

£3.50

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN
SOCIETY

(INCORPORATING THE CAMBS & HUNTS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY)



VOLUME LXI

JANUARY 1968 TO DECEMBER 1968

CAMBRIDGE
DEIGHTON BELL
1968

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY
(INCORPORATING THE CAMBS & HUNTS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY)

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN
SOCIETY

(INCORPORATING THE CAMBS & HUNTS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY)



VOLUME LXI

JANUARY 1968 TO DECEMBER 1968

CAMBRIDGE
DEIGHTON BELL

1968

*Published for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society (incorporating the Cambs and Hunts
Archaeological Society) by Deighton Bell, 13 Trinity Street, Cambridge*

Printed in Great Britain at the University Printing House, Cambridge

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Officers and Council of the Society, 1967-1968</i> | <i>page vi</i> |
| A Collection of Flint Implements from the Hunstanton District <i>By</i> HAMON LE STRANGE | I |
| A Neolithic Hut and Features at Little Paxton, Huntingdonshire <i>By</i> GRANVILLE T. RUDD | 9 |
| A Romano-British Settlement site at Brickhills Estate, Eynesbury, Hunts. <i>By</i> GRANVILLE T. RUDD <i>and</i> COLIN DAINES | 15 |
| A Roman Farm-settlement at Godmanchester <i>By</i> W. H. C. FRIEND, D.D., F.S.A. | 19 |
| The Anglo-Saxon S-Shaped Brooch in England, with Special Reference to one from Lakenheath, Suffolk <i>By</i> TERESA BRISCOE | 45 |
| The Hidation of Huntingdonshire <i>By</i> CYRIL HART | 55 |
| The Dissenting Churches in Cambridgeshire from 1660 to 1700 <i>By</i> MARGARET SPUFFORD | 67 |
| Review Note: West Cambridgeshire (R.C.H.M.) <i>By</i> MARY D. CRASTER | 96 |
| <i>Index</i> | 97 |

THE HIDATION OF HUNTINGDONSHIRE¹

CYRIL HART

OUR information on the hidage of Huntingdonshire derives from five main sources, covering a time-span of six centuries. A document known as the Tribal Hidage gives the assessment of individual groups of Anglo-Saxon settlers in the region at some date in the eighth century; there is good reason to suppose that these ratings had been imposed at least a century previously, and they survived unchanged until the Danish settlement of 877. A second document, called the County Hidage, records the total assessment of the shire and borough of Huntingdon soon after King Edward the Elder had brought it back under English control in 917. A number of land charters and other records of estate transactions supply the hidage of individual Huntingdonshire estates at various dates during the century and a half preceding the Norman Conquest. Domesday Book gives a complete picture of the distribution of the county's hidage assessment at the time of the Conquest, and establishes that there was no change in the assessment during the first twenty years of Norman rule. Finally, a remarkably conservative memorandum in the Ramsey cartulary shows that the nominal hidages of the Abbey's estates were substantially the same in the mid-thirteenth century as at the time of Domesday, and from this we may infer that the assessments of other estates within the shire were similarly stable during this period.

Before dealing with the assessment pattern in the period 917-1086, which is the chief concern of this paper, some reference must be made to the situation during the preceding forty years, during which the territory which became Huntingdonshire was settled by the members of a small Danish army centred on a *burgh* which they fortified at Huntingdon. These army settlers completely dispossessed their English predecessors, and as they no longer paid tribute to the English crown the initial tribal hidation of the territory was obliterated. The land was shared out instead in units known as *ploughlands*, one unit being the amount of arable capable of cultivation by an eight-ox plough team in one year. These units were grouped in a duodecimal pattern to form the basis of a new taxation assessment, the proceeds of any levies being payable to the earl who ruled them from the parent borough of Huntingdon. It is becoming increasingly clear that, for many shires of the Danelaw, the ploughland figures of Domesday Book preserve a record of the taxation imposed by Danish earls soon after the settlement of 877.

¹ Detailed evidence for the general thesis here put forward will appear in my forthcoming book *The Hide in English History*. Information concerning the pre-Conquest history of individual Huntingdonshire estates is to be found in my *The Early Charters of Eastern England* (Leicester, 1966).

