

THE HIDATION OF MIDDLESEX

KEITH BAILEY

SUMMARY

The paper is concerned with the development of the hide as a measure of liability to renders and taxation in various forms during the Anglo-Saxon period, from its first appearance in the records in the late seventh century until Domesday Book in 1086. The latter provides the only complete details of hidation in the whole county, and there is a discussion on the relationship between the hide, the ploughland, the ploughteam and the details of tenants' holdings which are, uniquely, provided in the Middlesex folios. The evidence for regular assessments, based on a five-hide module, is also discussed. There is an analysis of the information on hides contained in the surviving Anglo-Saxon charters for Middlesex, and of the evidence which they afford for the groups which went to make up the provincia of the Middle Saxons within the East Saxon and Mercian Kingdoms.

I

'What was the hide?' F. W. Maitland, in posing 'this dreary old question' in his seminal study of Domesday Book (1897, 416), was right in saying that it is in fact central to many of the great questions of early English history, be they economic, social or administrative. He was echoed by Baring a few years later, who wrote, 'the hide is grown somewhat tiresome, but we cannot well neglect it, for on no other Saxon institution have we so many details, if we can but decipher them' (1899, 290). Subsequently other scholars have directed their attention to this subject, directly or indirectly. Montague Sharpe in his various studies of Roman, Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Middlesex drew on Domesday Book as a source of evidence about hidation and the grouping of estates as part of an attempt to demonstrate continuity of land measurements between Roman and Norman times (1916; 1937). Eila Campbell discussed not only hidation but also many other economic and geographical aspects of late-eleventh century Middlesex in her essay in Darby's pioneering *Domesday Geography* (1962). Most recently, the introduction to the Alecto edition of

Domesday Book discusses Middlesex hides and hundreds, including evidence for the existence or otherwise of an assessment based on the five-hide unit and multiples thereof (Alecto, 1989–90).

Dreary and tiresome it may be, but clearly the answer to the question of the hide remains of interest to a wide variety of historians and historical geographers, and the very range of purposes for which the question must be asked shows just how difficult it is to reach a consensus. It is almost, one might say, a Holy Grail, and subject to as many interpretations designed to fit this or that theory about Anglo-Saxon society, its origins and its structures.

The aim of the present paper is to analyse the evidence for the hidation of Middlesex from various sources and in particular to set out the Domesday material in tabular form to see what, if any, patterns and groupings emerge. Some readers will perceive that the inspiration for this particular approach comes from the work of Cyril Hart on the hidation of the counties making up the southern Danelaw (1970; 1974). As with his work on Anglo-Saxon charters, Hart

adopted some pioneering methods in these studies, and although not free from controversy, his basically retrospective approach, starting with Domesday and working backwards into progressively more obscure times, seems to offer the best chance for understanding the principles underlying the system of assessment which was already well-established by the end of the seventh century and was central to the governance of England until 1100.

Middlesex is not so fortunate as some counties in its surviving records of hidation. Only the Domesday folios contain anything like a full record, in this case relating to the time of the survey in the first half of 1086, with no reference to the situation on the day King Edward (the Confessor) died (ie 5th January 1066). In shorthand, the Middlesex entries are T.R.W.—*tempore regis Willelmi*, rather than T.R.E.—*tempore regis Edwardi*. Middlesex has no almost-contemporary geld roll such as that of Northamptonshire to illuminate the dynamics of change which appear to characterise hidation in the late eleventh century. It does, however, have unusually detailed information about the holdings of various classes of tenants, expressed in hides, virgates and acres, and which may be compared with the overall geld assessment for each vill, even if the relationship between them remains complex and defiant of explanation (Campbell 1962, 107–9).

Equally, Middlesex does not feature in the so-called County Hidage, which gives total assessments for certain shires, probably earlier in the eleventh century (Maitland 1897, 524–9). The Burghal Hidage, dated to the period 910–920 and listing the *burhs* or fortified places of Wessex together with the number of hides required for the maintenance of their fortifications (Hill 1969), omits London (as does Domesday Book, although there is a blank folio (125c–126c) on which it is

usually assumed that London would have been entered (Campbell, 1962, 106)), and it is only possible to infer from the length of the medieval wall the hidage of the area which was allocated to maintain its defences. This is potentially far larger than the 880 or so hides allocated to Middlesex, but it should be remembered that London itself, probably the largest centre of population, even in the early tenth century, must have had an assessment for geld purposes expressed in hides like any other settlement. This idea will be discussed in more detail below.

Fortunately, Middlesex has a reasonable coverage of Anglo-Saxon charters which are useful in illuminating the nature of hidation in the centuries before 1066. Most show, however, that where a comparable estate can be identified in Domesday Book, there has been little or no change in its hidage assessment. In this respect, the county seems to belong with Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire, which display the same phenomenon, in contrast to Surrey, Berkshire, Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire, which experienced reductions of 50–60% in their hidation between the early tenth century and 1066 (Hart 1970, 38; 1974, 37).

II

For most counties, even the starting point for such an investigation, its hidage total in Domesday Book, is beset with difficulties of definition, and there seem to be as many answers as there are historians performing the count. This is fortunately not the case in Middlesex, where the nominal total of hides for the shire is clearly 880. Table 1 summarises the results from a selection of writers. Unlike many counties, Middlesex in 1086 had no detached parts lying in other shires, nor did it include such detached portions within its boundaries, which means that prior to the

Table 1. Estimates of Middlesex Hidation

Source	Total
Maitland 1897	868
Baring 1899	885
Corbett 1900	880
Davies 1901	880
Baring 1909	880
Sharpe 1916	880
Campbell 1962	879½ + 21½ ac.
Bailey 1990	880½ + 21½ ac.

annexation of the south-east of the county by London in 1889 the modern and the Domesday shires are identical. The boundary with Hertfordshire in the Barnet area may not have been fixed in 1086, although details of any settlements in this heavily-wooded area are subsumed in those of larger estates in each county.

Apart from Maitland's figure, which seems too low, all the rest are within a range of five hides, the more recent counts excluding any 'rounding'. There will always remain areas of ambiguity in some entries where it is not apparent whether the hidage is included elsewhere, or is a duplication.

Domesday Book of course, re-arranges the information collected on a geographical basis by the Commissioners under fiefs, starting with the king and proceeding via ecclesiastical tenants-in-chief to laymen great and small. This means that data on a location may be widely spread through the folios, concealing associations and regularities. In the Appendix, therefore, details are given for each separate estate listed on the Middlesex folios in Domesday Book arranged by hundreds in the order which the rubrics generally follow. Within each hundred, there is an indication of those which form part of the same parish. In 1086, however, that concept is perhaps anachronistic, and it is likely in certain cases that the parishes we know represent

an amalgamation of two or more Domesday vills. Also shown in the Appendix are the numbers of ploughlands on each estate. This is seen by many scholars as a measure of the arable potential of the land, as distinct from the artificial geld hidage assessments. As such, it may be argued that ploughlands were a more readily variable assessment than hidation.

The Middlesex Domesday is unique in providing details of the holdings of various classes of tenants which went to make up the non-demense land of each estate. These data, however, rarely agree with the number of hides, ploughlands, or teams actually employed in 1086. The variations moreover are not systematic, and cannot be accounted for by any simple hypothesis. The totals for hides, ploughlands, tenants holdings, demesne and plough teams are summarised for each hundred below.

