

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE SLAVERY IN 1086

K. A. BAILEY

Dr Bailey shows that although Buckinghamshire in 1086 had a higher proportion of slaves in the population than any other south-eastern county, with 16.6%, the institution was in decline. It was most significant in the NE and NW of the county, and was especially prevalent where there were demesne ploughs to be manned. There is some evidence that slaves surplus to the needs of the demesne ploughs may have been employed as swineherds, and in one case as a blacksmith. There is no correlation between slaves and areas of postulated British survival.

I

More than twenty years ago in a seminal paper on the early settlement of the Chilterns, John Chenevix Trench put forward the view that the proportion of slaves detailed in Domesday Book for blocks of contiguous estates indicated the possibility of recognisably British elements surviving in the population long after the first flush of Anglo-Saxon occupation in the seventh century.¹ His analysis was based on the only series of data on the subject of slavery in Buckinghamshire, the Domesday folios, and the purpose of this paper is to explore this information in more detail for the whole of the county, with a view to discerning patterns and attempting to explain them.

Pelteret's recent study of Anglo-Saxon slavery in general obviates the need for any detailed discussion of topics such as terminology here.² He too uses Domesday data for a series of county case studies of the institution of slavery at the end of its life (there is no evidence that it survived in England beyond the middle of the twelfth century), although Buckinghamshire is not one of them. Pelteret's thesis has three broad components: (1) that the institution of slavery in the period between the settlement and the Conquest was a developing one, characterised by fluidity over time and space; (2) that slavery was in decline, probably from the time of Alfred (871–900), as tribal society was progressively replaced by the growth of what might be termed the "manorial" system, and that slaves were

replaced at the bottom of the hierarchy by various classes of peasant; and (3) that there was a high correlation between the number of slaves on an estate at the time of Domesday and the number of demesne ploughs which required to be operated.

He adduces the decline in slavery as a function of the changing needs of lords, in part caused by the fragmentation of the old multiple-estates with their emphasis on food and other renders in kind, used to feed an itinerant royal or noble household. The demand for renders in terms of money or labour services gave rise to the replacement of formerly "free" peasants, such as *ceorlas* (but see Higham's recent study of the seventh century which suggests a much higher status for this group at that time),³ by the groups which appear in Domesday as *villani*, *bordarii* and *cottarii*, among others. He also sees the church as a conservative force with its continuing need for supplies to feed the monastic brethren, despite the teaching that slaves should be freed. In this paper, I shall follow Pelteret in translating Domesday *servi* as 'slaves', rather than as 'serfs', thereby distinguishing them clearly from the later medieval group of that name.

With the exception of the will of Ælfifu (966 × 975),⁴ there are no sources apart from Domesday Book that provide any details of slaves in Buckinghamshire. By 1086, the institution was in its terminal stages. Unfortunately, the folios for this county do not provide any data on population relating to 1066, so it is impossible to judge the rate

and distribution of any decline, as is the case in Essex.⁵ There, slaves were in the process of being freed and changed, perhaps at the rate of 2–3% per annum, into small tenants owing various services to the lord.

One fundamental question is the extent to which the situation in 1086 can reflect in any way that which pertained at the time when what is now Buckinghamshire was being taken over from its post-Roman rulers by a variety of Anglo-Saxon leaders, a process which probably began around AD500 and was not completed much before 650 in many parts of the later county. The only record of these events is to be found in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the year 571, when Ceawlin of the West Saxons took over four *tunas* and their territories: Luton, Aylesbury, Eynsham and Benson – a large swathe of land comprising some or all of that allocated about a century later to the *Ciltirnsætan* and *Hendrica* in the Tribal Hidage.⁶ It is not clear who had control of these areas before this takeover, but it seems reasonable to assume that it was a mixture of early Germanic settlers, of both Anglian and Saxon origin, and also one or more Romano-British rulers, successors to the tyrants described by Gildas two or three generations earlier.⁷ This was no doubt one of those takeovers in which only the aristocratic and military elite were replaced, the rest of the (almost wholly agricultural) population remaining in place, rendering their dues to new masters. Given that slavery was practised both by the Romans and by their Celtic successors, it is certain that there was a greater or lesser number of such individuals in this region in 571. The West Saxon conquest may well have added to their number as some of the indigenous population were enslaved. Such a pattern will have been repeated when this region was taken over by the Mercian king Wulfhere in the late-650s and 660s.

We cannot know what the proportion of slaves in the population was at any of these dates, nor the dynamics which underlay it. We do know, however, that the church became firmly established in the region after 650, and that its policy on manumission might well have counteracted any tendency for the proportion of slaves to increase. Equally, of course, their numbers are unlikely to have decreased on those estates, often very substantial, which were being granted by kings for the

support of the new network of minsters. (Unfortunately, there is little or no evidence for how extensive these estates may have been in Bucks., where the names of probable or suspected early minsters are about all we have: Aylesbury, Buckingham; possibly Wing, North Crawley and Brill/Oakley.)

