The purpose of this paper is to test a model of late Anglo-Saxon land division and tenure set out by Stephen Baxter (with the assistance of John Blair) in an essay published a few years ago in the journal *Anglo-Norman Studies* (Baxter & Blair 2005). While was far from being the first to engage with the subject of the fragmentation of multiple/federative/complex estates, Baxter comes at it from a different angle, by reappraising the significance of the Old English terms *bocland* (bookland, land granted in perpetuity by means of royal diploma, i.e. charter), *folcland* (folkland, on the face of it all land that was not bookland, but the term has been much-debated because it only occurs four times in contemporary records, including once in Surrey in the will of its late-ninth-century Ealdorman, Ælfred: Sawyer [= S] 1508), and *lænland* (“loanland”, either bookland or folkland leased for a defined period). Baxter then considers how these different types of tenure were applied “on the ground” by examining the nature of early-medieval landholding in Bampton Hundred in south-western Oxfordshire. His conclusion that it contained four ‘topographically distinct zones’, each characterised by a different type of tenure, that together formed an ‘unmistakable and rather remarkable’ pattern (2005, 29) is one that is hard to resist applying to an area closer to home.

Understandably, such pioneering studies are more often than not deliberately located in areas with plentiful amounts of whatever resource or resources are needed in order that a coherent model might be constructed. In the case of Bampton Hundred these are its detailed Domesday entries and considerable number of pre-Domesday muniments. But this should not discourage researchers in places like Surrey from attempting similar studies; after all, the county witnessed the same disintegration of most of its large early territorial units at much the same time (as has been explored by Blair 1991; Turner 2003; Saul 2005). The choice of Woking Hundred for this evaluation to an extent is influenced by the quality of its documentary sources, although they are still inferior to those of Bampton. This may be largely a product of its greater size, but the differences between the two Hundreds - including the existence of the tenth-century proto-urban *burh* at Guildford at Woking’s southern edge - should not be allowed to overshadow their similarities. Both were centred on large royal manors which have earlier documented histories as minsters, and which likewise could have arisen as the foci of early Anglo-Saxon *regio*-type units. Nevertheless, the complex patterns of land tenure recorded in Domesday Book arose in the two centuries or so prior to its compilation, for which Baxter’s work thus represents an invaluable guide to understanding how, why and when they came into existence. Baxter characterised the aforementioned quartet of zones, each of which forms the subject of a section below, as follows:

1. A ‘royal core’
2. An area of bookland adjacent to the above
3. A zone of ‘ministerial property’
4. A group of contiguous ‘comital manors’, i.e. ones held by earls

**Royal core**

One of the most significant differences between Woking and Bampton Hundreds is the existence of not one but two distinct royal estate centres in the former: Woking and Stoke. Woking first appears as a minster (“twinned” with one at Bermondsey) in a papal bull of 708x15, and again for a second time later in the eighth century when it was the subject of a benefaction by King Offa of Mercia (S 144). Described as being ‘*in loco ubi dicitur*’
Woccingas’. Offa’s gift was of twenty-hides, and was specified to be ‘*in loco in quo illud monasterium situm est*’ (“in the place in which that minster is sited”). Taken together, these two statements could well infer that the king was making over one of his royal estates to the minster. Offa is believed to have had a particular interest in minsters dedicated to St Peter, like Woking (and Chertsey), treating them as personal possessions with which he and his family could do as they pleased (Kelly 2009, 17, 73). This prefigured the growth of minster annexation during the ninth century (particularly by the West Saxon royal house: Blair 2005, 324-28), something that befell Woking at some point between the late-eighth and mid-eleventh centuries, by which time it was counted in King Edward’s farm at an assessment of 15.5 hides. Oscillation between high-status secular and monastic control between the seventh and eleventh centuries is hence demonstrable, and correlates (albeit over a broader period of time) with the interpretation of the enigmatic high-status complex at Flixborough in Lincolnshire (Lovelock and Atkinson 2007; cf. Blair 2005, 206-209).

Stoke, assessed at 17 hides before 1066, doubtless represents the rump of the so-called *ham* of Guildford left by King Alfred to his nephew Æthelwold in his will of the very late ninth century (S 1507). It was subsequently diminished in size by the establishment of the mercantile *burh* of Guildford (probably during the reign of Æthelstan, 924-39: Hill 2000), and by *bocland* or *lænland* grants, about which more will be said shortly (see also my tentative reconstruction of the pre-burghal Guildford estate in Briggs 2009, 9). However, there may be another layer to the story. The idea that the numerous estates bequeathed in Alfred’s will were not long-standing royal demesne, rather ‘sets of disposable property’ - in other words booklands - the king or one of his recent ancestors had acquired in the not too distant past has much to recommend it (Wormald 2001). If this was the case for Guildford, then its long-term pre-documentary tenure may not have been royal, rather aristocratic/noble, or more interestingly (and by no means improbably) monastic (see Blair 2005, 323-28; Briggs 2009, 10). Definitive statements on the royal or non-royal status of Guildford prior to the late ninth century are impossible to make in view of the absence of mid-Anglo-Saxon evidence of any type. Nevertheless, converse as it may seem, Guildford’s occurrence in King Alfred’s will may be reason enough to doubt the notion that it had been in royal hands for much or all of the preceding centuries.