Table 2 says as much about the complexities of Domesday data as it does about the realities which one might have encountered on the ground in the landscape of Middlesex in 1086. For example, in Hounslow Hundred, which is the closest approximation in geld terms in the county to an exact 100 hides, there was estimated to be potential for 80 ploughs. There were only 54 at work at the time of the Commissioners' visit to collect statistics, and the sum total of 'hides' on the demesnes and amongst the tenants was only just over 60. The fact that the number of teams was almost exactly two-thirds of the potential might be taken as a hint at the presence of open fields in which that portion of the land was under the plough at any given time, although this is unusually early for the operation of a regular three-field system. In any case, this system does not seem to have been characteristic of Middlesex when evidence becomes more abundant in the later

Table 2. Middlesex Hundreds in 1086: Hidation and Other Features

Hundred	Hides	Ploughlands	Demesne		Tenants	
			Hides	Teams	Hides	Teams
Ossulston	219 $\frac{3}{4}$ + 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	188 $\frac{1}{2}$	58 $\frac{1}{4}$	59	84 $\frac{1}{4}$ + 218 $\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	97
Spelthorne	112	89 $\frac{1}{2}$	38 $\frac{3}{8}$	26 $\frac{1}{2}$	49 $\frac{3}{8}$ + 212 ac.	60
Hounslow	105	80	24 $\frac{1}{2}$	9	35 $\frac{3}{8}$	45
Edmonton	70	60	25 + 2c.	10	32 + 142 ac.	50
Elthorne	224 $\frac{1}{2}$	148 $\frac{1}{2}$	64 $\frac{3}{4}$	27	84 $\frac{3}{4}$ + 233 ac.	86
Gore	149	109	50 $\frac{1}{2}$	13	43 $\frac{3}{8}$ + 64 ac.	63 $\frac{1}{2}$
Total	880 $\frac{1}{4}$ + 21 $\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	675 $\frac{1}{2}$	261 $\frac{1}{8}$ + 2c.	144 $\frac{1}{2}$	306 $\frac{3}{8}$ + 869 $\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	401 $\frac{1}{2}$

Table 3. Middlesex 1086: Relationship between Hides, Ploughlands and Teams

Hundred	Dem./Ten. Hides as % Geld Hides	Dem./Ten. Teams as % Ploughlands	Ratio
Ossulston	66	83	1.26
Spelthorne	80	97	1.21
Hounslow	57	67.5	1.18
Edmonton	84	100	1.19
Elthorne	67	76	1.13
Gore	63	70	1.11
Total	65	81	1.25

medieval period, and none of the other Domesday Hundreds reveals such a relationship (Gray 1915, 381–7; Avery 1965). Be that as it may, it is even more difficult to hypothesise why the hides allocated to the demesne and tenant lands are only 57% of the geld assessment. In the case of Edmonton Hundred, there is no shortfall in the number of plough-teams, but at about 59 hides, the ‘particulars’ fell short of the geld hidation by 16%.

There is a general correlation between high and low shortfalls, although overall there was a much more dramatic reduction between theoretical and actual hidages than between ploughlands and the teams in use at the time of the survey. For Middlesex as a whole, the ‘particulars’ show a reduction of 35% on the nominal geld hidation, whereas the number of teams at work is only 19% less

than the notional capacity expressed in ploughlands.

III

We turn now to the question of the ‘five-hide unit’ and its relevance to the situation in Middlesex in 1086. While it is true that throughout the period from the late seventh century, when Anglo-Saxon land charters first appear, until the time of Domesday Book four centuries later many estates have their hidage assessment expressed in multiples of five hides, it is not clear what basis underlies this seeming regularity. Among the qualifications for a peasant farmer to graduate to the ranks of the thegns was the possession of five hides of land and a hall (Stenton 1947, 480). This might be taken to imply a situation in which the land was divided into discrete blocks, with neither the nucleated village settlement nor the

open field system prevalent, although it could equally reflect a complex, mixed system. Possibly this was considered to be the minimum threshold for which the solemn procedures of granting land by charter was appropriate, and although there are many examples of smaller grants, and of small estates in Domesday, this may reflect a continuing tendency to fragmentation.

Be that as it may, there is an observable tendency for the size of grant to decrease over time. The early charters tend in the main to refer to the endowment of religious houses by kings, and the grants cover large tracts of land assessed at 50, 100 or even more hides. The land thus disposed clearly includes many settlements and their fields, and the lands of many thegns and peasants. We have no way of knowing, however, whether a grant such as that of 50 hides to St Paul's minster in 704-9 really means that it was then considered to be the land of 50 families or of 10 thegns. Neither is it apparent whether these assessments were built up from small units or merely broad approximations by royal officials as to the taxable capacity of a tract of land, including not only arable and pasture, but also woodland and waste. What is clear is that the hundred was not an original administrative concept and did not arise until the early tenth century during the period when kings such as Edward the Elder and Aethelstan were welding the former disparate kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxons and the reconquered Danelaw into a unitary state, divided into shires and hundreds with an associated hierarchy of courts and geld obligations (Stenton 1947, 289-90).

It is possible, therefore, that the five-hide unit and multiples thereof which is so notable a feature of the Domesday folios for Middlesex and for many other counties dates not from some primæval

period of Anglo-Saxon administrative development, but from the reforms of the tenth century. It is possible, of course, that there are elements of both in an area such as Middlesex, which lay outside the Danelaw, since there are clearly cases such as the Fulham estate of the Bishop of London and the Harrow estate of the Archbishop of Canterbury which maintained their assessments from the period before the Danish wars of the late ninth century up to 1086. Charters relating to grants after *c.* 900 tend to cover much more limited areas, and no doubt represent the breaking-up of older, larger entities. Without a complete surviving corpus of charters, however, it is impossible to estimate when this process began and how it might relate to changes in settlement and agrarian patterns.

Of the 65 estates listed in the Middlesex Domesday, grouping together those with the same place-name, 31 (47.7%) are exact five-hide units (including 2½, 7½ hides, etc.) and a further 14 (21.5%) fall within 10% of such a value (see Table 4). Between them these categories account for 69.2% of Middlesex estates in 1086. This may be compared with 51% in Hertfordshire, 74% in Buckinghamshire, 69% in Oxfordshire, and 66% in Surrey, placing Middlesex at the centre of the range. If the very small estates at Nomansland and Bishopgate in Ossulston Hundred

Table 4. Domesday Middlesex: Five Hide Units

Hundred	Five-Hide Units		Within 10%		Others	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Ossulston	11	45.8	2	8.3	11	45.8
Spelthorne	5	33.3	6	40.0	4	26.7
Hounslow	2	100.0				
Edmonton	3	100.0				
Elthorne	7	41.2	5	29.4	5	29.4
Gore	3	75.0	1	25.0		
Total	31	47.7	14	21.5	20	30.8

Table 5. Middlesex 1086: Distribution of Five-Hide Units by Hundred

Size	Ossulston	Spelthorne	Hounslow	Edmonton	Elthorne	Gore	Total
5	7	3		1	2		13
7½		3			2		5
10	2	1			2	1	6
12½		2					2
15	2	1			3		6
20		1				2	3
30				1	2		3
35			1	1			2
50	1						1
60	1				1		2
70			1				1
100						1	1
Total	13	11	2	3	12	4	45

containing only 21½ ac. between them are excluded, then the proportion of Middlesex Domesday estates within 10% of a five-hide unit increases to 71.4%. Unfortunately, the small number of estates in most Middlesex hundreds makes any generalisation about the distribution of regular assessments very hazardous.

It is worth examining in more detail the nature of those estates whose assessments seem to reflect an underlying regularity in the basis of hidation. Allowing for a limited amount of rounding, the distribution of five-hide units in Domesday Middlesex is shown in Table 5. It might be argued that some units which are apparently based on the five-hide principle should not in fact be included here. For example, Stepney, which has no less than 11 entries totalling 59¾ hides, includes not only a large tract of territory in the area known as Tower Hamlets, but also the adjacent parish of Hackney, and the detached area of Hornsey. It has also been shown that the five hides held from the Bishop of London by Hugh de Bernieres in fact lay in Islington, later becoming the manor of Barnsbury (VCH, viii, 1986, 51–2). Equally, Harlesden,

assessed at five hides, lies in the parish of Willesden, itself assessed at 15 hides, and it could be said that they should be treated as one 20-hide unit. The method adopted for the purpose of this analysis is that where a group of estates with essentially the same name—such as Stepney—form a unit based upon the five-hide principle, they are taken in aggregate, even if the territory concerned is not discrete, whereas separate units of this type with different names are treated separately, even if they lie with the same later parish, an area hardly likely to have been closely defined at the end of the eleventh century. For example, the three Bedfont estates fall in two present parishes—East Bedfont and Stanwell—while the two small Hatton estates also lie in the former.

