have sach and soch," that is, the Burgh had its own Court, and power to enforce the attendance of the burghers. And "the King has annual geld from all," that is, all burgesses were contributory to the King's borough-tax, whatever each burgess might pay to his own suzerain.

Domesday proceeds—

"Tempore Regis Edwardi reddebat burgum de Stadford de omnibus consuetudinibus ix libras denariorum. Duæ partes erant Regis, tercia comitis."—In King Edward's time £9 per annum covered the borough-tax and all other customary liabilities to the Crown. Of this sum, £6 went to King Edward, £3 to the Earl of Mercia. The Record adds—

"Modo habet Rex Willelmus de redditu burgi vii. libras inter suam partem et comitis. Medietatem partis propriæ Regis habet Robertus (*sic*), dono Regis ut dicit."—

The "firma burgi" was now (A.D. 1086) £7 instead of £9. King William, as King, received seven merks (£4 13s. 4d.); as Earl, three-and-a-half merks (£2 6s. 8d.). Robert de Stafford said that the King had given him half the regal income, that is, £2 6s. 8d. per annum. The gift to Robert de Stafford was, therefore, precisely equivalent to the old comital share of the revenue. But William did not put it in that light. He had no idea of making Robert de Stafford an Earl, nor of suggesting

¹ Though Domesday here specifies Earl Edwin as Fitz Ansculf's antecessor at Penn, under Penn itself it specifies Earl Algar. Of course the same thing is meant in either statement viz. that Penn has been T.R.E. a comital manor. The eccentricity of the Staffordshire Survey, in naming no less than three Mercian Earls of the Edwardian æra, has been before noticed.

such an ambition to the Baron's mind. It was Henry fitz Empress who first thought of alienating from the Crown the Earldom of Stafford, but, when the Crown was his, he abandoned the idea.

It should be observed that, as an item in Robert de Stafford's fief, Domesday inserts the following:—"In Burgo de Stafford habet Robertus lxx solidos de medietate partis Regis."—

This I conclude to have been an erroneous statement; at all events it is opposed to the statement, above extracted from the survey of the Burgh of Stafford. It gives to Robert de Stafford half of the King's whole receipts, whether as King or Earl, which whole receipts were £7.—That is, it gives the Baron £3 10s. per annum. But it is clear from the previous statement that he was only entitled to £2 6s. 8d.

PIREHOLLE (now Pirehill) HUNDRED. The Staffordshire Hundred of Pirehill, excluding Cheswardine and Chipnall, which it has lost since Domesday, and exclusive of Tirley, which it has attracted since Domesday, appears to contain 210,716 acres.

The Tables of Pirehill Hundred (Nos. VI. and VII.) will show how	
161,506 acres of this area were prefigured by Domesday in the situations which modern topography defines or suggests	161,506
And there are 46,858 acres ascertained by modern topography which cannot be definitely assigned to this or that Domesday Manor, but which must be taken individually, and wholly, to have been prefigured in the Domesday measurements of the said Tables. ¹ ..	46,858
	<hr/>
	208,364

Now there are two distinct methods of Domesday estimate and measurement, with each of which we will compare this area of 208,364 statute acres.

§ Under the old or hidational system, Domesday registers, or may be construed to register, $92\frac{19}{20}$ hides and 7 carucates of correlative estate;—say then 100 hides. Here, therefore, the hide correlates with 2,083 acres of modern ascertainment.

§ The exacter measures supplied by Domesday for the same area are:—

379½ Plough-lands, which, at the rate of 120 acres each, give of }	45,570 acres
Arable-land	
Of Wood-land, various measures, reducible to acreage, and realising.	57,603 acres
Of Meadow-land	413 acres
	<hr/>
Total.. .. .	103,586 acres

¹ These 46,858 acres consist of the following, viz. :—Stone Parish (20,030 acres), Stoke-upon-Trent (12,406 acres), Colwich (8,975 acres), and Stowe (5,447 acres).

According to the last calculation the Domesday hide was represented by about 1,035 acres of coeval measurement and registration.

In Pirehill Hundred, the now ascertained acreage (208,364 acres) exceeds the registered acreage of Domesday (viz. 103,586 acres) by 104,778 acres. The difference consisted, probably, of pasturage, moors, and downs, which, unless they were afforested, were not reckoned nor valued by the Domesday Commissioners.

NOTES ON THE TABLE (No. VIII.) OF TOTMONSLOW HUNDRED.

ROWECESTRE (Rocester); LEC (Leek); ENEDUN (Endon in Leek); RISETONE (The Rushtons); RUDIARD (Rudyard in Leek).

King William had no manor of ancient demesne in Totmonslo Hundred. He had five comital manors, escheats of the Mercian Earls, and he had seventeen wasted estates, in hand by escheat of certain Saxon Thanes. A century after Domesday not one of these twenty-two estates remained in the Crown. Some had gone in augmentation of the Honour of Chester, some in augmentation of the Honour of Tutbury, some went to constitute De Verdon's Honour of Alton, and a few had been bestowed in other directions.

The four manors indicated at the head of this note went primarily, I think, to the Honour of Chester. But De Verdon, seeking to improve his position as a baron and as *tenant-in-capite* of Alton, obtained also feoffments under the Earls of Chester of several estates in Totmonslo Hundred.

Hence a Record, of date *circa* 1240-1242, gives Roese de Verdon as holding one knight's-fee in Auneton (Alton) *cum pertinentiis*, of the King in capite, and as holding, of the Honour of Chester, "Longesdon, Rustone, et Alteram Longesden, et medietatem de Ipstan, per servicium inveniendi unum militem in warnesturá Castri Cestriæ per xl dies" (Testa de Nevill, p. 47).

It is necessary to explain that this Roese was the heiress of the elder line of Verdon, and Baroness of Alton in her own right; that the two Longsdons, since reduced to one, were members of the Domesday Manor of Enedun, and like Enedun, were in the parish of Leek; that the Manor of Risetone, *postea* Rushton, is now divided into several Rushtons, all in the same parish of Leek; and that Ipstones, unnamed in Domesday,

TABLE VIII. The Domesday Hundred of Tateslau *alias* Tatemaneslau ;

Domesday Name of Estate.	Saxon Possessor. T. R. E.	Domesday Tenant in capite	Tenants in Fee or Possession.	Subtenants.	Domesday Measures.			Terra quot Carucas.	Acres prati.
					Hides.	Virgates.	Carucates.		
§Rowcester	Algar Comes	Rex Willelmus.	1	0	...	9	20
§Crachemers	Algar Comes	0	2	...	0	6
§Wotochesbede	Algar Comes	0	2	...	10	16
§Lee	Algar Comes	1	0	...	12	3
§Medevelde	Algar Comes	1 Presbyter ...	1	0	...	12	8
†In Wodetone	Snain	Rex Willelmus.	2	...
†In Stantone	Archil	1	...
†In Musedene	Uetred	1	...
†In Secon	Alward	2	...
†In Stanesope	Wodie	1	...
†In Fernlege	Alward	1	...
†In Elvetone	Iwar	1	...
†In Domesstona	Iwar		{ Omnis hæc Terra Regis Wasta est ... }	3	...
†In Cumeslala	Ulfag	1
†In Cedla	Ulfag	1
†In Siwetone	Ulfag et Alward	2
†In Lufannesles	Ulfag	1	...
†In Fotesbroc	Snain	1	...
†In Emedun	Dunning	1	...
†In Rugeluda	Wlmar	1	...
†In Ruderd	Wlmar	1	...	
†In Risetone	Ulfag	2	...	
Lelachestone	Sanctus Cedde	Episcopus de Cestre.	0	1	...	5	3
*Lege	(Not recorded)	Abbatia S ^{te} Maria de Bertone.	{ Unns Liber homo et x Villani habent (5 carucas.) Eddulf tenet ad censum Nauken	0	3	...	3	...
*Acovre	0	3	...	2	...
*Witestone	Comes Rogerius.	Azelinus	Vastafuit et est	1	0	...	1	...
§Locheslei	Edmund		Willis (Malbane)	0	3	...	3	...
§Enestanefelt	(Goduin)	Robertus de Statford. Robertus de Statford.	(Will's Malbane)	(bi.)	8
§Celtetone	Goduin		Will's (Malbane)	0	2	...	4	...
§In Bechesword ptin. ibm	Goduin		(Will's Malbane)	0	2	1
Tene	Ulfag et Ulfag		In dominio	0	2	...	6	6
†In Grendone	Ulfag	Vasta est	0	1½
†In Caddone	Godiva	Vasta est	0	1	...	1	...
†In Bughale	Ulfag	0	1	...	1	...
†In Westone	Ulfag		Ernulf de Hesding	0	1	...	3	...
†In Grotewiche	Goding		Ulfag	0	1	...	3	1
†In Cayreswelle	Ulfag		Ernulfus (de Hesding)	0	1	...	4	6
Medietas Teche de Stoeche		Robertus de Statford. Robertus de Statford.	1
†In Madelie	Godiva (Comitissa)	Ulfag	0	2	...	6	2
†In cadem villa		Dno Angli	1½
†In Branselle	Ulfag	Bagod	0	1	...	3	...
†In Elachestone	VI Taini	Wodemar et Alsi	0	1	...	6	12
†In Blora	IV Taini	Edrie	0	1	...	5	...
†In Dulverne	Goduin cum filijs	Walbert	0	1	...	4	1
†In Cella	Godiva, et libera fuit	Robertus	0	1	...	4	1
†In Bretlei	Lenric	(Robertus de Buc)	2	0	...	3	1
†In Chingeslei	Lenric	(Robertus de Buc) (Nigellus de) (Roberto)	1	0	...	1	2
†In Chingesleia	Lenric	Nigellus.	{ De ipsa terra tenet Liolfus 11 hidas de Nigello	3	0	...	3	1
§Stagrigeshollo	Alricus	Alricus. Alwold. Otha.	{ Taini Regis Willelmi		0	1	...	2	2
§Crochesdene	Alwold				0	0½	...	2	1
§Cedla	Otha				0	2	...	3½	2
					19	1½	8	14½	107

precisely represented in the existing Hundred of Totmonslow.

Silva of Domesday.	Acres of Wood.	Value in Domesday.	Domesday Features and Particulars.	Modern Hundred.	Modern Name, or Situation.	Parochial Acreage.
1 quar. × 1 quar.	10	£ s. d. 8 0 0	Ibi I hida cum append. Ibi Molinus de 10 solidis ...	Totmonslow Hundred.	Rocester	2105
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	1440	0 10 0	Ibi dimid. hida cum append. Ibi Molinus de 10 sol.		Crakemarsch	1066
2 leu. × 2 leu. ...	5760	8 0 0	Ibi I hida cum appendiciis		Uttoxeter	8973
4 leu. × 4 leu. ...	23040	5 0 0	Ibi I hida cum appendiciis		Leek	6001
4 quar. × 2 quar.	80	(omitted.)	Ibi I hida cum appendiciis		Mayfield	3760
...	In Wodetone est terra ii vel iij carucis		(Wootton-under-Weever in) Ellastone
...	In Stanton terra j carucis		Stanton in Ellastone	c. 500
...	In Musdene terra j carucis		Musden Grange	2799
...	In Secon terra ij vel ij (sic) carucis		Shoon	alibi
...	In Stanesope terra j vel ij carucis		Stanesope in Alstonfield	alibi
...	In Fernlege terra j vel ij carucis		Farley in Alton	alibi
...	In Elvetone terra ij carucis		Alton Towers, al. Alveton ..	7399
...	In Denestona terra ij carucis		Denstone in Alton	alibi
...	In Cunneshala "terre una carucata"		Cunsall in Cheddleton	alibi
...	In Cella una carucata terre		Checkley, Part of	alibi
...	In Nivetone ij carucate terre		(Obsolete)
...	In Lufamesles terra j carucis		(Obsolete)
...	In Fotesbroc terra j carucis		Forsbrook in Dilborne
...	In Eneadun terra j vel ij carucis		Endon in Leek
...	In Rugehala terra j carucis		Rownall in Cheddleton	alibi
...	In Indierd terra j vel ij carucis		Rudyard in Leek
...	In Risetone terra ij carucis		The Rushtons in Leek
1 leu. × ½ leu. ...	720	0 12 0	(Rubricated as in "Tateslaw" Hundred)	Totmonslow Hundred.	Ellastone, Part of	8000
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	1440	2 0 0	...		Leigh	7055
½ leu. × 3 quar.	180	1 0 0	Ibi iij virg. terre cum append. suis. Ibi unus Molinus		Okeover	871
...	...	0 4 0	See Table IV, and p. 70 as to this locality		Whiston in Kingsley (?)
1½ lon. × ½ leu.	1080	1 0 0	Vasta finit et est		Loxley	1735
...	("Terra est iij car. In dominio est una et unus Vil- lanus cum 1 car. (sic).")		Alstonfield	21860
1 lou. × ½ lou.	720	2 0 0	(In Werleslei quæ pertinet huic manerio est terra (a blank space and r in margin). Ibi sunt iij villani, &c., &c. Valet 40 sol.)		Warslow in Alstonfield	supra
½ leu. × 3 quar.	180	0 15 0	Ipe Comes tenet Ceteone et Wills de eo		Cheddleton	6999
2 leu. × 1½ leu.	4320		In Bechesword quæ pertinet ad ipsum Maner- ium est dim. hida. Totum valet 15 solidos		Basford in Cheddleton	supra
1 leu. × ½ leu.	720	1 10 0	Ipe Robertus tenet in Grendone tertiam partem	Totmonslow Hundred.	Teau in Checkley
...	I hida. Vasta est		Grendon	3229
...	Ipe Robertus tenet in Caldene 1 virg. Terra est		Cauldon	1458
...	1 car. Vasta est		Obsoleto
2 acres	0 5 0	Ipe Robertus tenet in Bughale j virgatam terre quæ pertinet ad Halstone		(Weston Coyney in Cavers-) (wall	infra
1 lou. × ½ leu.	720	0 10 0	Ibi Molinus de 4 solidis		Gratwich	856
½ leu. × ½ leu. ...	360	1 4 0	("Ibi vi. acree prati et silva 1 leu. long. et dimidia lata et medietas Ecclesie de Stocche cum dimi- dia carucata terre")		Caverswall	5300
1 leu. × ½ leu. ...	720	1 10 0	Hanc tenuit Godiva etiam post adventum Regis Willelmi in Angliam sed recedere non poterat cum terra.		(Stoke Church—Moiety of) ...	alibi
1 leu. × 4 quar.	480	4 0 0	In eadem villâ do eadem terrâ tenent dno Angli 1 carucatam terre et dimidiam et ibi habent 5 bord. et ii vill's. cum 1 caruca		(Madeley Holm, alias Made- ley Ulfac, in Checkley (Parish)	alibi
...	...		Ibi Molinus de 32 denariis		Bramshall	1276
½ leu. × 4 quar.	240	1 0 0	Ibi II quarentina spineti		Ellastone, Part of
1 leu. × ½ leu. ...	720	1 10 0	...		Blore
2 quar. spineti	20	0 5 0	...		Dilborne	3648
1 leu. × ½ leu. ...	720	1 0 0	...		Cheddle	6700
2 leu. × 1 leu. ...	2880	1 0 0	Ibi Molinus do xii denariis		Bradley-in-the-Moors	630
1 leu. × ½ leu. ...	720	0 10 0	...		Kingsley, Part of	4714
1 leu. × 4 quar.	480	0 10 0	...		Kingsley, Part of	supra
...	...	0 17 0	...		Strainshall in Uttoxeter	supra
40 × 40 perticæ	10	0 5 0	...		Croxden	2399
1 leu. × 1 leu. ...	1440	0 5 0	...		Checkley	6036
	49200	45 7 0				115580

was so unnamed as being probably an outlying appendage of the King's Manor of Leek. Of Rudyard, and De Verdon's interest there, I shall have to speak presently.

De Verdon's feoffments and grants in the Honour of Chester were probably of much earlier date than can be proved by any positive or extant record. I think they were as early as the reign of Stephen, when Norman de Verdon was found more than once in the court of Earl Raoul le Meschin.

WOTOCHESHEDE (Uttoxeter.) I have often observed how strangely Roman names are rendered in Domesday. Such perversions of orthography are usually charged upon the Norman scribes who wrote the Record; but in this case, surely, the disguise is of Saxon authorship. When in this same page of Domesday we find Rocester rendered "Rowcestre," the proximate correctness savours of Norman scholarship. Uttoxeter, when alienated by the Crown, went to augment the Honour of Tutbury. The same destination is observed in the cases of—

CRACEMERS (Crakemarsh) and MEDEVELDE (Mayfield.)

KING WILLIAM'S SEVENTEEN WASTE MANORS in this Hundred have already been alluded to. The ten Thanes, his predecessors, will possibly have held their several estates under the Mercian Earls, for King Edward had no manor whatever in Totmonslow Hundred. However, Domesday gives no assurance of this possibility; and some at least of these Saxons appear elsewhere as ordinary Thanes of King Edward.

LOCHESLEI (Loxley). I can find nothing in the subsequent history of Loxley to identify it with the Domesday manor of the Earl of Shrewsbury. The case is in two ways anomalous. Ordinarily we expect any Domesday manor, held under the Earl by Azelinus, to be found subsequently in the fief of Fitz Alan.—Loxley is an exception. On the other hand, Henry de Ferrers had no Domesday footing in Totmonslow Hundred, yet Loxley appears subsequently in the fief of his descendants.

Chartley, be it observed, was some three miles south-west of Loxley, and in another Hundred (Pirchill). The Earl of Chester obtained Chartley from the Crown, soon after the date of Domesday (says Erdeswick), and it got into the hands of De Ferrers by marriage with one of the co-heiresses of the Chester Earls; and it is clear that, at some time or other, Chartley attracted several manors and parts of manors with which it had no connexion by any circumstances of previous tenure. Possibly Loxley was

acquired by an Earl of Chester, or by De Ferrers, with a view of similarly aggrandizing the Honour of Chartley.

