

THE MANOR IN DOMESDAY BUCKINGHAMSHIRE: I

K. A. BAILEY

Dr Bailey explores the information on the manor contained in the Domesday folios for Buckinghamshire, including backward glances at the situation in 1066. The aim is to see what kind of places were considered to be manors, what terminology was used to describe them, and what, if any, were the differences between these places and those not so described. The analysis considers each discrete entity in Domesday Book, and therefore treats each subdivision of a single place-name separately. It should be remembered, however, that many names cover more than one settlement, the components of which may not be named individually until long after 1086. Good examples are Wing – itself probably covering a substantial tract of land originally – with its satellites Ascott and Burcott (although Crafton in the later parish is named separately in DB) and Clifton Reynes, two of whose component estates were later known as Newton Blossomville. A later paper will discuss manorial demenses.

I

There are five basic rubrics or descriptors in this county which indicate the status of an estate.¹ The first consists of a marginal **M**, which is generally accepted as an abbreviation for *manerium*, as used occasionally in the main text of an entry. Secondly, there is the phrase *pro uno manerio*, '(held)? as one manor'. Third is the statement that an estate *se defendit pro x hidis*, 'answers for x hides', the implication being that it is not accounted for under another estate in terms of rendering the dues arising from its hidation. The fourth group is one in which none of the above terms are used, but which were said to have been held as one or more manors in 1066. This approach implies that they were no longer treated as separate accounting units in 1086, but had been incorporated with other holdings of the new tenant-in-chief. The fifth category is one in which the land is merely described as *terra*, the great majority of these being less than a couple of hides. Many are also in fragmented villis where one of the units is responsible for the collection of geld.

The marginal **M** is only found in a limited number of shires in Domesday Book, and not systematically even within the counties making up one

of the circuits which are believed to underlie the survey. Circuit III includes Beds., Cambs., Herts. and Middlesex as well as Bucks., and although the **M** is used extensively in Middlesex, it is much less common in Herts. Elsewhere it is only found in the north Midlands, and it has been suggested that it is used in formerly Danish regions where there are large, 'capital' manors with members. This does not seem to be the case in Bucks., however, where the Danish influence was really only strong in the north of the county and where manors are less often described in this way in the relevant Hundreds. Bradbury suggests that it had some fiscal significance,² which seems likely, although its non-random geographical spread in both Buckinghamshire and the country at large suggests that it owes at least as much to variations in data collection, which were transmitted through the various recensions of the material as it progressed from local jurors to final editing at Winchester. In some shires, numerals are added to the **M** to indicate multiple manors under a single place-name. This is not done in Bucks., although many estates are described as having been held as more than one manor in 1066.

The use of *pro uno manerio* seems to indicate the same kind of fiscal obligation. Where it is used

of one estate in a divided vill, that component may have had the fiscal obligation noted above.³

Taking all separate entries from the folios for Buckinghamshire, a total of 383, we find the following distribution of rubrics/descriptors:

Marginal M	122	31.85%
<i>Pro uno manerio</i>	63	16.45%
<i>Se defendit</i>	35	9.14%
Manor(s) TRE	44	11.49%
No indication	119	31.07%

Approximately three-fifths of Bucks. holdings seem to have been considered as manors in 1086, at least in terms of responsibility for geld collection and payment. About one tenth seem to have lost this status in the aftermath of the Conquest, while one third were merely landholdings at both dates. There is a steady progression in the use of the various terms to denote manorial status, roughly in the ratio 4:2:1

Palmer offers another indicator of manorial status, namely the use of the formula *x tenet y*.⁴ He says that in Bucks. only Oakley, Broc and Evershaw do not use this formula, and attributes this to probable scribal error. Only 113 of the 220 suggested manors use this formula, however. By far the largest group of *x tenet y* estates are unitary villas indicated by the M marginal rubric. Equally significant is the fact that 26 out of the 30 unitary *se defendit* estates use this formula also. In the case of divided villas, however, the proportions are quite different: only eleven of the 43 M estates and four

of the five 'answers for' holdings use *x tenet y*. None of the estates held 'as one manor' uses this formula. Palmer's paper outlines four "rules" based on an analysis of Circuit III:

- Rule 1: Undivided villas are manors, unless they are dependencies.
- Rule 2: No vill may contain more than one manor (but note that there may be more than one settlement with only one Domesday place-name).
- Rule 3: In divided villas, the manor will be the largest holding.
- Rule 4: Where a vill has no manor, it is subordinated to a manor in an adjacent vill.