**Bookland**

Leaving aside the somewhat unusual case of Guildford, identifying *bocland* estates in Woking Hundred is hindered both by its lack of “classic” royal diplomas (of the type which alienated the 16-hide Pyrford estate in neighbouring Godley Hundred = S 621, dated 956) and the fact that relevant alternative deeds have not survived in any great profundity. The latter do at least prove that two estates in the Hundred were booklands. The aforementioned will of Ealdorman Ælfred (of 871x99) includes a ten-hide holding at Horsley among the booklands bequeathed to his wife and daughter, almost certainly representing the Domesday manor of West Horsley, which was rated at the same hidage before 1066. That Send was *bocland* takes slightly longer to establish (the following abbreviates the analysis laid out in my earlier note on the “Surrey Fens” causeways = Briggs 2010). It appears in a curious extended note written in Old English (S 1447), detailing the changes in ownership it and another estate at Sunbury underwent during the 950s and 960s, culminating in their purchase by the saintly Archbishop Dunstan *circa* 968. A surviving charter (S 702) documents the booking of Sunbury by King Edgar to his ‘kinsman’ Ealdorman Ælfheah *circa* 962, and most likely there was an equivalent document for Send that has been lost. The fact that Ælfheah was free to profit from the sale of the estates further demonstrates how Edgar had alienated any claim to their lordship. S 1447 gives Send as being of twenty hides in the 960s; Domesday Book
records that this was still the case in the mid-1060s, and more unusually at the time of the Survey in 1086 (hidage assessments normally decreased, often significantly so, in the two decades after 1066).

It is almost certainly no coincidence that the pre-Conquest hidages of both West Horsley and Send are five-hide multiples. Baxter calls five-hide estates ‘the classic holding of the Anglo-Saxon thegn’, a statement informed by a clause in the early-eleventh-century legal text known as the Gēþingdēo that set out how a ceorl who ‘prospered’ through the possession of among other things ‘fully five hides of land of his own’ - i.e. bookland - was ‘henceforth entitled to the rights of a thegn’ (Reynolds 1999, 60). West Clandon and Sutton were rated at five hides apiece before 1066, and the former at least is among the several manors in Woking Hundred held by thegns before the Norman Conquest: Send by Karl (see Briggs 2010, 7; Lawson 1993, 172), West Horsley by Beorhtsige (possibly the ‘princeps’ who appears among the witnesses to S 1036, the royal charter supposedly of 1062 confirming the privileges of Waltham minster - see PASE, ‘Beorhtsige 23’), and West Clandon by Fulcwig (an uncommon name, making him almost certainly connectable to the pre-Conquest holder of a six-hide estate at Woolbeding in Sussex: PASE, ‘Fulcwig 1’). The most interesting case is Henley, held by a wealthy thegn named Azur both before and immediately after the Conquest. According to Domesday he bequeathed the manor to Chertsey upon his death at some point prior to 1086, for which they held the King’s writ (i.e. that of William I). This apparently has not survived, but can be accepted as a statement of fact nonetheless. Less clarity surrounds the circumstances of Henley’s occurrences in two Chertsey charters (S 1181 and S 1035) as a five-hide and six-hide holding respectively; according to Domesday Book it was rated at eight hides before 1066. Had Chertsey once owned Henley, and, having lost possession of it and seen it granted as bookland to a secular lord, thus set about persuading Azur to re-endow the monastery with the estate? And if so, how can the fluctuations in its hidage be accounted for?

Ministerial estates
Baxter characterized the area within Bampton Hundred classed as ‘ministerial property’ as one composed of mostly small estates held by ‘royal servants, ministers and (after the Conquest) sheriffs’ (2005, 41). Several such properties can be identified in Woking Hundred, although they are not topographically concentrated to the same extent. The three virgates at Woking removed from the royal manor by King Edward the Confessor and held up to at least 1066 by an unnamed forester (the holding thereafter being granted to Walter fitz Othere, keeper of the royal forest of Windsor) represents one lying close to a royal demesne centre. Lodesorde, if equivalent to Lollesworth between the two Horsleys (rather than Lodsworth in Sussex as some have suggested), embodies the opposite extreme; a one-hide estate that passed to Ketel Huntsman from his father’s possession after 1066, implying its tenure was by lease of more than one life - highlighted by Baxter as a key characteristic of lænland.