Ælfgifu was probably the separated wife of king Eadwig, and her will is addressed to his successor Eadmund.⁸ Amongst other things, she requests that he frees in every *tun* (estate) every penally enslaved man who was enslaved under her. Arnold Baines considers that this petition relates only to the estate at Princes Risborough, which she willed to New Minster at Winchester, and which had several component settlements.⁹ He considers that the freed individuals became *coliberti*, remaining on the estate, and ultimately appeared in later sources as *bordars*. Although there were only three slaves out of a population of 45 at Princes Risborough in 1086, it is equally possible that Ælfgifu intended to free penal slaves on other estates which she bequeathed, mostly to the king – for example Wing, Linslade, Haversham and Marsworth. Her action may account for the relative absence of slaves on some of these estates a century later, and was a common feature of testamentary provision.¹⁰

II

It is necessary at the outset to define the size of the slave population in the county in 1086, and to compare this with other counties in the region. Buckinghamshire had a total enumerated population of 5,103, of whom 845 were slaves (16.6%). This is a high figure for southeast England, as may be seen from the following table:

TABLE I
Proportion of Slaves in Selected Counties in 1086

County	% Slaves
Buckinghamshire	16.6
Oxfordshire	14.9
Bedfordshire	13.4
Hertfordshire	13.0
Essex	12.9
Surrey	12.3
Kent	9.9
Northamptonshire	9.6
Middlesex	5.1
Berkshire	2.9

It will be seen that Bucks. has 11% more serfs than Oxfordshire, and 24% and 28% more than Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. The widely divergent political and socio-economic histories of the counties make it impossible to generalise about the reasons for these differences, especially as we shall see that within Bucks., there were concentrations of slaves in areas which had belonged to different early administrative units, and which had been affected more or less by the Danish wars of the ninth and eleventh centuries and their aftermaths. It is sufficient to note that in Bucks., the institution of slavery seems to have been decaying less rapidly than in the rest of the Home Counties.

Appendix 1 gives details of the proportion of slaves in all those places which had them. Where a name covers more than one manor or estate in Domesday Book, these have been grouped together here, although they will be considered in a disaggregated form later.

Overall, 180 places in Bucks. possessed one or more slaves in 1086, an average of just under five each. The maximum number in one place is seventeen at Waddesdon, followed by fifteen at Haddenham, fourteen at Chesham and thirteen each in Aston Clinton and High Wycombe. As important as these absolute figures, however, is the proportion of slaves in the population, which has an equally wide range. Table 2 summarises the data by settlement population size, Table 3 by "Three Hundred" groupings.

It is clear that the distribution of slaves was not uniform, either in terms of settlement size or location within the county. There is a steady decline in the proportion from small settlements to large, with places whose population was 1-10 people having

TABLE 2
Buckinghamshire Slaves in 1086 by Population Band

Population	No.	Av. % Slaves	σ %
1-10	25	31.64	15.00
11-20	57	21.43	9.97
21-30	40	17.96	9.07
31-40	27	16.10	7.72
41-50	16	16.28	6.05
51+	15	14.34	6.64

more than twice as many slaves pro rata as those with 31 or more recorded inhabitants. In geographical terms, the Chiltern and Ashendon Hundred groups approximate to the county average of 16.6% slaves, but this is exceeded by a substantial margin in Cottesloe and Buckingham. This differs from the conclusion reached by John Chenevix Trench that slaves were concentrated in the Chiltern Hills, reflecting the survival of the post-Roman British population there.

A statistical measure of the dispersion of values about the average (mean) is provided by the standard deviation (σ), and this has been calculated for all places with slaves in 1086, divided into settlement-size bands and Three Hundred groups. Places which exceed the difference from the mean by more than $+1\sigma$ or -1σ are listed in Table 4.

Three principal areas of anomalies are highlighted by this exercise. The first is in the far north-east of the county and comprises a block of parishes in Moulsoe Hundred, from Moulsoe itself to Emberton, which has a much lower than expected proportion of slaves. (Astwood is not mentioned in Domesday, but was subsumed under Newport Pagnell. There is a reference to renders from men living in the woodland, however, suggesting an area of active clearance, probably with few or no

TABLE 3
Buckinghamshire Slaves in 1086 by Hundred Group

Group	Places with Slaves	Total Pop.	Slaves	% Slaves	Av. % Slaves	σ %
Aylesbury/Stone/Risborough	20	780	122	15.64	19.74	10.38
Stoke/Burnham/Desborough	29	958	126	13.15	15.85	7.66
Ashendon/Ixhill/Waddesdon	31	793	127	16.02	20.39	12.06
Mursley/Cottesloe/Yardley	33	833	147	17.17	22.94	13.76
Lamua/Rowley/Stodfold	31	731	137	18.74	23.03	11.26
Moulsoe/Seckloe/Bunsty	35	1075	195	18.14	18.66	8.53

TABLE 4
Significant Variation in Slave Population from the Mean,
1086

Population	Places $>+1\sigma$	Places $<-1\sigma$
<i>A. By settlement size:</i>		
1-10	Barton Hartshorn Ivinghoe Aston (Waddesdon Hund.)	Addingleave Dadford Shipton Lee
11-20	Addington Fawley Shalstone Shenley Church End Upton (Stone) Cheddington Chearsley Chetwode Tingewick Hanechedene? Creslow Ibstone Singleborough	Aston Abbots Chalfont St Peter Great Horwood Loughton Moulsoe Burston Caldecote Granborough Fleet Marston
21-30	Padbury Aston Sandford Weston Turville Whitchurch Stoke Hammond	Wooburn Emberton Upton (Stoke) Westbury
31-40	Marsh Gibbon Newton Longville Calverton Twyford Tyringham	Burnham Aylesbury Hardmead Chicheley Wingrave
41-50	Aston Clinton Stone	Stoke Mandeville Monks Risborough Iver Princes Risborough Marlow Buckingham Winchendon
51 +	Haddenham Chesham Hartwell Water Eaton	
<i>B. By Hundred Group:</i>		
Aylesbury	Weston Turville Upton Hampdens	Stoke Mandeville Monks Risborough Aylesbury Princes Risborough Marlow
Chiltern	Chesham Fawley Stoke Poges Ibstone Hitcham Lude	Burnham Wooburn Upton Dilehurst
Ashendon	Aston Sandford Chearsley (Waddesdon Hund.) Waldrige	Winchendon Brill Granborough Fleet Marston Wingrave Aston Abbots
Cottesloe	Creslow Dunton Helsthorpe Horton Ivinghoe Aston	
Buckingham	Shalstone Chetwode Barton Hartshorn	Steeple Claydon Buckingham Beachampton Leckhampstead Westbury Edgcote
Newport	Newton Longville Tyringham Stoke Hammond Shenley Church End Stantonbury Bradwell Tickford Little Woolstone	Hardmead Chicheley Emberton Loughton Moulsoe Caldecote

slaves.)¹¹ This is an area of extreme fragmentation of holdings in 1086, and it is likely that the influence of Scandinavian settlement in the Danelaw, with a higher than average proportion of freemen, or sokemen, holding up to one hide, caused this scarcity of slaves. Chibnall showed that it was an area in which assarting was actively proceeding in the late-eleventh century and after, and the absence of institutional landholders would also have been a factor depressing the number of slaves.