We shall consider these axioms further below, but it is worth noting here that Palmer himself states that forty-one villas in Buckinghamshire have more than one manor, thereby rendering Rule 2 of little value in this county.⁵ This he attributes to the higher proportion of unitary villas in the county, the relative absence of fragmented villas, and the absence of large numbers of sokemen, which between them meant that the need for 'strict manorial discipline' found in the counties to the north-east was absent (?).

II

There were significant geographical variations in the distribution of unitary and divided villas across Buckinghamshire, and the data are summarised below (expressed in round percentage terms for Triple and then individual Hundreds) in Table 1.

Using the triple hundreds as a base, the proportion of unitary to divided villas ranges from 3:1 in

TABLE I
Proportion of Unitary to Divided Villas in Bucks. 1086

Group		Individual Hundreds					
Aylesbury	68:32	(Stone	56:44	Aylesbury	85:15	Risborough	33:67)
Chiltern	77:23	(Stoke	100:0	Burnham	64:36	Desborough	71:29)
Ashendon	62:38	(Ixhill	80:20	Ashendon	38:62	Waddesdon	67:33)
Cottesloe	47:53	(Cottesloe	50:50	Yardley	33:67	Mursley	50:50)
Buckingham	68:32	(Stotfold	53:47	Rowley	77:23	Lamua	78:22)
Newport	43:57	(Seckloe	47:53	Bunsty	55:45	Moulsoe	27:73)

the Chiltern Hundreds to 0.75:1 in the case of Newport. When the Hundreds are disaggregated, the range is even greater – 100% unitary in Stoke Hundred and 5.67:1 in Aylesbury down to 0.49:1 in Yardley and only 0.37:1 in Moulsoe. Overall, the propensity for villis to be divided into a multiplicity of ownerships is greatest in the north-east of the county and in the adjacent Cottlesloe group, and least in the Thames and Chiltern region. This situation was not, however, static, as we shall see.

The intensity of subdivision was also far from uniform, ranging from 2.13 estates per named vill in Ashendon to 5.50 in neighbouring Waddesdon – overall the figure was 3.16. There is no evidence of a spatial pattern in this case. The most subdivided Hundreds were Moulsoe, with 34 separate units, Cottlesloe, where there were 28, and Yardley, with 23. The reasons for this require a much more detailed treatment than can be given here, and are likely to vary widely, depending on the tenorial history of any individual vill. For example, areas of active woodland clearance or other forms of colonisation of hitherto unoccupied or under-utilised land, are likely to have been the scene of individual efforts in their early stages, even if they later conformed to the model of communal open-field farming. Chibnall has suggested that this was the case in the northern part of Moulsoe Hundred in the late eleventh century, and this was certainly an area of fragmented villis in 1086.⁶ (It is also the case that many settlements later known by individual names were subsumed in the Domesday folios under that of their head manor – for example various limbs of Newport Pagnell close to the county boundary, Newton Blossomville and parts of Lavendon.) In the case of the Cottlesloe group, the fragmentation may reflect longer-established settlements, although their origins remain completely obscure. A good example is Soulbury, whose six entries conceal separate settlements such as Bragenham, Liscombe and Chelmscott, even though Hollingdon is named, and is itself divided into three holdings.⁷

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 summarise the data on manorial status by unitary and divided villis, by Hundred.

There are ten anonymous holdings in the Domesday folios, of which the great majority have

no indicator of manorial status. Two were held *pro uno manerio* – one in Lamua and one in Moulsoe, and one in Ixhill was described as having been a manor in 1066.

Overall, 32% of estates in Buckinghamshire in 1086 are rubricated with **M** in the margin of the text; 16% are described as being held *pro uno manerio*; with 9% 'answering' for so many hides; 12% were manors in 1066, but not apparently twenty years later, while the final 31% had none of these attributes. In round terms, therefore, three-fifths of estates were "manors" in some sense in 1086, one tenth had been in King Edward's time, but were no longer, and almost a third were accounted for in taxation terms by other estates, if Palmer's Rule 4 applies.