That this generalization applies in the case of Huntingdonshire is suggested by the duodecimal character of its Domesday ploughland assessments. Moreover, it could be argued, from the fact that these assessments are usually equal to the number of ploughs employed on each estate at the time of Domesday, that there was no great advance in the exploitation of arable land within the county between the period of Danish settlement and the Norman Conquest. There is no space here to pursue this important matter further; we must return instead to the taxation of Huntingdonshire under the English, Danish and Norman kings of the tenth and eleventh centuries.

One of the most interesting aspects of King Edward the Elder's policy during his campaign to reconquer the Eastern Danelaw, is the manner in which he came to terms with the individual armies. The annals for the years 917-18 leave one in no doubt that, as the Danish host owing allegiance to each fortress was defeated, separate surrender terms were imposed. These reflected the exigencies of the moment. Many of the Danes from the large armies based on Cambridge and Northampton were allowed to keep their lands, but landowners in the smaller districts settled from Huntingdon and Bedford were entirely dispossessed, and the whole of their territory became for a while the personal possession of the English crown. The consequences of this tenurial upheaval continued to be felt right up to the time of the Norman Conquest, and some of its repercussions are even to be found underlying the fiscal policies of the Norman kings.

Having reconquered this vast area, Edward proceeded with all speed to bring it under effective local government, on the West Saxon model. He retained for the most part the boundaries of the territory occupied by each Danish army, creating out of these settlement areas the new English shires of Bedford, Huntingdon, Cambridge, and Northampton. Upon each he imposed an entirely fresh hidage assessment, the overall figures for each shire being allocated on a duodecimal basis: Bedfordshire was rated at 1,200 hides, Huntingdonshire 800 hides, Cambridgeshire 2,400 hides, and Northamptonshire 3,200 hides. In order to distribute these ratings equitably, each shire was divided into units called 'hundreds', each of 100 hides; in Bedfordshire there appear to have been initially 12 single units of this size, in Huntingdonshire 4 double units, each of 200 hides, and in Northamptonshire 3 double units, 20 single units, and 4 'hundreds and a half', each of 150 hides. The initial arrangement for Cambridgeshire has been lost irretrievably; by the time of Domesday Book it possessed only 14 units described as 'hundreds', plus the two hundreds forming the Isle of Ely.

Within each hundred the taxation was distributed on a decimal basis, in 5 and 10 hide units, or multiples for larger estates. Each hide of assessment had certain burdens imposed upon it; when a national 'geld' or tax was levied, so much (often two shillings) was collected from each hide, and in addition each had to supply its share of manpower for army service and for duties such as repairing the shire's bridges and causeways, and maintaining and defending the walls of the parent borough. The boroughs themselves were also assessed, Huntingdon and Bedford each at 50 hides, Cambridge at 100 hides, and Northampton at 25 hides. These

Danelaw assessments were much higher than those of the boroughs of Wessex and Mercia, which commonly had only to discharge the obligations of 5, 10, or 20 hides. In this connection it may be mentioned that certainly in the case of Bedford and Huntingdon, and probably of Northampton and Cambridge too, large stretches of territory surrounding each borough were held as crown lands for many years after their reconquest.

As the price of their continued loyalty to the English royal line, the descendants of those Danish landowners who had been left by Edward the Elder in possession of their estates in Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire were able to secure very large reductions in geld liability, so that by the time of the Norman Conquest the hidation of these two counties was much less than the assessment imposed in or soon after 918. In strong contrast, in Huntingdonshire and Bedfordshire where the Danes had been replaced by English landowners, the hidation recorded in Domesday Book is substantially the same as the initial county assessments. There had been some re-allocation of geld liability between individual estates, and a few favoured holdings received minor beneficial reductions in hidation; probably the hundredal boundaries in the region surrounding Huntingdon underwent some modification. Apart from these changes, it can be shown from pre-Conquest charters that the distribution pattern of the hidage assessment among the constituent estates varied very little in Huntingdonshire in the century and a half preceding the Norman Conquest.

This claim must be qualified to some extent in the case of the double hundred of Hurstingstone, where the demesne of the manors acquired by Ramsey Abbey was freed of its hidage imposition. To compensate for this loss, the geld liability of Huntingdon borough was for a time paid through the Hurstingstone hundred court; the borough, being assessed at 50 hides, found a quarter of the total assessment of this double hundred. Eventually, however, the borough was allowed to revert to the custom of direct payment of geld into the royal fisc.