The second group of anomalies lies around Aylesbury, although in this case there are both positive and negative deviations from the mean. On the basis of settlement size, there are two clusters of lower than expected numbers of slaves: around Wing, Wingrave and Aston Abbots, and a much larger one to the west, from Winchendon through Quarrendon, Aylesbury itself, to Wendover and Halton. On either side of the latter, south-west and southeast of Aylesbury, are clusters of much higher than average numbers of slaves – from Chearsley to Hartwell, and Weston Turville/Aston Clinton, and on to Chesham. On the basis of Hundred groupings, the negative anomalies are equally apparent, but the positive ones are more fragmented, although Weston Turville stands out, as does Aston Sandford.

Last of these groups is a block of parishes west of Watling Street, from Calverton in an arc through Whaddon to Stoke Hammond, which have more than 1σ slaves above the mean. Other high slave concentrations are found at Chetwode/Barton/Tingewick; Padbury/Addington; Creslow/Whitchurch, while negative anomalies are in the group of parishes between the last two; and along the Thames in Marlow and Wooburn.

Possible reasons for these strong geographical variations will be discussed below.

III

There are other ways in which the distribution of slaves in Buckinghamshire in 1086 may be analysed. One is by the type of tenant-in-chief. We shall be looking both at the post-Conquest owners and their predecessors of 1066. It is also likely that the type of estate itself had some bearing on the

socio-economic structure found within it. There are five major categories of estates in the Bucks. Domesday to test this hypothesis against. Thirdly, there are suggestions which have been made by scholars over the years that the slaves were specifically used on certain tasks, of which the most notable are as demesne ploughmen and as household servants, with other options including dairymaids.¹²

There were 67 tenants-in-chief in 1086, ranging from the King through various lay and ecclesiastical magnates to Godwin the beadle. Sixteen had no slaves on their estates.

TABLE 5
Slaveholding by Tenant-in Chief, 1086

<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Total Pop.</i>	<i>Slaves</i>	<i>% Slaves</i>	
King	192	14	7.29	
Church	466	48	10.30	
Laymen*	>151 (8)	2932	496	16.92
	51-150 (11)	840	144	17.14
	21-50 (14)	473	90	19.03
	11-20 (5)	81	17	20.95
	1-10 (18)	80	9	11.25

* Figures denote total population on all Bucks. estates

The suggestion that churchmen were influenced by their own teaching against the perpetuation of slavery, and led the way in manumitting slaves, seems to be borne out, and it appears that the King also was able to manage his estates (albeit not very significant in Bucks.) without recourse to large numbers of such individuals. This reflects the close links between church and monarch before 1066. As usual, averages conceal quite wide variations: Westminster had no slaves and St. Albans only five (8.77%), whereas the Archbishop and the abbess of Barking had 14-15% of the population on their local estates in this category.

Lay tenants-in-chief (which for this purpose includes the Norman bishops of Bayeux and Coutances, whose role in England was as leading adherents of the new regime, not as religious leaders) seem to have acted under no such compunction, except at the very lowest level in the landowning hierarchy, where minute estates of less than two hides or so could obviously be managed by the efforts of the tenant's family and a small body of free or semifree peasants - although even here one in nine of the recorded population were slaves.

(There is a paradox between the high proportion of slaves in small settlements and the low number on small landowners' holdings; this reflects the number of small entities which had no slaves at all.)

The eight great territorial magnates between them accounted for 56% of the county's population in 1086, and 60% of slaves. The largest, Walter Giffard, had 734 people living on his estates, of whom 128 (17.44%) were slaves. Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, had 470 and 100 respectively (21.28%), followed by the Bishop of Coutances (322/59: 18.32%) and Miles Crispin (316/58: 18.35%). of these great landowners, only the Count of Mortain (270/31: 11.48%) had significantly less than the average number of slaves on his estates. Landowners with total populations of 51-150 had a similar proportion of slaves, although in the case of Edward of Salisbury (63/22: 34.92%) this level more than doubled. Owners with between ten and fifty on their estates had almost one-fifth in slavery, and it is clear that they were far from abolishing this institution which had lasted so long. Change came very rapidly in the decades after 1086, however, and by the end of the twelfth century, slavery had been replaced by a variety of types of unfree peasant, who, while they may not technically have been the property of the landowner were not exactly characterised by high levels of personal freedom.

In the absence of any population data for 1066, it is impossible to know whether the proportion of slaves in the county was declining, and if so at what rate. We are able, however, to rework the data for 1086 on the basis of landownership twenty years previously.

TABLE 6
Slaveholding by Owner 1066

<i>Owner</i>	<i>Total Pop.</i>	<i>Slaves</i>	<i>% Slaves</i>	
King/Queen	560	70	12.50	
Church	385	43	11.17	
Laymen	>151 (6)	1382	231	16.71
	51-150 (20)	1599	279	17.45
	21-50 (23)	714	123	17.23
	11-20 (14)	210	40	19.05
	1-10 (22)	123	19	15.45

(NB: The overall population and slave totals for 1066 are slightly less than those for 1086 [Table 5] because there are several examples of shared ownership in the former year, in which it is impossible to divide the number of slaves.)

