

# AN OLD DOMESDAY CRUX: HANECHEDENE, RADNAGE & BRADENHAM

ARNOLD H. J. BAINES

*Dr. Baines confirms earlier conjectures that DB's Hanechedene was Radnage, and supplies support for the identification. He also disposes of any idea of a philological connection, finding the precursor of the former in Eaningadene.*

"In Hanechedene Tædald [Theodwald] held 3 hides from the Bishop [Odo, Bishop of Bayeux]. Now it is in the King's revenue".

This entry in Domesday Book<sup>1</sup> is in three respects remarkable.

First, it is the only entry in Buckinghamshire with the past tense, *tenuit*, 'held', instead of 'holds'. Elsewhere *tenuit* was used in DB of the holder on 5 January 1066, the day when King Edward the Confessor was alive and dead. It looks as if a change had to be made at a late stage, because the estate had been taken into King William's hands – not with Odo's consent (the Bishop was already under arrest) and not because Theodwald had died, for another entry on the same page of Great Domesday shows that he still held 5 hides from the Bishop at (Little) Marlow. This had been a manor of Queen Edith, the Confessor's widow; Theodwald may have been among those who enjoyed her protection, and the effect of Domesday would have been to confirm his position. His dispossession at Hanechedene may perhaps be connected with the note in DB that half a hide there had been wrongfully taken from Alric Gangemere and his sister in King Edward's time.

Second, 'In Hanechedene' should imply that there was another holding in the same vill, or at least sharing the same name. G. R. Elvey<sup>2</sup> pointed out that in such cases the word 'in' would have been added after the Survey data, collected by vills, had

been rearranged and listed according to land holders – probably in the circuit offices, not at Winchester; "1086 was no time for frills".<sup>3</sup> 'In' provides a warning that users of the Survey, including ourselves, must look elsewhere for the remainder of Hanechedene. But at first sight we look in vain; the rest of the land so named must have been recorded with a different place-name, or with none, since some small landholdings had no distinctive names.

The rule about 'in' needs some qualification, and is not quite invariable, though nearly all the exceptions can be explained. Thus Geoffrey de Mandeville 'holds' Amersham because his land answers for 7½ of the 10 hides, while the five separated half-hides, who doubtless paid their geld through his reeve, are 'in' Amersham; then and later they had no settled names. The position was similar at West Wycombe, but at Chesham all the holdings, even the largest, are 'in' Chesham and none has the marginal M for *manerium*; did they perhaps all geld in Amersham as former members of a 25-hide unit, under-assessed to encourage settlement? Lude is clearly named but was so clearly subordinated to Wooburn that 'in Lede' has probably displaced 'in Waborne'. At Hoggston the use of 'in' may have arisen because the manor had previously been fragmented. 'In' is used for both the estates called Westbury; if both were in Westbury in Stodfold there is no anomaly, but this involves a correction to a hundredal heading. At Ilmer the clerks who sorted the returns may have supplied 'in' because of an association with the

next entry, with the same lord and tenant. The one virgate and six acres 'in' Southcote with half a plough team could obviously not have stood alone;<sup>4</sup> a very local name for this little holding, given in the return, may have displaced that of the vill wherein it lay. This was clearly Stone, and the name Stanes appears just above as the hundred name in the heading. One could wish that DB revealed more such minor place-names. At Thornborough the 'in' may point to a link with one or more of the three unnamed holdings in Lamua hundred. This leaves Grove unexplained; but residual inconsistencies were inevitable, since the clerks in the central office at Winchester could frequently not resolve their queries with the regional offices, still less with the field staff. They were working in 'controlled haste'<sup>5</sup> against a very tight time limit.