The beneficial hidation of Ramsey Abbey's demesne was almost certainly a privilege granted by King Edgar soon after the monastery's foundation. Bury St Edmunds received a similar foundation grant from King Cnut some fifty years later. It is interesting that each of the great fenland abbeys of the Benedictine reform was given jurisdiction—sake and soke and financial rights—over the court of the double hundred in which it lay, or of an adjacent double hundred. Thus Ramsey Abbey gained the lordship of Hurstingstone, Thorney Abbey the two hundreds of Norman Cross, Peterborough the two hundreds of Nassaburgh which became the Soke of Peterborough, and Ely the two hundreds which became the Liberty of Ely. It is probable that Crowland received the double hundred formed by Gedney, Tydd, and Lutton in the Holland division of Lincolnshire. All these double hundreds were adjacent to one another. Only in the case of Ramsey, however, was any substantial beneficial hidation granted, and this was probably due to the influence with King Edgar of Ealdorman Æthelwine, who was the patron of Ramsey.

It is proposed now to take each Huntingdonshire double hundred in turn, and discuss the internal distribution of its geld liability.

THE TWO HUNDREDS OF NORMAN CROSS

'The two hundreds which owe suit to Norman Cross' are mentioned in a document of c. 963. There is every reason to suppose that the hidage of individual estates within these hundreds remained virtually unchanged from 918 onwards, with a few exceptions which are discussed below. Evidence of this continuity of assessment is provided by pre-Conquest charters, with which Norman Cross is richly endowed.

| Holding | Charter no. ¹ | Hidage | Date |
|---|--------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Water Newton | 4 | 5 | 937 |
| Orton II | 5 | 4 | 948 |
| Haddon | 6 | 5 | 951 |
| Alwalton | 7 | 5 | 955 |
| Yaxley and Farcet | 8 | 15 | 956 |
| Conington | 9 | 9 | 957 |
| Orton I | 10 | 5 | 958 |
| Wood Walton | 311 | part of 10 | 969-983 |
| Yaxley, the other Yaxley, and Farcet } | 16 | 25 | 973-975 |
| St Mary's, Huntingdon | 16 | 2 | 973-975 |
| Sawtry Beames | 323 | 4 | c. 1050-1065 |
| Conington | 46 | 3+6 | c. 1060 |

In every case, the hidage is the same in the charter as in Domesday Book. The original hidation was probably as follows:

| | | Hides |
|---------------------|---|-----------|
| Estate of 30 hides | Orton | 30 |
| Estates of 20 hides | Yaxley, Sawtry | 40 |
| Estate of 15 hides | Elton | 15 |
| Estates of 10 hides | Glatton, Chesterton, Conington | 30 |
| Estates of 5 hides | Farcet, Fletton, Woodston, Bottlebridge, Alwalton, Stilton, Water Newton, Sibson, Stibbington, Haddon, Morborne, Lutton, Folksworth, Wood Walton, Washingley, Caldecote, Denton | 85 |
| TOTAL | | 200 hides |

A feature of this double hundred is the remarkable frequency with which the settlement names have OE *tun* as the second element. The hidage assessment is based on twenty-four settlements, of which no less than fifteen were 'tuns'.

Three of these, Elton, Stibbington, and Lutton, paid part of their geld in Northamptonshire by the time of the Conquest. Their assessments were possibly split up as follows:

| Estate | Hidation | | | Original Northants | Northants Hundred |
|-------------|----------|------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Original | Hunts D.B. | Northants D.B. | | |
| Elton | 15 | 10 | 2 | 5 | Willybrook |
| Stibbington | 5 | 2½ | 2 | 2½ | Nassaburgh |
| Lutton | 5 | 2½ | 2½ | 2½ | Willybrook |

¹ These are the numbers allotted to the charters in *The Early Charters of Eastern England*.

Two more estates, Conington and Chesterton, were each relieved of one hide of their assessment before the Conquest. In the case of Conington we know that this beneficial hidation occurred in or before 957.