The apparent difference between the royal estates over the two decades is caused by the transfer of most of the estates held by Queen Edith in 1066 to major lay magnates, and the acquisition by Matilda, William's Queen, of estates which had not been royal at that time. The proportion of slaves on the former was 17%, on the latter only 8%. King Edward had only 6.5% slaves on his estates (cf. William 5%). The church had slightly more slaves in 1086 than 1066, which reflects the resumption of estates by Canterbury which had been in lay hands at the Conquest. This no doubt reflects the activities of Stigand, who had been deposed by William, and who seems to have had rather an ambivalent attitude to church property. In contrast, Westminster had only acquired its slave-free estate from a layman in 1065-6.¹³ As in 1086, there is a progressive increase in the proportion of slaves with decreasing size of estate (remembering that at both dates there was more or less extreme fragmentation of any given individual's holdings in this shire). The 15% slaves in the smallest group in 1066 is overstated by the omission of estates held by two or more individuals.

There does not seem to be a significant variation in the propensity to have slaves between the various levels of the landowning hierarchy, either at the end of the Anglo-Saxon era, or in the first generation after the Conquest. With the exception of royal and ecclesiastical estates, between one in five and one in six of the recorded population of Bucks. was in slavery at the end of the eleventh century.

IV

We turn now to examine variations in slave-owning by type of estate. There are five basic categories in the Domesday folios for Buckinghamshire: (i) those rubricated with 'M' in the mar-

gin, denoting a manor; (ii) those described in the text as 'answering for' such-and-such a liability (*se defendit*); (iii) estates described in the text as 'held as one manor' (*per uno manerio*) – both categories may be considered "full" manors;¹⁴ (iv) estates which are described as having been held as one (or more) manors in 1066, but which do not belong to that category in 1086; (v) estates which have no reference to having been manors at either date. Places may be further divided into names which cover only one estate (which may or not be a single settlement), "undivided vill", and those which cover two or more estates ("divided vill") – up to ten in the case of Lavendon. The two types are not randomly distributed across the county, and have been discussed in a separate paper.¹⁵

There is a high correlation between 'proper' manors, that is those with the marginal rubric M, and slaveholding in 1086, especially in unitary vills. Taking these and the next two categories, estates which were definitely Domesday manors, 85% of unitary vills had slaves, a proportion which does not change when estates which had ceased to be manors since 1066 is taken into account. The effect of fragmentation is obvious, with almost half of all the components not having any descriptor in 1086. Here, 73% of the first three categories had slaves, which falls slightly to 69% if erstwhile manors are included. In general, however, it is true to say that slaves were heavily concentrated on 'manors', although there was a goodly proportion of these which had already transformed this asset into some kind of unfree or semi-free peasantry.

This correlation between 'manors' and slaves suggests that they formed an integral part of the activities related to the landholder's portion of the estate, that is the demesne. Such a link has become a commonplace of studies of slavery in Domesday

TABLE 7
Slaveholding by Estate Type: 1086

Description	Undivided Vills			Divided Vills		
	No.	Slaves	%Slaves	No. of Divns.	Slaves	%Slaves
Manor	80	67	83.75	40	31	77.50
Held as one manor	2	2	100.00	63	44	69.84
Se Defendit	29	25	86.20	5	4	80.00
Manor 1066	7	6	85.71	35	19	54.29
None	8	2	25.00	112	25	22.32

Book, and it is useful to develop the Buckinghamshire data further to see whether the frequently alleged correlation between slaves and demesne ploughteams is strong or weak.

TABLE 8
Slaves and Demesne Ploughteams: 1086

1. By Hundred				
Hundred	DTs	Slaves	Corr.1	Corr.2
Stone	26	53	+0.92	+0.79
Aylesbury	23	42	+0.56	+0.67
Risborough	9	17	+0.61	+0.61
Stoke	18	31	+0.34	+0.33
Burnham	21	37	+0.49	-0.03
Desborough	32.5	57	+0.83	+0.83
Ixhill	41	57	+0.35	+0.35
Ashendon	33	38	+0.56	+0.44
Waddesdon	16	25	+0.98	+0.99
Cottesloe	34	47	+0.20	+0.31
Yardley	17	38	+0.93	+0.92
Mursley	27	43	+0.66	+0.60
Stodfold	22.5	35	-0.23	+0.55
Rowley	25	44	+0.62	+0.45
Lamua	26.5	51	+0.71	+0.85
Seckloe	42	91	+0.89	+0.85
Bunsty	27.5	50	+0.44	+0.94
Moulsoe	28.5	44	+0.81	+0.78
County Total	469.5	765	+0.68	+0.66

Note: Correlation 1 is based on actual demesne teams
Correlation 2 includes potential extra demesne teams where given.

2. By population group

Population	Dem. Teams	Slaves	Corr.
1-10	29.5	40	+0.45
11-20	117.5	175	+0.33
21-30	104.5	176	+0.43
31-40	85.5	152	+0.58
41-50	61	111	+0.43
51+	65.5	128	+0.46

Using Hundreds and Triple Hundreds as the basis for calculating correlations, it will be seen that across the county, there is a high positive correlation between demesne teams and slaves (on estates where both are recorded): +0.68 on the basis of actual teams, and +0.66 if potential teams are included. As usual, however, there are wide variations between subdivisions. Aylesbury and Newport groups exhibit much higher correlations, Buckingham matches the overall average, while

Cottesloe and the Chiltern Hundreds have a lower correlation between slaves and demesne teams. If potential teams are added in, the Chilterns stand out as an area of weak correlation, although this is concentrated in the "lowland" hundreds of Stoke and Burnham, whereas there is a high positive correlation in Desborough, which is matched in Stone, but not in Aylesbury and Risborough. This would indicate that the slave population of the Chilterns was only partially a function of the requirements of demesne arable cultivation.