More than half of these regular units fall in the 5–10 hide range, and they account for 29% of all estates in the county. Eleven more estates fall in the 12½–20 hide range, and only 10 exceed this level. The latter, however, have a total assessment of no less than 500 hides—57% of the Middlesex total.

Since it is unusual for early charter grants and sources such as Bede to mention any area with less than 50 hides, it

would appear that the smaller entities recorded in the Domesday folios represent the break-up of larger units. This probably occurred during the period after 900, when great estates were no longer being granted away to religious houses. Instead, smaller grants, often of five or 10 hides were being made by kings to laymen, presumably as a reward for services rendered, and also as a way of enlarging the thegnly class. This process has been seen as the beginnings of a native feudalism, in which land was given in exchange for military service (Stenton, 1947, 672-4; Brown, 1973). It was indeed most unusual for any Anglo-Saxon land grant to exclude the obligations for the three basic services—the defence of *burhs* and bridges and the provision of men for the *fyrð*.

The 'single' five-hide units in Middlesex are listed in Table 6, along with the sum total of the 'particulars' of demesne and tenant hidages and an indication of their agricultural potential in the form of ploughlands and of the actual number of ploughs at work in 1086.

The 'particulars' column highlights the

great differences between the 'geld' hidage and that allocated to the demesnes and tenants in each case. Overall, they total only three-quarters of the hidage. Only at Kempton and Charlton (both in Sunbury parish), and at Lisson (Marylebone) do the two figures equate, although they are not too removed at Hampstead, Harlesden and Harefield. Ploughlands also fall short of the theoretical norm of one hide = one ploughland in most cases, with only Islington, Kempton and Harefield achieving parity. The number of teams at work in 1086 in total is identical to the notional capacity on these estates, although only Harefield actually had five, and Islington four and a half teams. In many cases, the agricultural activity in these places appears to have been out of line with the taxation base as expressed in geldable hides.

It is a commonplace that the hide in 1086 had a very variable extent on the ground. The old concept that it contained a long hundred (120 acres) of land cannot be sustained in practice. Thus, Middlesex with its 180,000 acres and only 880 hides

Table 6. Five-Hide Estates/Groups in Middlesex, 1086

<i>Estate</i>	<i>'Particulars'</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>	<i>Teams</i>
Hampstead (2)	4	3½	2½
Harlesden	4½	4	2½
Islington (4)	4	5	4½
Lisson	5 + 2ac.	3	3
St Pancras (2)	0	3	2
Tottenham Court	0	4	3½
Tyburn	2½ + 10ac.	3	3
Charlton	5 + 7ac.	4	4
Hanworth	2½	3	4
Kempton	2½ + 2¼	5	4
Tottenham	11¼ + 60ac.	10	14
Cranford	2¼ + 2ac.	3	3
Harefield	4½ + 38ac.	5	5
Total	46½ + 119ac.	55½	55
Average	3.66	4.27	4.23

Note: Figures in brackets indicate the number of component estates of that name.

had an average of 204.5 acres/hide. The further the data are disaggregated, the wider the departures from an average become. Of those five-hide units which can reasonably be equated with later parochial areas, the number of acres to the hide ranges from no less than 924 at Harefield and 450 at Hampstead to 275 at Hanworth and 147 at Cranford. If it were not already apparent that the hide had originated as a measure of the *total* taxable capacity of a tract of countryside, including all its woodland, pasture and other appurtenances as well as the all-important arable land, these data should soon disabuse the reader. It would appear, however, that with the exception of Tottenham, none of these estates was the subject of so-called 'beneficial hidation', that is where the geld assessment is far lower than the potential and actual agricultural activity of the land. In Harefield, for example, large tracts must have been taken up with the woodland required to feed the 1,200 swine recorded in 1086. Although swine totals were probably as much a theoretical measure of capacity as ploughlands, it has been suggested that the equation of one pig = one and a half acres might be applicable, in which case some 1,800 acres of Harefield would have been wooded, 39% of the total area (Rackham 1976, 60).

IV

Six Middlesex estates were assessed at 10 hides in 1086.

The 'particulars' once more fell short of the nominal hidage, in this case by one-third. Laleham, where the 'particulars' and the geld hidage are virtually identical, appears to have been taken out of the larger estate of Staines in the recent past (DB, i, f. 129b, 130c). This may imply that when a new estate was created some attempt was made to relate the assessment to the capacity to pay, a relationship which became blurred through time. Only at Kensington and Kingsbury is the exploitation of the land close to the level suggested by the geld assessment. Other 10-hide units, especially West Drayton and Harlington, adjacent places in Elthorne Hundred, seem to have been taxed at a higher level than one might expect, especially as neither are recorded as having significant resources apart from their arable land. Kingsbury in contrast not only had nine teams at work, but also woodland for 1,200 swine, which is potentially equivalent to the entire area of the later parish. This suggests that some lay in a detached wood-pasture area, possibly in Edgware (Baylis, 1952).

There were six '15-hide' units in Middlesex in 1086, all in the west of the county, with three of them forming a sub-

Table 7. Ten-Hide Estates/Groups in Middlesex, 1086

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>	<i>Teams</i>
Ebury	8½	8	7
Kensington	4	10	9
West Drayton	7 + 39ac.	6	6
Harlington	4 + 11ac.	6	5
Kingsbury (2)	3¾ + 25ac.	9	9
Laleham (2)	10¼	6½	6½
Total	37¾ + 75ac.	45½	42½
Average	6.38	7.58	7.08

Table 8. Fifteen-Hide Estates / Groups in Middlesex, 1086

Estate	'Particulars'	Ploughlands	Teams
Westminster	13½ + 5ac.	13	12
Willesden	n/a	15	8
Stanwell	14 + 28ac.	10	13
Greenford (4)	12	9½	7½
Ickenham (3)	3½ + 20ac.	9	6
Northolt	15	10	8
Total	n/a	66½	54½
Average	n/a	11.08	9.08

stantial block of territory in Elthorne Hundred.

These estates also show a tendency for the 'geld' hidage to exceed the 'particulars', in this case by a quarter. If the suggestion made above that where there is a high correlation in this respect the estate concerned had only recently been separately assessed for geld is correct, then Westminster, Stanwell and Northolt in 1086 might be relatively 'new' units. Stanwell may have been part of the great Staines estate which seems to have been disintegrating at the time of Domesday, with areas such as Laleham having already become separate estates, whereas others, such as Ashford, were still part of Staines (DB, i, f. 128c). If this is the case, the original Staines estate probably covered most, if not all, of Spelthorne Hundred. As such, it has all the hallmarks of an early grant of a block of territory to support a minster church (Blair, 1989). This is unlikely to have been Chertsey, just across the Thames, for this never had any recorded connexion with the Staines area. There is a reference in Domesday Book to a link between East Burnham (Bucks.) and a minster at Staines about which nothing else is on record (DB, i. f.145d). This church was probably not an otherwise unknown foundation of the monastic reform period after 960. More likely, Domesday Book contains an echo

of an old foundation which had been reduced in status by the incursions of the Danes into this area in 1009 (Whitelock, 1979, 243), albeit retaining many of its *berewicks* in south-west Middlesex two centuries later. Even in 1291 the *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* of Pope Nicholas shows that Staines church (with Laleham) was the highest valued in Middlesex, a possible indicator of erstwhile minster status. It has been suggested that the Staines area might be the *Norð ge* or 'northern district', counterbalancing 'Surrey', an area in the north-west of the later county granted to Chertsey Minster in 666–674 (Bailey, 1989, 114; Blair 1989).

The case of Northolt is not so easy to unravel, although its name, from Old English (*æt*) *norð healum* ('the northern angles [of land]') (Gover et al. 1942, 44),¹ implies that it was not originally a free-standing estate, but merely one part of a larger entity. Southall, 4kms to the south, seems to have been the southern extremity of this territory, whose focus would have been either Hayes or Yeading, both of which appear in Anglo-Saxon charters and are discussed below.

There were three 20-hide units in Domesday Middlesex.