It is probable that Yaxley was always the administrative centre of the two hundreds; this was certainly the case after the foundation of Thorney Abbey in 973. Initially Yaxley was divided into two estates, an upland and a fenland portion, each assessed at 10 hides; its neighbour Farcet was assessed at 5 hides. Soon after Thorney Abbey was founded, it received a 2-hide estate belonging to St Mary's, the mother church of Huntingdon. For convenience, the geld from this estate was paid into the hundred court at Yaxley. Subsequently there was an internal rearrangement of the hidage assessment, by which the two estates at Yaxley were relieved of 5 of their 20 hides, Farcet's assessment was increased by 3 hides (the 8-hide estate appears in Domesday Book under the guise of Stanground), and the remaining 2 hides of the combined assessment of Yaxley and Farcet were supplied from St Mary's Huntingdon.

This internal rearrangement probably occurred towards the end of the reign of Cnut, when Turkil of Harringworth on the king's orders redistributed Whittlesey Mere among the adjacent villages. A similar modification may have been made at the same time, by which Glatton's hidage was reduced by two, at the expense of its neighbour Sawtry, where Turkil himself held an estate.

THE TWO HUNDREDS OF HURSTINGSTONE

That Hurstingstone was originally a double hundred, assessed at 200 hides, is confirmed by an entry in Domesday Book. The analysis of this double hundred given by Round¹ cannot be sustained. He includes Spaldwick and part of Catworth (both in Leightonstone), and excludes one of the Broughton holdings, as well as two small estates in Stukeley and Bluntisham.

Some of the changes in the hidation pattern consequent upon the foundation of Ramsey Abbey, *c.* 970, have been referred to already. The picture is further blurred by the fact that Ramsey itself—the whole area within the monastic *banleuca*—must have been quit of the geld after its foundation, in addition to all the demesne hides of the Ramsey and Ely manors within the double hundred. Unfortunately, we do not have any record of the hidation of any estate in this hundred prior to Ramsey's foundation.

There is good reason to suppose that Broughton was originally a 20-hide estate, and St Ives was originally assessed at only 10 hides. Old Hurst and Woodhurst, which do not appear by name in Domesday Book, were probably originally reckoned as half of the Broughton estate, but were attached to St Ives to form part of the endowment of the monastery there, which was founded in 1001–2. For this reason, St Ives appears as a 20-hide estate in Domesday. Broughton was subsequently relieved of one hide of its assessment. Similar beneficial hidation was probably granted to Holywell and Wistow, both of which like Broughton appear as 9-hide estates in Domesday. One may suppose that Houghton and Wyton, which both appear with assessments of

¹ J. H. Round, *Feudal England* (London, 1909), p. 58.

7 hides at the time of the Domesday Survey, each received a 3-hide reduction; Bluntisham's Domesday assessment similarly adds up to 7 hides, and it is quite possible that all these estates, together with Colne and Somersham, were originally 10-hide units. Stukeley, Warboys, Upwood, and Abbots Ripton all appear to have retained their original 10-hide assessments, so that the exemption of the demesne of these estates appears to have been compensated for by an equivalent increase in the assessment of their villein holdings.

If this hypothesis is correct, it appears that unlike Norman Cross, where the average estate received a 5-hide assessment, the estates of Hurstingstone were usually assessed at 10 hides. It is impossible to reconstruct the early hidation with certainty, but the following is probably not far from the truth:

| Estate | Hidage | |
|----------------------|--------|------|
| | 918 | 1066 |
| Ramsey | 20 | 0 |
| Broughton | 20 | 9 |
| Hartford | 18 | 15 |
| St Mary's Huntingdon | 2 | 0 |
| St Ives | 10 | 20 |
| Stukeley | 10 | 10 |
| Abbots Ripton | 10 | 10 |
| Upwood | 10 | 10 |
| Warboys | 10 | 10 |
| Holywell | 10 | 9 |
| Wistow | 10 | 9 |
| Houghton | 10 | 7 |
| Wyton | 10 | 7 |
| Bluntisham | 10 | 7 |
| Colne | 10 | 6 |
| Somersham | 10 | 8 |
| TOTALS | 180 | 137 |

The figure of 20 hides allotted to Ramsey is purely arbitrary; on this supposition the total hidage of the estates listed comes to 180, which allows 20 hides for estates which may once have gelded in Hurstingstone, but which had transferred their geld liability to Leightonstone by the time of the Norman Conquest.