The range of correlation between demesne teams and slaves is less in the case of settlement size – between +0.33 and +0.58 – but is still consistently positive. Settlements with 31–40 recorded population have the strongest correlation and those with 11–20 the weakest, although the differences are not significant.

It appears, therefore, that a substantial proportion of the slaves in Domesday Buckinghamshire can be accounted for by the need to provide manpower to operate ploughs engaged on the demesne. If the assumption that it took two men to operate the cumbersome eight-ox plough of the time (cf. the tenth century work of Ælfric, where the (unfree) ploughman had a boy to assist him)¹⁶ is valid, then 220 slaves (26%) are accounted for on estates where the ratio between slaves and demesne teams is exactly two (which increases to 252 (30%) if potential ploughs on some estates are taken into account). A further 220 slaves were enumerated on estates where the ratio with demesne teams exceeded 2.00, bringing the number of slaves who may reasonably be assumed to work as ploughmen or their assistants to 472 (56%). Looked at another way, however, this leaves more than two slaves in five to be accounted for across the county. There are two basic categories of estate left: (1) those where there are demesne teams, but with less than two slaves to the team; (2) those where there are no such ploughs recorded, but which still have slaves.

There are 31 of the latter (13% of all estates with slaves), although they only have 48 slaves between them (5.7%). Most only have one, who may represent a household slave, a dairymaid, or some other specialist about the home farm. There may also be estates where the process of reducing slaves to zero is caught by the snapshot that is Domesday – by

1090 these areas may have joined those with no slaves. A few estates, however, seem to have a large number of slaves in relation to the demands of the demesne: Hartwell 2 & 3, four each; an unnamed holding in Waddesdon Hundred (4), and Weston Underwood 1 (3). The third of these has been identified with part of Hoggeston, lying in Creslow, although neither of these places seems ever to have been in Waddesdon Hundred.¹⁷ The seven virgates in question, however, do make a ten-hide unit with the rest of Hoggeston, and represent two of Edward of Salisbury's three estates in Buckinghamshire. Also, there is a shortfall of three slaves at Creslow in relation to demesne ploughteam requirements, so it is at least possible that they were thus employed. Salisbury's lands are unusual in both having more recorded slaves than other categories of men, and this is one of the areas of the county which shows up as a positive anomaly (see above). There is a deficit of two slaves in relation to the teams at Hartwell 4, although that still leaves six slaves unaccounted for on the other components of that vill. There are other cases where slaves are allocated to properties without demesne teams, who may have been used on neighbouring land – for example, Lude at Wooburn; Chearsley 1 and 2; Burston at Aston Abbots; Helsthorpe; Wingrave; Lamport; Leckhampstead; Gawcott; Bradwell; Hardmead and Wavendon.

It has also been suggested that slaves may have acted as swineherds. The recording of swine across Buckinghamshire does not appear to be consistent.¹⁸ For example, none at all are recorded in Cottelsoe Hundred, and relatively few in neighbouring Mursley. Also, swine totals in the Chiltern region are often recorded under the head manor, whereas they may have been located several miles away in woodland pasture areas. Iver and Datchet are examples of this. Nevertheless, there is some evidence that surplus slaves on some estates (i.e. those over and above the demesne ploughing requirements) may have been employed as swineherds for at least part of the year. There are thirty-one estates with surplus slaves, and swine totals, totalling 60 and 10,954 respectively. Aston Clinton and Weston Turville, for instance, have seven slaves and 400 swine. At the former, ploughshares were made, suggesting that the surplus slave was the demesne blacksmith. Other areas with substantial quantities of surplus slaves and woodland

include Amersham and Chesham (five and 2,000), Wraybury (three and 500), Hambleton (three; 700), the Wycombes and Hughenden (four; 2,100), Edlesborough (two; 400), Akeley (one; 800), Tingewick (four; 800), Hanslope (four; 1,000), Haversham (two; 300) and Clifton Reynes (three; 440).

While many of the surplus slaves may be dealt with in this way, the problem of estates where there was a deficit in relation to the needs of the demesne arable and its cultivation remains. It is these examples which may afford evidence of the process by which slaves were being replaced by other types of peasant, who, while they were not actually the property of the landholder, were obliged to perform more or less onerous labour services on or about the demesne in exchange for often very small holdings which can scarcely have afforded a living for them and their families (often as little as five acres or less).¹⁹ There are only three basic categories of peasant recorded in the Bucks. folios: *villani*, *bordarii* and *servi*. The last are slaves, the first are usually translated as villeins and the second as bordars. We know from the Middlesex Domesday that villeins were a heterodox group in terms of their holdings, although most seem to have fallen in the range of one virgate to one hide. Both the latter are highly variable terms in their turn, but may be considered as falling generally in the fifteen to one hundred acre bracket. At the top end of the range were those who had once been substantial free *ceorlas*, whose status had begun to decline long before the arrival of the Normans. At the bottom were men who were no doubt both on the way down and those on the way up, possibly even former slaves. There is unfortunately no evidence of the peasant land market this early, although if later medieval evidence is anything to go by, it could have been locally vigorous.²⁰ There were 2,899 villeins in Bucks. in 1086, 57% of the total population. Bordars are also described as cottars in some shires, and although there is some degree of mixing, it seems likely that they represent similar groups of cottagers. (There are ten cottars in Bucks., but 1,321 bordars [26% of the total]).²¹

The population data may be analysed in terms of places with surplus slaves in relation to demesne teams, those where there is a deficit, and those where the two slaves-to-the-team ratio applies.