Only in the case of Staines (including Ashford, Littleton and Teddington), does the total of the 'particulars' equate to the geld hidage. The two Stanmore estates (probably including some at least of Edgware (Baylis, 1952)) have only half the

Table 9. Twenty-Hide Estates / Groups in Middlesex, 1086

Estate	Particulars	Ploughlands	Teams
Staines	18 + 119ac.	24	24
Hendon	16	16	11
Stanmore (2)	13½ + 26ac.	14	7½
Total	47½ + 145ac.	54	42½
Average	16.24	18.00	14.17

potential number of ploughs at work, although in this case there was a substantial woodland area, capable of sustaining no fewer than 1,600 swine. Nearby Hendon was also well endowed in this respect, with wood for 1,000 swine. Northern Middlesex on the heavy London Clay was apparently still well-forested in 1086. About 79% of the notional number of ploughs on these estates was at work in 1086. This compares with 99%, 93% and 82% respectively in the case of five-, 10-, and 15-hide estates, and points to a relative over-assessment of the larger units. It also appears that the intensity of agricultural activity decreased with increasing estate size, further evidence that most Middlesex estates in 1086 were not under great pressure to extend their arable at the expense of woodland, pasture and 'waste'.

V

Above 20 hides, there are too few regular units of any given size to enable any detailed analysis. There are, nevertheless,

some interesting features in respect of these estates, not least their large assessments and size which appear to take us back to a much earlier stage in the process of subdividing the landscape of Anglo-Saxon England. For the sake of completeness and comparability, the relevant details of these estates are set out in Table 10. The use of a single name, usually that of the estate *caput* (e.g. Fulham, Stepney) does not necessarily mean that the land concerned lay in a discrete block, nor that settlements not named in Domesday Book did not exist at the time. The Domesday Commissioners were concerned to identify the resources and value of each tract of territory under a common lordship, and places such as Hackney, Chiswick and Ealing were glossed over.

These estates account for 56.8% of the geld hidage of Domesday Middlesex, 51.6% of the 'particulars' of individual holdings and demesnes, 55.5% of ploughlands and for 52.1% of teams at work. This is not, however, out of line with

Table 10. Estates/Groups of 25+ Hides, Middlesex, 1086

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Particulars</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>	<i>Teams</i>
Enfield	30	26 $\frac{3}{4}$ + 30ac.	24	20
Harmondsworth (2)	31	17 $\frac{1}{4}$ + 30ac.	21	13 $\frac{1}{2}$
Ruislip	30	21 $\frac{1}{4}$ + 28ac.	20	15
Average		21.99	21.67	16.17
Hampton	35	28 $\frac{1}{2}$	25	20
Edmonton	35	28 $\frac{1}{2}$ + 52ac.	26	26
Average		28.72	25.5	23
Fulham (3)	50	55 $\frac{3}{8}$ + 43ac.	48	36
Stepney (11)	59 $\frac{3}{4}$	40 $\frac{3}{8}$ + 104 $\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	46	43 $\frac{1}{2}$
Hayes	59	39 $\frac{1}{2}$	40	28
Average		40.37	43	35 $\frac{3}{4}$
Isleworth	70	31 $\frac{3}{8}$	55	34
Harrow	100	60 $\frac{1}{2}$ + 13ac.	70	49
Total	499 $\frac{3}{4}$	349 $\frac{3}{8}$ + 300 $\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	375	285

their share of the county area—52.8%, or almost 95,000 acres.

Their ownership falls neatly into two groups. First are the estates in the hands of great religious houses—Hayes and Harrow (Archbishop of Canterbury), Fulham and Stepney (Bishop of London), assessed at 268 $\frac{3}{4}$ hides (30.5% of the county hidage; 28.9% of the ‘particulars’, 30.2% of ploughlands and 28.6% of teams). Second are the estates in lay hands. (Although the principal estate at Harmondsworth was held by the Abbey of the Holy Trinity of the Mount at Rouen in 1086, it had belonged to Harold in 1066). The whole of Hounslow Hundred (Hampton and Isleworth) was held by Walter of St Valery in 1086, both having been held by Earl Aelfgar before 1066. Geoffrey de Mandeville, founder of a noted dynasty, held Edmonton and Enfield, including the *berewic* of South Mimms, thereby disposing of more than 25,000 acres in the north-east of the county, which had been in the hands of Asgar ‘the Staller’ T.R.E., an important man in the region. Ruislip in 1086 was held by Arnulf of Hesdin, but was soon granted by him to the Norman Abbey of Bec (VCH, iv, 1971, 134). In 1066, it had been held by Wulfward Wight, a king’s thegn with holdings at Kempton, Ruislip and Kingsbury in Middlesex and also in Kent and Berkshire. Together, these great estates were assessed at 231 hides (26.25% of the Middlesex total, with 22.7% of the ‘particulars’, 25.3% of its ploughlands and 23.5% of the teams at work). These estates occupied almost 50,000 acres and accounted for 27.6% of the total for the county.

The presence of these great territorial units in a county so closely associated with London is perhaps surprising at first sight, especially given the almost complete absence of land still in royal hands. The 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres of ‘Nomansland’ and 32

cottagers are all that remains. The great blocs in the shire are held by four major churches (427 $\frac{3}{4}$ hides, 48.61% of the total) and seven laymen (380 $\frac{1}{2}$ hides, 43.25%). In the absence of charters it is impossible to say when this occurred, other than that most of the great grants to churches date from the period 670–825. There is virtually no evidence that the citizens of London were more than marginally involved in Middlesex property before 1086.

The lands held by St Paul’s and Canterbury were the result of the strategy for endowing great churches adopted by various rulers at a time when London was probably still at a low ebb commercially. The Fulham and Stepney estates in particular seem to reflect the policy of Eorcenweald, Bishop of London *c.* 675–693, whose aim was to make these lands independent of the various kings contending for control of London and its hinterland. The Canterbury estates of Hayes and Harrow seem to have been acquired by the archbishops in the period 760–830 (Brooks, 1984, 132, 137–42). The great estates held by laymen in Domesday Middlesex contrast strongly with the tendency towards their break-up which may be observed not only in this county but also in its neighbours. Given that London was a commercial rather than a governmental centre at this period, it may be that kings tended to reward their followers with grants of land closer to the traditional heartlands of their kingdoms. It may equally be a reflection of the fact that large tracts of Middlesex seem to have been relatively underdeveloped in the late eleventh century.

No charter records the granting of any of these estates to laymen, other than 20 hides at Harmondsworth to Aethelred *minister* by Offa of Mercia in 781 for 100 *mancuses* of gold in a bracelet (Sawyer 1968, no. 119; Gelling 1979, no. 203). The

political contexts of most of these grants cannot therefore be ascertained. They may have occurred during the troubled reign of Aethelred the Unready (978–1016), or earlier, during the Danish wars of Alfred and the ensuing reconquest of the Danelaw by his son Edward (870–925). Both Isleworth and Twickenham had originally been granted to minsters—Isleworth by Eorcenweald to Barking c. 677, and Twickenham by an East Saxon king to St Pauls in 704 (Sawyer 1968, nos 1246, 65; Gelling 1979, nos 310, 191). The latter grant seems to have lapsed, however, for in 795 Twickenham was granted by Offa to Canterbury, a grant restored or made anew in the 940s (Sawyer 1968, nos 132, 477, 515, 537; Gelling 1979, 205, 215–8). Unlike the other Canterbury estates in Middlesex, it had been lost before 1066. Whatever the reality behind this confusion, the Hundred of Hounslow was entirely in lay hands in 1066.

VI

Before turning to consider the extensive body of data on hidation contained in the Anglo-Saxon charters of Middlesex, it is necessary to give some attention to the 'Burghal Hidage' (Maitland 1897, 577–81) This is a list of the *burhs* or fortified places (not all of them towns, and not all surviving even as settlements today) which was compiled during the reign of Edward the Elder, in the 910s. It covers all of those in the kingdom of Wessex, along with a few in Mercia. Southwark is included, but London, despite having been refortified by Alfred after its capture from the Danes in 886, does not appear. This is unfortunate, because the principle underlying the system of *burhs* is that they required a given number of men to guard their defences, using a formula based on hides in the area considered tributary to each place. This formula is that each

acre's breadth of wall was equivalent to 16 hides, and one hide = one man. Each pole (5½ yards, 16½ feet) of wall required four men for its defence, presumably on a kind of rota system.