Again, less than two miles south of Loxley is the Manor and Parish of Kingston, in Totmonslow Hundred. Kingston is not mentioned in Domesday at all. It was involved in some other manor then: and no other manor of those named in Domesday is so contiguous to, or so likely to have involved, Kingston, as the Domesday manor of Locheslei. In this way, and so far, our expectation about Locheslei is revived. In the 13th century, and for centuries later, Kingston was held of the Honour of Fitz Alan,—held by Gresley of Drakelow.

ÆNESTANEFELT, WERESLIE, CELTETONE, BECHIESWORDE (Alstonfield, Warslow, Cheddleton, Basford). The Manors of Alstonfield and Cheddleton, each with an appurtenance, are said in Domesday to be held under Earl Roger by "Willelmus." Erdeswick, doubtless for sound reasons, considered this "Willelmus" to represent William Malbanc. One of Erdeswick's Commentators, getting hold of a false analogy, insisted on "Willelmus" being William Pantulf, Baron of Wem.—

There is perhaps no absolute proof either way, but all the phenomena that have occurred to my notice are in favour of Erdeswick's dictum and subversive of his Commentator's idea.

A further theory is my own, viz., that Alstonfield and the other estates aforesaid were among those which the Conqueror originally assigned to Hugh de Abrincis, and that he, on becoming Earl of Chester, resigned the same to Roger, Earl of Shrewsbury: but that William Malbanc, already the feoffee of Earl Hugh was not thereby displaced.

BUGHALE (obsolete). Domesday says of this estate of Robert de Stafford—"Ipse Robertus tenet in Bughale unam virgatam terræ quæ pertinet ad Halstone." The sequence of the Record, the governing Rubric, and the old tenure of Ulmar, all point to Totmonslow Hundred as comprising "Bughale." The name is obsolete. The "Halstone" of which it was a member can hardly have been Haughton, as Erdeswick suggested. Haughton was in Cuttlestone Hundred, and was wholly held under Robert de Stafford by his tenant, Urfer. But Robert de Stafford held Bughale in demesne.—

Robert de Stafford also held the Manor of Tean in this Hundred. He held it in demesne, and in half thereof he had been anteceded by Ulmer. I should have supposed the Halstone of

Domesday to have meant Elachestone (Ellastone),—not the least important of Robert de Stafford's Totmonslo^w Manors, but here he had two tenants,—Wodeman and Alsⁱ.—

Again, Bughale is mentioned in Domesday next after Gren^don and Cauldon, and they, being waste, were unoccupied.

In what part of Totmonslo^w Hundred we should look for the representative of Bughale seems a many-sided question.

WESTONE (Weston Coyney in Caverswall).—It seems strange that so great a feudalist as Arnulf de Hesding should have held two Staffordshire Manors and have held under another Baron, hardly his superior in any other ratio of comparison. It is not so strange that the descendants of Robert de Stafford should have lost this seign^eury, and that Fitz Alan, who was a co-heir of Arnulf de Hesding, should have inherited, or gained, it.

It is of some importance to County history that the fief of Fitz Alan in Staffordshire should be as clearly defined as circumstances will permit. In 1166 the feodary known as the *Liber Niger* names several Knight-tenants of Fitz Alan whose fees we judge from the sequence of the Record to have been in Staffordshire, though we cannot assign to each of at least eight tenants his particular fee. One of these Knights might be expected to have been Lord of "Weston-subtus-Kavermont," as it was then called. However this was not the case. In the year following the *Liber Niger*, that is in the year 1167, Thomas Coyney was unquestionably Lord of Weston and, all but certainly, held it under Fitz Alan. Yet he is not mentioned in the *Liber Niger*. Possibly there was a mesne-lord, over Thomas Coyney and under Fitz Alan, and such mesne-lord may appear in Fitz Alan's schedule, but I cannot identify him.

A plurality of documents, dating between 1240 and 1242, combine to show that at that period John Coyney and others, called his "participants," held a knight-fee in Weston-subtus-Kavermont, Caverswall, and Forsbrook, of the Barony of John fitz Alan (*Testa de Nevill*, 47, 49, 51). And previously, viz., June 19, 1240, the service of "John Coinee" in respect of his Staffordshire fee had been assigned out of the estate of John fitz Alan, then deceased, as part of the dowry of Hawise, widow of the said Baron (*Rot. Claus.* 24 Hen. III).

That a portion of the adjoining Manor of Caverswall should have been annexed by Fitz Alan to the tenement of his feoffees in Weston is highly improbable, though Weston was in the

parish of Caverswall. But with Forsbrook (called "Fotebroc" in the Record) the case was different. It was in another parish,—that of Dilhorne. In Domesday it had occurred as one of those waste tainlands which, being then *in manu Regis*, had since been annexed by the Crown to the neighbouring fief of this or that Baron. Thus Fitz Alan, or it may be his ancestor, Arnulf de Hesding, having a seignery in Caverswall and Weston, acquired also the seignery over Forsbrook, which happened to be nearer to Caverswall and Weston than to Dilhorne.

CAVRESWELLE (Caverswall.) The Domesday tenure of Ernulf de Hesding under Robert de Stafford, the subsequent loss of De Stafford's paramountcy, and the substitution of Ernulf de Hesding, or his co-heir Fitz Alan, as seignorial lord, are facts common to Weston-subtus-Cavermont and Caverswall, but with better proof in the case of Caverswall; for the *Liber Niger*, A.D. 1166, gives Walter de Caverswall as holding a muntator's fee under William fitz Alan.

This case, however, differs from that of Weston Coyney, in that Fitz Alan's seignery over Caverswall did not endure. It was transferred,—of course under sanction of the Crown,—to De Verdon. The muntator's service, which implied castle-guard at Oswestry, was abolished.

Of the two transfers of the seignery over Caverswall, from De Stafford to Fitz Alan, and from Fitz Alan to De Verdon, the negative evidence is as to the successive losses, and is so far complete. The positive evidence is as to the gains. Fitz Alan's gain is proved by the *Liber Niger*; De Verdon's gain is proved by the fact that ultimately a descendant and heir of Walter de Caverswall held Caverswall under De Verdon's heirs by an annual chief-rent of ten shillings.¹

MADELEY (Madeley Ulfac). It is not singular that Robert de Stafford should retain a Saxon as his tenant-in-fee. He retained several. But it is remarkable that one of these Saxons, Ulfac, should have bequeathed a distinctive name to the manor which he held. But under "Madeley-Ulfac" we have a further Domesday note of exceeding interest. The Mercian Countess Godeva

¹ This is due to the research of Colonel Wrottesley. De Verdon's *tenure-in-capite* consisted, I believe from the first, of the Manor of Alton and its appendages only. His seignery over Caverswall and perhaps some other places, was probably, in its essence and origin, no more than a mediate interest. Such accumulations, not being got by inheritance, were called *acata*, *acquisita*, or *perquisita*. They could only become *tenures-in-capite* of the Crown by the effacement or buying-up of a previous seignorial interest.

survived the Conquest. She continued to hold a part at least of her lands under King William,—so, however, as that she could not subject herself or them to any *mesne-tenant-in-capite*. Whether Godeva survived her grandsons, Edwin and Morcar (both said to have been slain in A.D. 1071), I have not been able to discover. The Domesday note under Madelie is no evidence either way. It is strange that no Mercian legend, speaking to the point, should have been preserved.

BRANSELLE (Bramshall.) “Ipse Robertus (de Stafford) tenet in Branselle unam virgatam terræ, cujus vero medietas est Regis sicut via eam dividit, sed Robertus eandem partem Regis invasit et se defensorem facit. Ulviet tenuit,” &c.

The road here spoken of was probably that which passed through Bramshall, eastward to Uttoxeter, wherein the King had 5760 acres of forest. Robert de Stafford not being able to vouch the King as his warranty for seizing this moiety of Bramshall, defended his title thereto on grounds not set forth. Probably his defence will have been that his antecessor, Ulviet, had been seized of the said moiety. He had succeeded to estates of Ulviet at Tean, Grendon, and Caverswall, all three in Totmons-low Hundred.

CRACHEMERS (Crakemarsh), CROCHESDENE (Croxden), ELVETONE (Alton or Alveton), DENESTONE (Denston in Alton), STAGRIGESHOLLE (Stramshall in Uttoxeter), FERNELEGE (Farley in Alton), RUDIERD (Rudyard in Leek).—I have massed these seven manors together because I have found that they eventually came to be held by De Verdon. How they came to be so held, and of whom De Verdon originally held them, are questions which are only partially to be solved by authentic Records. I will group them according to their Domesday aspects.—

Crakemarsh was a Royal Manor. The King had it by escheat of the Mercian Earls. The King had also in hand the several Manors of Alton, Farley, Denston and Rudyard:—these by escheat of three Saxon Thanes, Iwar, Alward, and Wolmar, who had left them waste and worthless. Croxden and Stramshall having been held T.R.E. by two Thanes, Alwold and Alric, were at the date of Domesday still held by the same two Saxons, *sine medio*, of the King. Except over Alton, Farley, and Rudyard, the seigneurie over all these estates is said, or implied, to have been given by the Crown to De Ferrers. The

Ferrers tenant in all four is said, and, indeed, ascertained, to have been that Roisia, who having married Bertram de Verdon (II.) was ancestress of the subsequent Barons of the Verdon name, and who, having founded, or rather sanctioned the foundation of, Croxden Abbey in her widowhood, died 17 January, 1215.

This said Roisia is also said, I think erroneously, to have been heiress of Alton (Farley, probably, intended to be included), but she is not said to have held Alton under De Ferrers.

These observations lead up to some curious questions as to the descent of De Verdon, a subject in which Samson Erdeswick was fain to confess himself "not very perfect."

The first Bertram de Verdon was a Domesday *tenant-in-capite*. He was Lord of Farnham, Bucks. During his absence abroad, in the service of King William, his estate was curtailed of a member by a neighbouring Baron. The notorious Ivo Tailgheosc, too, built a mill on Bertram's manor, which mill had not been there what time Goda (sister of Edward the Confessor) had held Farnham.

This Bertram, about the year 1095, attested a charter of King William II. to the Abbey of St. Mary, at York, and in January, 1100, he occurs as Sheriff of Yorkshire.

Norman de Verdon, son, I believe, of Bertram, appears about the year 1123 attesting a charter of Raoul le Meschin, Earl of Chester; but it is not till the year 1130 that Norman fines 100 shillings with the Crown *pro terrâ patris sui*—in succession to his father. This fine is entered on the Leicestershire Pipe-Roll, and it is said that Norman de Verdon married Lescelina, daughter of Geoffrey de Clinton, minister of Henry I., who had great possessions in Leicestershire.

At the same date (1130) Norman de Verdon was lord of his own demesne. This demesne will have been in Alton.

Norman de Verdon was living in 1153, when, by the Treaty of Devizes, Henry Duke of Normandy subjected his fief to Ranulf Earl of Chester, whose speedily ensuing death voided the contract. Had the treaty taken effect, the result would have been merely that Norman de Verdon, instead of holding *in capite*, would have held of the Honour of Chester, to which the Earldom of Stafford was to have been annexed by the same treaty.

My impression is that, at the date of the Treaty of Devizes,

Norman de Verdon was already a considerable holder under the Earl of Chester. Such tenements were not proposed to be touched by the treaty.

Norman de Verdon seems to me to have had a daughter, Alice, who becoming second wife of Ivo Pantulf, Baron of Wem, had two sons by the said Ivo, the younger of which sons was named Norman,—presumably after his maternal grandfather. Alice de Verdon seems further to have had her *maritagium* in Rudyard, and to have dealt with that estate accordingly. My conviction is that when her father, Norman de Verdon, endowed her with Rudyard, he held it, not of the Crown, nor yet of De Ferrers, but of the Honour of Chester.

Bertram de Verdon (II.) is concluded to have been son and successor of Norman. Chronology, that keen detector of factitious pedigrees, does not destroy this assumption. The earliest notice which I have of Bertram de Verdon is in 5th Henry II. (1159), when the Sheriff of Staffordshire accounts on his behalf for an amercement of forty merks set on the said Bertram. Eighteen merks were promptly paid; the King excuses twenty merks; the remaining two merks are accounted of by Bertram in person in the following year.

In 1161, the Justice of the Forest visiting Staffordshire, amerced Bertram de Verdon in a sum of ten merks. It was promptly paid. Bertram de Verdon's political career I date from the year 1166, when he appears in King Henry's court at Caen. On 3rd February, 1170, the King being over sea, the Constable of Normandy, Richard de Humez, and Bertram de Verdon were at Stamford (Lincolnshire). Bertram, be it known, held estates in Lincolnshire, both under the Crown and under the aforesaid Constable. What is more remarkable is that at this very juncture De Humez was Sheriff of Rutland, while at the ensuing Easter (April 5, 1170) the King, in Council at Windsor, instituted that enquiry into the conduct of the English Sheriffs which resulted in the ejection of William Bassett from the Shrievalty of Warwickshire and Leicestershire, and the substitution of Bertram de Verdon. The latter held the office for 15 years.

Meanwhile in the rebellion of 1173, Bertram de Verdon was one of those Barons whom Benedictus signalizes as having stood by the elder King. For twelve succeeding years Bertram de Verdon variously occurs as a Sheriff, as an assessor in the *Curia Regis*, as a witness of royal charters in England and Normandy; and on

one occasion as King Henry's ambassador to Spain. His relinquishment of the Shrievalty of Warwickshire and Leicestershire in 1185, was not for any cause of disgrace. At that very juncture he was attending Prince John in his notable mission to Ireland; and while Hugh de Lacy figures as Constable (of Ireland) during John's vice-royalty, so has Bertram de Verdon the title of Seneschal when attesting one of the Prince's charters.

On June 14, 1188, William de Humez, then Constable of Normandy, and Bertram de Verdon, were assessors of the King in a *Curia* sitting at Geddington. Bertram de Verdon, accompanying King Richard in the Crusade of 1190, died at Jaffa in 1192, and was buried at Acre. When it is said that Roisia, the second wife and widow of Bertram de Verdon, was foundress of Croxden Abbey, little more can be concluded than that the original foundation having been out of her inheritance, she sanctioned it as a wife and confirmed it as a widow. Erdeswick's Editor tells the story in its simpler form:—"Bertram de Verdon," he writes, "in 1176, gave to the Cistercian Monks, of Aulney, in Normandy,¹ a piece of ground at Chotes, to build an abbey of their Order, which three years after," (in 1179, then) "was removed to Croxden."

I am aware that I am rather contributing a chapter to the "Baronage" than illustrating Domesday by territorial notes. My temptation is the difficulty of shewing satisfactorily how "Alton Towers" represents the Domesday "Elveton."

It is of little importance to our present enquiry that the *Librer Niger*—the Feodary of 1166—makes Bertram de Verdon to have been holding two fees in the Barony of Hamo fitz Meinfelin. The schedule of that barony is given under Buckinghamshire. The two fees were of old feoffment, that is, Bertram de Verdon, or his ancestor, had held them at least thirty years.

But Bertram de Verdon's own return as a *tenant-in-capite* is of more relevance. It is scheduled under Staffordshire. It acknowledges one fee of old feoffment, which he or his predecessor had in the time of Henry I. (1100-1135), held wholly in demesne, and of one fee of new feoffment, which had also been taken out of the Verdon demesnes within the preceding 30 years, and been

¹ Aunai Abbey was founded by Richard de Humez, the above-named Constable of Normandy. He himself became a monk of Aunai, in 1180, and died in cloister. I cannot help surmising that there was some kinship between the Houses of De Humez and De Verdon. The subject belongs to Lincolnshire rather than to Staffordshire history.

divided between two sub-feoffees, viz., Ruelen de Verdon and Geoffrey de Chamel.

The Antiquary, Hearne, editing the *Liber Niger*, seems to have dealt unwisely with Bertram de Verdon's Writ. He unwarrantably corrected the tense of a verb, and then, to make the emendation plausible, intruded a punctuation of his own. The genuine Writ probably ran as follows:—"Totum tenementum, quod Bertram de Verdun tenet de Rege, tempore Henrici Regis fuit feodum unius militis et tunc fuit totum in Dominico. Modo Bertram habet unum militem fefatum de eodem Dominico. Et de novo fefamento, Ruelen de Verdon dimidium militem et Galfridus de Chamel dimidium militem."

Hearne proposes to read "tenuit" for "tenet," and instead of putting the comma after "Rege" (as we have done) he puts it after "Henrici Regis"; thus altering the whole sense of the Writ, making the Bertram of Henry I.'s time to be the Bertram referred to; whereas the existing Baron was speaking of himself.

To the Aid, assessed according to these Writs, on the marriage of King Henry's daughter, Bertram de Verdon contributed, in 1168, one merk. The assessment was on the old fee, of course, and it was at half the usual rate. Nevertheless, the Baron got his *quictus*.

And here arises the curious question already adverted to,—Where and what were those two fees thus held *in capite* by Bertram de Verdon in 1166? He paid his assessment on this and on other occasions under Staffordshire. His Writ or return is scheduled under Staffordshire. The conclusion is, that the older fee, the only one to which he or his descendants were ever assessed, was in Staffordshire. Was this fee, then, in Alton *alias* Alveton? If it was, and if Alton was a possession of Bertram's wife Roisia, as Erdeswick thought it was (Harwood's ed. p.500), then had Bertram married the said Roisia before the date of the *Liber Niger*.

How comes it, then, that neither Bertram de Verdon nor Roisia appear as tenants in that contemporary schedule which was returned by William, Earl Ferrers? Roisia had other estates, held of Ferrers. Who represented her in that contemporary schedule? Not her husband, we have seen; not her father, for in that case her heirship, being assumed to have arisen in Alton, should also have arisen in Earl Ferrers's fief. Her father was dead, and could not represent anyone.

There is no escape from the horns of such dilemmas except by re-consideration of the premises. My theory is, that Alton has been improperly stated to have been Roisia's; that it was Bertram de Verdon's by descent from his father, Norman; and that Bertram's marriage with Roisia, whether she were his second wife or not, was after the date of the *Liber Niger*. I further believe that Alton, with its appurtenances, was, at the same date, the only genuine *tenure in capite* of Bertram de Verdon, whether in Staffordshire or any other county.