Third, where in Desborough Hundred was Hanechedene? This has been discussed for two centuries. In 1813 D. and S. Lysons<sup>6</sup> suggested that it was 'Haneringdon', cited as an ancient name for West Wycombe, but there appears to be no authority for this spelling, the early forms of the fifth of the ten tithings of West Wycombe being Havering(e)dune or -don.<sup>7</sup> As the tithing contained the church of St Lawrence, on a magnificent site within the hill-fort, its name came to be used for the extensive parish, though not for the manor.<sup>8</sup>

In his magisterial work in 1905 on the Buckinghamshire Domesday, J. H. Round<sup>9</sup> sought to locate Hanechedene in W(h)inchbottom, on the Wycombe-Marlow boundary, and this became the common identification, though Sir Frank Stenton<sup>10</sup> commented in 1925 "If this is correct the DB form, as may well be the case, is so corrupt that it is useless for etymological purposes". Even in 1977 John Morris<sup>11</sup> mentioned Winchbottom without apparent disapproval, though he also suggested that Hanechedene could be emended to Hauechedene, for *hafoca-dene*, 'hawks' valley'. However, G. H. Fowler<sup>12</sup> had long since identified Hanechedene with Radnage and in 1960 Elvey had accepted this,<sup>13</sup> while commenting that Fowler's "ingenious attempt to explain how a clerk on hearing the name of Radnage came to write Hanechedene was unnecessary; in point of fact the clerk dealt very creditably with a difficult name, for this is the Eaningadene mentioned half a century before in an Anglo-Saxon

charter"—or rather, an entry in a gospel book<sup>14</sup> made c. 1033.

This is probably the true solution, though Fowler's reason for it was wrong, and the case is less straightforward than Elvey claimed. In the absence of historical evidence, one would hardly have discerned a real linguistic connection between Eaningadene and Hanechedene, except the ending and perhaps the beginning; could -eche- be a misheard -inga-? But instead of mishearing one may suggest palatalisation of -ng- to -nj-. Some local parallels seem specially relevant. Thinghurst has become Fingest, locally pronounced Vinjest. Tingewick, originally *Tidinga-wīc*, Tedinwiche in DB, soon lost its intervocalic *d* to be Tinsuicg in 1088-94<sup>15</sup> and then Ting(e)wic or -wich in the twelfth century. The pronunciation with -nj- has persisted, though Tynchewyk is also found, and the local Tinjik is almost Tinchick. A similar -inganame is Tetchwick, from *Totinga-wīc*, Tochingewiche in DB, the first *ch* being perhaps a scribe's anticipation of the second. Toting(e)wich is found as late as 1182 in the Pipe Rolls, but the name was settling down as Tochwic, though the first vowel long remained variable. However, nearly all the evidence on such palatalisation relates to Middle English; not until a century after DB do surviving documents become abundant. Could we have palatalisation of -inga- or -ing- as early as 1086? Ekwall<sup>16</sup> and Dodgson<sup>17</sup> have discussed the complex questions involved, and although finality has not been achieved, it seems that there could well have been parallel forms in Old English; if so there is no need to postulate serious mishearing by a scribe whose native tongue was Norman-French.

There is no difficulty about the inorganic H. In the Bucks Domesday we have Hesintone for Easington, though we also have Ilesdone, Ulesdone for Hillesden (better -don; Hildesdun in 949). Forms in twelfth-century documents include Hachecot(a) for Edgcott, Heselberge for Ellesborough (Esenberge DB for *esol-beorg*, ass-hill) and once Hivingho for Ivinghoe.

The identification with Radnage is reconcilable with the statement in the Hundred Rolls that in 1086 Radnage was royal demesne, attached to the manor of Brill.<sup>18</sup> It had just been assigned to the King's "farm" (OE *feorm*, Latin *firma*) but perhaps was not

formally Terra Regis until Odo's final dispossession and exile in 1088. Part of Radnage (the part latterly owned by the Fanes of Wormsley) was granted by Henry I to the nuns of Fontevrault. The larger part, after some temporary grants, was given by King John to the Knights Templars; on their dissolution it was granted to the Knights Hospitallers, and on their suppression it reverted once again to the Crown. Charles I mortgaged it and Charles II gave the quitrents to one of his mistresses, but the formal lordship of the manor of Radnage has remained with the Crown, though all the land had become freehold before the final enfranchisement of copyhold in 1925.<sup>19</sup>