There are, however, significant differences between unitary and divided villis right the way across the spectrum of estate types. Three-fifths of villis were unitary, and 40% were divided (123 and 82, respectively), although the latter accounted for 259 estates (68% of the total).

Unitary villis were four times more likely to be rubricated as manors than divided ones, but there was only one solitary example of *pro uno manerio*, compared with 62 in the latter. Conversely, the *se defendit* formula was used twelve times more often in unitary than divided villis (30:5 actual examples). Divided villis were almost three times as likely to have reverted in status from manor to subordinate holding in the upheavals following the Conquest, and seven times more likely to have been subordinate under both the old and new regimes, which fits well enough with our preconceived ideas about fragmented settlements.

The descriptors used to denote manorial status are not uniformly distributed across the county. Thus, taking unitary and divided villis together, there are no manors with the *pro uno manerio* formula in the Triple Hundreds of Aylesbury and the Chilterns, nor in neighbouring Ixhill, and they are rare in the other two Ashendon Hundreds. Sixty out of sixty-three examples are in the north of the county, almost half of them in the Newport Hundreds (Seckloe 8; Bunsty 6 and Moulsoe 13). Manors 'answering' for so many hides are also rare in

TABLE 2.1
Status of Villis by Hundred

A: Unitary Villis

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Villis</i>	<i>Manor</i>	<i>Held As</i>	<i>Se Defendit</i>	<i>(Manor)</i>	<i>None</i>
Stone	5	3		1		1
Aylesbury	11	7		2		2
Risborough	1	1				
Group	17	11		3		3
%		64.70		17.65		17.65
Stoke	10	8		1	1	
Burnham	7	6		1		
Desborough	10	6			2	2
Group	27	20		2	3	2
%		74.07		7.41	11.11	7.41
Ixhill	12	8		3	1	
Ashendon	5	3		2		
Waddesdon	4	3		1		
Group	21	14		6	1	
%		66.67		28.57	4.76	
Cottesloe	8	6		1	1	
Yardley	4	2		2		
Mursley	6	4		1	1	
Group	18	12		4	2	
%		66.67		22.22	11.11	
Stotfold	8	3		4		1
Rowley	10	2		6	1	1
Lamua	7	5	1	1		
Group	25	10	1	11	1	2
%		40.00	4.00	44.00	4.00	8.00
Seckloe	7	5		2		
Bunsty	6	4		2		
Moulsoe	3	3				
Group	16	12		4		
%		75.00		25.00		
Total	124	79	1	30	7	7
%		63.71	0.81	24.19	5.64	5.64

the southern Hundreds (five examples) and in Cottesloe (4), they are concentrated in Ashendon (8) and Buckingham (12), especially in Stotfold and Rowley, facing each other across the Ouse in the north-west corner.

Excluding estates which had no manorial status

in 1086, and those which had lost it since 1066, the following pattern of manorial indicators emerges (Table 3)

The decline in the use of **M** as an indicator of manorial status as one proceeds northwards across the county is very marked in the case of all types of

TABLE 2.2

Status of Villis by Hundred

B: Divided Villis

<i>Hundred</i>	<i>Villis</i>	<i>Divisions</i>	<i>Manor</i>	<i>Held As</i>	<i>Se Defendit</i>	<i>(Manor)</i>	<i>None</i>
Stone	4	14	3			2	9
Aylesbury	2	5	3				2
Risborough	2	6	2			1	3
Group	8	25	8			3	14
%			32.00			12.00	56.00
Stoke	0						
Burnham	4	15	4			4	7
Desborough	4	13	3			4	6
Group	8	28	7			8	13
%			25.00			28.57	46.43
Ixhill	3	7				3	4
Ashendon	8	17	5	2	2	1	7
Waddesdon	2	11	5	1			5
Group	13	35	10	3	2	4	16
%			28.57	8.57	5.71	11.43	45.71
Cottesloe	8	28	1	6		3	18
Yardley	6	23	3	4			16
Mursley	6	16	2	8		3	3
Group	20	67	6	18		6	37
%			8.96	26.87		8.96	55.22
Stotfold	7	16	2	8	1	2	3
Rowley	3	7		5			2
Lamua	2	5		1		2	2
Group	12	28	2	14	1	4	7
%			7.14	50.00	3.57	14.29	25.00
Seckloe	8	22	2	8	1	3	8
Bunsty	5	20	3	6		4	7
Moulsoe	8	34	5	13	1	5	10
Group	21	76	10	27	2	12	25
%			13.16	35.53	2.63	15.79	32.89
Total	80	259	43	62	5	37	112
%			16.60	23.94	1.93	14.29	43.24