Who Roisia's father, or other antecessor, or representative, enrolled in the Ferrers hief of 1166, was—under what name he may have occurred in that long list, has next to be enquired. It has been suggested [this is due to Col. Wrottesley] that it was William de Ferrers, a tenant apparently of four knight's-fees under the Earl, his namesake.

There is a memorandum in the Bredon Chartulary, which, though not evidence of the best kind, cannot but be respected in such an enquiry as ours. It tells how Robert de Ferrers, Earl of Derby, gave four knights'-fees, as the *maritagium* of his daughter Matilda, to Bertram de Verdon. The estates composing these four fees are enumerated. One of them involved Crakemarsh. "In Crakemers et Broughton, $1\frac{1}{2}$ f. m.")¹ and this was the only Staffordshire estate of the series. The others, in Derbyshire and Leicestershire, can most of them be traced without difficulty to Bertram de Verdon's descendants.

Now, this Earl Robert can only have been he who, living in 1154, was deceased in 1158. He probably left some of his children in minority, so that Matilda, thus bestowed upon Bertram de Verdon, may have been no older than her sister Isolda, who, we happen to know, was born about 1146.

The difficulty being to find some plausible reason why Bertram de Verdon does not appear as holding these four fees under Earl de Ferrers in 1166, I will endeavour to meet it.—My conjecture is, that Matilda de Ferrers' marriage was not as yet consummated, and that these four fees were indeed those which Earl William, her brother, spoke of in his return to the Feodary of 1166, in these words :—"Willelmus de Feriers tenet unum Manerium de Dominio patris mei, unde facit servitium quatuor militum."

¹ Broughton is West Broughton, 4 miles S.E. of Crakemersh. It was Henry de Ferrers' at Domesday, viz., Broctune, in Derbyshire. (Domesday, fo. 274, b. 1.)

It is quite clear that Earl Robert had a brother William : he was a Templar, I believe, and, if so, could inherit nothing. It is probable that the manor alluded to in Earl William's return was Crakemarsh, and that it was taken as *caput* of the "four fees" in question. It is possible that William de Ferriers held the whole as a trustee, on behalf of his niece Matilda, till her marriage with Bertram de Verdon should be consummated.

Now, it has been said that Bertram de Verdon was twice married, and that his first wife died childless. It is clear that his children were the children of his Ferrers wife, and no fair presumption can otherwise account for their succession to Crakemarsh. And this wife survived him, and was called "Roisia"! Here the mystery, instead of increasing, vanishes, and we find everything consistent with authentic records. It was no solecism if Matilda de Ferrers, on her marriage, took the name of Roisia.

STAGRIGESHALLE (Stramshall in Uttoxeter.) The Thane Alric's possession of this estate beginning before the Conquest and enduring at Domesday, did not, we may be sure, last much later, or pass to his descendants. The manor was one of those which, like Uttoxeter, were annexed by grant of the Crown to the Honour of Tutbury. Whether by marriage with an heiress, or by direct feoffment of De Ferrers, Stramshall came to be held under De Ferrers by Verdon. Hence a Feodary of the Earl of Derby's barony (*circa* 1240-1242) says that "Roese de Verdun" holds one fee in *Crakemers*, and *Cratton* (Creighton in Uttoxeter) and 8 bovates of land in *Strongeshul* (Stramshall). (Testa de Nevill p. 47.)

TOTMONSLOW HUNDRED.—The present Hundred of Totmonslo w appears to contain 140,958 acres.

Of these, 115,580 acres were prefigured by Domesday in definite and still assignable localities }	115,580
And 25,378 acres, ¹ somewhere implied in the Domesday Survey cannot now be so definitely assigned to this or that Domesday Manor .. }	25,378
	<hr/> 140,958 <hr/>

Under the older or hidational system, and within limits proximately corresponding with the present Hundred of Totmonslo w, Domesday registers 19 $\frac{1}{4}$ hides and 8 carucates, or, say, an equivalent of 27 $\frac{1}{4}$ hides.

¹ These 25,378 acres consist of the following, viz., Draycott-in-the-Moors (3,791 acres), Kingston and Blythe Bridge (2,009 acres), Horton (4,672 acres), Ipsstones (6,490 acres), Ilam (2,939 acres), Waterfall (2,868 acres), and Wetton (2,609 acres).

In Totmonslow Hundred, therefore, the Domesday hide is correlative with $5133\frac{1}{4}$ modern acres.

The exacter measures supplied by Domesday for the same area, are :—

148½ Plough-lands, which, at 120 acres each, give, of Arable-land ..	17,820 acres
Of Wood-land, various measures reducible to acreage and realizing ..	49,200 acres
Of Meadow-land	107 acres
	<hr/>
	67,127 acres

Here then the ancient hide is represented by about $2,441\frac{2}{3}$ acres of Domesday register.

§ In Totmonslow Hundred the now ascertained acreage (140,958 acres) exceeds the registered acreage of Domesday (67,127 acres) by 73,831 acres. This difference is of land not registered in Domesday,—pasturage, moors, and downs,—utterly disregarded by the Staffordshire Commissioners of 1086.

CHAPTER VI.

THE STAFFORDSHIRE DOMESDAY ARRANGED ACCORDING TO FIEFS.

The following Table will show the technical measures and annual values of the several Fiefs of Staffordshire in 1086.

Tenant-in-Chief.	Domesday Hidge and Quasi-Hidge.				Annual Revenues or Valuations given in Domesday.		
	Hides.	Virgates.	Carnates.	Plough Lands.	£	s. d.	
King William, in right of his Crown	27	2	1	...	20	2 4	{ This item of value is inclusive of £4 13s. 4d., being two-thirds of the Revenue of the Burgh of Stafford.
King William, in his right as Earl.....	48	2½	123	6 8	{ This item of value is inclusive of £2 6s. 8d., being one-third of the Revenue of the Burgh of Stafford. Domesday presents an alternative of 26 instead of 21 waste and valueless Plough-lands in the King's hands.
King William, by Escheat of Saxon Thanes.....	4	3½	5	21	0	0 0	
	81	0½	6	21	152	9 0	
The Bishop of Chester.....	41	0	14½	8	36	3 11	{ There were only eight Plough-lands in the Bishop's Fief which did not fall within the hidation of his greater manors.
The Abbot of Westminster ...	3	0	2	0 0	
The Abbot of Burton	9	2	15	18 8	
The Abbot of St. Remigij	4	3	3	13 0	
The Canons of Stafford	3	0	3	0 0	
Sanson, Clericus, and his subordinate Canons and Priests.....	26	2	8	2 0	{ Parts of this Fief were waste. Five hides had been absorbed by the King's Forest. Two virgates, usurped by Osbern fitz Richard, are included in the estimate.
The Clerks of Peukridge.....	3	3	1	5 0	
Roger, Earl of Shrewsbury ...	58	2	66	15 0	{ The value of Morton (2 hides) is not given in Domesday.
Hugh de Montgomery	30	0	18	0 0	{ This Fief consisted of Worfield only.
Henry de Ferrers	12	0	...	2	26	19 0	{ This revenue includes £4 10s. arising from Tutbury; but excludes the value of 1 virgate and 2 Plough-lands.
Robert de Stafford.....	109	3½	1½	...	123	6 8	{ This value includes £2 6s. 8d., being one-third of the Revenue of the Burgh of Stafford.
William fitz Ansculf.....	76	1	33	19 0	{ In this Fief 7½ hides were waste and valueless.
William fitz Corbucion	3	0	1	10 0	{ This Fief consisted of Chillington only.
Turstin	5	0	8	0 0	{ This Fief was only a part of Drayton.
Richard Forester	6	2½	3	9 0	{ This Fief consisted of 10 estates.
Raunald Bailiote	4	2	4	5 0	{ This Fief involved only 2 manors.
Ralph fitz Hubert	3	0	1	0 0	{ This Fief consisted of 2 estates.
Nigel (de Stafford)	7	0	3	7 0	{ This Fief consisted of 3 estates.
King William's Thanes	8	0½	10½	4	3	14 0	{ This combination is of 20 estates.
	499	2½	32½	35	£516	16 3	
	567½ hides and quasi-hides.						

The Carucate of the Staffordshire Survey is neither more nor less than the conceptional but non-geldant hide. The carucates, therefore, may be taken as quasi-hides.

The column of "plough-lands" includes only such plough-lands as were attributed in the Survey to non-hidated estates ; and, as the most usual element of the hide was a single plough-land, these plough-lands may be taken as so many quasi-hides.

When the carucutage, the plough-lands, and the value of an estate of profit are omitted, its extent is calculated from the number of ploughs going thereon.

In each case it is to be understood that the Annual Revenue of a Fief includes not only the receipts of the Over-Lord for his demesnes, but the receipts of his free-tenants for their feoffments.

The Totals of the Table differ materially from the totals given in a somewhat similar Table (*supra* p. 15). The subject matter of the two Tables being, in some respects different, occasions the variation. For instance,—

The former Table purported to collect and group such portions of modern Staffordshire as were in any way prefigured or surveyed in Domesday: but the present Table deals with the County as bounded and surveyed by Domesday, without regard to what it has gained or lost since the Survey.

Again, the former Table comparing Domesday hidation with Domesday acres, and with modern acreages, admitted only the carucate as a quasi-hide; but the present Table further admits certain ploughlands as quasi-hides.

The results of these calculations are as follows:—

The collective Fiefs of the Domesday County contained 567 $\frac{13}{120}$ hides or quasi-hides; and the gross annual revenue of the said Fiefs was £516 16s. 3d.

	£	s.	d.		
The King's Revenue was	152	9	0	His estates consisted of	108 $\frac{23}{120}$ hides or quasi-hides
The Earl of Shrewsbury's Fief was annually worth	123	6	8	His estates consisted of	111 $\frac{3}{120}$ hides or quasi-hides
The Lord of Shrewsbury's Fief was annually worth	66	15	0	His estates consisted of	58 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides
The Lord of Chester's Fief was annually worth	36	3	11	His estates consisted of	66 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides or quasi-hides
William Fitz Anselm's Fief was annually worth	33	19	0	His estates consisted of	76 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides
Henry de Ferrers' Fief was annually worth	26	19	0	His estates consisted of	14 hides or quasi-hides
Henry de Montemery's Manor was annually worth	18	0	0	His estates consisted of	30 hides
The Abbot of Ebury's Fief was annually worth	15	18	8	His estates consisted of	91 hides or quasi-hides
The Chaplain Scarpson's Fief was annually worth	8	2	0	It extended to	26 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides
Thomas, Mayor of Drayton was annually worth	8	0	0	It was accounted to be	5 hides
The Abbot of Westminster and the monks had annually	5	13	0	Their estates were	7 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides
The Citizens of Stafford & of Penkridge had annually	4	5	0	Their lands were	6 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides
Richard de Ladbroke had annually	4	5	0	His estates were	4 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides
King William's Thanes held lands valued at	3	14	0	per annum. The lands were	22 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides
Richard Forester held lands valued at	3	9	0	per annum, and comprising	6 $\frac{1}{120}$ hides or quasi-hides
Nicholas Stafford held lands valued at	3	7	0	per annum, and comprising	7 hides
William Corbin held Chalfington, valued at	1	10	0	per annum, and containing	3 hides
Ralph Fitz Herbert held lands valued at	1	0	0	per annum, and containing	3 hides
£516 16 3				567 $\frac{13}{120}$ hides or quasi-hides	

A more concise way of contrasting the above values is that, while the King's estates yielded £152 9s., and Robert de Stafford's £123 6s. 8d., per annum; the lands of the Bishops and six other Ecclesiastical persons and bodies, yielded only £70 2s. 7d. The estates of the Earl of Shrewsbury, his son, and two greater Barons, were jointly worth £145 per annum. Six lesser Barons or Feudatories had estates, yielding altogether £21 11s. per

annum. The few Thanes, who still remained immediate homagers of the Crown, divided £3 14s. of annual revenue amongst them.

It will serve to show the abject condition of Staffordshire in the eleventh century, if we contrast some of its Domesday statistics with those of the lesser County of Dorset.

Dorset, as outlined by Domesday, contained a territory which now measures 632,909 statute acres.

Staffordshire, so far as it was surveyed by Domesday, contained a territory which now measures nearly 740,500 statute acres.

§ The prosperity of any County in the eleventh century may be fairly estimated by its capacity for taxation. Geldable hidage is one and the best measure of that capacity. Ingeldant hidage, or, as I generally express it, *quasi-hidage*, is a measure of privileges, or of exemption from taxation: it is also, though in a secondary sense, an indication of capacity.

In the eleventh century, the geldable hidage of Dorset stood at 2321½ hides; the ingeldable or quasi-hidage, at 283½ hides. Total of hides and quasi-hides,—2650 hides (see Dorset volume, p. 144). At the same period the geldable hidage of Staffordshire, the larger county, stood at 499½ hides; the ingeldant or quasi-hidage, at 67½ hides. Total of hides and quasi-hides, 567 hides.

§ In the year of Domesday (1085-6) the collective revenues, or annual values, of Dorset estates, are found to have been £3359 12s. 9d. (See Dorset Volume, p. 146.)

In the same year the estates of Staffordshire,—of the county as surveyed by Domesday,—were estimated as collectively yielding £516 16s. 3d.

§ So, on the whole, the larger county did not, and probably could not, bear so much as one-fourth of the taxation to which the smaller county was liable; and the annual revenues of the larger county were not so much as a sixth of the revenues of the smaller.

It is beyond our scope to make invidious comparisons about rates of progress or to collate a progress in things good with an advance with much that is evil. Suffice to say of Staffordshire, that this, once the poorest of Midland Counties, is now a hive of industry and a mine of wealth.

INDEX OF PLACES.

•• Domesday spellings are usually rendered in Italic Type
 The letter T. or the syllable Tab., followed by Roman Numerals, stands for "Table."
 The Syllable Col. stands for "Column" of any Table.
 The abbreviation *al.* stands for *alias*; *n.* or *n.* for "note"; *v.* for *vide*.

A.

Abbey Hilton, in Burslem (*Holtone*), T. vii.
 Abbots Bromley (*Brunlege*), T. vi.
Abetone, *v.* Apeton.
Ache, *v.* Oaken.
Aclei, *v.* Oakley.
Acovere, *v.* Okeover.
 Acre (Palestine), 104.
 Acton Trussell, in Baswich (*Actone*), T. iv., 70.
 Adbaston (*Edbaldestone*), T. vi.
 Admaston, implied in Blithfield, T. vii.
Ænestanfelt, *v.* Alstonfield.
 Agardsley (*Edgareslege*), T. ii., 61.
Aldiddege *v.* Audley.
 Aldridge (*Atrewic*), T. ii., 63.
 Almington (*Atmontone*), 7, T. vii., 84.
Atnetum of Domesday, The, 87.
 Alrewas (*Alrewas*), 39-40, T. i., 59.
 Alston, in Bradley (*Alverdestone*), T. v.
 Alstonfield (*Ænestanfelt*), 49, T. viii., 98.
 Alton, *al.* Alveton, *al.* Alton Towers (*Elvetone*), 96,
 T. viii., 100 *n.*, 101-106
 Alveley, Salop (*Alvidelege*), 6-7, 51, T. iii.
Alverdestone, *v.* Alston.
 Amblecote (*Elmslecote*), T. ii., 68.
Anne (Little Onn), 35-36.
 Apedale (near Newcastle), 82.
 Apeton, in Bradley (*Abetone*), T. v.
 Arley, Lower (*Alia Ernlege*), 44, T. iii., 67.
 Arley, Upper (*Ernlege*), T. iii., 67.
 Armitage, implied in Handsacre, T. i., col. 15.
 Ashley-on-Tern (*Esselie*), T. vii., 84.
 Aspley (*Haspeleia*), T. vi.
 Aston, in Seighford (*Estone*), T. vi.
 Aston, in Stone (*Estone*), 13, T. vii., *bis.* 78, 86.
 Audley (*Aldiddege*), 76, T. vii., 90.
 Aunai Abbey (*Normandy*), 104, 104 *n.*

B.

Badenhall, in Eccleshall (*Badenhale*), T. vi.
 Bagnall, implied perhaps in Endon, T. viii.
 Bagots Bromley (Domesday status uncertain).
 Balterley (*Baltreidelege*), T. vii., 90.
Barcardeslim, *v.* Burslem.
 Barking (Essex), 27.
 Barlastone (*Bernulvestone*), T. vii.
 Barr Magna (*Barra, Barre*), T. ii. *bis.* 63.
 Barr Parva, 63.
 Barthomley (Cheshire), 90.
 Barton-under-Needwood (*Bertone*), 39-40, T. i.
 Basford, in Cheddleton (*Bachesworde*), 49, T. viii., 98.
 Baswich (*Berchestwic*), 40, T. iv.
 Bath (*Somerset*), 11.
Bachesworde, *v.* Basford.
Badhala, 38 *n.*, T. iv., *v.* Bednall.
 Bedinton, in Penkridge (*Beddintone*), 70, T. iv.
 Bednall (*Badhala*), T. iv.
 Befecote (*Bifecote*), T. iv.
 Beighterton, in Weston under Lyzeard, T. v.
Bedintone, *v.* Billington.
 Bentley, near Willenhall, 59, 64 *n.*
Bernertone (obsolete, near Bradley), 35, T. v., 72.
 Bescot, in Walsall (*Bresmndescote*), 58, T. i.
 Betley (*Betelege*), 76, T. vii.
 Bickford, in Penkridge (*Bisgefurd*), T. v., 73.
 Biddulph (*Bidolf*), T. vi., 75-6.
 Bilbrook, in Tutenhall (*Bilrebroke*), 45, T. iii.
 Billington, in Bradley (*Bedintone*), T. v.
 Bilston (*Billestone*), 38, T. iii.
 Bishops Offley (*Offleia*), T. vi.
 Bishopswood (implied in Brewood, T. iv.)
 Bishton, in Colwich (*Bispestone*), T. vii.
Bispestone, *v.* Bishton.
 Bitertone, in Weston (*Bertone*), T. v.
 Blithfield (*Blidefeld*), T. vii., 84, 86.