Burghal Hidage gives the total number of hides allocated to each *burh*, and where it is possible to measure their perimeters, there is usually a very good 'fit' between the formula and the reality. The reverse should also apply where the line of the Anglo-Saxon defence is unknown. Southwark, for example, is given 1,800 hides, implying a defended perimeter of 2,475 yards, about 1.4 miles. Its territory is represented by the county of Surrey, excluding the area in the south west which centred on the *burh* at Eashing.

In the case of London, we may infer the hidage required to support the refurbished walls of the Roman city from their length, including the riverside wall. The total distance is some 5,555 yards. The Burghal Hidage formula requires no less than 4,040 hides to support *Lundenbyrig*. Although there is no information about any *burhs* in Essex, it is unlikely that any of this territory lay east of the Lea, since the latter was the boundary of the Danelaw agreed between Alfred and Guthrum in 886. Similarly, Surrey was tributary to Southwark and Eashing, while Hertfordshire seems to have been created as an administrative unit about this time to support the *burhs* on the Lea at Hertford. If the hidage of Middlesex c. 920 was the same as in 1066, this leaves 3,160 hides to find. The most likely explanation is that they are to be found in the *burh* itself. We have no way of knowing, of course, the population of London in the reign of Edward the Elder, and there is no yardstick provided by Domesday Book. The enumerated population of Middlesex in 1086, excluding serfs, was only 2,065 in a relatively underdeveloped area. A population of 6–8,000 in early tenth-

century London sounds large for the period, but may not be impossible in view of John Clark's suggestion of 10–20,000 people in the city in 1086 (Clark 1980, 20).

VII

It has already been noted that Middlesex has no sources indicating the nature of its hidation apart from Domesday Book and a series of charters which starts in the last quarter of the seventh century and ends in the reign of Edward the Confessor. The charters are, however, relatively numerous and most are deemed by scholars who have studied them to be

authentic or nearly so. They provide a series of data on the hidage of many parts of Middlesex over several centuries.

It is not appropriate here to discuss the charters in detail. It should be noted that only four of these 29 grants were to laymen, and the great majority were to the three houses of St Paul's, Westminster and Canterbury, a pattern not necessarily typical of grants after 900. The propensity for religious houses in general, and particularly Westminster to produce forged charters is well known, and Domesday Book may in fact provide the earliest evidence for the hidages of some estates.

Chronologically, the Middlesex char-

Table 11. Middlesex Charters 675–1066

Date	Location	Quality	Donor	Grantee	Hides
c. 677	Isleworth	***	Eorcenweald	Barking	53
693 × 704	Ealing	*	Aethelred	St. Pauls	10
704	Twickenham	*	Sucabræd	St. Pauls	30
704 × 709	Fulham	*	Tyrhtil	St. Pauls	50
716 × 757	Yeading	*	Aethelbald	Wiltred	7
767	Harrow	†	Offa	Stithberht	30
781	Harmodsworth	**	Offa	Aethelred	20
793	Stanmore	***	Offa	St. Albans	10
795	Hayes	***	Offa	Canterbury	60
795	Twickenham	***	Offa	Canterbury	30
821	Harrow	†	Cenwulf	Canterbury	104
831	Botwell	†	Wiglaf	Canterbury	5
845	Roxeth	*	Werenberht	Werheard	2
925 × 939	West Drayton	****	Aethelstan	St. Pauls	10
925 × 939	Neasden	****	Aethelstan	St. Pauls	10
948	Twickenham	*	Eadred	Canterbury	30
957	Loceresleage	*	Eadwig	Lyfing	9
959	Codenhlæw	****	Edgar	Westminster	3
959	Hanwell	****	Edgar	Westminster	8
962	Sunbury	†	Edgar	Aelfheah	10
971?	Westminster	*	Edgar	Westminster	5
974?	Hampstead	*	Edgar	Westminster	5
963 × 975	Hendon	****	Dunstan	Westminster	20
972, 978	Loðeres Leage	*	Dunstan	Westminster	9
972	Bleccanham	****	Edgar	Westminster	5
1002	æt Berewican	*	Aethelred	Westminster	2
1062	Lalcham	***	Edward	Chertsey	2
1062	Ashford	***	Edward	Chertsey	1
1053 × 1066	Staines	***	Edward	Westminster	35

Note: The various categories of 'quality' are— † original charter; * later copy, not in doubt; ** later copy with addenda to original; *** basically fabricated, but with some authentic material; **** complete fabrication.

ters fall into two groups. There are 13 from the period 675–850 and 16 dating from 925–1066, of which all but three date from before 1005. In broad terms, the first of these phases marks the endowment of original minsters with estates, usually in reasonably close proximity to the church in question. In this respect the grants to Canterbury are anomalous, and seem to be related to the fact that the priest Werhard, who was related to Archbishop Wulfred, held at least part of the area from his own patrimony before granting it to his community (Sawyer 1968, no. 1414; Brooks 1984, 132). Grants to laymen and of small estates (less than 20 hides) are unusual in this period. After 850, there was a hiatus, not only in Middlesex but across England, in which relatively few grants were made, marking the turmoil of the first Danish wars and the subsequent Danelaw period. Not until the reconquest and unification of England under the kings of Wessex does the trickle of grants increase under Aethelstan and his successors, reaching a flood under Eadwig and Edgar (955–975). The second half of the tenth century is marked by the monastic revival under Dunstan and Aethelwold, in which many of the minsters sacked or abandoned during the ninth century were endowed anew, albeit with smaller, more scattered lands, rather than with great blocks of territory.

Not only do the charters fall into two distinct phases, but the size of the grants changes dramatically. Before 850, the average size of the dozen separate grants in Middlesex is 31.75 hides (35.4 hides if the two grants to laymen are excluded). After 925, in contrast, the average for 15 grants is only 10.33 hides. The small units of five and 10 hides which are so characteristic of Domesday Middlesex had scarcely made their appearance before 850, and although there may have been other small grants such as that at Yeading

to Wihtrud and his wife Ansith by King Aethelbald whose charters have not survived, this would not distort the general impression.

The earliest surviving Middlesex grant is of 53 hides at Isleworth to the newly-founded minster at Barking (Sawyer 1968, no. 1246). It is one of a series of large estates around London, including 70 hides at Battersea. It may be that the 53 hides attributed to Isleworth is a scribal error for 70 (LIII instead of LXX), a rounded figure more likely at this period, and the same as the Domesday figure, confirmation of the longevity of Middlesex hidage assessments. The grant of 10 hides of *Gillingas* (Ealing) by king Aethelred of Mercia ‘for the increase of the monastery in the city of London’, (i.e. St Paul’s, founded by Aethelbert of Kent *c.* 604) seems small compared with others of this period. The charter itself does not survive, only a fragmentary reference in a compilation of much later date (Gibbs 1939, J7; Sawyer 1968, no. 1783).

This grant does, however, take us back to the days when the basic administrative unit within the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom was not the shire or the hundred, but the territory of a group owing allegiance to a leader, possibly in origin a group of related kin or families. These groups often bore names in *ingas*, and are a common feature of seventh-century Middlesex. The period between 675 and 700 not only saw the emergence of Mercia as the foremost of the kingdoms of the so-called ‘Heptarchy’ under two sons of the great warrior-king Penda—Wulfhere (657–674) and Aethelred (674–704)—but also an increasing sophistication in government, no doubt fostered by the consolidation of the Church with its literate leadership and knowledge of the administrative procedures of Rome and its predecessor the Roman Empire. This is evidenced by the important, if enigmatic,

tribute-taker's list known as the Tribal Hidage, generally agreed to have been compiled at this time (Hart, 1971; Davies and Vierck, 1974). The Tribal Hidage details the assessments of a wide variety of kingdoms and tribal groups in England from Mercia southwards, and is the first comprehensive indication of the system of hidation in operation. There is nothing to suggest that this was a novel method of assessing subject groups and others for the purposes of raising tribute or taxation, rather the innovation seems to have been the production of a comprehensive listing. The province of the Middle Saxons, first mentioned in the Twickenham charter of 704, was part of the East Saxon kingdom at this time, included in its 7,000 hides.