Tyting (later reckoned in Blackheath Hundred) shows how the grantees of lænland properties could vary markedly in status. Before the Conquest it was in the hands of a hunter, Almær (probably not the man of the same name who held Ockham at the time); significantly Domesday Book records that the estate had been separated from the other land in King Edward’s feorm by an (unnamed) Sheriff, implying the loan was of his innovation. However, sometime after 1066 Tyting was transferred to the possession of Osbern, a Norman chaplain to Edward the Confessor who prospered under William I, becoming Bishop of Exeter in 1072 (The Domesday Book Online, ‘Landowners D-F’). He had held an eight-hide estate at Woking since before the Conquest, quite possibly representing the residue of the estate of the minster (Kelly 2009, 73), which would make
the Bishop more likely to be the Osbern who held the church separately as part of the main royal manor than the noted “minster collector” Osbern de Ow (as suggested by Blair 1991, 105). By the time of the Domesday Survey, the eight hides had been divided into two equal holdings held by men named Ansgot and Godfrey; the former may be the *interpres* - “interpreter” - of the same name who held a moiety of the manor of Coombe near another major Surrey royal centre, Kingston.

One fundamental issue with identifying ‘ministerial’ properties is whether the holders of certain estates who are on record as having held positions in royal service did so purely on account of their work for the crown, or because they were of sufficient wealth and standing as to be able to purchase and/or be granted them. The aforementioned Azur, for instance, served as bursar to Edward the Confessor, but this was commensurate with his position as one of the wealthiest pre-Conquest thegns in southern England (Molineux 2009, 12). The 14-hide archiepiscopal estate at East Horsley first came into Canterbury hands circa 1036, when it was granted by Thored, believed to be the Anglo-Scandinavian staller of the same name on near-contemporary record with ostensible Kentish connections; this would not have been possible had it been *lænland* (S 1222; he is named as a witness to S 1465 of 1032 or 1035 and the undated, probably fabricated S 981 - see Lawson 1993, 164-65). The Osmund who held Worplesdon and Burpham (with its outlier at Wyke) may have been the *minister* of this name who witnessed a confirmation c1065 (S 1042) or the title-less witness to a lease of 1049x52 (S 1425), but then again may have been nothing more than a thegny namesake (*PASE*, ‘Osmund 22’, ‘Osmund 24’ & ‘Osmund 26’ respectively). The two manors do form an arc to the north of royal Stoke/Guildford - possibly established after the creation of the Anglo-Saxon predecessor of Guildford Park (Briggs 2009, 11) - but their contiguity is a long way from being proof of ‘ministerial’ origins. Finally, the post-Conquest ownership of Sutton (whose name infers an origin as the “south tun” of Woking) invites speculation as to whether it was the perpetuation of pre-Conquest ‘ministerial’ tenure. In 1086 it was in the hands of Robert Malet, sheriff of Suffolk, having been unjustly seized not long before by a Durand who may be identifiable as his Gloucestershire counterpart (*PASE*, ‘Durand 1’); regrettably, Domesday Book gives no information about the status of its last Saxon owner, Wynsige.

**Comital property**

The ‘comital complex’ of estates at the western edge of Bampton Hundred in the possession of two powerful pre-Conquest Earls, Harold and Ælfgar, is wholly at odds with the contemporary position in Woking Hundred, where there was not a single holding in comital hands in 1066. The two brothers, Swein and Leofwine, who Domesday Book records as having held Wanborough as two manors, have been identified by some as the brothers of Harold of the same names (e.g. *VCH*, 3, 374), but the former died in 1051 (*PASE*, ‘Swein 3’, ‘Swein 13’, ‘Leofwine 69’, ‘Leofwine 102’ - the Leofwine who held half of Wanborough may also have held the one-hide estate at Tuesley in the neighbouring Hundred of Godalming). Wisley was a small manor in the hands of Osweald before 1066, who held it of Earl Harold (the only Woking Hundred manor to be placed in his protection), and he was still in possession of it at the time of the Domesday Survey. Osweald is an interesting personage in the history of Domesday-era Surrey, being brother of Abbot Wulfwald of Chertsey and very possibly the Sheriff of Surrey who remained in place in the years following the Norman Conquest (*PASE*, ‘Osweald 1’; Molineux, ‘Transition’). While Wisley might once have been a modest comital estate, Osweald as Sheriff merely could have held it under Harold’s protection because he had the freedom to make the choice to do so, having been granted it as the consequence of his royal service. On the other hand, it is far from improbable that Osweald held Wisley as bookland purchased with his own money.
The pre-Domesday documentary evidence moreover infers this was not a situation that had only arisen in the years immediately prior to the Norman Conquest. Earl Godwine’s presence at Guildford in 1036 in conjunction with the arrest of Ætheling Alfred (brother of the future King Edward) is not directly inferential of him having any kind of territorial interest in the area at the time, let alone in Woking Hundred in particular (e.g. Campbell & Keynes 1998, xxxi, 42-43). A royal confirmation charter purportedly of 1062 from the Chertsey archive (S 1035) includes a reference to Abbot Wulfwald’s purchase of two hides ‘in altera Clenedune’ (“in the other Clandon”) from Harold ‘comes’ - Godwine’s son - for two gold marks, a transaction made in the presence of King Edward. Taken as a whole the charter is of questionable reliability, but the details of how the two-hide holding came into Wulfwald’s ownership are such that they are unlikely to be fictitious, and hence must stem from an episode which took place during the years 1058x65. However, while this may confirm former comital possession of this small landholding in the middle of the eleventh century, it also raises questions as to the accuracy of the charter testimony relative to that of Domesday Book.