- Blore, in Totmonslow Hundred (*Blora*), T. viii.
 Blore, in Market Drayton, 84.
 Bloxwich (*Blockeswic*), T. i., 59.
 Blynhill (*Brunnhelle*), T. v.
 Blythe Bridge and Kingston, v. Kingston.
 Bobbington (*Bubinton*), 7, T. iii.
 Bradford North (Salop), Hundred of, 7.
 Bradley, in Bilston (*Bradley*), T. ii.
 Bradley, in Pirchill Hundred (*Braddie*), (Qy. obsolete ?), T. vii.
 Bradley-in-the-Moors (*Bredie*), T. viii.
 Bradley, near Stafford (*Bradeleia*), 50, T. v., 72, 93.
 Bradwall, in Wolstanton, 88.
 Bramshall (*Bramshelle*), T. viii., 101.
 Branstone (*Branfstone*), 41, T. i.
 Bredon Abbey (Leicestershire), 106.
Bre mundesote, v. Bescot.
Bret, v. Bradley.
 Brewood (*Breude*), 3, 39-40, T. iv.
 Bridgeford, in Seighford (*Brigeford*), T. vi.
 Brimstree (Salop), Hundred of, 7, T. iii.
 Brimeton, in Blynhill (*Brimfstone*), T. v.
 Brockton Grange, Sheriff-Hales (*Bratone*), T. v.
 Brockton, in Baswich (*Bractone*), T. iv.
 Brockton, in Leecleshall (*Bractone*), 38, T. vi.
 Brome (in Clent, Worcestershire), 8.
 Bromley Abbots, v. Abbots Bromley.
 Bromley, King's (*Bromlei*), 25, T. i.
 Broughton, in Eccleshall (*Heriborgestone*), T. vi.
 Broughton, West (Derbyshire) (*Broctane*), 105.
Brunh, 25, v. Blynhill.
Brunn, 6, T. vi., v. Abbots Bromley.
 Backnall, in Stoke-upon-Trent (*Buchenole*), 76, T. vi.
Buckale (obsolete), 37, T. viii., 98-9.
 Buldwas Abbey (Shropshire), 72.
Burcastone, Near Weeford (obsolete), T. i.
 Burslem (*Barcardeslin*), T. vii., 87.
 Burton Abbey, 10, 41, 49, 70. T. iv. T. vi., *ter.* 79-80.
 Burton, in Castle Church (*Burton*), 23, T. iv. T. v.
 Barton-on-Trent, 10, 11, 14, 49, 50, 64.
Burtone (postea Tutbury), 49-50, T. ii.
 Bushbury (*Biscopesberie*), 44, T. iii., *bis.* T. v., 73.

 C.
 Caldon *al.* Caudon (*Caldone*), T. viii.
 Cannock (*Chent*), 39, T. iv. 70, T. v. 73, 74 *n.* Cannock Forest, 34 *n.*, 40, 56, 70.
 Canwell, 64, 64, *n.*
 Castle Church, near Stafford, 21.
 Castle Farm, in Castle Church, 21.
 Castle Holgate (Salop), 84.
 Cauldon (*Caldone*), T., viii.
 Caverswall (*Cavreswelle*), T., viii., 100, 101.
Catspelle, v. Gospel-End.
Cedde (Cheshire), 76.
Cedla (Checkley), 37.
Celle, T., viii., v. Cheddle.
Celtone, v., Cheddleton.
Cerlone, 36 v. Chapel Chorlton.
Cerveadone (Chapel Chorlton ?), 36.
Cervernest, v. Charnes.
Ceterville, v. Chatnall.
 Chapel-Chorlton (*Cerlone*), (*Cerveadone*), 36, T. vi., *bis.*
 Charnes, in Eccleshall (*Cervernest*), T. vi.
 Chartley (*Cerlie*), 39, T. vi., 90-1, 97-8.
 Chatnall, in Eccleshall (*Ceterville*), T. vi.
 Chatterley, in Wolstanton, 88-9.
 Cheddle (*Celle*), T. viii.
 Chelsey (*Cebbesio*), 19, T. vii., 77, 91.
 Checkley (*Cedla*), 37, T. viii., *bis.*
 Cheddleton (*Celtone*), 49, T. viii., 98.
 Chell, in Wolstanton, 88.
Chenut (Cannock), 39, T. iv., 70.
Cheneware, v. Kinfare.
Chenwardstone, v. Kinvaston.
Chenichdone, v. Knighton.
 Cheshire, 1.
 Cheslyn Hay, 74, *n.*
 Chester, 32.
 Chester Castle, 32, 96.
 Chester, St. Werbergh's Monastery at, T. ii.
 Chesterton (implied in Wolstanton) T. vi.
 Chesterton (Warwickshire), 55.
 Cheswardine (*Ciscworde*), 7, T. vii., 86-7, 95.
 Chiffington, in Brewood (*Cillentone*), 3, 15, T. v., 73, 109, 110.
Chingelsci, v. Kingsley.
 Chipnall, in Cheswardine (*Ceppecanole*), 7, T. vii., 86-7, 95.
 Chorley, 60.
Chotes (Site of a Monastery, afterwards removed to Croxden), 104.

Church Eaton (*Eitone*), T. v., 72.
Cilebi (Leicestershire), 25, *n*.
Ciseworde, *v*. Cheswardine.
Cippemore (obsolete, near Kinver), 35, T. iii.
 Claverley, Salop, (*Claverlege*), 6, 7, 51, T. iii.
 Clayton Griffith, in Trentham (*Claitone*), 53, T., vii., 82, 89, 90.
 Clent (Worcestershire), 8, 66-7.
 Clifton Campille (*Clistone*), 39, 55, T. i., 60, T. ii., Col. 12.
 Clive, Haye of, 37, 77.
Clotone, T. vii., *v*. Knutton.
Cobintone, T. vi., 82, *v*. Kibblestone.
Cocrdone or *Cocortone* (near Trysull), 35, T. iii., *bis*, 69.
 Codsall (*Codeshale*), T. iii., 73.
 Cold Meese, in Eccleshall (*Mess*), T. vi.
 Coleshill (Warwickshire), 9.
Colt (obsolete, near Colton), 37.
 Colton (*Coltune*, or *Coltune*), T. vii. *bis*, *v*. Errata.
 Colwich Parish, 13, T. vi., 95 *n*.
Come (Templecombe, Somerset), 45 *n*.
Comegrave, *v*. Congreve.
 Compton, in Tettenhall (*Contone*), T. iii.
 Congreve, in Penkridge (*Comegrave*), T. iv.
 Cooksland, in Seighford (*Cuchesland*), T. vii.
 Coppenhall (*Copchale*), T. v.
 Coseley, implied in Sedgely, T. iii.
Cota, T. vi., *v*. Cotes Quarter
Cote (near Penn), 35, 44, T. iii., 67.
Cote, T. vi., *v*. Coton Clanford.
 Cotes, in Eccleshall (*Cota*), T. vi.
 Cotes Heath, implied in Cotes, T. vi.
 Cotes Quarter, in Eccleshall (*Cota*), T. vi.
 Coton Clanford, in Seighford (*Cote*), T. vi.
 Coton, near Stafford (*Cote*), T. vii.
 Coton-Hayes, in Milwich (*Cote*), T. vi. 77.
 Cotwalton, in Stone (*Coterwoldestune*), (*Coderwalle*), 13, T. vii., 78.
 Coven, in Brewwood (*Cove*), T. v.
 Coventry (Warwickshire), 55 *n*.
 Cowley, in Gnosall (*Covelau*), T. iv.
 Cradley (Worcestershire), 12.
 Crakemarsh (*Crachemers*), 39, T. viii., 97, 101, 106-7.
 Creighton, in Uttoxeter (*Cratton*, A.D. 1241), 107.

Cresswell (*Cressvale*), T. vii., 75.
 Cresswell, in Sandon, 75.
 Croxden, (*Crochesdene*), T. viii., 101.
 Croxden Abbey, 102, 104.
 Croxhall, Derbyshire, T. ij.
 Croxton, in Eccleshall (*Crochestone*), T. vi.
 Croyland Abbey (Lincolnshire), 11.
 Cublesdon, 82, *v*. Kibblestone.
Cuchesland, *v*. Cooksland.
 Cuddlestone (*Culvestan*), Hundred, 3, 6, 11 *n*., 15, 34, 35, 36, 40, T. iv. & v., 70, 74.
 Cunsall, in Cheddleton (*Cuneshala*), T. viii.
 D.
 Darlaston, in Stone (*Dorlastestone*), T. vi., 79, 80, 81, 82.
 Darlaston, near Wolverhampton, 64 *n*.
 Dean Forest (Gloucestershire), 29.
 Denstone, in Alton (*Denstone*), T. viii., 101.
 Derbyshire, 1.
 Derrington, in Seighford, (*Dodintone*), T. vii.
 Devizes (Wilts.), 102.
 Dilhorne (*Dulverne*), T. viii., 100.
 Dimsdale, in Wolstanton (*Dulmesdene*), 53, T. vii., 89, 90.
 Dodsley (in Totmonslow Hundred), 78.
 Dorset, 23, 24, 111.
Dorveslau (obsolete, but in Pirehill Hundred), 36, T. vi., 78.
 Doxey, in Seighford (*Dochesig*), T. yi.
 Drakelow (Derbyshire), 51.
 Draycott-in-the-Clay (*Draicote*), T. ii., 61.
 Draycott, in Sandon, 75.
 Draycott-in-the-Moors, 187.
 Drayton Bassett (*Draitone*, *Draiton*), 23, 39, 52, T. i. (T. ii. in error), 63, 64, 64 *n*., 109. *v*. Errata.
 Drayton-in-Halcs, T. vii., col. 15.
 Drayton, in Penkridge (*Draitone*), T. iv.
 Drinton, in Stowe (*Dregetone*), T. vi.
Dua Hammerwich, *v*. Hammerwich, Nether and Over.
 Dudley (Worcestershire), 12.
Dulmesdene, *v*. Dimsdale.
Dulverne, *v*. Dilhorn.
 Dunston (*Dunestone*), T. iv.

E.

Eccleshall (*Eceleshelle*), 36, 39, 40, T. vi., 78, 79.
 Eccleshall, Honour of, 78.
Ecclesia Sancti Cædæ, v. Lichfield.
Ecclesiæ (generally), 2.
Edbaldestone, v. Adbaston.
Edelachestone, *Elachestone*, v. Ellastone.
 Edingale (*Eduinghale*), 7, 14 n., 15, T. ii., *bis*, 64.
Efnufeld, v. Enville.
Eitone, v. Church Eaton.
 Elford (*Eleford*), 39, T. i., 59, 60.
 Ellastone (*Edelachestone*), (*Elachestone*), 39, T. viii.
bis.
 Ellenhall (*Linchale*), T. vi.
Elmdale, v. Amblecote.
Elstane, v. Alton Towers.
 Ely, Isle of, 32.
 Endon (*Enadun*), 96, T. viii.
 Enfield, *en'fo* Enville, v. Enville.
 Enson, in St. Mary's, Stafford (*Entone*), T. vi., 78, 93.
 Inville (*Efnufeld*), 51, T. iii.
 Enville Chase, 51.
Erdale, 83, v. Y. rlett.
Erdale, v. Upper Arley.
 Essington (*Easing-ton*), 4, 73, T. v.
Ettone (obsolete), 35-6.
Ettone, v. Aston.
Ettone, v. Stretton.
 Ettingshall, in Selgley and Bilston (*Etinghale*), T. iii.
Ettone, v. Water Eaton.
 Eux v. 33 n.

F.

Falaise (Normandy), 54.
 Farewell, 60.
 Farley, in Alton (*Fernelege*), T. viii., 101, 102.
 Farnham (Bucks), 102.
 Fauld (*Felde*), 48, T. ii., *bis* 61. T. ii. *bis*.
 Featherstone, in Wolverhampton (*Ferdestan*), 11, 46, T. iv.
Felde, v. Fauld.
 Fenton, Great, in Stoke-upon-Trent (*Fentone*), 13, 54, T. vii., 91, 92 n.
Ferdestan, v. Featherstone.
Fernelege, v. Farley.
 Fisherwick, T. i., col. 14.

Flashbrook, in Adbaston (*Fletesbrec*), T. vi.
 Fontenaye (Normandy), 9.
 Forsbrook, in Dilthorne (*Fotesbroc*), 37, T. viii., 99, 100.
 Forton and Meertown (*Mera*), T. iv.
 Fradswell, in Colwich (*Frodeswelle*), T. vi.
 Freeford (*Fraiforde*), T. i.
Fricescote, 62, v. Syersecote.
 Fulford, in Stone (*Fuleforde*), 13, T. vi., 77.
 Fulford (Yorkshire) 27.

G.

Gailey, in Penkridge (*Graglie*), T. v.
 Gayton (*Gaitone*), T. vii., 83, 84.
 Geddington (Northants), 104.
 Gerards Bromley (*Bramelie*), T. vi., 78-9.
Gestron, v. Ingestre.
Geneshale, v. Gnosall.
Ghellinger (Yorkshire), 31 n.
 Gnosall (*Geneshale*), 46, T. iv.
 Gospel End, in Segeley (*Catipelle*), T. iii., 68.
Graglie, v. Gailey.
 Gratwicke (*Gratwicke*), T. viii.
Grava, of Domesday, The, 87.
 Great Barr (*Barra*), T. ii., *bis*, 63.
 Great Haywood (*Haizwoode*), T. vi., v. Haywood.
 Great Onne (*Onne*), v. High Onn.
 Grendon (*Grentone*), T. viii., 99, 101.
Gurzele, v. Worfield.
 Gutlagestan Wapentac (Leicestershire), 25 n.

H.

Hales, v. Sheriff Hales.
 Hales, in Market Drayton, 84.
 Hales Owen (Worcestershire), 12, 93.
Halstone (Ellastone?), 37, T. viii., col. 13, 98-9.
Hallone, v. Hilton.
 Hampshire, 16, 25 n.
 Hamestan Hundred (Cheshire), 76 n.
 Hammerwich, Nether and Over (*Due Hamerwich*), T. i.
 Hamstall Ridware (*Ridware*, *Ridware*), 58, T. i., *bis*, 62, 63.
 Hanbury, 61.
 Hanchurch, in Trentham (*Hancere*), 53, T. vii., 82, 89, 90.
 Handsacre (*Hadesacre*), T. i.

Handsworth (*Honesworte*), T. ii., 63.
 Hanford, in Trentham (*Heneford*), 53, T. vii., 89, 90.
 Hanley, 77, 92 n.
Hantone, or *Handone*, v. Wolverhampton.
 Harborne (*Horeborne*), T. i.
Hargelone, v. Hatherton.
 Harlastone (*Hornvestune*), 39, T. i., 60
 Haselour, 60, 64 n.
Haspeleia, T. vi., v. Aspley.
Haswic (near Newcastle?), 36, 44, T. iii., col. 12, T. vi., 82.
 Hatherton (*Hargedone*), 44, 46, T. iv.
 Haughton (*Haltone*), T. v., 72.
 Haywood, Great (*Haiwode*), 39, T. vi.
 Heaton, in Rushton Spencer, 77.
 Heighley, in Audley (*Heolla*), 176, T. vi.
 Heighley Castle, 76, 77.
Hilcote, v. Hileote.
Henlistone (Cornwall), 25, n.
Hentone (Qy. Enson in St. Mary's, Stafford), T. vi., 77-8.
Heolla, v. Heighley.
Hereborgestone, v. Broughton.
Hetone (obsolete), 36, T. vi., 77.
 High Offley (*Offelie*), T. vii.
 High Onn (*Onne*), 36, T. iv., 83.
 Hileote, in Chebsey (*Hilcote*), T. vi., 77, 78.
 Hilderstone, in Stone (*Heldulvestune*), 13, T. vii., 78.
 Hilton, in Wolverhampton (*Hlton* or *Haltone*), 44, 46, 46 n, T. iii., col. 12; 70, 71, T. iv., bis.
 Himley (*Himlei*), 35, T. iii.
 Hints (*Hintis*), T. i.
 Hixon, in Colwich (*Hustalone*), T. vi.
Hocintune (obsolete; near Wolverhampton), 35, 44, T. iii., col. 12; 70, 71, T. iv.
 Hopton, in St. Mary's, Stafford (*Hotonz*), T. vii., 86, 93.
Honesword, v. Handsworth.
 Hopwas (*Opewas*), 23, 39, T. i., 59.
 Horseley, 79.
 Horton (near Leek), 107 n.
Horulvestune, v. Harlaston.
 Horton, in St. Michael's, Lichfield (*Hortone*), T. i.
Holone, v. Hopton in St. Mary's, Stafford.
Hustalone, v. Hixon.

I.

Ilam, 187 n.
Iltonz, v. Hilton.
 Ingestre (*Gestreon*), T. vii., 87.
 Ipstones 96, 107 n.
 Ireland, 104.

J.

Jaffa, 104.

K.

Keele, implied in Wolstanton, T. vi.
 Kibblesstone, in Stone (*Cobintone*), 13, 17, T. vii.
 Kilmersdon (Somerset), 10.
 Kinfare (*Chenevare*), 39, 66, T. iii.
 Kings Bromley (*Bromelei*), 24, T. i.
 Kingsley (*Chingeslei*), T. viii., bis.
 Kingston, 98, 187 n.
 Kingswinford (*Suinesford*), 8, 35, 38, 66, 67, T. iii., 68.
 Kinvaston (*Chenwardestone*), 44, 46, T. iv.
 Kinver, v. Kinfare.
 Kinver Forest, 40, 51.
 Knightley, in Gnosall (*Chenistelei*), T. iv., 72.
 Knighton, in Adbaston (*Chnilestone*), T. vi.
 Knighton, in Mucclestone (*Chenistetone*), T. vii.
 Knutton, in Wolstanton (*Clotene*), 53, T. vii., 89, 90.
 Knypersley, implied in Biddulph.