TABLE 9
Buckinghamshire Population Groups 1086

A. Places with Slaves >2 per Team			
	Villeins	Bordars	Slaves
No.	872	324	380*
%	55.33	20.56	24.11
% ± Overall	-1.90	-5.52	+7.43
Difference	-29	-87	+113

* - includes four *huri* (boors)

B. Places with Slaves <2 per Team			
	Villeins	Bordars	Slaves
No.	1001	487	243
%	57.83	28.13	14.04
% ± Overall	+0.64	+2.07	-2.71
Difference	+13	+36	-47

C. Places with Slaves=2 per Team			
	Villeins	Bordars	Slaves
No.	604	207	214
%	58.93	20.19	20.88
% ± Overall	+1.74	-5.87	+4.13
Difference	+18	-60	+42

These tables reveal a clear link between the proportions of slaves and bordars in relation to demesne teams in 1086. On estates where there are surplus slaves, there are 87 fewer bordars and 29 fewer villeins than would be expected if the population was composed in the same way as the county as a whole, but 112 more slaves. Four of the latter were *huri* (boors), all of them on the estate of Robert D'Oilly at [High] Wycombe (held by Queen Edith in 1066 and marked as a former royal estate by its reference to meadow for the horses of the court).²² There were only 65 boors in the whole of Domesday, 17 of them in neighbouring Oxfordshire and 19 in Hereford. They are probably to be associated with the *coliberti*, of whom there were 840, and with the *bovarii* (oxmen), of whom there were 759.²³ Both groups display geographical concentrations - the former in Wessex (notably Hants., Wilts. and Somerset) and the latter along the Welsh border (especially in Shropshire). Some of the oxmen were described as "free", which suggests that all three groups represent the recently freed, and that all occupied a place intermediate between slaves and free peasants such as bordars and cottars. The substantial group defined as oxmen were clearly involved in ploughing and in view of what has been said about the correlation between slaves and demesne ploughs, the *coliberti* may well also have

been. The apparent deficit of villeins on these estates in Bucks. is further support for the relatively low status of many within this group.

On estates with less than two slaves to the team, there is a shortfall of 47 slaves which is balanced by surpluses of 36 bordars and 13 villeins, further evidence of the changes which were affecting local society in the late eleventh century. On estates where all the manpower for the lord's teams seems to have been provided by slaves, there is nevertheless an excess of this group in relation to the expected proportion - 42 more slaves being balanced by a shortfall of sixty bordars (the balance being villeins)

V

What, then, does this preliminary survey of the Domesday evidence for Buckinghamshire slavery reveal? Four broad conclusions may be drawn:

- (1) The institution of slavery was more prevalent in this county than its neighbours. This may be ascribed to the relative weakness of royal and ecclesiastical tenants-in-chief and to its peripheral position vis-a-vis the Danelaw. Lay landholders seem far less likely to have progressed the manumission of their slaves.
- (2) There is a positive correlation between the slave population and the number of demesne ploughteams, with pronounced geographical variations. The Hundreds of Stone, Desborough, Waddesdon, Yardley and Seckle stand out particularly in this respect. The shortfall of slaves on many estates is matched by a greater-than-expected number of bordars, suggesting that the process of manumission was actively under way in 1086, albeit more slowly than elsewhere.
- (3) There is a strong correlation between slavery and manors, however defined and described in Domesday Book. Small estates which do not fall into any of the relevant categories did not usually have separate demesnes, and were often relatively new creations in marginal areas such as those of woodland clearance. Here, there was no institutional basis for maintaining or indeed creating slavery.

- (4) There are marked variations in the density of slaves between Hundreds and groups of Hundreds. They are most significant in the north-west and north-east corners of the county, the proportion generally decreasing as one moves south.

The last point does not support the argument that they were especially prevalent in the Chilterns, nor indeed in the area of Bernwood in the west, a forested area in which Celtic place-names survive more than elsewhere in Bucks.²⁴ So many centuries had elapsed since the final annexation of the area which is now known as Buckinghamshire by a variety of Anglian and Saxon leaders that, while not dissenting from the view that the mass of the rural population remained "British" in some way, the dynamics of assimilation, personal success and failure, warfare, and economics will have long since blurred any direct relationship between being British and being a slave, apart from the semantic shifts revealed by the Old English word *wealh*. Concentrations of slaves in 1086 seem more likely to owe their origin to the type of landholder, the size of settlement and the extent of demesne arable farming, than to the survival of distinct pockets of "Britons".

On balance, there are few places in Buckinghamshire where the number of slaves is greatly in excess of the number required to man the demesne ploughteams (or in some cases, including those of a neighbouring estate with the same name, or those with a different name but still within the same modern parish). Such excesses as there are may be accounted for by other demands of the estate owner. Unfortunately, we do not know the sex of the slaves recorded in Domesday Book, nor whether those entered therein represent individuals or heads of families. Notwithstanding this problem, some of the local *servi* were probably women and girls engaged as dairymaids, or as domestic servants. Among the men, some will have been associated with demesne activities such as milling and forestry.

As usual with this source, however, there are tantalising clues to be followed up. For example, why do the paired settlements of Aston (Clinton) and Weston (Turville) have so many slaves in relation to their size – 25 out of 69? Between them, they

have a surplus of five slaves after actual and potential demesne teams are fully manned. Weston had four mills and Aston one. The latter owed shares for the lord's ploughs – was its "spare" slave a blacksmith? Aston had been held by Wulfwen of Creslow in 1066, a lady whose other Bucks. estates were also marked by a very high proportion of slaves and demesne arable. Aston and Weston were presumably part of the original multiple estate of which Aylesbury was the head, with its strategic site on Akeman Street overlooking the Vale and its early minster church, although slaves are in short supply in the rest of the Hundred by 1086.