vill, and especially in the case of divided villis. In the case of unitary villis, with the exception of the Buckingham Hundreds, there is a much more consistent use of *M*. Across Bucks., 55% of all manors are so indicated (unitary villis 72%; divided villis 39%). The decline in the use of *M* in the case of divided villis is startling, from 100% in the Chiltern/Aylesbury region to 67% in Ashendon, to only

18% in north Bucks.

Equally marked is the steep increase in the proportion of manors denoted by *pro uno manerio* from south to north. Effectively, there are none in the nine southern and western hundreds, but 40-50% in the north-west and north-east. Even more striking is the virtual absence of this formula in

TABLE 3
Manorial Status by Type of Vill

Indicator	Unitary		Divided		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Manor	79	63.71	43	16.49	122	31.85
Held As	1	0.81	62	23.94	63	16.45
Se Defendit	30	24.19	5	1.93	35	9.14
(Manor)	7	5.64	37	14.29	44	11.49
None	7	5.64	112	43.24	119	31.07

TABLE 4
Proportion of Manorial Types by Triple Hundred

Hundred Grp.	M %			Held As %			Se defendit %		
	All	Unit.	Div.	All	Unit.	Div.	All	Unit.	Div.
Aylesbury	86.36	78.57	100.00	0	0	0	13.64	21.43	0
Chiltern	93.10	90.91	100.00	0	0	0	6.90	9.09	0
Ashendon	68.57	70.00	66.67	8.57	0	20.00	22.86	30.00	13.33
Cottesloe	45.00	66.67	25.00	45.00	0	75.00	10.00	33.33	0
Buckingham	30.77	45.45	11.77	38.46	4.55	82.35	30.77	50.00	5.88
Newport	40.00	75.00	25.64	49.09	0	69.23	10.91	25.00	5.13
Total	55.45	71.82	39.09	28.64	0.91	56.36	15.91	27.27	4.55

describing manors in unitary villis. There is only one example in fact – Thornborough in Lamua Hundred – and that may be more apparent than real if either or both of the anonymous holdings in this hundred are parts of Thornborough, as Elvey suggested.⁸ About three-quarters of all manors in the nine northern hundreds are described by the 'held as one manor' formula. Given the higher degree of fragmentation of villis in this region, this may reflect a conscious choice on the part of either local jurors or the Circuit Commissioners, or it may have been introduced at a higher level in the editing and collating process. Given the consistency of use, however, and the fact that the data were collected on a geographical basis, before being rearranged by fief, a local origin seems more likely.

Overall, only one manor in six uses the *se*

defendit formula, but again this conceals a wide variation between unitary (27%) and divided (5%) villis. Taking all these estates together, there is no clear pattern in spatial terms, although the whole county is generally low with the exception of the Ashendon and Buckingham groups. There are thirty unitary estates using this status indicator, but only five in divided villis (Ludgershall; Upper Winchendon; Leckhampstead; Shenley Church End and (Great) Brickhill). The last two of these were held by Earl Hugh in 1086, while Winchendon and Brickhill were distinct settlements, but not so distinguished in Domesday.

To summarise, unitary villis (one place-name = one estate) are almost three times as likely to use the M rubric as *se defendit* to indicate manorial status, and are probably never described in Bucks.

as being 'held as one manor', if Thornborough is in reality a divided vill. Villages where a single name covers more than one estate on the other hand have a 56% probability of using the latter formula and a 39% chance of being denoted by *M*. There appears to be a genuine north:south divide between the use of *M* and of *pro uno manerio*, although it is not clear whether this reflects the tenurial history of regions affected to widely differing degrees by the Danish wars and their subsequent settlement phases, of whether the degree of fragmentation – low in the south, high in the north – is at its root, although these two phenomena are not entirely independent of one another, of course.