L.

Lapley (*Lepelie*), 5, 6, 15, 41, 42, T. v., 73.
 Lapley Priory, 41.
 Leek (*Læ*), 39, 40, 96, T. viii.—
 Leicestershire, 103.
 Leigh (*Lege*), T. viii.
Lepelie v. Lapley.
 Levedale, in Penkridge (*Lævehale*), T. v.
Levintone v. Loynton.
 Lichfield (*Læcfele*), 19, 39, 40, T. i., 60, 61, 64 n.
 Lichfield Cathedral (*Ecclesia Sti Cedde*), 19, 39, 40, 42, T. i. pluris, T. vi. pluris.
 Lincolnshire, 103.
Linchalle v. Ellenhall.
 Litchbeck, near Weeford (obsolete), 34, T. i.
 Little Onn, in Church Eaton (*Anne*), T. v., 73.
 Little Sandon (in Great Sandon), 75.
 Little Saredon, in Shareshill (*Seresdone*), T. v., 73.

Littywood, in Bradley (*Lutiude*), T. v.
Loeshale, v. Voxall.
 London, City of, 10.
 Longdon, 60, 64 n.
 Longner, in Bradley (*Longenalre*), T. v.
 Longnor, implied in Alstonfield, T. viii.
 Longsdon, in Endon, 96.
 Longton, in Stoke-upon-Trent, 92 n.
 Loxley (*Locheslei*), T. viii., 97-8.
 Loynton, in Norbury (*Lecintone*), 18, T. v.
Lufameslas (obsolete; in Totmonslow Hundred), 37.
Lutiude, v. Littywood.
 Lutley, included in Enville.

M.

Madeley (*Madeley*), Table vii., 77.
 Madeley Ulfac (*Madeley*), T. viii., 100, 101.
 Maer (*Maer*), T. vii., 87.
 Magna Barr v. Barr.
 Marchington (*Marchamtone*), T. ii., 6.
 Marchington Woodlands, T. ii.
 Market Drayton, Salop, Parish of, 84.
 Marston, in Church Eaton (*Mersdane*), 5, 6, 15, 41, T. v., 73, 83.
 Marston, in St. Mary's, Stafford (*Mertone* and *Mersdane*), T. vii. *bis*, 82, 83, 93.
 Mavesyn Ridware (*Ridware*), T. i.
 Mayfield (*Malderside*), 39, T. viii., 97.
 Meaford, in Stone (*Messford*), 13, 41, T. vii. *bis*, 84.
 Meertown (*Mera*), 39, T. iv., 87.
Melewiche, v. Milwich.
 Mercia, Province of, 22, 25-32.
Mersdane, v. Marston, in St. Mary's, Stafford.
Mersdane, T. v., Marston, in Church Eaton.
Mertone, v. Marston, in St. Mary's, Stafford.
Mess, v. Cold Meese and Mill Meese.
Meaford, v. Meaford in Stone.
 Mill-Meese, in Eccleshall (*Mess*), T. vi. 77.
 Milwich (*Melewiche*), T. vii., 77.
 Mitton, in Penkridge (*Mitone*), T. v.
 Mixon, implied in Leek, T. viii.
 Moddershall, in Stone (*Modrateshale*), 13, T. vii., 78.
Moleslei, v. Moseley, in Bushbury.
Mondvile (obsolete, near Castle-Church), 35, 36, T. v., 72.

Moreton, in Gnosall (*Mortone*), T. iv., 71, 72, 109.
 Moreton, in Colwich (*Mortone*), T. vi., T. vii., 92.
 Moreton, in Hanbury (*Mortune*), T. ii., 61, T. ii.
 Morfe Forest, 51.
 Morfe, in Enville (*Morve*), 51, T. iii.
 Moseley, in Bushbury (*Moleslei*), T. iii.
Motre (Cheshire), 76.
 Mucclestone (*Moclestone*), 76, T. vii.
 Musden Grange (*Musedene*), T. viii.
Mutone, v. Mitton.
 Muxton, v. Muclestone.

N.

Needwood Forest, 40, 50.
 Newborough (*Edgareslege*), T. ii., 61, v. Agardsley.
 Newcastle-under-Lyme, 14, 21 n., 53-4, 75, 77, 88, 91, 92.
 —The Castle of, 88 n., 91, 92.
 Newton, in Blithfield (*Niwetone*), T. vii.
Niwetone (obsolete, in Totmonslow Hundred), 37.
 Norbury (*Northerie*), T. iv., 71.
 Norley Regis, Salop (*Nordlege*), 6, 7, 31, T. iii.
 Northamptonshire, 5, 6.
 Normacott, in Stone (*Normanescote*), 13, T. vii., 88 n., 89.
 Norton Canes (*Nortone*) 34 n., T. i.
 Norton-in-the-Moors (*Nortone*), T. vii.
 Nottingham Castle, 29, 30.

O.

Oaken, in Tettenhall (*Ache*), T. iii.
 Oakley, in Mucclestone (*Acle*), 76, T. vi.
 Oakley, near Elford (*Acle*), T. ii.
 Offley, High (*Offdie*), T. vii.
 Offlow Hundred, 14 n., 15, 19, 24, 34, 40, T. i. T. ii., 58-66.
 Okeover (*Acovre*), T. viii.
 Onecote (Derbyshire), 60.
 Onn, High, in Church Eaton (*Otne*), v. High Onn.
 Onne, Little, in Church Eaton (*Anne*), v. Little Onn.
 Onncley, implied in Madcley, T. vii.
Orrdane, v. Otherton.
 Orchard, (Dorset) The Manor of, 87.
 Orslow, implied in Church-Eaton, T. v.
 Oswestry (Salop), 100.
 Orton, in Wombourne (*Overtone*), T. iii.

Oseney Abbey (Oxfordshire), 61.
 Otherton, in Penkridge (*Orretone*), T. v.
Obue, 83, v. High Onn.
 Oxfordshire, 2, v. Errata.
 Oxley, in Bushbury (*Oxeliz*), T. iii.

P.

Packington, in Weeford (*Pagintone*), 58, T. i.
Paneris, v. Penkridge.
 Patshull (*Pecleshella*), T. iii.
 Pattingham (*Patingham*), 39, T. iii.
Pecleshella, v. Patshull.
 Pelsall (*Peleshale*), 44, T. i., T. iii. col. 12.
 Pendeford, in Tettenhall (*Pendeford*), T. iii.
 Penkhull, in Stoke-upon-Trent (*Pinchetel*), 13, 39.
 T. vi.
 Penkridge (*Pancriz*), 38, 46, T. iv., *bis*. 73.
 Penkridge, Collegiate Church of, 46-7.
 Penn, Upper and Lower (*Penne*), T. iii., *bis*. 94.
 Perry Barr (*Pirio*), T. ii., 63.
 Perton, in Tettenhall (*Pertone*), 27, 40, T. iii.
 Pillaton, or Pilleton Hall, 70.
Pinchetel, v. Penkhull.
 Pipe Ridware (*Ridware*), T. i., 62, 63.
 Pirehill Hundred, 13, 14 n., 15, 18, 34, 36-7, 50.
 T. vi., vii., 75-96.
Pirio, v. Perry Barr.
 Podmore, in Eceleshall (*Podemore*), T. vi.

Q.

Quat, Salop (*Quatone*), 2, 6, 7, T. iii.

R.

Ranton (*Rantone*), T. vii.
Redbaldestone, v. Rodbaston.
 Rheims, Abbey of St. Remigius at, 5, 6, 41, 42.
 T. i., T. v., T. vi.
 Rickerscote, in Castle Church (*Ricardescote*), 36.
 T. v., 72.
 Ridge, The, in Standon (*Rigge*), T. vii.
 Richmond Castle (Yorkshire), 31 n.
Ridware T. i., T. ii., 41, 63, v. Hamstall Ridware
 and Pipe Ridware.
Riduare, T. i., v. Mavesyn Ridware.
Ridware, T. i., v. Hamstall Ridware.
Ridware, T. i., v. Pipe Ridware.

Ridware, as a District, 63.
Rigge, v. Rudge.
Rigge, v. Ridge, The
Rischale, v. Rushall.
 Rocester (*Roccestre*), 39, 96, T. viii.
 Rodbaston, in Penkridge (*Redbaldestone*), 56, T. v.
 Rolleston (*Rolvestune*), 48, 48 n., T. ii.
 Romer in Sandon, 75.
 Romesley, Salop (*Rameslege*), 2, 6, 7, T. iii.
 Ronton, v. Ranton.
 Rowley Regis, 12, 14, 69.
 Rownall, in Cheddleton (*Rugchala*), T. viii.
 Rudge, in Pattingham (*Rigge*), 2, 6, 7, T. iii.
 Rudyard, in Leek (*Rudierd*), 96, T. viii., 97, 101.
 103.
Rugchala, v. Rownall.
 Rugeley (*Rugselci*), 39, 40, T. iv.
Ruscote (obsolete; near Blymhill), 35-6.
 Rushall (*Ruschale*), T. ii.
 Rutland, 103.
 Rushtons, The, in Leek (*Risetone*), 86, T. viii.
 Rushton Grange, in Burslem (*Risetone*), T. vii.
 Rye, Normandy, 54.

S.

Salt, in St. Mary's, Stafford (*Selte*), T. vii., 86, 93.
 Sandon (*Scandone* and *Parva Sandone*), T. vi.,
 T. vii., 86.
 Saredon, in Shreshill (*Sardone*), T. v.
Scelfitone, v. Shelton.
Secon, v. Sheen.
Scoteslei (obsolete; near Colwich), 37, T. vi.
Scotestan, v. Shushions.
 Scrivelsbye (Lincolnshire), 9.
 Sedgely (*Segleslei*), T. iii. *bis*.
 Seighford (*Cesteforde*), 3, T. vi., 79.
 Seisdon (*Seisdone*), T. iii.
 Seisdon Hundred, 6, 7, 14 n., 15, 24, 34, 35.
 T. iii., 66, 70.
 Selby (Yorkshire), 29.
 Selby Abbey, 29 n.
Selchemore, v. Silkmere.
Senest, v. Shenstone.
 Senlæ, 27.
Scredone, v. Saredon.
Servescel, v. Shreshill.

- Shareshill (*Serresed*), T. v.
 Sheen (*Sceon*), T. viii.
 Shelfield, in Walsall Foreign (*Scelfeld*), T. i., 59.
 Shelton, in Stoke-upon-Trent (*Scelftone*), T. vi., 77.
 Shenstone (*Seneste*), T. i., 61, T. i.
 Sheriff Hales (*Halus*), T. iv., 71, 82.
 Sheriff Hales Church, 24 n., 71.
 Shipley, Salop (*Sciplei*), 2, 7, 16. T. iii.
 Shropshire, 1, T. iii.
 Shushions, in Church Eaton (*Sceotestan*), T. v.
Subford (Qy. in Oxfordshire?), 3, 4, 52.
 Silkmore, in Castle Church (*Sekehmore*), T. v.
 Sirescote, in Tamworth (*Fricscote*), T. ii., v.
 Syerscote.
 Slindon, in Eccleshall (*Slindone*), T. vi.
 Smethwick (*Smetewick*), T. i.
 Smallrise, in Sandon, 75.
Sotchelle, T. vi., v. Sugnall.
 Sow, The River, 20, 21.
 Spam, 10.
 St. Evroul Uticium, Abbey of, 24 n., T. iv., 93.
 St. Martin le Grand, London, Church of, 28.
 St. Remigius, at Rheims, Abbey of, v. Rheims.
 St. Werbergh, at Chester, Church of, 48.
 Stafford (*Stafford*), The Burgh of, 15, 17, 19-21,
 30, 38, 48, 50, 51. T. vi., *bis*. T. vii., 93-95,
 109, *bis*.
 The Castle, 17, 19-21, 32.
 The "Old Castle," 21.
 The Church and Parish of St. Mary, 43, T. vi.,
 T. vii., 93, 94.
 The "Vivatium," 21.
Stagrigesholle, v. Stramshall.
 Stamford Bridge (Yorkshire), 27.
 Stamford (Lincolnshire), 27.
 Standon (*Stantone*), T. vii., 87.
Stanley Hundred (Warwickshire), 2, 3.
 Stanley, implied in Endon, T. viii.
 Stansope, in Alstonfield (*Stansope*), T. viii.
 Stanton, in Ellastone (*Stantone*), T. viii.
 Statfold, 60, 64 n.
 Stitchbrook, in St. Chad's parish, Lichfield (*Tiche-*
 broe), T. i.
 Stoke by Stone (*Stoca*), 13, T. vii., 86.
 Stoke-upon-Trent (*Stoehe*), 12, 13, 77, 92.
 Church and Parish, 13, 24, T. vii., 92 n., 95 n.
 T. viii., col. 13.
 Stone, 13,
 Stone Parish, 12, 86, 95 n.
 Stone Priory, 13.
 Stonnall, Upper and Lower (in Shenstone), 61.
 Stottesden Hundred (Shropshire), 7, T. iii.
 Stowe Parish, 13, T. vi., 95 n.
 Stramshall, in Uttoxeter (*Stagrigesholle*), T. viii.,
 101, 107.
 Stretton, in Burton-on-Trent (*Stratone*), T. i.
 Stretton, near Brewood (*Estretone*), T. v., 72.
 Sugnall, in Eccleshall (*Sotchelle*), T. vi., 78, 79.
Suinetford, v. Kingswinford.
Sulverton, v. Swynnerton.
 Swineshead, in Eccleshall (*Suesueshed*), T. vi.
 Swinford, Old (Worcestershire), T. iii., 68.
 Swynnerton (*Sulverton*), T. vii.
 Syersecote, in Wigginton (*Fricscote*), T. ii., 62, 63.

T.

 Talke, in Audley (*Tale*), T. vii., 90.
 Tamhorn, in Whittington (*Tamahore*), T. i.
 Tamworth (Staffordshire and Warwickshire), 8-10,
 14, 63, 64, 79. T. i., col. 12.
 Tarbeck (*Terdeberie*), (Worcestershire), 8, 66.
 Tatenhill, v. Barton-under-Needwood.
 Tean, in Checkley (*Tine*), T. viii., 98, 101.
 Teddesley Haye, 74 n.
 Tettenhall (*Totthala*), 38, T. iii., *bis*.
 Tettenhall Collegiate Church of, 46.
 Tettenhall Clericorum, 35, 46, T. iii., 67, 68.
 Thorpe Constantine (*Torp*), 54, 55, T. ii.
 Thursfield, in Wolstanton (*Turvoldefeld*), now New
 Chapel, 53, T. vii., 87, 88, 88 n., 89.
Tuhibroc, v. Stichbrook.
 Tillington (*Tillintone*), T. vii.
 Tipton (*Tibitone*), T. i.
 Tirley, in Drayton-in-Hales (*Tirelire*), 7, 14 n., 15.
 T. vii., 84, 95.
 Tittensor, in Stone (*Titesoure*), 13, 23, T. vii.
 Tixall (*Tichesale*), T. viii., *bis*. 84.
Torp, v. Thorpe Constantine.
 Totmonslow Hundred, 14 n., 15, 18, 24, 34, 37.
 T. viii., 96-98.
Trelvege (Cornwall), 25 n.
 Trentham (*Trenham*), 14, 38, 49, T. vi., 75, 91-2.
 Trescott, 62.

Trysull (*Treslei*), T. iii.
 Tunstall, in Adbaston (*Tunestaf*), T. vi.
 Tunstall, in Wolstanton, 88-9.
Turgarestone, v. Wolgarston.
Turvoldesfeld, v. Thursfield.
 Tutbury (*Toleberie*), 30 n., 49-50, T. ii., 61, 109.
 Tutbury Castle and Borough, T. ii.
 Twirlow, in Sandon, 75.
 Tymmore (*Timmor*), T. i.

U.

Ullavestone, v. Woollaston.
Ulselei, v. Wolseley.
Ulverstone (Warwickshire), 2.
 Upper Arley (*Ernlege*), T. iii., 67.
 Uttoxeter (*Wolochesdale*), 39, 40, T. viii., 97, 101, 107.

V.

Val-es-dunes (Normandy), 54.
 Valognes (Normandy), 54.

W.