East Clandon was rated at ten hides before 1066, suggesting that it was coterminous with the landholding quantified as such in four Chertsey charters (S 1181, S 420, 752 and the aforementioned S 1035); three of them distinguish the two hides from it. But Domesday Book gives the tenurial information about the same two hides as part of the entry for East Clandon, stating that they were ‘laid in the manor’ following their purchase by Wulfwald (the entry goes on to note they were ‘wrongfully’ placed by the Bishop of Bayeux in his manor of Bramley in Blackheath Hundred after 1066, and they do appear to be referred to in a section of its multipartite entry; however, as an illegal action, it is not directly relevant to the purposes of this analysis). The two sources are not easily reconciled, but a credible scenario involves the detachment of the two hides from what would become West Clandon and their later annexation to its already larger easterly namesake shortly before 1066. Original holdings of seven and eight hides are certainly feasible: the former matches the pre-Conquest hidage of Wanborough - assessments of certain other estates in the Hundred are multiples (East Horsley) or fractions (Wisley) of the number - and the latter the equivalent assessments of Worplesdon, Henley, and Woking church. As with Henley, the purchase of the two hides may have been influenced by the previous tenure of the land by Chertsey; Susan Kelly’s forthcoming edition of all of the monastery’s pre-Conquest muniments will hopefully resolve whether this could have been the case or not.

Conclusions
As was perhaps to be expected, there are both similarities and differences between the land-tenure patterns of Bampton and Woking Hundreds. The absence of any comital estates in Domesday Book (and the tiny size of the solitary documented pre-Conquest example) is especially notable, and immediately suggests the landholding patterns in Woking Hundred were somewhat different to Bampton (probably because Surrey was not a theatre for comital rivalries in the same way as Oxfordshire). Instead bookland was the dominant land tenure type by 1066, and by some margin. As a result of this preponderance, bookland had a less proximate relationship to the two royal cores than in Bampton - it was found both adjacent to (Send) and well removed from (West Horsley) such places. To an extent this is replicated by the less-numerous ministerial holdings (Tyting and the forester’s three virgates at Woking exemplifying the former, and Lollesworth the latter), although there are hints of a pre-Conquest ‘ministerial’ estate belt to the north of Stoke/Guildford comprising the manors of Worplesdon, Burpham and Sutton.
The bequest of a ten-hide bookland estate at West Horsley by Ealdorman Ælfred towards the end of the ninth century shows the tenure type was in existence in Woking Hundred significantly earlier than Bampton, where the charter evidence suggests its bookland belt was ‘substantially formed’ in the third quarter of the tenth century (Baxter & Blair 2005, 44). Nonetheless, Baxter’s conclusion that the resultant bookland zone was the product of a deliberately-planned process, satisfying the concurrent demands for economic enrichment and royal patronage, is no doubt just as applicable to Woking Hundred and the dismantling of large royal landholdings over a longer period of time. Bookland clusters have also been noted around ‘important central places’ in Wiltshire by Andrew Reynolds, who hypothesizes that their juxtaposition may attest to the status of the latter as burghal and sub-burghal fortifications, for which the owners and inhabitants of the former were obliged to do burhbot, “fortress-work” (Reynolds 2005, 180). This would certainly correlate with the plethora of bookland estates in Woking Hundred, site of a ?mid-tenth-century burh at Guildford and an important royal manor at Woking that may have been enclosed by the substantial ditch recently located in limited excavations close to Old Woking church (Savage 2010, 2). As Baxter concludes, the division of land in Bampton Hundred speaks of the power of the late-Anglo-Saxon crown to satisfy its own requirements and those of its leading subjects (2005, 45-46). In this key respect Woking Hundred seems to be firmly in accordance with it, and I am confident equivalent appraisals of the evidence from other Surrey Hundreds would reveal much the same.
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