Perhaps one day there will be a full study of Buckinghamshire's Domesday society and economy, towards which the present paper offers a small contribution.

Appendix 1

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE SLAVES BY LOCATION, 1086

Place	Servi:All	Pop.	Servi	% Servi
Marlow	4:4	107	5	4.67
Waddesdon		77	17	22.08
Long Crendon		72	10	13.89
Haddenham		71	15	21.13
Hambleton		68	9	13.26
Lavendon	3:10	66	8	12.12
High Wycombe		60	8	13.33
Steeple Claydon		60	7	11.67
Chesham	3:5	59	14	23.73
Wrayisbury		57	7	12.28
Buckingham		55	2	3.64
Hanslope		55	8	14.55
Hartwell	3:6	54	12	22.22
Water Eaton		53	12	22.64
Winchendon	2:2	52	2	3.85
Dinton		50	8	16.00
Edlesborough		50	10	20.00
Wolverton		50	10	20.00
Aston Clinton		45	13	28.89
Ellesborough	2:3	45	6	13.33
Princes Risborough		45	3	6.67
Stoke Mandeville		45	3	6.67
Stone	2:2	45	11	24.44
Monks Risborough		44	4	9.09
West Wycombe	1:3	44	7	15.91
Amersham	1:6	43	7	16.28
Bledlow		43	8	18.60
Hardwick	2:3	42	9	21.43

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE SLAVES BY LOCATION, 1086 (CONT.)

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE SLAVES BY LOCATION, 1086 (CONT.)

<i>Place</i>		<i>Pop.</i>	<i>Servi</i>	<i>% Servi</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Entries</i>	<i>Servi:All</i>	<i>Pop.</i>	<i>Servi</i>	<i>% Servi</i>
Iver		42	4	9.52	Winslow			25	3	12.00
Quainton	2:2	42	8	19.05	East Claydon	1:4		24	3	12.50
Clifton Keynes	4:5	41	6	14.63	Hoggeston			24	5	20.83
Bow Brickhill	3:3	40	6	15.00	Horton			24	4	16.67
Marsh Gibbon	2:2	39	11	28.21	Preston Bisset			24	6	25.00
Newton Longville		39	11	28.21	Taplow			24	2	8.33
Ivinghoe		38	6	15.79	Weston Turville			24	12	50.00
Great Linford	2:4	38	5	13.16	Whitchurch			24	8	33.33
Milton Keynes	2:3	38	7	18.42	Woughton	2:2		24	6	25.00
Saunderton	2:2	38	4	10.53	Eton			23	4	17.39
Burnham		37	2	5.41	Hughenden			23	5	21.74
Aylesbury		36	2	5.56	Westbury	2:2		23	2	8.70
Hardmead	2:7	36	3	8.33	Broughton (Aylesbury)			22	4	18.18
Hillesden	1:2	36	7	19.44	Stoke Hammond			22	6	27.27
Great Kimble		36	6	16.67	Middle Claydon			21	3	14.28
Sherington		36	8	22.22	Cublington			21	5	23.81
Stewkley	1:2	36	5	13.89	Dorton			21	3	14.28
Wavendon	3:7	36	4	11.11	Edgcott			21	2	9.52
Calverton		35	9	25.71	Ickford	1:2		21	2	9.52
Brill		34	2	5.88	Mentmore			21	3	14.28
Olney		34	5	14.71	Aston Abbots			20	1	5.00
Soulbury	2:6	34	6	17.65	Chalfont St. Peter			20	2	10.00
Twyford		34	9	26.47	Great Horwood			20	2	10.00
Tyringham	2:2	34	10	29.41	Maids Moreton	1:3		20	5	25.00
Charndon		33	4	12.12	Ravenstone			20	4	20.00
Chicheley	1:3	33	2	6.06	Thornton			20	3	15.00
Linslade		33	5	15.15	Weston Underwood	1:3		20	3	15.00
Whaddon		33	10	30.30	Addington	2:3		19	6	31.58
Thornborough		32	4	12.50	Drayton Beauchamp	2:3		19	4	21.05
Wingrave	2:5	32	2	6.67	Fawley			19	5	31.58
Beachampton	2:3	30	3	10.00	Oakley			19	3	15.79
Leckhamstead	2:3	30	3	10.00	Shalstone	2:2		19	7	36.84
Haversham		29	5	17.24	Shenley Church End	1:2		19	6	31.58
Lathbury	2:3	29	6	20.69	Upton (Stone)	2:2		19	5	31.58
Padbury		29	8	27.59	Drayton Parslow	1:2		18	3	16.67
Great Brickhill		28	6	21.43	Grendon Underwood			18	4	22.22
Slapton	1:2	28	4	14.28	Pitstone	2:6		18	3	16.67
Wotton Underwood		28	5	21.43	Pollicott			18	4	22.22
Emberton	1:3	27	1	3.70	Water Stratford			18	3	16.67
Aston Sandford	2:3	26	10	38.46	Broughton (Mousloe)	1:2		17	2	11.76
Upton (Slough)		26	2	7.69	Cheddington	2:7		17	6	35.29
Wooburn		26	1	3.85	Chilton			17	3	17.65
Worminghall		26	4	15.38	Kingsey			17	5	29.41
Chalfont St. Giles		25	4	16.00	Loughton	1:3		17	1	5.88
Datchet		25	3	12.00	Moulsoe			17	1	5.88
Ludgershall	1:2	25	5	20.00	Stoke Poges			17	4	23.53
Medmenham		25	4	16.00	Chearsley	2:2		16	6	37.50
Shabbington		25	6	24.00	Dilehurst			16	1	6.25
Simpson	1:2	25	6	24.00	Mursley	1:3		16	2	12.50
Swanbourne	2:5	25	3	12.00	Salden	1:2		16	2	12.50
					Chetwode			15	6	40.00
					Stoke Goldington	1:2		15	2	13.33

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE SLAVES BY LOCATION, 1086 (CONT.)