THE TWO HUNDREDS OF LEIGHTONSTONE

The pattern here is more diverse than in the two double hundreds already considered, and there can be little doubt that 5- and 10-hide units were sometimes split between adjacent estates bearing different names, in order to achieve a fair distribution of the assessment. Sometimes estates lying some distance from each other may have been combined to form one unit of assessment. A group of estates on the western border of the hundred were each assessed at 4 hides, and although it is possible that each of these represents beneficial reduction of a 5-hide unit, I have preferred to bracket them with the 14 hides of Godmanchester, to the east of the

hundred, to form a total assessment unit of 30 hides. None of the other assessments within this hundred suggest that there had been any beneficial hidation.

There are several possible explanations for the fact that the hidage total for Leightonstone at the time of Domesday was $20\frac{1}{2}$ hides in excess of its original assessment. Godmanchester is separated physically from the rest of the double hundred, and may once have gelded elsewhere. A number of Leightonstone estates divided their geld liability between Huntingdonshire and the adjacent counties of Bedfordshire and Northamptonshire; originally all their geld may have been payable outside Leightonstone. It seems to me, however, that the most likely reason for the surplus is that some Leightonstone estates originally gelded in Hurstingstone double hundred.

There are few early references to the hidage of Leightonstone estates, but Old Weston was assessed at 10 hides in 958, as in 1066.

THE TWO HUNDREDS OF TOSELAND

As with Leightonstone, there is little evidence of the 5-hide unit of assessment within this double hundred, and it is clear that larger units of 10 and 15 hides were broken up among a number of adjacent estates. Gransden and Fen Stanton both gelded partly in Huntingdonshire and partly in Cambridgeshire at the time of Domesday, and it is interesting that there is much earlier evidence in each case that the estate was originally a 15-hide unit. The Domesday assessments were as follows:¹

| Estate | Hunts | Cambs | Total |
|------------------|-------|--------|-----------|
| (Great) Gransden | 8 h | 5 h | 13 h |
| (Fen) Stanton | 13 h | } 1½ v | 14 h 1½ v |
| Papworth | 1 h | | |

It is clear from the study of Cambridgeshire's hidation that it was the portions of these estates lying in that county at the time of Domesday which suffered a reduction from their original assessments. Early references to Yelling, Hemingford, Waresley, and Eynesbury, all quote hidages which are not incompatible with the Domesday assessments.

The total Domesday assessment for Toseland is 214 hides, of which the 14 hides representing Fen Stanton and Papworth may originally have gelded in Cambridgeshire.

THE DOMESDAY HIDATION

The Domesday hidation of the four double hundreds is reconstructed in the Appendix. The total assessments were as follows:

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Norman Cross | 188 h |
| Hurstingstone | 137 h |
| Leightonstone | $220\frac{1}{2}$ h |
| Toseland | 214 h |
| Huntingdon | 50 h |
| TOTAL | $809\frac{1}{2}$ h |

¹ In this and subsequent tables h = hide, v = virgate, p = ploughland, b = land ploughed by one ox. The equations 1 h = 4 v and 1 p = 8 b obtained throughout the Domesday assessments of Huntingdonshire.