In the Hundred of Desborough the aggregation of scattered hamlets and farms into 5-hide, 10-hide or larger fiscal units was carried out with exceptional thoroughness,<sup>20</sup> soon after the area that became Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire was transferred from Mercian to direct West Saxon administration in 911–12. Probably the full imposition of the Alfredian scheme presented less difficulty in the Chilterns than where the settlement pattern was more nucleated. The fiscal units defined in the tenth century were likely to become parishes in the eleventh or early twelfth. Hardly any political decision has had greater social consequences. Unfortunately the Domesday commissioners were not asked to record churches, except incidentally as sources of revenue, like mills or fisheries.

The simplicity of Desborough as a Hundred and a half, with exactly 150 hides, had only been slightly distorted by 1086. The Marlows still had 35 hides, the Wycombes 30, Hambleden 20, Hughenden, Wooburn (with Lude), Medmenham and Fawley<sup>21</sup> 10 each and Turville 5 (reduced at some time from 10). Ibstone had 4 hides, all held by Hervey the 'legate' (a king's officer, perhaps interpreter), but two were returned in Bucks as Hibestanes, two in Oxfordshire as Ypestane and Ebestan. To make up 5 hides the single hide of Broch is needed. Langley placed this in Medmenham, and Lysons<sup>22</sup> gave Brock as an alternative name for that part of the manor of Medmenham that was not granted to Medmenham Abbey. As the Domesday Medmenham was a 10-hide unit Broch would have to be sought outside it, though it probably paid geld at Medmenham; Hugh

de Bolbec held both himself, and in DB Medmenham but not Broch had the marginal M for *manerium*, though 'ipse Hugo tenet Broch' would otherwise indicate full manorial status. Elvey<sup>23</sup> would place Broch far away at Grove in Cottesloe Hundred, where a place called Broc, identified by Vere Woodman, gave its name to the del Broc family. This could explain the anomalous 'in Langrave' with no other holding so named, but it contradicts the hundredal heading, and would leave Desborough one hide short of the target. Such was the insistence on making up the 150 hides that the two 5-hide estates in Saunderton,<sup>24</sup> which naturally belonged to Risborough Hundred, had to be brought into Desborough, leaving Risborough severed.

Three parishes in Desborough are not named in DB. Hedsor can safely be assigned to Little Marlow. Whether it belonged to Odo's holding or to Miles Crispin's it would have come into the privileged Honour of Wallingford, of which it remained a member until the sixteenth century<sup>25</sup>. Fingest indicates by its name, with that of Skirmett nearby, that the area had been settled and organised by Danes in the early tenth century; perhaps earlier, during 874–79, when Mercia's puppet king Ceolwulf II was a Danish vassal. The position of Danes settling in the western Chilterns could have been recognised by the Mercian Witan meeting at Risborough in 884. How their little *scīr* with its *thing* was absorbed in the Chiltern Hundreds "admits of wide conjecture". DB does not distinguish Fingest, unless indeed it was Broch (it has a brook). That leaves Radnage, with three hides, a light assessment in view of its 7 plough teams. Bradenham had 2 hides and 2 plough teams. Though not contiguous, these are near enough to have constituted a five-hide fiscal unit with the name Eaningadene, which survived in Radnage long enough to be given in answer to the commissioners' first question "What is the name of this place?" rather than the local *readan æc* 'red oak' with *c* palatalised in the locative dative. In Bradenham the enterprising Swerting<sup>27</sup> and Harding with their two villagers made sure that their land was returned under its own attractive name *bradan hamm*, broad meadow, in a valley though not on a river. The entry for Bradenham breaks or bends the rule that an undivided vill was a manor unless it was a dependency of another manor. The English entrepreneurs held

Bradenham from the King; they are not said to have held it *pro uno manerio*, but they wished to avoid any suggestion of dependence on Radnage, or any risk of reassessment. They returned no woodland and admitted no unrealised agricultural potential. J. J. N. Palmer's suggestion of simple clerical error<sup>28</sup> seems unnecessary.