The interesting features of the Tribal Hidage for the present purpose is that it lists no group smaller than 300 hides, of which the nearest examples to Middlesex are the *Hicce*, centred on Hitchin in northern Hertfordshire, and the *Gifle*, who lay just to the north in the basin of the River Ivel in Bedfordshire. Below this level, it would seem that the various local folk groups or tribes were not considered to be self-governing in the late seventh century, although that is not to say that they had never been autonomous. The evidence for these groups in Middlesex has been discussed in detail in a recent paper (Bailey 1989), but it appears that they were declining in importance at the very time land grants by charter were coming into vogue.

Middlesex charters allude in a more or less oblique way to several of these groups. The territory of the *Gillingas* may be equated with the 50-hide estate acquired in 704 × 709 by Wealdhere, Bishop of London from Tyrhtil, Bishop of Hereford (Gibbs 1939, J6; Sawyer 1968, no. 1785). We learn also of the *regio* of the *Geddingas* which must have contained much more than the seven hides granted to Wihtred

in 716 × 757 to warrant this description (Sawyer 1968, no. 100; Gelling 1979, no. 198). It appears from the account of the dispute between Archbishop Wulfred and King Cenwulf of Mercia and his daughter Cwoenðryð, settled in 821, that part of the territory of the *Geddingas* lay in the later Harrow estate, along with Wembley (Sawyer 1968, no. 1436; Gelling 1979, no. 206). The *Gumeningas* whose *hearh* or heathen temple gave its name to the archbishop's Harrow estate may be presumed to have occupied at least the 100 hides mentioned in both 821 and 1086, and possibly the whole 150 hides of Gore Hundred, equivalent to half of one of the smallest groups recognised by Tribal Hidage (see below, however). The grant of 60 hides at Hayes in 795 describes that place in the problematic phrase *on lingas hæse* ('in the brushwood of the . . . *lingas*'), but the name appears from the boundaries of a small grant at nearby Botwell in 831 to have been *Lullingas* (Sawyer 1968, 132, 188; Bailey 1989, 118). If so, these 60 hides may represent another component of a larger administrative unit in north-west Middlesex, possibly one assessed at 300 hides.

The *Wixan* pose more of a problem in that they are a group inferred from a series of related place-names, rather than being documented in a charter. Their bridge, hill and clearing are located at Uxbridge, Uxendon (in Wembley) and Waxlow (in Southall), respectively (Gover et al., 1942, 49, 54, 45)². Their territory, assuming that it was continuous, covers part of two later hundreds and also appears to include at least one of the *-ingas* groups discussed above. This suggests that the *Wixan* may have been a more substantial group, possibly one of the 300-hide 'tribes' which feature elsewhere as independent units in the Tribal Hidage, whose territory was actively breaking up into its component folk groups and ultimately the

Table 12. *The Hundreds of Middlesex in 1086*

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>	<i>Teams</i>	<i>Acreage</i>	<i>Ac./Hide</i>
Ossulston	220	188½	157	49426	224.7
Spelthorne	112	89½	86½	20035	178.9
Hounslow	105	80	54	12744	121.4
Edmonton	70	60	60	31701	452.9
Elthorne	224½	148½	113	36298	161.7
Gore	149	109	76½	29175	195.8
Total	880½	675½	547	179379	203.7

sort of estates granted by charter after 670.

Although other group names are known elsewhere in Middlesex, such as the *Mimmas* whose territory also extends into Hertfordshire, there is unfortunately no indication of what their early hidages were, nor how they related to the estates of Domesday Book. Equally problematic is the relationship between the assessments of the Tribal Hidage and those of later charters and Domesday. For the kingdom of the East Saxons as a whole, the 7,000 hides of the late seventh century had become just under 4,000 in three counties in 1086. Applied pro rata to the territory of Middlesex, the 880 hides of Domesday would have been 1,568 four centuries earlier, giving an average remarkably close to the notional 120 acres per hide so often quoted in the literature. The problem with this seemingly straightforward exercise, however, is that there seems to have been no significant change in the assessment of those estates for which the charter evidence is comparable with that of Domesday.

VIII

The hundreds of Middlesex, which probably emerged as administrative units during the tenth century, contained irregular assessments of hides by 1086, which further confuses any attempt to relate early and late hidation in the

county. The salient details are set out below (excluding the City of London).

With the exception of Hounslow and Spelthorne Hundreds, none of the six approximates to the notional 100 hides. Ossulston and Elthorne are examples of the so-called 'double' hundred. Gore is equal to one-and-a-half hundreds. Edmonton, on the other hand was also known as the Half-Hundred of Mimms, from its meeting place in South Mimms, which suggests that its original assessment was notionally 50 hides.

On this basis, the hidation of Middlesex in 1086 would be:

Table 13. *The Original Hundreds of Middlesex*

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Hides</i>
Ossulston	200
Spelthorne	100
Hounslow	100
Edmonton	50
Elthorne	200
Gore	150
Total	800

It is not clear how this division of the area was arrived at, nor indeed at what period the Middlesex area was finally separated from Essex and those parts of Hertfordshire which once formed the kingdom

of the East Saxons. Although 800 hides is small for an English shire, Huntingdonshire (233,000 acres) had only 755 hides and Bedfordshire (298,000 acres) had 1,200 hides.

In Ossulston, we know that the great episcopal estates of Fulham and Stepney accounted for 110 hides between them, but the rest of the area is much subdivided in 1086. There is no obvious geographical division within the hundred to suggest that it may once have been two separate units. It is noteworthy, however, that the area to the west of Watling Street and the City and south of the Oxford Road was assessed at 117½ hides, the rest at 102½ (excluding the City). The hundredal meeting place, 'Oswulf's Stone', lay to the east of Park Lane, close to the boundary between these two areas.

Spelthorne Hundred has an assessment close to the notional 100 hides, and the predominance of Staines within the area makes it likely that this tract of fertile territory bordering the Thames was once wholly controlled from there. It was the site of a minster church, and might even represent the *territorium* of the Roman settlement of *Pontes*. Neighbouring Hounslow Hundred, lying roughly between the Thames and the London-Staines-Silchester Roman road, is the closest approximation in Middlesex to a 'hundred', albeit rather small in area. Its main centre seems to have been Isleworth, and it may represent an early Anglo-Saxon folk group territory, whose name went unrecorded in any charter.

Elthorne was also a double hundred, and again there is no clear internal division. The site of 'Ella's thorn tree' where the moot assembled is not known. Gore Hundred does fall into two distinct parts, the great estate of Harrow assessed at 100 hides and the rest, with 49 hides. In view of the fact that the latter forms a block of land on both sides of Watling

Street in the north of the county, it could once have been a separate territory, possibly centred on Kingsbury, 'the king's fortified place'. There is a reference in a charter of 972-8 to the *kinges mearce* or 'king's boundary' which is represented by the county boundary between Barnet Gate and the Dollis Brook, implying that this whole area had once been a royal estate (Gover et al. 1942, 220; Sawyer 1968, no. 1451). If there was indeed a different group here, their name has been lost. The hundred moot of Gore lay in a field on the Kingsbury/Harrow boundary (Braun, 1935), and this might echo a former division of the area between two groups. The question as to whether the area of Totteridge and Barnet, in Hertfordshire in all surviving records, but not mentioned by name in Domesday Book, lay at one time in Middlesex must remain unanswered for the present.