APPENDIX

THE DOMESDAY HIDATION

The two hundreds of Norman Cross

| Tenant | Holding | Hides | Ploughlands |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Thorney Abbey | Yaxley | 15 h | 20 p |
| Thorney Abbey | Stanground ¹ | 8 h | 10 p |
| Thorney Abbey | St Mary's (Huntingdon) ² | 2 h | 2 p |
| Peterborough Abbey | Fletton | 5 h | 8 p |
| Thorney Abbey | Woodston | 5 h | 9 p |
| King | Bottlebridge | 5 h | 8 p |
| Peterborough Abbey | Orton (Waterville) I | 5 h | 3 p 2 b |
| Peterborough Abbey | Orton (Waterville) II ³ | 3½ h | 3 p 2 b |
| Bp of Lincoln | Orton (Waterville) III | 3 h + 1 v | 2 p 1 b |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Orton (Longueville) I | 8 h + 1 v | 5 p 3 b |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Orton (Longueville) II | 7½ h | 5 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Orton (Longueville) III | 2½ h | 2 p |
| Peterborough Abbey | Alwalton | 5 h | 9 p |
| Count Eustace | Chesterton I | 4½ h | 7 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Chesterton II | 4 h + 2 v | 7 p |
| Thorney Abbey | (Water) Newton ⁴ | 5 h | 8 p |
| Thorney Abbey | Sibson I | 2½ h | 4 p |
| Count Eustace | Sibson II | 2½ h | 4 p |
| Thorney Abbey | Stibbington I ⁵ | 5 v | 1 p |
| Count Eustace | Stibbington II | 5 v | 1 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Elton ⁵ | 10 h | 24 p |
| Thorney Abbey | Haddon | 5 h | 12 p |
| Crowland Abbey | Morborne | 5 h | 9 p |
| Walter Giffard | Folksworth | 5 h | 5 p |
| King's Sokemen | Stilton I | 3 v | 2 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Stilton II | 2 h 1 v | 3 p 1 b |
| Bp of Lincoln | Stilton III | 2 h | 2 p 7 b |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Caldecote | 5 h | 6 p |
| Bp of Lincoln | Denton | 5 h | 2 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Washingley I | 2½ h | 4 p |
| King's Thegns | Washingley II | 2½ h | 4 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Lutton ⁵ | 2½ h | 2 p |
| Countess Judith | Sawtry Judith (St Mary) | 10 h | 15 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Sawtry Beaumes (St Andrew) | 3 h 3½ v | 8 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Sawtry Moyné I (All Saints) | 7½ h ½ v | 12 p |
| Wife of Alwine | Sawtry Moyné II (All Saints) | ½ h ⁶ | 6 b |
| Count Eustace | Glatton | 8 h | 24 p |
| Countess Judith | Conington ⁷ | 9 h | 15 p |
| Hugh de Bolebec | (Wood) Walton | 5 h | 7 p |
| TOTALS | | 188 h | 256¼ p |
| RATIO | | 1 h | 1·37 p |

¹ Includes Farcet.² See *Proc. C.A.S.* LIX, pp. 105-11.³ Listed twice in Domesday Book; once under the king's holdings, and once under Peterborough.⁴ See *Proc. C.A.S.* LVI-LVII, pp. 86-7.⁵ Stibbington, Elton, and Lutton lay partly in Huntingdonshire, and partly in Northamptonshire.⁶ Entered in Domesday Book as ½ *carucate*, but two writs of William Rufus show that the holding was in fact rated at ½ *hide*. *Chron. Rams.* pp. 208-9.⁷ Includes Holme.

The two hundreds of Hurstingstone

| Tenant | Holding | Hides | Ploughlands | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| | | | Demesne | Men |
| Ramsey Abbey | <i>Slepe</i> (St Ives) ¹ | 20 h | 3 p | 24 p |
| King | Hartford ² | 15 h | | 17 p (total) |
| Ramsey Abbey | (Abbots) Ripton ³ | 10 h | 2 p | 16 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Upwood ⁴ | 10 h | 3 p | 16 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Warboys ⁵ | 10 h | 3 p | 20 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Stukeley I | 7 h | } 10 h | 2 p |
| Countess Judith | Stukeley II | 3 h | | 2 p |
| (Eustace the Sheriff | Stukeley III ⁶ | | 1 v | 'waste') |
| Ely Abbey | Colne | 6 h | } 20½ h | 2 p |
| Ely Abbey | Somersham ⁷ | 8 h | | 2 p |
| Ely Abbey | Bluntisham I ⁸ | 6½ h | } ½ h | 2 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Bluntisham II | | | |
| Ramsey Abbey | Holywell | 9 h | | 2 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Wistow ⁹ | 9 h | | 3 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Broughton I | 4 h | } 9 h | 7 p 2 b (total) |
| Ramsey Sokemen | Broughton II | 5 h | | 8 p 6 b (total) |
| Ramsey Abbey | Houghton | 7 h | | 2 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Wyton | 7 h | | 2 p |
| TOTALS | | 137 h | 207 p + 30 p (demesne) = 237 p | |
| RATIO | | 1 h | : | 1.76 p |

Excluding demesne ploughlands, Ratio 1 h : 1.54 p

¹ Includes Woodhurst and Old Hurst, cf. *Proc. C.A.S.* LVI-LVII, p. 64, n. 1.

² Includes King's Ripton, cf. *V.C.H. Hunts*, II, p. 207.

³ Includes Wennington, cf. *Chron. Rams.* p. 63.