Radnage is separated from Bradenham by Bledlow Ridge. In Cnut's time Toki, a Dane who was negotiating with the Archbishop of Canterbury to safeguard his tenure of Halton, had stewards at Bledlow and Eaningadene.<sup>29</sup> The valley with that

unique name can hardly be the Risborough Gap: that was surely Horsenden, a name which survived as that of a dismembered and absurdly narrow parish. Eaningadene is rather the valley on whose sides Radnage and its hamlets stand, and it was natural that the name should persist there longer than at Bradenham. One suspects that Eaningadene became a 'book name' for the two villis; the Eaningas lost their collective identity, but the administrative designation was still used officially although more specific names were preferred locally.<sup>30</sup> At all events, the name did not survive long enough to become \*Angedene.

### References

1. Domesday Book i 144c
2. G. R. Elvey, 'Buckinghamshire in 1086', *Recs. Bucks* 16 (1960) 394
3. Ed. J. C. Holt, *Domesday Studies* (1987) 45–6
4. Cf. *Domesday Studies* 145, n. 32. If Suetinus (Sweeting) was Swerting cf. ref. 27
5. *Domesday Book: Studies* (Alecto, 1987) viii
6. D. & S. Lysons, *Magna Britannia* I iii (1813) 454
7. For *Hæfering(a)dun*, 'hill of Hæfer or of Hæfer's people', cf. Haversham, at *Hæfaresham*, c. 970
8. *Vict. Hist. Counties of England; Bucks* iii (1925) 136 n. 13
9. *VCH Bucks* I (1905) 236 b
10. A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Buckinghamshire* (1925) 203 n. 1
11. Ed. J. Morris, *Domesday Book: Buckinghamshire* (Chichester, 1978) note on 144c (4, 20)
12. G. H. Fowler, *Beds and Bucks Pipe Rolls*, n ii/ D 15
13. See ref. 2. Also accepted by H. C. Darby and G. R. Versey, *Domesday Gazetteer* (1975)
14. The Gospels of Macdurnan, Lambeth Palace Library 1370, fo. 115 (see ref. 29)
15. *Archaeol. J.* iv 249
16. E. Ekwall, *English Place-Names in -ing*, 2nd edition (1962), 169 ff.
17. Conveniently in *The Place-Names of Cheshire*, ii (1970), 8
18. Hundred Rolls (Rec. Comm.) I, 23, 36
19. *VCH Bucks* iii (1925, but text completed 1914) 90
20. See K. Bailey, 'The Hidation of Buckinghamshire I' *Recs. Bucks* 32 (1990) 1–34, esp. Table 2i and refs. p. 22 n. 3
21. Herbrand de Sackville, Walter Giffard's steward, is said to have chosen Fawley as his reward, rather than the more valuable Long Crendon, on account of its beauty (Add. Chart. 27143). His descendants retained Fawley for five centuries. Walter, a Domesday Commissioner for this circuit, kept Crendon for himself.
22. Lysons, *op. cit.*, 453, 605
23. Elvey, *loc. cit.*
24. Later called St Mary and St Nicholas, from their respective churches. Of these, the former was burnt in the Barons' War and has twice been rebuilt; the latter fell into decay after the associated manor was fragmented. The rectories were united shortly before 1535
25. *VCH Bucks* iii 55
26. The Commissioners' brief is given in *Inquisitio Eliensis*, para. 1
27. Swerting, *opibus ex facili confluentibus fortunatus*, was probably a moneyer who accompanied Wigod of Wallingford to Wycombe. For his connections and activities see A. H. J. Baines, 'Saint Wulfstan in Buckinghamshire,' *Recs. Bucks* 30 (1988) at pp. 46–48 and refs. 62–65
28. In *Domesday Studies*, 146 n. 33
29. A. H. J. Baines, 'Halton in the Eleventh Century', *Recs. Bucks* 33 (1991) 64–67. The Toki who held Iver is described in DB as a thegn of King Edward
30. Ed. J. Bradbury and F. R. Thom, *The Buckinghamshire Domesday* (Alecto, 1988), 46