The Hundred of Edmonton also lies athwart a major Roman road, in this case Ermine Street, with its roadside settlement at Enfield, and probably another across the border at Cheshunt (Gillam 1973; Gover et al. 1938, 220)³. Its alternative name, the Half-Hundred of Mimms, gives a clue to its origin, since the *Mimmas* seem to have been a tribal group, whose territory is now divided between the two later counties. The low assessment of this area may reflect the fact that much of it was undeveloped for agriculture in 1086, becoming the hunting preserve of Enfield Chase (Pam, 1984), or that it was beneficially hidated having been royal demesne until granted away to an important layman. It is interesting to note that the area of Essex facing Edmonton Hundred across the River Lea was rubricated as the Half-Hundred of Waltham in Domesday Book. Its hidage was then 63, of which the former royal estate of Waltham Holy Cross accounted for 40. It is possible that these areas had once formed

a primitive administrative unit, predating the separation of Middlesex from Essex (Doree, 1986, 13–5). This unit may have been assessed at either 100 or 150 hides.

I do not propose here to discuss in any detail the apparently neat division of Middlesex into two blocks of 440 hides, each comprising two 220-hide units (Ossulston + [Gore + Edmonton], and Elthorne + [Spelthorne + Hounslow]), which has attracted the attention of earlier researchers (Sharpe, 1916; Campbell, 1962, 106). Whilst this may be true for the pattern of hides given in Domesday Book, it is not necessarily a reflection of the situation at an earlier time. For instance, if the original pattern of Middlesex hundreds was that outlined above, then the two main areas would consist of 400 hides each, with four blocks of 200 hides. Equally, if the area now called Middlesex was defined somewhat arbitrarily in the early tenth century, the original hidation may have included areas now lost to Hertfordshire. One could advance an equally valid argument that the middle-range administrative unit was earlier considered to be that of 300 hides (cf. Tribal Hidage), in which case Middlesex would divide into three areas: Spelthorne + Elthorne alone the western side, clearly bounded by the Colne Valley, Ossulston + Hounslow along the Thames, bounded in the east by the Lea, and Gore + Edmonton + ? the rest of the Mimms territory and/or the Half-Hundred of Waltham in Essex.

IX

To conclude this survey of the hidation of Middlesex let us summarise what can be learnt from the disparate sources which have been used. The Middle Saxon province of the East Saxon kingdom emerges from the mists of antiquity at the end of the seventh century, just as Mercia had established its hegemony over most of

southern England and become the leading political power in the London region. The desire to control the re-emergent commercial centre outside the old Roman walls appears to have led to the annexation of Middlesex from its previous homeland, possibly in the reign of Aethelbald (716–757) (Dumville, 1989, 135). At the same time, the loose federation of tribal groups which characterised this part of the East Saxon kingdom seems to have been in the process of being transformed into territories, some of which were granted to newly-founded minsters by various kings.

Because they were not self-governing, the Middle Saxons are not mentioned in the Tribal Hidage, although it is likely that their province included all of the East Saxon realm outside Essex itself, and may have been equivalent to a 1,200 hide unit (cf. the *Unecung-ga* in Bedfordshire, or the East and West *Willa* in Cambridgeshire). The chance references to the various smaller groups in Middlesex charters are not precise enough to even hazard a guess at the hidage of such polities, although 50–75 hides seems to be a reasonable range, with four-six making up a typical 300-hide unit. In west Middlesex we know of the *Geddingas*, the *Lullingas*, the *Wixan* and the group centred on Staines. Further east are the *Gillingas*, the Isleworth group, and the *Waepplingas* (Gover et al., 1942, 152). In the north of the county are the *Gumeningas* and the *Mimmas*. Apart from those names which were later attached to single settlements within a territory (eg Ealing, Yeading and Uxbridge), nothing further is recorded of these units.

They were replaced by the great ‘multiple’ estates of minsters and great laymen, with upwards of 30 hides, and mostly granted away before 850. After 900, the trend was for these great blocks to be broken up into smaller units, often assessed at a regular five to 10 hides.

These in their turn were often identical with the small parishes which were created out of the ancient minster *parochia* (Blair, 1988). The Middlesex of 1086 which is revealed in the Domesday folios is a mixture of these two types of estate. The coarse weave of the great units such as Fulham and Edmonton, including a number of settlements and field systems and stretching for miles across the landscape were interspersed with the fine weave of small units such as Twyford, Ashford and Cowley. Paradoxically, the

increased bureaucracy which produced the Domesday Book seems to have arrested the centrifugal tendency of the previous two centuries, for the great estates of Middlesex in 1086 remained more or less intact throughout the medieval period, despite the creation of many smaller parishes within them, and also large numbers of manors and pseudo-manors, which are described in detail in the volumes of the Middlesex Victoria County History.

APPENDIX

KEY TO TENANTS-IN-CHIEF

<i>No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Abbreviation</i>
(25b).	Aelfeva wife of Hwætmann of London	Aelfeva
10.	Arnulf of Hesdin	Hesdin
21.	Aubrey de Vere	Vere
6.	Barking Abbey	Barking
2.	Archbishop of Canterbury	Canterbury
23.	Derman [of London]	Derman
(25a).	Edeva	Edeva
20.	Edward of Salisbury	Salisbury
9.	Geoffrey de Mandeville	Mandeville
5.	Holy Trinity Abbey, Rouen	Rouen
24.	Countess Judith	Judith
3.	Bishop of London	Bishop
8.	Count of Mortain	Mortain
22.	Ranulf brother of Ilger	Ranulf
13.	Richard son of Count Gilbert	Richard
17.	Robert Blunt	Blunt
15.	Robert Fafiton	Fafiton
14.	Robert Gernon	Gernon
16.	Robert son of Rozelin	Rozelin
7.	Earl Roger	Roger
18.	Roger of Raismes	Raismes
3a.	Canons of St. Pauls	Canons
11.	Walter son of Othere	Othere
12.	Walter of St. Valery	St Valery
4.	Westminster Abbey	Westminster
1.	King William	King
19.	William son of Ansculf	Ansculf

Note: The numbers refer to the original order in Domesday Book

I: OSSULSTON HUNDRED

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Bishopsgate	Canons	9ac.	—
Chelsea	Salisbury	2	5

I: OSSULSTON HUNDRED continued

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Fulham 1	Bishop	40	40
Fulham 2	Bishop	5	3
Fulham 3	Canons	5	5
Hampstead 1	Westminster	4	3
Hampstead 2	Westminster	1	$\frac{1}{2}$
Holborn	King	()	()
Islington 1	Canons	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Islington 2	Canons	2	$2\frac{1}{2}$
Islington 3	Mandeville	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Islington 4	Derman	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$
Stanestaple	Canons	4	2
Tollington	Ranulf	2	2
Kensington	Vere	10	10
Lisson	Edeva	5	3
Stoke Newington	Canons	2	$2\frac{1}{2}$
Nomansland	King	$12\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	—
St Pancras 1	Canons	4	2
St Pancras 2	Canons	1	1
Rug Moor	Canons	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Tottenham Court (Shoreditch)	Canons	5	4
Haggerston	Gernon	2	2
Hoxton 1	Canons	1	1
Hoxton 2	Canons	3	3
Stepney 1	Bishop	32	25
Stepney 2	Bishop	$5\frac{1}{4}$	4
Stepney 3	Bishop	5	$2\frac{1}{2}$
Stepney 4	Bishop	$3\frac{1}{2}$	5
Stepney 5	Bishop	1	1
Stepney 6	Bishop	$1\frac{1}{4}$	1
Stepney 7	Bishop	$1\frac{1}{4}$	1
Stepney 8	Bishop	$1\frac{1}{4}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Stepney 9	Bishop	1	1
Stepney 10	Fafiton	4	2
Stepney 11	Rozelin	$3\frac{1}{2}$	2
Twyford 2	Canons	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Westminster 1	Westminster	$13\frac{1}{2}$	11
Westminster 2	Westminster	3	2
Ebury	Mandeville	10	8
Tyburn	Barking	5	3
Willesden	Canons	15	15
Harlesden	Canons	5	4
Twyford 1	Canons	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$
n/a	Mandeville	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1
Total		$219\frac{3}{4} + 21\frac{1}{2}$ ac.	$188\frac{1}{2}$