Walecros Wapentac (Derbyshire), T. ii.
 Walsall, 58-9, T. i.
 Walsall, Foreign, 59.
 Walsall-Wood Chapelry, 59.
 Walton Grange, in Gnosall (*Waltone*), T. iv., 71, 72, 81.
 Walton, in Baswich (*Walestone*), T. iv.
 Walton in Stone (*Walestone*), 13, T. vii., 86.
 Walton, near Eccleshall (*Walestone*), T. vi., 79.
 Walton-on-the-Hill, v. Walton, in Baswich
Wamburne, v. Wombourne.
 Warslow, in Alstonfield (*Wereslei*), 49, T. viii., 98.
 Warwick Castle, 29.
 Warwickshire, 2, 3, 10, 103.
 Washingborough (Lincolnshire), 10.
 Water Eaton, in Penkridge (*Etone*), T. v.
 Waterfall, 107 n.
 Wednesbury (*Wadnesberie*), 38, 58, T. i., 50.
 Wednesfield (*Wodnesfeld*), 44, T. i., T. iii., col. 12.
 Weeford (*Weforde*), 34, T. i.
 Wellow (Somerset), 12,
Wereslei, v. Warslow.
 West Bromwich, 63, 64 n. *See Errata.*

Westminster Abbey, 26, 27, 40, 41.
 Weston, in Standon (*Westone*), T. vii.
 Weston Coyney, in Caverswall (*Westone*), T. viii., 99, 100.
 Weston Jones, in Norbury (*Anonymous in Domesday*), T. v., 72.
 Weston-subtus Kavermont, 99, v. Weston Coyney.
 Weston-under Lyzeard (*Westone*), T. v.
 Weston-on-Trent (*Westone*), T. vii., 90.
 Wetmore, in Burton-on-Trent (*Wilmere*), T. i.
 Wetton, 107 n.
 Wheaton Aston, 41.
 Whiston, in Kingsley (*Witstone*), 70, T. viii.
 Whiston, in Penkridge (*Witstone*), T. iv., 70.
 Whitmore (*Witemore*), 53, T. vii., 89, 90.
 Whittington, 60, 64 n.
 Wichnor (*Wicmore*), T. ii., 62.
 Wigginton, in Tamworth Parish (*Wiggetone*), 9, T. i., 59, 62, 63.
 Wightwick, in Tettenhall (*Wistwic*), T. iii.
 Wilbrighton, in Gnosall (*Wilbrestone*), T. v.
 Willenhall (*Winchala*, *Winenhale*), 38, 44, T. i., 59, 64 n., T. iii., col. 12.
 Winchester, City of, 10.
 Winnington, in Mucclleston (*Wonnitone*), T. vii.
 Wirley, Little (*Wirdela*), 34 n., T. i.
Wistwic, v. Wightwick.
Witstone, v. Whiston.
Witemore, v. Whitmore.
Wodetone, v. Wootton-under-Weever.
Wodestone, T. vi., v. Wootton, in Eccleshall
Wodnesfeld, v. Wednesfield.
 Wolgarston, in Penkridge (*Turgarestone*), T. iv.
 Wolseley, in Colwich (*Ulslei*), T. vi.
 Wolstanton (*Wlstantone*), 14, 39, 75, T. vi., 87, 91, 92 n.
 Wolverhampton (*Hantone*, or *Handone*) 44, T. iii.
 Collegiate Church of St. Mary, 44-46, 58, 59.
 Monastery, 44, 58, 59.
 Parish, 74 n.
 Wombourne (*Wamburne*), T. iii.
 Woodford Grange, 69.
 Woollaston, in Bradley (*Ullavestone*), T. v.
 Wootton, in Eccleshall (*Wodestone*), T. vi., 79.
 Wootton-under-Weever, in Ellastone (*Wodetone*), T. viii.
 Worcester, Cathedral Monastery of, 45.

Worcestershire, 1, 12, 66-7, 68.

Worfield, Salop (*Wrfeld*), 6, 7, 23, 48, 51, T. iii.,
93, 109.

W'otolchshalc, v. Uttoxeter.

W'rfeld, v. Worfield

Wrottesley in Tettenhall (*W'rotolci*), T. iij.

Wyrley, Great,—implied in Cannock, T. iv.

Wyrley, Little (*W'ireleia*), 34 n, T. i., 65.

Y.

Yarlett (*Erlide*), T. vii. 83

Yarnfield,—implied in Swinnerton, T. viii.

York, 27, 30, 31.

York Castle, 30.

York, St. Mary's Abbey at, 102.

Yoxall (*Locheshalc*), T. i.

INDEX OF PERSONS.

. In the following Index the syllable Ant., followed by the name of any person in the possessive case, signifies "Antecessor of" or "Predecessor of."

The syllable Ten., followed by the name of any person in the possessive case, signifies "Tenant of" or "Tenants of."

The letter T. or the syllable Tab., followed by a Roman Numeral, stands for "Table."

The syllable Col. stands for "Column" of any Table.

T. R. E. signifies "Tempore Regis Edwardi," viz., A. D. 1041-1066.

T. R. W. signifies "Tempore Regis Willielmi," viz., A. D. 1066-1087.

The abbreviation *al.* stands for *alias*; *c.* for *circa*; *def.* for *defunctus*; *n.* or *n.* for "note;" *ob.* for *obit*; *occ.* for "occurs" or "occurring;" *tem.* for *tempore*; *v.* for *vide*.

A.

- Abetot, Urso de (Sheriff of Worcestershire, 1086), 66-7.
 Abrincis, Hugh de (1067), 48, 53, *v.* Chester, Earls of.
 Alan, Fergant, or Rufus, Comte of Lower Bretagne (occurs, 1066, 1069, &c., *Obit* 1088, *s. p. l.*), 31.
 —, Alan Niger, brother and heir of, 31 *n.*
 Alcher, Ten. Henrici de Ferrieres, Tab. ii.
 Algar Comes, T. i. *octies*, T. ii., T. iii. *octies*, T. iv. *quater*, T. vi. *ter*, T. viii. *quinquies*.
 Almar, Ten. Ricardi Forestarii, Tab. vii., 89.
 Alric, *alias* Ailric, *alias* Alric, *alias* Aluric, a Thane under K. Edward and K. William (1066-1086), 47, T. ii., T. v. *quinquies*, 73, T. vi., T. viii., 107
 Alric and Edwin—Priests holding in 1086 under Sampson the King's Chaplain, *v.* Edwin.
 Alric, Ten. of the Bishop at Ridware (1086), T. i.
 Alwin, Ten. of the Bishop at Horton and Yoxall (1086), T. i.
 Amerland, Ten. Rainaldi Bailgole, T. v.
Ancille (of Domesday), 6 *n.*, 48.
 Arden, Osbern de (*c. tem.*, Steph.), 62.
 Ardern, Walcheline de (*c.* 1240-1255), 60.
 Arundel, The Earl of, (1211-12), 85.
 Auberville, Robert de (Forester of Somerset, 1086), 53, *n.*
 Audley, Adam (I.) de, 90.
 —, —, Lyulphor Lydulph, son of (1130), 76, 90.
 —, —, Adam (II.), son of, 88 *n.*, 90.
 —, Henry de (occ. 1211, 1227), 76-7, 88-9.
 —, —, Petronilla de Gresley, wife of, 88, 89.
 Azelinus, Ten. Rogerii Comititis, T. i., T. vii. *ter*, T. viii., 97.

B.

- Bagot of Bromley, Sir Ralph, 85.
 —, —, Elizabeth de Blithfield, wife of, 85.
 Bailgole, Rainald (Domesday Sheriff of Shropshire), 17, 18, 54, T. iv. *bis*, 71, T. vii. *bis*, 82, 108, 109.
 Bassett, Turstin (of Drayton, 1086), 52. *See Errata.*
 Ralph, alleged son of Turstin (Justice of England), 52. *See Errata.*
 Richard, son of Ralph (Justice of England), 52, 64, 80.
 —, Matilda Ridel, wife of, 53.
 Bassett of Sapcoate, William (1170), 103.
 Bayeux, Odo, Bishop of, 45 *n.*
 Beauchamp, of Elmley, William de (Sheriff of Worcestershire, 1155), 91-2.
 Beauchamp, Stephen de (*ob.* 20 November, 1184), 56.
 Bevill, Ranulph de (1220-40), 92 *n.*
 Blithfield, Hereman de (*c.* 1100-30), 85, 86.
 —, —, Walter, son of (Tem. Henry II.), 72, 86.
 —, —, William, son of, 85.
 —, —, —, Almaric, son of, 85.
 —, —, —, —, William, son of, 85.
 —, —, —, —, Richard de Hulcomb, son of, 85.
 —, —, —, John de Blithfield, younger son of, 85.
 Blithfield, John, son of William de (*ut. supra*), 85.
 —, Sir Henry de, son of John, 85.
 —, Sir James de, son of Sir Henry (1240), 85.
 —, Richard de, son of Sir James, 85.
 —, Richard de, son of Richard de, 85.
 —, Henry de, son of Richard (*ob. s. p.*), 85.

Bliethfield (*cont'd.*), John de, brother of Henry, 85.
 —, Richard de, son of John, 85.

—, —, Catherine de Baliden, wife of, 85.

—, —, Elizabeth, daughter and heir of, 85, *v.*

Bagot of Bromley.

Brismar (a Cornish Thane, 1066), 25 *n.*

Brittany, Alan Fergus, Comte of (1069), 39.

—, —, Alan, brother and heir of, 31 *n.*

Broc, Robert, 55.

—, —, Margery Broc, wife of, 55.

—, —, Margery, daughter of, 55, *v.* Loges.

Buci, Robert de (Ten. Rad'i fil Huberti, 1086),
 T. viii. *bis*.

Burton, Abbot and Convent of, 11, 12, 17, T. i
ter, T. iv. *bis*, T. vi. *bis*, T. viii. *ter*, 108, 109.

Burton, Abbots of. —

Leofric (1066-1085), 80.

Geoffrey de Mala Terra (succeeded, 1085;
 expelled, 1091), 80, 93.

Nigel (*ob.* 1114), 80.

Geoffrey (11.) (1114-1150), 80, 81.

Robert (1150-1159), 81.

Bernard (1159-1175), 81.

Robert, restored (1175; *ob.* 1177), 81.

Burton, Priors of. —

Swegen (*occ.* between 1114 and 1150), 80, 81.

Edwin (succeeded Swegen), 81.

Jordan (succeeded Edwin), 81.

Burton, Sub-Priors of. —

Edwin, 81.

Jordan (succeeded Edwin), 81.

Brien (succeeded Jordan), 81.

C.

Canterbury, Anselm, Archbishop of, 45.

Caverswall, Walter de (1166), 100.

Chamel, Geoffrey de (1166), 105.

Chenuin, *al.* Chevene, Thane of Codsall (1066-
 1086), 55, 56, T. iii., 90.

Chenene, Richard, *alias* Richard Forester, *alias*
 Richard Venator, probably son of Chenuin
 (1086), 51, 53-56, 76, 90, 90 *n.*

—, —, Margery, daughter of, wife of William
 (Qy. Walter) Croc, 55.

—, —, Ormus le Guidon, *alias* Ormus de Dar-
 laston, son of (living 1130), 53, 76, 80.

Chenene, Richard, Ormus le Guidon, son of (*contd.*)

—, —, —, * * *, daughter of Nicholas
 Vicecomes, wife of, 80.

—, —, —, Robert, son of (*occ.* 1130), 53, 80.

—, —, —, Alina, daughter of, 53, *v.*
 Gresley.

—, —, —, Thomas, son of, 76.

—, —, Ralph de Knutton (temp. Johannis
 Regis), eventual co-heir of, 53.

Chester, Robert de Limesey, Domesday Bishop of
 (appointed Dec. 1085), 3, 39-40. T. i. *pluries*,
 T. iv. *quingues*, T. vi. *pluries*, T. vii., 93,
 T. viii., 108, 109.

Chester, Earls of. —

Hugh de Abrincis (1071-1100), 48, 49, 53,
 64, 75, 97.

—, —, Geva, illegitimate daughter of, 53.

—, —, Matilda Ridel, daughter of, 53,
 64, *v.* Bassett.

Raoul le Meschin (I.), (1121-1128), 102.

Raoul le Meschin (II.), (1128-1153), 49, 97.

Ranulf Blundevill (1180-1232), 88 *n.*

Clinton, Geoffrey de (1130), 76, 102.

—, —, Lescelna, daughter of, 102, *v.* Verdon.

Cnoton, Randolph de, *v.* Knutton.

Corbucion, William, son of, 3, 4, 52, T. v.

Cospatrik (1068), 29.

Coyney, Thomas (1167), 99.

—, John (1240-2), 99.

Croc, William (Qy. Walter), 55.

—, —, William, son of (hanged), 55.

—, —, Margery, daughter of, 55, *v.* Broc.

D.

Darlaston, Ormus de, *alias* Ormus le Guidon, *alias*
 de Guldone (living 1130), 53, 76, 80, 81, 89.

—, —, * * *, daughter of Nicholas Vicecomes,
 wife of, 80.

—, —, Robert, son of (*occurs* 1130), 53, 80,
 81, 89.

—, —, —, Alina, daughter of, 53.

—, —, —, Mabilia de Perpant, wife of, 81.

—, —, —, Ralph, son of (*ob. s. p.*), 81.

—, —, Edward, son of, 81.

—, —, Thomas, *al.* Thomasin, son of, 81.

—, —, Alured, supposed son of, 81.

Despenser, Robert le (1086), (ancestor of Marmion), 9.
 Domesday Clerks and Scribes, 3, 4, 4*n.*, 5*n.*, 6*n.*
 Domesday Commissioners, 1-6, 11-12, 17, 48, 67.
 Domesday Rubricators, 2, 3, 5, 5*n.*, 6*n.*, 57, 82.
 Drogo, Ten. W'mi. fil Ansculfi, T. ii. *ter.*
 Dugdale, Sir William, 8.

E.

Eadgar, the Atheling (1066), 27, 29.
 Eddulf, Ten. Abbatis de Burton, T. viii.
 Edmund, Tainus Regis Edwardi, 41 *bis*, T. i.,
 T. vii., T. viii.
 Edric, Tainus Regis Edwardi, T. iii., T. vii.
 Edrie, Ten. Comitis Leofric (*ante* 1057), T. iii.
 Edwardus Rex, T. i. (with six Manors), T. iii.
 (with six Manors), T. iv. (with six Manors), T.
 vi. (with one Manor).
 Edwin and Alric, Priests (holding Hatherton, &c.,
 under Sampson, the King's Chaplain), 46, T.
 iv. *quater.*
 England, Kings of—their kindred, &c.
 Alfred (872-900), 8.
 —, Ethelfleda, daughter of, 8.
 Edward, the Elder (900-925), 8, 20.
 Ethelred (978-1016), 44.
 Edward, the Confessor (1042-1066), 26, 42,
 v. Edwardus Rex.
 —, Goda, Comtesse of Boulogne, sister of,
 102.
 Harold (Jan. 6—Oct. 14, 1066), 26, 27, 39,
 39*n.*, T. i.
 —, Ealdgyth, wife of, 26, 30, *n.*
 William the Conqueror (1066-1087), 33*n.*,
 54, *et passim*, 108-109.
 —, Matilda, wife of, 28, 29, 31*n.*
 William Rufus (1087-1100), 20, 75.
 Henry I. (born 1068, reigned 1100-1135), 29.
 Stephen (1135-1154), 75.
 Henry II. (1154-1189), 21, 75, 77, 91, 95.
 Richard (1189-1199), 104.
 John (1199-1216), 104.
 Erdinton, William de (1211-12), 91.
 —, —, Philippa, wife of, 91.
 Evesham, Aglwi, *al.* Elwi, *al.* Alwin, *al.* Ægelwin,
al. Æthelwig, Abbot of, 27, 27*n.*, 28.

F.

Ferrariis, Robert, Comes de (1131-1154), 106, 107.
 —, Matilda, *al.* Roisia, daughter of, 105-107.
 —, Isolda, daughter of (*natu. c.*, 1146), 106.
 —, William, presumed brother of (1166), 106-7.
 Ferrariis, William, Comes de (1166), 105.
 Ferrers, Henry de (1086), 7, 16, 19, 20, 48, 50,
 51*n.*, T. ii. *nonies*, 61, T. iv., T. vii., 94,
 97, 106*n.*, 108-9.
 —. —, Waleheline, father of, 49.
 Fitz, Alan, House of, 54, 82, 99.
 —, William (*occ.* 1166), 82.
 —, John (*def.* 1240), 99.
 —. —, Hawise, widow of, 99.
 Fitz John, Pagan (tem. Henry I.), 84.
 —, —, Cecily dau. and coheir of (*ob.* 1207),
 84, v. Hereford, Earls of.
 —, —, Agnes dau. and coheir of, 84, v.
 Munchensi.
 Forestarius, Ricardus, *al.* Richard Venator, *al.*
 Richard Cheneke (1086), 51, 53, 55-6, T. v.
bis. 76, 81, T. vii. *octies*, 87, 88*n.*, 89, 108-9.
 —, Ormus le Guidon, *al.* Ormus de Darlaston,
 son of, 80, v. Darlaston.

G.

Gamel, Thane of Little Saredon (1066), T. v., 73.
 Gamel, Thane of Balterley, Audley, and Talke
 (1086), T. vii., 90, possibly identical with—
 Gamel, son of Grifin (slain by Lyulph de Audley
circa 1129), 75, 76, 90.
 Godeva Comitissa (*superstes* 1066), 26, 41, 47, 51,
 86, 101, v. Mercia, Earls of.
 Godeva (libera femina, T. R. E), T. vii. *bis*, T.
 viii. *bis.*
 Godrie, Ten. Abbatis, Sti Remigii, T. i.
 Godwin Earl (*ob.* 1053), Tostig, son of, 26, 27.
 Gresley of Drakelow—
 —, Nigel de Stafford, ancestor of, v. Nigellus.
 —. —, William de Gresley, son of, 81.
 —, —, —, Ingenulf, younger son of, v.
 Gresley, Ingenulf de (*infra*).
 —, —, —, Alisia de Darlaston, wife
 of, 53, 81.

Gresley, Ingenulf de (1166), 53, 81, 82, 88, 89.

—, —, Alisia, wife of, 53, 81.

—, —, William, father of, 81, 89.

—, —, Robert, son of (*ob. s. p.*), 81.

—, —, Petronilla, daughter of, 81, 88.

—, —, Other daughters of, 82.

—, —, Henry de Verdon, descendant of, 82.

—, —, Hawvisia, alleged daughter of, 88, *v.* Verdon.

Griffin, Thane of Biddulph and of certain Cheshire estates, T. R. E., T. vi., 75, 76.

Gruffydd, King of North Wales, 26.

—, —, Eadgyth, wife of, 26, *v.* Mercia, Earls of.

Guidon, Ormus le, *al.* Ormus de Guldene 79, 80, *v.* Darlaston.

—, —, * * * *, wife of, 79.

—, —, Robert, son of, 79, 80.

II.

Hamo Fitz Mamfelin (1166), 101.

Hanley, William de (1211-12), 92 *n.*

Hanton, Clerici *sive* Canonici de, 82, *v.* Wolverhampton.

Harold, Earl and King, 26, 27, 39, *n.*

—, —, Eadgyth, wife of, 26, 39, *n.*

Harold Hardrada, King of Norway, (*occisus* 1066), 27.

Helgot, Ten. Comit. Rogerii, T. vii., 84.

Helgot, *al.* Helgot, Ten. Robi de Stafford, T. iii., T. vii. *bi*, 78.