III

How, then, do the data for Bucks. fit with Palmer's four "Rules"? Taking the first three categories together, 88% of unitary villages are indeed manors, as Rule 1 requires. What of the remaining fifteen places? They are concentrated in the Aylesbury-Chiltern region, and especially the latter, with six examples, four of them in Desborough Hundred. There are two in the Cottesloe group and three in Buckingham. Southcote was part of Stone, and with only one virgate and six acres was clearly a small farm or open-field holding which for some reason was considered separately from the rest. Similarly, Bedgrove was taxed under Weston Turville and Birtton with Broughton, as later. Datchet, although a single estate in 1086 held by Giles brother of Ansculf, had been two separate holdings in 1066, of which only one was said to have been a manor. Since the holders were two brothers at that time, the division of the estate seems to have been a function of inheritance, although the absence of any status indicator in 1086 seems to have been an oversight. An unnamed half-hide holding in Burnham Hundred is said to represent Beaconsfield, not otherwise mentioned in Domesday Book, a member of Lude.⁹ Bradenham was held by Swarling in 1086, one of the few surviving pre-Conquest landowners in Bucks. His other estates were not in this area, and the absence of a status for this land may be another clerical error. *Broch* was part of Medmenham roughly equivalent to Radnage. The name derives from *Eaningadene* with palatalized *g*.¹⁰ This was an area of new settlement in the period, although

Hanechedene had been a manor in 1066, it was now likely to have been assessed as a member of one of the Bishop of Bayeux's other local estates.

The 1.75 anonymous hides in Ixhill Hundred which, are usually assumed to represent Towersey,¹¹ were a manor in 1066, but not 1086. They may have been accounted for in Giles's Datchet estate, even though that is at the opposite end of the county. Grove in Cottesloe was another small estate which was a manor in 1066. It was no doubt a dependency of one of Jocelyn the Breton's other local estates in 1086, possibly Cublington. Hoggeston, although a ten-hide estate, follows the same pattern, and was probably dependent on Edward of Salisbury's main Aston (Clinton) estate in Domesday. Evershaw was part of Biddlesden, making a six-hide unit said to be characteristic of Danish influence in north Bucks.¹² Gawcott ('cottages paying rent', OE *gafol*) was part of Buckingham, but held by the bishop, and probably represented part of the endowment of the minster. Haseley had been a manor in 1066, but was later covered by Roger d'Ivry's other local estate, Radclive, together a six-hide unit.¹³

Most of the exceptions to Rule 1 are therefore to be explained by places which had once been independent, but were now subsumed for geld purposes with others held by the same tenant-in-chief, or which were merely a separately-identified settlement in a vill or parish, and which therefore belong to the divided rather than the unitary category. Datchet seems to be the odd man out, and this is likely to be scribal error, perhaps caused by the confusion of two holdings re-merging into one.

Rule 2, 'no vill may contain more than one manor' is far from universally true in Buckinghamshire. It should also be remembered that this is not the same as saying that no parish shall contain more than one manor, since the discrete parish centred on a single settlement with a manor and a church was an evolving phenomenon in the late-eleventh century, and was never universal. Divided villages with more than one manor are summarised in Table 5.

There were 48 villages breaking this rule out of 82 (58%), a significant enough proportion to raise serious questions about its validity. (It should be

TABLE 5

Multiple-Manor Villis in 1086

Vill	Manors	Held As	Defendit (Manor)
Stone	1		1
Upton (Stone)	1		1
Ellesborough	2		
Risborough	2		
Amersham	2		
Chalfont	1		1
Chesham	1		2
Marlow	1		1
Wycombe	2		
Aston Sandford			2
Ludgershall			1
Quainton	1	1	
Winchendon	1		1
Claydon	3	1	
Marston	2		
Crafton			2
Soulbury		1	1
Wingrave		3	
Pitstone	1	3	
Mursley	1		1
Salden		2	
Shenley Brook End		2	
Stewkley		2	
Swanbourne		1	2
Leckhampstead	1		1
Maid's Moreton		2	1
Shalstone		2	
Westbury		2	
Lenborough		2	
Beachampton		2	
Thornborough*		2	
Caldecote		1	1
Great Linford	2		
Shenley Church End		1	1
Woolstone		2	
Woughton		2	
Lathbury		2	
Lavendon	1	2	3
Stoke Goldington	1		1
Tyringham		2	
Brickhill	2		1
Broughton	1	1	
Chicheley		3	
Clifton Reynes	1		2
Emberton		2	1
Hardmead	1	3	
Wavendon		3	

*Assumes that one of the anonymous holdings in Lanua Hundred lay in Thornborough.

noted, however, that two of these villis only fall into this category because they had more than one manor in 1066 [Aston Sandford and Crafton], and a further twelve do so because they had had two or more manors in 1066, whereas they had only one in 1086, indicating that the dynamics of change were increasing the likelihood of Rule 2 applying at the latter date.)