II: SPELTHORNE HUNDRED

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Ashford	Mortain	1	1
East Bedfont 1	Mortain	2	1
East Bedfont 2	Othere	10	5
Hatton 1	Roger	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1
Hatton 2	Othere	1.83	1
Feltham	Mortain	12	10
Hanworth	Roger	5	3
Laleham 1	Mortain	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Laleham 2	Blunt	8	5
Shepperton	Westminster	8	7
Staines	Westminster	19	24

The Hidation of Middlesex

II: SPELTHORNE HUNDRED continued

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Stanwell	Othere	15	10
West Bedfont	Othere	8	4
Sunbury	Westminster	7	6
Charlton	Raismes	5	4
Kempton	Mortain	5	5
n/a	Rouen	1	$\frac{1}{2}$
n/a	Aelfeva	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Total		112	89 $\frac{1}{2}$

III: HOUNSLOW HUNDRED

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Hampton	St Valery	35	25
Isleworth	St Valery	70	55
Total		105	80

IV: EDMONTON HUNDRED

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Edmonton	Mandeville	35	26
Enfield	Mandeville	30	24
Tottenham	Judith	5	10
Total		70	60

V: ELTHORNE HUNDRED

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Cowley	Westminster	2	1
Cranford	Ansculf	5	3
West Drayton	Canons	10	6
Greenford 1	Westminster	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	7
Greenford 2	Mandeville	3	1 $\frac{1}{2}$
Greenford 3	Mandeville	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Greenford 4	Aelfeva	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Hanwell	Westminster	8	5
Harefield	Richard	5	5
Harlington	Roger	10	6
Dawley	Roger	3	2
Harmondsworth 1	Rouen	30	20
Harmondsworth 2	Roger	1	1
Hayes	Canterbury	59	40
Hillingdon	Roger	4	2
Colham	Roger	8	7
Ickenham 1	Roger	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
Ickenham 2	Mandeville	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	2
Ickenham 3	Fafiton	2	1
Northolt	Mandeville	15	10
Ruislip	Hesdin	30	20
n/a	Canterbury	2	1
n/a	Gernon	2	1
Total		224 $\frac{1}{2}$	148 $\frac{1}{2}$

VI: GORE HUNDRED

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Ploughlands</i>
Harrow	Canterbury	100	70
Hendon	Westminster	20	16
Kingsbury 1	Westminster	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	2
Kingsbury 2	Hesdin	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	7
Stanmore 1	Mortain	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	7
Stanmore 2	Raismes	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	7
Total		149	109

NOTES

1. This reference, however, cites Sawyer no. 1447, which is in fact the record of a dispute over land at Sunbury (Tapp and Draper 1951). This suggests that the Domesday reference to Northolt is the earliest.
2. A group called the Wixan are mentioned in the Tribal Hidage, located in the Fenland (Hart 1971, 143–4). It seems unlikely that they are the same as the Middlesex Wixan, although the latter may represent a migrant group (see Davies and Vierck 1974, 232–3).
3. The name Cheshunt derives from Old English *ceaster*, a loanword from Latin *castra*, 'camp, fort', combined with OE *fonta*, 'spring' (cf. Latin *fontana*). This strongly suggests close contact between Anglo-Saxon and Romano-British people, which is hardly likely to have occurred after the fifth century in this area (see Gelling 1978, 83–6).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALECTO (1989–90) Alecto Historical Editions, *The Middlesex and London Domesday*, 3 vols., (London, 1989–90)
- EVERY (1965) D. Every, *The Irregular Common Field of Edmonton*, Edmonton Hund. Hist. Soc., Occ. Paper, n.s. 9 (1965)
- BAILEY (1989) K. A. Bailey, 'The Middle Saxons', in Bassett (1989), 108–22.
- BARING (1899) F. H. Baring, 'The Hidation of some Southern Counties', *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, xiv (1899), 290–9.
- BASSETT (1989) S. Bassett ed., *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms*, (Leicester, 1989).
- BAYLIS (1952) C. F. Baylis, 'The Omission of Edgware from Domesday', *Trans. London Middx. Arch. Soc.*, N.S. ix (1952), 62–6.
- BLAIR (1988) J. Blair ed., *Ministers and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition 950–1200* (Oxford 1988).
- BLAIR (1989) J. Blair, 'Frithuwold's Kingdom', in Bassett (1989), 97–107.
- BRAUN (1935) H. Braun, 'The Hundred of Gore and its Moot-Hedge', *Trans. L. & MAS N.S.* vii (1935), 218–28.
- BROOKS (1984) N. P. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (Leicester, 1984)
- BROWN (1973) R. A. Brown, *The Origins of English Feudalism* (London, 1973).
- CAMPBELL (1962) E. M. J. Campbell, 'Middlesex', in H. C. Darby & E. M. J. Campbell eds., *The Domesday Geography of South-East England* (Cambridge, 1962), 103–110.
- CLARK (1980) J. Clark, *Saxon and Norman London* (London, 1980).
- DARBY (1962) E. Darby, *Domesday Geography of South East England*.
- DAVIES & VIERCK (1974) W. Davies & H. Vierck, 'The Context of Tribal Hidage: Social Aggregates and Settlement Patterns', *Frimittelalterliche Studien* 8 (1974), 223–93.
- DB *Domesday Book: Middlesex*, ed. and trans. J. Morris, (Chichester 1975).
- DOREE (1986) S. Doree, *Domesday Book and the Origin of Edmonton Hundred* Edm. Hund. Hist. Soc., Occ. Paper 48 (1986).
- DUMVILLE (1989) D. Dumville, 'Essex, Middle Anglia, and the Expansion of Mercia in the South-East Midlands', in Bassett (1989), 123–40.
- GRAY (1915) H. L. Gray, *The English Field Systems* (Cambridge, Mass. 1915).
- GELLING (1978) M. Gelling, *Signposts to the Past* (1st. ed., 1978).
- GELLING (1979) M. Gelling, *The Early Charters of the Thames Valley* (Leicester, 1979).
- GIBBS (1939) J. Gibbs, *The Early Charters of St. Pauls Cathedral* Camden 3rd. ser. lviii (London, 1939).
- GILLAM (1973) G. R. Gillam, *Prehistoric and Roman Enfield* (1973).
- GOVER ET AL. (1938) Gover, Mawer & Stenton, *The Place-Names of Hertfordshire*, (Cambridge, 1938).
- GOVER ET AL. (1942) J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer & F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Middlesex*, (Cambridge, 1942).
- HART (1970) C. R. Hart, *The Hidation of Northamptonshire*, (Leicester, 1970).
- HART (1971) C. R. Hart, 'The Tribal Hidage', *Trans. Roy. Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser. xxi (1971), 133–57.
- HART (1974) C. R. Hart, *The Hidation of Cambridgeshire*, (Leicester, 1974).
- HILL (1969) D. Hill, 'The Burghal Hidage: The Establishment of a Text', *Med. Arch.*, 13 (1969), 84–92.
- MAITLAND (1897) G. W. Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond* (Cambridge, 1897), page references from 1960 ed.
- PAM (1984) D. O. Pam, *The Story of Enfield Chase* (1984).
- RACKHAM (1976) O. Rackham, *Trees and Woodland in the British Landscape*, (London, 1976).
- SAWYER (1968) P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography* (London, 1968).
- SHARPE (1916) M. Sharpe, *The Middlesex District in Saxon Times* (1916).
- SHARPE (1937) M. Sharpe, 'Middlesex in Domesday Book', *Trans. London & Middx. Archaeol. Soc.*, n.s. vii (1937), 509–527.
- STENTON (1947) F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 2nd. ed. (Oxford, 1947).
- TAPP & DRAPER (1951) W. H. Tapp & F. W. M. Draper, 'The Saxon Charter of Sunbury-on-Thames', *Trans. L. & MAS*, n.s. x (1951), 302–6.
- VCH *The Victoria History of the County of Middlesex*.
- WHITELOCK (1979) D. Whitelock ed. & trans. *English Historical Documents, vol. 1 500–1042* (2nd. ed., London, 1979).