Place	Servi:All	Pop.	Servi	% Servi
Tingewick		15	10	66.67
Hanechedene		14	5	35.71
Stantonbury		14	4	28.57
Turweston		14	4	28.57
Ashendon	1:2	13	2	15.38
Biddlesden	1:2	13	4	30.77
Bradwell	3:3	13	4	30.77
Horsenden	1:4	13	2	15.38
Ilmer		13	4	30.77
Little Kimble		13	2	15.38
Radclive		13	3	23.08
Shortley	1:2	13	2	15.38
Burston	1:4	12	1	8.33
Caldecote	1:3	12	1	8.33
Creslow		12	5	41.67
Gayhurst		12	2	16.67
Granborough		12	1	8.33
Ibstone	1:3	12	4	33.33
Lenborough	1:2	12	3	25.00
Fleet Marston		12	1	8.33
Great Missenden		12	2	16.67
Singleborough		12	4	33.33
Dorney		11	2	18.18
Hitcham		11	3	27.27
Lampport	2:2	11	3	27.27

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE SLAVES BY LOCATION, 1086 (CONT.)

Place	Servi:All	Pop.	Servi	% Servi
Addingrove		10	1	10.00
Dunton		10	4	40.00
Farnham Royal		10	2	20.00
Littlecote	1:3	10	3	30.00
Shenley Brook End	2:2	10	2	20.00
Tickford		10	4	40.00
Easington		9	2	22.22
Akeley		8	2	25.00
Dadford	1:2	8	1	12.50
Nashway		8	2	25.00
Tythrop	1:2	8	2	25.00
Barton Hartshorn		7	4	57.14
Helsthorpe	2:2	7	3	42.87
Shipton Lee	1:3	7	1	14.28
Little Woolstone	1:2	7	2	28.57
Hampdens		6	2	33.33
Ivinghoe Aston	1:2	6	4	66.67
(Waddesdon Hund.)		6	4	66.67
Ditton		5	1	20.00
Foxcote		4	1	25.00
Horton	1:3	4	2	50.00
Lude		4	1	25.00
Tetchwick		4	1	25.00
Gawcott		3	1	33.33
Waldridge		3	1	33.33

Note: The second column refers to all Domesday entries for each place name, indicating those with slaves present. Where there is agreement about distinguishing places sharing the same name in DB, they are shown separately in this Appendix.

REFERENCES

- J. C. Trench, 'Coleshill and the Settlement of the Chilterns', *Recs. Bucks.*, 19/3 (1973), 241-258.
- D. A. E. Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Medieval England*, (Woodbridge 1995).
- N. Higham, *An English Empire*, (Manchester 1995), 235-244.
- P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated Handlist and Bibliography* (1968, hereafter S), no. 1484; D. Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, (Cambridge, 1930), no. VIII; A. H. J. Baines, 'The Lady Elgiva, St. Aethelwold and the Linslade Charter of 966', *Recs Bucks.*, 25 (1983), 110-138.
- Pelteret, *op. cit.*, 204-213.
- K. A. Bailey, 'Early Anglo-Saxon Territorial Organisation in Buckinghamshire', *Recs. Bucks.*, 36 (1996 for 1994).
- N. Higham, *The English Conquest* (Manchester, 1994), 170.
- Baines, *art. cit.*, 115.
- Ibid.*, 116.
- Pelteret, *op. cit.*, Chap. V.
- A. C. Chibnall, *Beyond Sherington*, (Chichester, 1979), 5641.
- Pelteret, *op. cit.*, 115-117.
- M. Gelling, *Early Charters of the Thames Valley*, (Leicester, 1979), 117-118; S 1040, 1043.
- J. J. N. Palmer, 'The Domesday Manor' in J. Holt (ed.), *Domesday Studies* (Woodbridge, 1987), 139154.
- K. A. Bailey, 'The Manor in Domesday Buckinghamshire', forthcoming.
- Ælfric's *Colloquy* in H. Sweet, *First Steps in Anglo-Saxon*, (Oxford, 1897), 28-38.
- G. R. Elvey, 'Buckinghamshire in 1086', *Recs. Bucks.*, 16/5 (1960), 358.
- E. M. J. Campbell, 'Buckinghamshire' in H. C. Darby & Campbell, eds., *The Domesday Geography of South-East England* (Cambridge, 1962), 165-9; H. C. Darby, *Domesday England*, (Cambridge, 1977), 81-3 - there were 460 swineherds (*porcarii*) in DB, of whom 370 were in Devon and 84 in Somerset; Pelteret, *op. cit.*, 116-8, notes an apparent reluctance to free slaves employed as swineherds in the tenth century.
- See Middlesex Domesday folios, of which the Phillimore Edition is the most accessible; K. A. Bailey, 'The Hidation of Middlesex', *Trans. London & Middx. Arch. Soc.*, 39 (1988), *passim*.
- M. M. Postan, *The Medieval Economy and Society*, (1975), 141-158.
- All the cottars were associated with Buckingham church (DB i, 143a); cf. the 41 cottars with their gardens belonging to Westminster Abbey (DB, i, 128b).
- DB, i, 149b.
- Darby, *Domesday England*, 78-79.
- J. C. Trench, 'Coleshill'; A. H. J. Baines, 'Bernwood: Continuity and Survival on a Romano British Estate', *Recs. Bucks.*, 35 (1995 for 1993), 19-30, esp. 25.