Helio, Ten., Robi de Stafford, T. ii.

Hereward (1071), 32.

Herman, Ten. Robi de Stafford, T. ii.

Hereman, *v.* Blithfield, Hereman de.

Herveus, Domesday Tenant of Robert de Stafford at Stretton, Water-Eaton, Gailey, Saresdon, Shreshill, T. v. *quinquies*, 72.

—, —, Hervey de Stratton, descendant of (Sheriff of Staffordshire, tem. Hen. II.), 72.

Hesding, Ernulf de, T. vii. T. viii., 99-100.

Hubert, Ten. Henrici de Ferrers, T. ii.

Hugh fitz Grip, Sheriff of Dorset (after 1068, *def.* 1084), 33.

Hugh, Ten. Robi de Stafford, T. iii. *bis*, T. vii.

Humez, Richard de (Constable of Normandy, *ob.* 1180), 103, 104.

Humez (*continued*), William de (Constable of Normandy, 1188), 104.

Humfridus, Ten. Henrici de Ferrers, T. viii.

I.

Ingulfus, Abbot of Croyland (1086), 11.

K.

Kilpee (Herefordshire), Family of, 71.

Knutton (*Cnoton*), Randulf de (tem. Joh'nis), 53, 89-90.

—, John de (tem. Hen. III.), 54.

L.

Lacy of Ewyas, Roger de (1086), 71, 84, 85.

—, Hugh de (1185), 104.

Lichfield, Bishops of—

Leofwine (living 1067, deceased 1070), 27, 27 *n.*, 28, T. vii., 86.

Peter (appointed in or before 1070; deceased 1084-5), *v.* Chester, Bishops of.

Lichfield, Canons of, T. i., 61.

Liulfus, Ten. Nigelli de Stafford, T. viii.

Loges, Hugh de, 55.

—, —, Margery Broc, wife of, 55.

—, —, Hugh, son of, 55, 56.

M.

Malhanc, William, 75, T. viii. *quater*, 98.

Marlesweyn (1068), 29.

Marmion of Fontenaye.

—, Robert (1086-1130, *def.* 1106), 9.

—, Roger (*occ.* 1115), 9, 10.

—, —, Robert, son of, 9.

Matthew of Westminster, 71.

Meauld, Sir Roger de (1255), 60.

Mercia, Earls of.—

Leofric (*obit* 31 Aug. 1057), 9, 25-6, 39 *n.*, 48, T. iii.

—, Godeva, wife of (*superstes* 1066), 26, 41, 47, 51, T. i., T. iii. *bis*, T. v. *bis*, T. viii., 86, 101.

Ælfgar. *al.* Algar (*ob. circa* 1062), 9, 25-6, 41, 42, 51, T. i. *octies*, T. ii., 63, T. iii. *octies*, 68, 71, T. iv. *quater*, 91.

—, Burchard, son of (*obit* 1061), 42, 47-48, 63.

Mercia, Earls of (*continued*).

- Edwin (*ob.* 1071), 9, 26-32, 38, 48, 71, T. v. *ter*, 93, 94.
 —, Ealdgyth, sister of, 26.
 —, Morcar, brother of, 26-29, T. ii., 101.
 Mercia, Ethelfreda, Lady of, 8, 20.
 Mercia, Offa, King of, 8.
 Montgomery, Roger de (Vicomte of the Oximin, 1067), 28, *v.* Shrewsbury, Earls of.
 —, Hugh, son of, *v.* Shrewsbury.
 Morcar, Comes, 48, T. ii., *v.* Mercia, Earls of.
 Moretain, Robert, Comte of, 25 *n.*
 Munchensi, William de (grandson of Agnes Fitz John), (*infra ætatem* 1207; *ob. circa* 1210), 84, 85.
 —, Warin, brother and heir of (1213-1254), 85.
 Murel, William (1211-12), 77.

N.

- Nauuen, Ten. Abbatis de Burton, T. iv.
 Nauuen, Ten. Abbatis de St Remigio, T. vi.
 Nicholas, Sheriff of Staffordshire, A.D. 1086, 19 *n.* 55 *n.*, 79.
 Nicholas, Sheriff of Staffordshire, *c.* 1112, (called "De Beauehamp" by Erdeswick), 79, 80.
 —, * * * *, mother of (*def'd* 1130), 80.
 Nigellus (Nigel de Stafford, Ancestor of Gresley), 53-55, T. ii., T. vii., 89, 92, T. viii., 108-9.
 —, William de Gresley, son of, 88, 89.
 —, Eugenulf de Gresley, grandson of (1166), 53, 88, 89.
 —, —, Alina de Darlaston, wife of, 53, 89, *v.* Gresley.
 —, —, Petronilla daughter of, 89, *v.* Audley.
 Nigellus (Northamptonshire, 1086), 5 *n.*, 37.
 Nigellus, Ten. Episcopi de Cestre, T. i., T. vi. *quater*, 92.
 Nigellus, Ten. Picoti apud Hustedene, T. vi.
 Nigellus, Ten. Ricardi Forestarii, T. vii. *quater*, 90.
 Nigellus, Ten. Roberti de Buci, T. viii.
 Noel, Family of, 77-78.

O.

- Oger Brito (1086), 25 *n.*
 Oiley, Robert de (Tenant of Earl Roger at Shenneston), Tab. i., 6.

- Ordericus Vitalis (*natus* A.D. 1075), 30, 49, 72.
 Osbern fitz Richard (Baron of Richards-Castle, 1086), T. iii., 67, 108.
 Outi, Ten. Comitis Rogerii, apud Quatone, T. iii.

P.

- Pantulf, Barons of Wem.—
 William (1086), 7, 20, 21, Table vi., 78, 98.
 Ivo (1166), 103.
 —, Alice de Verdon, 2nd wife of, 103.
 —, Norman, younger son of, 103.
 Pantulf of Cublesdon, 82.
 Penkridge, The Prebendaries of (1086), 47, T. iv. *bis*, 108, 109.
 Port, Adam de (outlawed 1172), 67.
 Priests of Domesday, 24; Column 5 in Tables i., ii., iii., iv., v., vi., vii. and viii.

R.

- Radulfus filius Huuberti (de Rye), 54, Table viii. *bis*, 108, 109.
 Radulfus, Ten. Episcopi de Cestre, T. i.
 Radulfus, Ten. Henrici de Ferrers, 20, Tab. iv.
 Radulfus, Ten. W'mi. filii Ansculfi, Tab. iii.
 Rannulfus, Ten. Episcopi de Cestre, apud Fraiforde et Timmor, Table i. *bis*.
 Rheims, The Abbot of St. Remigy at, 108, 109.
 Richard Forester, *v.* Forestarius.
 Richards-Castle, The Barons of, 67.
 Robertus, Ten. Comitis Rogerii, Table vi., 83, Table vii.
 Robertus, Ten. Episcopi de Cestre, Table i. *bis*.
 Robertus, Ten. Rob'i de Stafford, T. ii., T. v., 72, T. viii.
 Robertus, Ten. W'mi. filii Ansculfi, T. ii. *bis*, T. iii. *quater*, T. viii.
 Rogerius Comes, *v.* Shrewsbury, Earls of.
 Rogerius, Ten. Comitis Rogerii, T. iv. *bis*, 71, T. vii., *v.* Lacy.
 Rogerius, Ten. Henrici de Ferrers, T. ii.
 Rogerius, Ten. W'mi. f. Ausculfi, Table ii. *bis*, Table v. *bis*.
 Rye, Huubert de (1047), 54.
 —, —, Adam, son of, 54.
 —, —, Eudo Dapifer, son of, 54.
 —, —, Ralph, son of, 54, *v.* Radulfus filius Huuberti.

S.

- Saint Evroul of Uticum, Abbot and Convent of, 24 *n.*, T. iv., Col. 4; 71, T. vii., Col. 4; 83, 93.
- Saint Remigy, The Abbot of, *v.* Rheims.
- Saint Werbergh, *Virgin*, 48.
- Samson, Regis Capellanus, *postea* Episcopus Wigorn., 43-46, T. i., T. iii. *sexies*, 67-68, T. iv. *sexies*, T. vi., 108-9.
- Scrupe, Richard (T. R. E.), (Founder of Richards-Castle), 67.
- , —, Osbern, son of, *v.* Osbern fitz Richard.
- Sheen (Surrey), The Carthusians of, 83.
- Sheriffs of Shropshire.—
 Warin Calvus (*def.* 1086), 71.
 Rainald Bailgiote (1086), 71, *v.* Bailgiote.
- Sheriffs of Staffordshire.—
 Nicholas (1086) 19 *n.*, 55 *n.*, 79.
 Nicholas (*c.* 1112), 79.
 Robert de Stanley (1123-1128), 80.
 Milo de Gloucester (1129, 1130), 80.
 Hervey de Stratton (tem. II.), 72.
- Sheriffs of Worcestershire.—
 Urso de Abetot (1086), 66, 67.
 William de Beauchamp (1155), 91, 92.
- Shrewsbury, Earls of.—
 Roger de Montgomery (*ob.* July 1091), 3, 6, 16, 22-3, 28, 47, 49, 51, T. i. *ter.*, 61, 65, T. iii. *septies*, T. iv. *sexies*, 71, T. vii. *pluries*; 82, 83, 93, T. viii. *quingies*, 108, 109.
 Hugh de Montgomery (*occisus* July 1098), 6, 22-3, 47-8, 51, T. iii., T. vii., 93, 108, 109.
 Robert de Belesme (attainted 1102), 20, 83.
- Sokemen (*Socmanni*), 6 *n.*
- Somervill, Walter de (1166), 62.
 —, Roger de (*ob. circa* 1211), 60.
- Stafford, the Barons of.—
 —, Robert de (*obit* 1088), 7, 19, 50-51, T. ii. *quater*, T. iii. *quater*; 62, T. v. *pluries*, 72, T. vi., 77, 78, T. vii. *pluries*, 93-95, 98-9, 100-101, T. viii. *pluries*, 108-9.
 —, —, Nigel, brother of, 51, 54-55.
- Stafford, Hervey de, 77.
- Stafford, Canons of St. Mary's at, 42, 43, T. vi., 94, 108-9.
- Strange, John le (of Cheswardine, 1166), 7.

T.

- Tailgebosc, Ivo (1086), 102.
- Taini Regis Edwardi (1041-1066).—
 Achi, or Achil, 47, T. iii., T. vi., 86.
 * * *, sister of, 86.
 Achil, T. vii., *v.* Achi.
 Ælric, *v.* Ælric.
 Ælric, or Ailric, or Alric, or Aluric, 47, T. iii., T. v. *quingies*, 73, T. vi., T. viii. *bis*, 101.
 Ailric, *v.* Ælric.
 Ailric et Ormar (of Tixall), T. vii.
 Ailverd, *v.* Alured.
 Algar, T. ii.
 Almar, 47, T. vi., T. vii. *bis*.
 Almund, *al.* Elmund, 47 *bis*, T. iv., T. vii. *quater*.
 Alric (1066, surviving 1086), T. v., T. vii. *ter.*, T. viii. *bis*, 101, *v.* Ælric.
 Alsî, 47, T. iii.
 Alti or Alsî, 47, T. iv., T. v.
 Aluiet, *v.* Alviêt.
 Alured, or Ailverd, or Alward, T. ii. *bis*, T. vi.
 Alured et Alwin, 1, T. ii.
 Alurie (1066-1086), *v.* Ælric.
 Alviêt, or Aluiet, 47, T. iv., T. vi. *bis*.
 Alward, T. vi., T. vii. *ter.*, T. viii. *ter.*, 101, *v.* Alured.
 Alwin, T. ii., T. vii., *bis*.
 Alwin, Alwin, et Wicstric, Table vii.
 Alwin et Rafwin, 78, T. vi.
 Alwold (surviving 1086), T. viii., 101.
 Archil, T. viii.
 Augustine (of Barlaston), T. vii.
 Bernulf, 47, T. iv., T. vii.
 Bodin, T. v.
 Broder, *al.* Brodor, T. iii. *bis*, T. vii.
 Chenuin, T. iii., *v.* Chenuin.
 Chetel, T. vi.
 Dunning (surviving 1086), T. vii. *bis*.
 Edmund, 47 *bis*, T. i., T. vii., T. viii.
 Edric, T. iii., T. vii.
 Eduin, T. iii.
 Elmund, 47, T. vii., *v.* Almund.
 Elving, T. vi.
 Ernui, T. vii.
 Gamcl, T. v.

Taini Regis Edwardi (1041-1066), (*continued.*)

Gladuin, T. vii.
 Godeva Comitissa, *v.* Mercia, Earls of
 Godeva (*libera*), T. vi. *bis*, T. viii. *bis*.
 Godeva et Edric, T. viii.
 Goding, T. viii.
 Godric (surviving 1086), T. vii. *quater*.
 Goduin, 47 *bis*, T. i., T. iii. *bis*, T. v. *bis*,
 T. vii. *octies*, T. viii. *quinquies*.
 Goduin et Alrie, T. iii.
 Goduin et Ustan, T. iii.
 Griffin, T. vi.
 Hunta, T. iii.
 Iwar, T. viii. *bis*, 101.
 Leurie, T. viii. *ter*.
 Lauare, T. ii.
 Lauet, T. iii.
 Oda, *al.* Ode, T. vi., T. vii.
 Ordmer, T. v.
 Ormar, T. v., T. viii. *bis*, 86.
 Outi, 47, T. iii.
 Pata, T. vii.
 Rafwin, T. vi. *bis*, T. vii., 77, 78.
 Rafwin et Alwin, T. vi., 78.
 Rauesuard, T. vii.
 Roucehetel, T. iii.
 Sagrim, T. vii.
 Siward, T. ii., T. vii.
 Suain, or Swain, 47 *bis*, T. iv., T. vii. *quater*,
 T. viii. *bis*.
 Toehi, T. vii.
 Tol, T. vii.
 Toulf, T. vii.
 Turbern, T. vi.
 Turgot, T. iii.
 Turstan, or Turstin, T. iii. *bis*.
 Uctred, T. viii.
 Ulfac, or Ulfag, T. vi., T. viii. *bis*.
 Ulfelm, T. vii.
 Ulfere, T. vi.
 Ulfrie, or Wlfrie, T. iii., T. vii.
 Ulgar, 47.
 Ulmar, or Ulmer, or Wlmar, 47, T. vii. *bis*,
 T. viii. *bis*, 98.
 Ulstan, or Ultan, T. iii. *ter*.
 Ultan, *v.* Ulstan.
 Uluric, T. v. *bis*, T. vi., T. vii. *quinquies*, T. viii.

Taini Regis Edwardi (1041-1066), (*continued.*)—

Uluiet, *v.* Ulviet.
 Uluin, *v.* Ulwin.
 Ulviet, Ulviet, or Uluiet (surviving 1086), T.
 vii. *series*, T. viii. *septies*, 102.
 Ulwin, or Uluin, or Wlwen, T. ii. *bis*, 68.
 Untan, T. ii.
 Waga, T. ii.
 Wicstric, T. vii. 86.
 Widegrip, T. vii.
 Wifare, T. iii.
 Wilegrip, T. v.
 Wiuara, T. ii.
 Wlfrie, T. viii., Ulfrie
 Wlmar, Wolmar, T. viii. *bis*, 101.
 Wlwen, *v.* Ulwin.
 Wodie, T. viii.

Taini Regis Willielmi, 55, T. v., 108, 109.

Almar (1086), 55, T. ii., T. vii.
 Alrie, *al.* Aluric (1066-1086), 55, T. v. *bis*.
 73, T. viii.
 Alward (1086), 55, T. vii., 91.
 Alwold (1066-1086), 55, T. viii.
 Chenuin (1066-1086), 55, 56, T. iii., 73.
 Dunning (1066-1086), 55, T. vii.
 Gamel (1086), 55, T. vii. *ter*.
 Levild (1086), 55, T. v.
 Leving (1086), 55, T. vii. *bis*.
 Otha (1086), 55, T. viii.
 Richard (perhaps son of Chenuin, perhaps
 identical with 'Ricardus Forestarius'), (1086).
 55, 56, T. v.
 Sperri (1086), 55, T. vii., 90.
 Udi (1086), 55, T. v. 73, *v.* Wodie, Tainus
 Regis Edwardi.
 Ulwin, *al.* Wluinus (1086), 55, T. vii., 76.
 Wluinus, T. vii., *v.* Ulwin.

Tenants of the Abbot of Burton (1086).—

Eddulf, T. viii.
 Nauuen, T. iv., T. viii.

Tenants of the Bishop of Chester.—

Alfelmus, (1086), T. vi.
 Alric (1086), T. i.
 Alwin (1086), T. i., *bis*.
 Frane, T. vi.
 Fragrin (1086), T. vi.
 Leuenot (1086), T. vi.

Tenants of the Bishop of Chester (*continua*).—Nigellus (1086), T. i., T. vi. *quater*, 92.

Oswold (1086), T. i.

Picot, T. vi.

Radulf (1086), T. i.

Rannulf (1086), T. i. *bis*.

Raven et Alwin (1086), T. i.

Robertus (1086), T. i. *bis*.

Willelmus (1086), T. i.

Tenants of Roger, Earl of Shrewsbury.—

Azelinus (1086), T. i., T. vii. *ter.*, T. viii., 97.

Benedictus, T. iv.

Goifrid, T. vii.

Goisbert, T. vii.

Helgot, T. vii., 84.

Henry de Ferrers (at Tixall), T. vii., 84.

Outi (1086), T. iii.

Ralph de Mortimer (1086), T. iii. *bis*.

Raynald Bulgide (1086), 54, T. vii.

Robert Olgi or De Olcy (1086), T. i.

Robertus (Tenant of Yarett and Gayton), T. vi., 83, T. vii.

Roger de Lacy, T. iv. *bis*, T. vii.

Ulric, T. vi.

Walter (1086), T. i.

William Mallane (1086), T. viii. *quater*.William Pantulf, T. vii. *quinquies*.

Tenants of Henry de Ferrers (1089).—

Alber, T. ii.