Several of these multiple-manor "villis" are of course represented by more than one settlement today and may be seen as district- rather than specific place-names. Claydon ('clay hill') now has four settlements - of which Steeple Claydon lay in Lamua Hundred, while the others were in Waddesdon. One of the three rubricated manors is represented by East Claydon, and another by Middle Claydon. The third is therefore likely to have been Botolph Claydon, not mentioned separately until 1224. It does not derive from the saint, but from OE *botl* 'dwelling, house',¹⁴ presumably one of some significance, perhaps the manor itself. There is, however, yet another 'manor' in this group at Claydon, for one of Miles Crispin's two holdings uses the *pro uno manerio* formula. Another such group is the Brickhills. Here too, however, two of the rubricated manors are believed to be located in Bow Brickhill, whereas Little Brickhill had been a manor in 1066, as was one of the three Bow Brickhill estates. Neither of their 1086 holders had estates in the immediate area, so they must be accounted for under places at some distance. There is no doubt that there were two Winchendons and two Wycombes in 1086, but they had not yet acquired their prefixes.

Some villis with more than one manor are today represented by only one place-name, but there is evidence that they represent more than one settlement. Stewkley is a good example. It always contained two major manors in the medieval period, and its six open fields are all very large and probably represent two discrete three-field systems. It has only recently lost the terms North End and South End to describe foci of settlement which lay at least half a mile apart, but which had coalesced by growing towards the twelfth-century church located in the centre of the modern village. One of the Emberton manors has been identified with Astwood, a marginal settlement in an area of vigor-

ous woodland clearance in 1086.¹⁵ The same process may account for other multiple-manor villis in the north-east corner of the county, and for those north of the Ouse in Stotfold Hundred in the north-west.

We also have to take account of those estates which were in the process of being reduced from independent manorial status to subordination. What Domesday Book does not reveal, however, is how these estates were then accounted for in terms of their geld liability. Were they bracketed with the remaining holding(s) of that name? Or were they treated with other holdings of the same tenant-in-chief? A case could be made for both, depending on the proximity of other such estates, so perhaps the answer was variable. Thus, William Peverel's Upton estate lost its manorial status after 1066, and could have been taken with his Hartwell property, a full manor in 1086, although it formed a five-hide unit with Miles Crispin's Upton land. There were twelve villis where this had been completed between 1066 and 1086, of which five were south of the Chiltern scarp: Stone, Upton, Chalfont, Chesham and Marlow. Of the seven villis thus affected in the north of the county, three (Swanbourne, Mursley and Soulbury) are part of a block of territory in which there seems to have been a strong propensity for villis to have more than one manor, and may therefore be seen almost as an exception to a local rule, rather than as examples conforming to Palmer's Rule 2!

We are left with 35 villis which Domesday records as having more than one manor in 1086, however defined (15 have one or more *M* rubrics; 24 have the *pro uno manerio* formula, and only four use the term *se defendit*). Some can be easily disposed of as cases where the data collection process failed to distinguish separate settlements bearing the same basic name: Risborough; Wycombe; Winchendon; Claydon; Marston; Woolstone; Brickhill. In other cases, a late-recorded place-name seems likely to reflect an unnamed Domesday settlement: Tyringham/Filgrave, Emberton/Astwood. This still leaves a substantial number of villis where Rule 2 seems to have been genuinely broken. In certain cases, there seems to be an overlap with Palmer's Rule 3 ('in divided villis the manor is the largest holding'), which will be con-