⁴ Includes berewick of Great Raveley, cf. *Chron. Rams.* pp. 52, 186.

⁵ Includes possibly Fenton and Pidley, cf. *V.C.H. Hunts*, II, p. 276.

⁶ Probably this virgate was originally part of one of the other Stukeley estates.

⁷ Includes Needingworth, cf. *Cart. Rams.* I, p. 293.

⁸ Includes Earith, cf. *V.C.H. Hunts*, II, p. 153.

⁹ Includes berewicks of Little Raveley and Bury, cf. *Chron. Rams.* p. 186.

*The two hundreds of Leightonstone*¹

| Tenant | Holding | Hides | Ploughlands |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Bp of Lincoln | Pertenhall | 1 v | $\frac{1}{2}$ p |
| King's Thegns | Keyso I ² | 1 v | 2 b |
| William de Warrenne | Keyso II | 3 v | 6 b |
| William de Warrenne | Swinehead I | $3\frac{1}{2}$ h | 4 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Swinehead II | $\frac{1}{2}$ h | $\frac{1}{2}$ p |
| William de Warrenne | Kimbolton | 10 h | 20 p |
| King | Graffham I | 5 h | 8 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Graffham II | $\frac{1}{2}$ h | ? 6 b |
| King's Thegns | Brampton I | 1 h 1 v | 10 b |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Woolley I | $\frac{1}{2}$ h | 1 p |
| King's Thegns | Woolley II | 3 h | 6 p |
| King | Brampton II | 15 h | 15 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Ellington | 10 h | 16 p |
| King | Alconbury ³ | 10 h | 20 p |
| Count of Eu | Buckworth | 10 h | 18 p |
| Ely Abbey | Spaldwick ⁴ | 15 h | 15 p |
| Ely Abbey | (Little) Catworth I | 4 h | 4 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Catworth II ⁵ | 3 h | 4 p |
| William de Warrenne | Catworth III | 1 h | 1 p |
| King's Thegns | Catworth IV | 3 h | 4 p |
| King's Thegns | Catworth V | 1 h | 1 p |
| William de Warrenne | Catworth VI | 1 h | 1 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Catworth VII | 2 h | 3 p |
| Bp of Countances | Hargrave I ⁵ | 1 v | 2 b |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Hargrave II | 1 v | 2 b |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Hargrave III | 1 h | $1\frac{1}{2}$ p |
| Roger de Ivri | Covington | $8\frac{1}{2}$ h | 13 p |

¹ Including Kimbolton.² Keyso lay partly in Huntingdonshire, and partly in Bedfordshire.³ Includes berewick at Gidding.⁴ Includes Barham, Easton, and Long Stow. A small portion of Easton gelded in Bedfordshire.⁵ Catworth, Winwick, Thurning, Luddington, and Hargrave lay partly in Huntingdonshire, and partly in Northamptonshire.

The two hundreds of Leightonstone (continued)

| Tenant | Holding | Hides | Ploughlands |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| King | Keyston | 4 h | 12 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Bythorn | 4 h | 4 p |
| Countess Judith | Molesworth | 4 h | 4 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Brington | 4 h | 7 p |
| King | Godmanchester | 14 h | 57 p |
| Bp of Lincoln | Leighton Bromswold | 15 h | 17 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Old Weston | 10 h | 13 p |
| Eudo Dapifer | Hamerton | 15 h | Not given |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Winwick I ¹ | 2½ h | Not given |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Winwick II | 2½ h | 2½ p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Thurning I ¹ | 5 h | 5 p |
| Crowland Abbey | Thurning II | 1½ h | 1½ p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Luddington ¹ | 2½ h | 3 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Gidding I | 1 h | 1 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Gidding II | 7 h | 8 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Gidding III | 4½ h | 6 p |
| William Engaine | Gidding IV | 4½ h | Not given |
| Earl Hugh | Coppingford | 4 h | 5 p |
| Earl Hugh | Upton | 4 h | 6 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Alconbury Weston | 1 h | 2 p |
| | | TOTALS 220½ h | 326 p |
| | | RATIO 1 h | : 1.48 p |

¹ Catworth, Winwick, Thurning, Luddington and Hargrave lay partly in Huntingdonshire, and partly in Northamptonshire.