Hubert, T. ii.

Hunfridus, T. vii.

Rachellus Miles, T. iv.

Roger, T. ii.

Tenants of Robert de Stafford, A.D. 1085.

Aelgot, T. vii., 75, Helgot.

Alsi, T. viii., 99.

Anger, T. v.

Aslen, T. vii.

Bagod, T. viii.

Briend, T. v., T. vii. *bis*.

Briend and Drogo, T. v.

Burred, *al.* Bueret, T. v. *bis*.Cadio, T. vii. *bis*, 78.Clodoan, *al.* Glodoen, T. iii., T. v.

Drogo, T. v.

Edric, T. viii.

Ernald, T. vii.

Tenants of Robert de Stafford (*continued*).—Ernulf de Hesdin, T. vii., T. viii. *bis*. See also p.p. 99, 100.Gislebert, T. v., T. vii. *ter*.

Godric, T. v., T. vii.

Goifrid, T. vii.

Helgot, *al.* Aelgot, T. iii., T. vii. *bis*, 78.

Helio, T. ii., T. vii.

Hervey (de Stratton), T. v. *quinquies*.Hugo, T. iii. *bis*, T. vii. *bis*.

Laurence, T. v.

Osbern, T. vii.

Robertus, T. ii., T. v., 72, T. viii.

Stenulf, T. vii.

Tanio, T. vii.

Turchil, T. ii.

Ulfac, T. vii., T. viii. *bis*, 100.Ulniet, T. vii. *quater*.Urfer, T. v. *bis*, Table vii., 98.

Vitalis, T. vii., 78.

Walbert, T. viii.

Walter, T. v.

Walter et Anger, T. v.

Warin, T. v. *ter*.

Woleman et Alsi, T. viii., 99.

Tenants of William Fitz Ansculf, A.D. 1086.

Almar, T. iii.

Arni, T. iii.

Balduin, Table iii. *bis*.Drogo, T. ii. *ter*.Gislebert, T. vi. *ter*.

Goifrid, T. iii.

Pagen, T. iii.

Radulfus, T. iii.

Robertus, T. ii. *bis*, T. iii. *quater*, T. viii.Roger, T. iii. *bis*, T. v. *bis*.

Turchil, T. ii.

Walbert, T. ii., T. iii. *bis*.Tettenhall, Priests, or Prebendaries of, 45-46, T. iii. *bis*, 68.Thanes, having *sac* and *soc*, 62, 64 *n*.Thurkil, Sheriff of Warwickshire or Staffordshire (1068), 28, 28 *n*. *Vide Errata*.—, Ailwin, father of, Sheriff of Warwickshire (1067) 28 *n*.

Turchil, Ten. Rob'ti. de Stafford, T. ii.

Turchil, Ten. W'mi. filii Ansculfi, T. ii.

Turstin, Lord of Drayton (1086), 52, T. ii., 63, 108, 109. *See Errata*, where it is explained that this Drayton was not in Staffordshire, but in Oxfordshire, and that its Lord was not "Turstin" but "Turchil de Warwick."

U.

Ulfac, Ten. Rob't. de Stafford (1086), T. vii., viii. *bis*, 100.

Ulniet, Tenant of Robert de Stafford (A.D. 1806), Table vii. *quater*.

Ulric, Ten. Ric'di Forestarii (1086), T. vii., 89.

Urfer (1086), Ancestor of De Haughton, T. v. *bis*, 72, T. vii., 98.

Utium, Abbot and Convent of, *z*. St. Evroul.

V.

Venator, Richard, 55, *z*. Forestarius, Richard.

Venator, Roger (Ancestor of Kilpec), 71.

Verdon, Bertram de (1086-1130), 102.

—, Norman de (1130-1153), 76, 97, 102-3, 106.

—, —, Lesceline de Clinton, wife of, 76, 102.

—, —, Alice, daughter of, 103, *z*. Pantulf of Wem.

—, Bertram (II.) de (occ. 1159 *ob.* 1192), 102-107

—, —, Matilda de Ferrers, wife of, probably identical with—

—, —, Roisia, wife and widow of (*ob.* 1215), 104, 107.

—, Roese de (occ. 1240-2), 96, 107.

Verdon, Ruclen de (1166), 105.

Verdon (of Darlaston) Henry de (c. 1211-1212), 82, 88, 89.

—, —, Hawise de Cresley, wife of, 88-9.

Villani, Villeins, 61 *n*.

W.

Walbert, Ten. Rob't. de Stafford, T. viii.

Walbert, Ten. W'm. fitz Ansculf, T. ii.

Walter, fil. Hereman (tem. Hen. II.), 72, 86.

Walter, Ten. Abbatis Sti Ebrufi, T. vii.

Walter, Ten. Rogerii Comititis, T. i.

Walter, Ten. Rob'ti de Stafford, T. v. *bis*.

Waltheof, Earl (beheaded 1075), 28.

Ware (Hertfordshire), The Prior of, 83.

Warin Calvus, Sheriff of Shropshire, (*def.* 1086), 24 *n*.

Wells, Giso, Bishop of (1068), 28.

Westminster, The Abbot of (1086), T. iii., 109-109.

William fitz Ansculf, 4, 51, 52, Tab. ii. *septies*, Tab. iii. *flurics*, Tab. vii., 94, 108, 109.

William fitz Corbucion, 3, 4, 52, T. v., 108, 109.

Winara, Tainus, cum *sac* et *soc*, T. ii.

Wolverhampton, The Clerks or Canons of (1086), 43-46, T. i. *ter*, T. iii. *quinquies*, 67, 71, Tab. vi., 82.

Worcester, Bishops of.—

Sampson, *prior* Canon of Bayeux and Dean of Wolverhampton (1096-1113) 44, 45.

Theulph, *prior* Canon of Bayeux (appointed Bishop, 1113), 15.

Worcester, Thomas, Prior of (became Abp. of York, 1109), 45.

Wulfrena, Foundress of Hampton Monastery (A.D. 996), 44, 46, 58.

Y.

York, Archbishops of.—

Aldred (*obit* A.D. 1069), 42.

Thomas (II.), (1109-1114), 45.

ERRATA AND ADDENDA.

Page 14, Note 1, Line 1, for nearly eight thousand read more than forty-five hundred.

„ „ Line 10, for 212,388 read 208,950.

„ „ Line 12, for 736,463 read 733,025.

„ „ Line 13, for 7,995, read 4,557.

Page 15. The Table. Various errata, to be particularized in the sequel, dictate so many arithmetical alterations in this Table that it seems better to reconstruct it entirely.

Hundreds and Manors.	Hides.	Virg.	Carn- cates.	Plough Lands.	Acres of Wood.	Acres of Meadow.	Teams em- ployed.	Villeins.	Boors.	Serfs.	Annual Value.
											£ s. d.
Otflow Hundred	117	0	11	299½	1,951½	631	252	432	170	31	127 0 4
Edingale	3	4	60	4	9	16	0	0	2 0 0
Sesdon Hundred	103	2	0	161½	1091½	88	146	231	129	57	55 17 0
Cuddestone Hundred	113	2½	2	251	582½	160½	204½	328	211	60	62 19 4
Chillington	3	0	0	6	1110	2	6	13	6	9	1 10 0
Lapley	3	0	0	6	90	16	11	18	9	5	2 10 0
Marston	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 5 0
Pirehill Hundred	92	34	7	379½	579½	413	297½	435	268	68	126 18 3
In Stafford 179 Burgages
Turley	1	0	0	2	1	4	0	1	1 0 0
Totmonslow Hundred	19	1½	8	118½	1920	107	93	182	108	13	45 7 0
Total 179 Burgages	451	21½	31	1221½	3262½	1421½	990½	1659	901	211	425 6 11

A reduction of six items in the above Table to two denominations will show proximately the relation between hideage and the exacter measurements of Domesday.

	Hides.	Acresages.
Hides contained in Domesday	451½	146790
Quasi hides or Carucates	31	10670
Supposed hideage of 100)		
Borough tenements in)	212½	32628
Stafford)		1421½
	488	468452½

Hence there will result the following calculations and conclusions:—

- I. The average Staffordshire hide corresponded with $(\frac{146790}{451\frac{1}{2}})$ about 960 acres of Domesday measurement and registration.
- II. The modern acreage of the areas which correlate with the above 488 hides, being 713,818 statute acres, it follows that the Domesday hide corresponds with $(\frac{713818}{488})$ nearly 1462½ acres of modern ascertainment.
- III. The Domesday Commissioners, surveying a district, which is now ascertained to have contained 713,818 acres, registered only 488,452 acres thereof; that is, they permitted or ignored 215,366 acres, or considerably more than one-third of the territory with which they were dealing, and somewhat more than one-third of the County, such as it was, had they dealt with all its Manors.

§ On the whole, so small in amount are the arithmetical differences between this and the former Table (p. 15), and so nearly do they balance one another, that the main result is hardly affected. The Staffordshire hide instead of prefiguring 1,457 statute acres of modern ascertainment prefigured 1,462½ such acres.

Page 15, Line 4 below the Table, for 245,844 read 245,396.

Page 22, Line 12, for £435 6s. 11d. read £425 6s. 11d.

„ Line 13, for 490 read 487.

„ Line 14, for 17s. 9½d. read 17s. 5½d.

Pages 41, 43, 45, 47. In lieu of the Page-Title—“TERRA REGIS—KING WILLIAM'S ESTATIS” the Title—“THE STAFFORDSHIRE FIEFS” should be substituted.

Page 41, Lines 24 to 28, read—Had the fifth and sixth manors on the list been placed second and third, the order would have been perfect, for the first and fifth manors were in Pirehill Hundred. As it is, the fifth and sixth manors are cut off from the first by a group of three manors which were in Otflow Hundred.

Pages 52, 53. With regard to the article, headed "TURSTINUS" and ending "Matilda's Mother";—the idea imported into this and into other passages (viz., that there was a second Manor of Drayton in Drayton—near Tamworth,—a manor other than the King's, and held *in capite* by Turstinus) proves to be a delusion. The Domesday entry is a gloss, for it is not referred to in the Staffordshire Elenchus. It is worse than a gloss, for, instead of "supplying a coeval fact," it distorts such a fact.

The lady who has discovered this Domesday gloss, obliges the Author by giving account thereof in the following terms :—

"The entry of Drayton in fol. 250 is a duplicate of that in Oxfordshire, fol. 160. b. the only material difference being that the name of the tenant is in the one case given as Turstin, and in the other as Turchil. There are one or two such slight variations of wording as seem to show that the two entries are independent extracts from fuller materials before the scribe; but there can be no doubt that the same place is described in both cases.

"That the Drayton intended is in Oxfordshire, not in Staffordshire, seems evident from the following facts :—

"First, the entry in fol. 250 is not rubricated, nor does the name of the tenant, Turstine, appear on the list of tenants in capite which precedes the Survey of the County. It is clear from this, that the entry of Drayton, like that of Sibeford, which it immediately follows, was inserted in an almost blank column, after the fair copy of the Survey was completed, by a scribe who had confused his materials and did not know where these two entries ought to go.

"Secondly, there are but two Draytons in Staffordshire, viz., Drayton near Penkridge, and Drayton Bassett; and these are both entered in the 'Terra Regis,' fol. 246 and fol. 246. b. There is sufficient internal evidence, in both cases, to identify them beyond the possibility of a mistake.

"On the other hand, there are two Draytons in Oxfordshire. One appears in Domesday, fol. 158, among the lands of Robert de Stafford: the other remains to be accounted for by this duplicate entry, which, in the Oxfordshire Survey, is duly inserted in the body of the record (fol. 160. b.), the name of the tenant, Turchil, also appearing in the preliminary index (fol. 154.) One of these Oxfordshire Draytons is in the same hundred (Bloxham) as Sibeford: this perhaps points to its being the one described by the duplicate entries.

"The transformation of Turstin of Drayton Bassett, into Turchil of Drayton in Oxfordshire, puts an end to the idea that he can be as Dugdale (and before him Erdeswick) supposed, 'Turstine de Bassett,' of Drayton Bassett, father of Ralph Bassett, Chief Justice under Henry I. The Bassetts evidently did not become possessed of the manor to which they have given their name until the marriage of Richard Bassett, Chief Justice of England, son of Ralph Bassett, with Maud Ridel, daughter and heir of Geoffrey Ridel, whose wife Geva obtained Drayton (now called Drayton Bassett) from her father, 'Hugh the Wolf,' Earl of Chester, who must have obtained it from the King soon after the date of 'Domesday.'

"CHARLOTTE S. BURNE.

"3rd Dec., 1880."

It may serve to illustrate the above emendation, if we add that Turchil, Lord of the Oxfordshire Manor of Drayton, was no other than Turkil de Warwick, and that the manor is traceable to his descendants of the name of Arden. The progenitor of the house of Bassett,—the father of the Chief Justice, Ralph Bassett, has still to be discovered. It is not a hopeless problem. The dispersion of error is the first step in the discovery of truth.

Table I., Column xi. There is a slight arithmetical error in the reduction of "9 leagues 1 quarentine by 7 leagues 2 quarentines of wood," into statute acreage. The latter should be 93,740, not 93,760 acres.

Table II. The whole of the twentieth entry (* In Draiton—Drayton Bassett, Part of) should be cancelled, and in lieu thereof should be inserted the following :—

§ Bromwic;—held T. R. E. by Brictuin;—held *in capite* A.D. 1086, by William Fitz Anselm;—underheld A.D. 1086, by Radulfus;—containing 3 hides and a wood of 720 acres;—annual value of the whole, £2;—now represented by West Bromwich;—5,719 acres. The grounds of this emendation will be given in the Errata of page 64.

This and other emendations will dictate the following alterations in the totals at the foot of the Offlow Hundred :—

The Hides should be 117, not 119. The Plough-lands should be 260½, not 262½. The Wood acres should be 136,510, not 135,810. The Domesday value should be £127 os. 4d., not £133 os. 4d. The parochial acreage should be 140,010, not 134,201 acres.

Page 63, Line 20—23 should be cancelled. West Bromwich was an independent manor; not involved.

Pages 63, 64. "DRAITON (*postea* Drayton Bassett)." This article is mostly inept. It should be corrected by the addenda, given above, relative to pages 52, 53.

Page 64. The area of West Bromwich (5,719 acres) should be deducted from the unassignable areas enumerated in the note and added to the areas prefigured by Domesday in definite localities. The total (165,014 acres) will remain unchanged.

Page 64, Note 2, Line 6, for "with Turstin's Manor of Drayton" read "with the King's Manor of Drayton."

Page 64, Note 2, Lines 6 and 7. "West Bromwich (5,719 acres), probably reckoned with one or other of Fitz Anselm's manors." These words should be cancelled.

§ On page 108 of the Staffordshire Collectanea Colonel Wrottesley has pointed out that William Fitz Anselm's Staffordshire Manor of West Bromwich is surveyed in Domesday under Northamptonshire. The entry is on fo. 226 a. 2 of the Record, and purports to place West Bromwich in the same Wapentac (viz., Optongrave) as Bernack. It runs as follows :—

"Radulfus tenet de Willelmo (filio Anselm) iij hidas in Bromwic. Terra est iij carucis. In dominio est una (caruca) et 10 villani et 3 bordarii habent iij carucas. Silva iij leuca longa et dimidia leuca lata. Valuit et valet 40 solidos. Brictuin tenuit."

The emendation which results to this treatise from Colonel Wrottesley's discovery is given above, under the Errata of Table II.

Table IV. Eighteen acres of meadow are erroneously assigned to the King's Manor of Comegrave (Congreve).

Table V., Column ix. The total number of "Acrae prati" should be 160½, not 178½.

Page 74, Line 21, for 178½ acres, read 160½ acres.

" Line 22, for 92,173½ acres, read 92,155½ acres.

" Line 23, for 763 acres, read 751 acres.

Page 75, Line 20, for *were distinct manors* read *have no distinct mention*.

" Line 20, for The appendiciz read Other appendiciz.

Page 93, Lines 4 and 5. "At the date of Domesday the Parish of St. Mary's was apparently the only Parish of Stafford."

These words, the Author is told, are open to misapprehension. He does not intend them, he does not think them, to apply to any Parochial supremacy or any Parochial divisions of the Pre-Domesday era.—

The subject of Stafford Churches and Chapels, no less than that of Stafford Castles, presents a wide and interesting field for future enquiry. The two subjects will be found in curious complication. Not the less, the Author is fain to believe, will they be found eventually to harmonize and will serve to illustrate one another.

Page 95. The gross acreage of Pirehill Hundred is 207,278 acres, not 208,364 acres. From the latter amount should be deducted 3,665 acres for the acreage of Colton, reckoned twice over in Table VII. And 2,579 acres should be added for the acreage of Keele, which is omitted in the calculations on page 95. Arithmetically, $208,364 + 3,665 - 2,579 = 207,278$.

Page 96, Lines 4-6. The modern acreage, being only 207,278 acres, exceeds the registered acreage of Domesday by 103,692 acres, not by 104,778 acres.

In other words, Domesday ignored a full half of the actual area of the territory, and 53 acres besides.

Table VIII. The insertion of Witestone on two Tables (ix. and viii.) is of course erroneous on one. The Author cannot say on which, for its identity is still uncertain (See page 70).

Page 109, Table, Fifteenth entry. Add to William fitz Ansculf's Fief 3 hides and £2 annual revenue.

Page 109, Table, Seventeenth entry. "Turstin 5 hides, value £8. This fief was only a part of Drayton." The entry should be cancelled. There was no such tenement in Staffordshire (See Addenda to pp. 52, 53).

Table,—Totals. For 499 (hides) read 497, and again, for $567\frac{1}{2}$, (hides and quasi-hides) read $557\frac{1}{2}$. For £516 16s. 3d. (annual revenue) read £510 16s. 3d.

Pages 110, 111. Other arithmetical and verbal corrigenda are identical with, or follow on, the above. It seems unnecessary to repeat them.

DA
670
S7E8

Eyton, Robert William
Domesday studies

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