The two hundreds of Toseland

| Tenant | Holding | Hides | Ploughlands |
|--|-------------------------------|-------|-------------|
| Eustace the Sheriff | (Hail) Weston | 1½ h | 1½ p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | (Hail) Weston | ½ h | ½ p |
| Robert Fafiton | (Hail) Weston | 2 h | 6 p |
| Bp of Lincoln | (Great) Staughton | 6 h | 15 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Dillington | 6 h | 12 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Perry | 1 h | 2 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Boughton (in Diddington) | 1 h | 2 p |
| Robert Fafiton | Southoe I | 2 h | 3 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Southoe II | 4½ h | 8 p |
| Bp of Lincoln | Diddington I | 2½ h | 2 p |
| Countess Judith | Diddington II | 3 h | 3 p 6 b |
| Bp of Lincoln | Buckden | 20 h | 20 p |
| Arnulf de Hesding | Offord (Cluny) I | 10 h | 10 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Offord (Darcy) II | 4 h | 4 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Offord (Darcy) III | 3 h | 3 p |
| Countess Judith | Offord (Darcy) IV | 3 h | 8 p |
| Countess Judith | (Great) Paxton ¹ | 25 h | 41 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Yelling I | 5 h | 7 p |
| Alberic de Ver | Yelling II | 5 h | 8 p |
| Rohais the wife of Richard son of Gilbert | Eynesbury I | 15 h | 27 p |
| Countess Judith | Eynesbury II | 9 h | 28 p |
| Countess Judith | Cotes I ² | 4 h | 8 p |
| Bp of Lincoln | Cotes II | 2 h | 3 p |
| Ranulf brother of Ilger | Everton | 7 h | 18 p |
| Suain of Essex | Waresley I ³ | 7 h | 9 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Waresley II | ½ h | ½ p |
| William son of Ansculf King | Waresley III | 2½ h | 5 p |
| Ralf son of Osmund | (Great) Gransden ⁵ | 8 h | 15 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Hemingford (Abbots) I | 1 h | 1 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Hemingford (Abbots) II | 1 h | 1 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Hemingford (Abbots) III | 18 h | 16 p |
| Ramsey Abbey | Hemingford (Grey) IV | 5 h | 5 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Hemingford (Grey) V | 4 h | 3 p |
| Alberic de Ver | Hemingford (Grey) VI | 11 h | 7 p |
| Gilbert de Gand | (Fen) Stanton ⁴ | 13 h | 18 p |
| Eustace the Sheriff | Papworth ⁵ | 1 h | 1 p |
| | TOTALS | 214 h | 331¼ p |
| | RATIO | 1 h | 1:50 p |

¹ Includes berewicks of Little Paxton, Toseland, and Agden in Great Staughton.

² *Cotes* is now Caldecote, 1 mile north of Abbotsley. Domesday Book says the soke of *Cotes* lay in Eynesbury.

³ Includes possibly Tetworth and Abbotsley.

⁴ Gransden and Papworth lay partly in Huntingdonshire, partly in Cambridgeshire.

⁵ Includes Hilton.

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY

VOLUME LXI
JANUARY 1968 TO DECEMBER 1968

4os. net.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---------|
| <i>Officers and Council of the Society, 1967-1968</i> | page vi |
| A Collection of Flint Implements from the Hunstanton District <i>By</i> HAMON LE STRANGE | i |
| A Neolithic Hut and Features at Little Paxton, Huntingdonshire <i>By</i> GRANVILLE T. RUDD | 9 |
| A Romano-British Settlement site at Brickhills Estate, Eynesbury, Hunts. <i>By</i> GRANVILLE T. RUDD <i>and</i> COLIN DAINES | 15 |
| A Roman Farm-settlement at Godmanchester <i>By</i> W. H. C. FREND, D.D., F.S.A. | 19 |
| The Anglo-Saxon S-Shaped Brooch in England, with Special Reference to one from Lakenheath, Suffolk <i>By</i> TERESA BRISCOE | 45 |
| The Hidation of Huntingdonshire <i>By</i> CYRIL HART | 55 |
| The Dissenting Churches in Cambridgeshire from 1660 to 1700 <i>By</i> MARGARET SPUFFORD | 67 |
| Review Note: West Cambridgeshire (R.C.H.M.) <i>By</i> MARY D. CRA'STER | 96 |
| <i>Index</i> | 97 |