sidered below. In these villis, there are two, or in rare cases three, holdings which have equal or approximately equal assessments, thereby obscuring any primacy. (They do not of course necessarily have equal resource bases.) These multiple-manor villis are: Ellesborough (13.5:14.5 hides); Shenley Brook End, Westbury (2.5×2); Salden (2.875:3.125); Stewkley (3.5×2); Maids Moreton, Shalstone, Beachampton, Lathbury (5:4); Great Linford (2.375×2); Woughton (5.5:4); Chicheley (3:3:3.75); Emberton (3:4); Wavendon (2:2:2.75). In all these cases, there seems to have been a persistent requirement for estates to maintain a separate hidation. Some may have contained more than one settlement in 1086. This has already been noted as likely in the case of Stewkley, and one of the Chicheley manors may be identified with Little Crawley.¹⁶

The list of deserted medieval villages for Buckinghamshire is likely to be reasonably complete, although evidence for shrinkage may be less so, and may conceal the loss of a Domesday estate sharing the name of a surviving settlement.¹⁷ It seems, however, that most of the separately-named sites in this category were not considered to be manorial in 1086. For example, Ackhampstead in the north-western corner of Marlow, a detached part of Lewknor (Oxon.); Denham Farm in Quainton, Liscombe in Soulbury (although this had been a manor in 1066), and Putlowes in Fleet Marston. Tattenhoe, which later became a small parish in its own right, is probably represented by one of the two 2.5-hide manors called Shenley (Brook End) in 1086.

After deploying these possible explanations for the presence of more than one manor in a vill, we are left with a residual category which contains around a dozen villis with multiple manors. Wingrave has five entries in Domesday Book, of which three were held *pro uno manerio*. Two, of five hides and two hides, were held by Miles Crispin, and in 1066 by Brictric, Queen Edith's man and Aelmer, Brictric's man, respectively. It is difficult to see why these should have been assessed separately at either date. Wingrave 5 (six hides) was held by Swein, a King's thegn in 1066, and by Gunfrid of Choques in 1086. It is not clear from the later settlement pattern in the parish whether these represent more than one location,

Wingrave already had a church – or at least a priest – in 1086, who held half a hide. In 1066 it is assigned to Leofmer, Brictric's man. If he was the priest, this is an example of the *eigenkirche* or proprietorial church, built by the landowner and served by his appointee. Such foundations took over some of the roles hitherto performed for large blocks of territory by the minsters – in this case that of neighbouring Wing. Swein and Brictric both had the minimum holding enabling them to qualify as thegns, although both are common names. They may well have held other estates (Brictric at Chesham and Wycombe, for example). Some at least of the Wingrave holdings will have been at Rowsham, although the later medieval evidence suggests that they were intermingled, rather than discrete.¹⁸

Pitstone had six estates, of which one was rubricated as a manor and three held *pro uno manerio*. The former (Pitstone 5) was the largest holding (6 hides), held by Miles Crispin as successor to Leofsi, Brictric's man, as was the two hides of Pitstone 6. Pitstone 4 (5.5 hides) was almost as large, held by Walter Giffard in succession to Thorulf, Earl Leofwin's man. Pistone 1 and 2, both 3.25 hides, were both held by the Count of Mortain in 1086, but separately by Aelfgeat of Aylesbury and two men of St. Albans at the Conquest. This is an area of fragmented settlement, so it is possible that these manors represent separate sites, for instance, Yardley, which gave its name to the local Hundred, Church End, Barley End and Moneybury on the Chiltern scarp (cf. neighbouring Edlesborough with its main village and satellite hamlets, mostly with names from OE *healh*, 'nook, corner').

Leckhampstead has three Domesday entries, of which the largest (18 hides) uses the *se defendit* formula, whereas the rubricated **M** applies to Geoffrey of Mandeville's three hides. The latter had been part of a five-hide estate held by Swarthing in 1066, of which the other two hides had lost their status for some reason. There are several possible sites around the much-shrunken village – South End, Limes End, Barretts End and Church End. Thornborough, just across the Ouse, is similar, with Mainou the Breton's 14.75 hides and Mandeville's 3.5 both using the *se defendit* formula. In this case, there are substantial earthworks

west of the existing village which may mark the site of one or both of the subsidiary estates. There are also sites at Lower End, Nash End and Shelspit which may represent the Domesday holdings. Lenborough has two quite distinct settlement nuclei, about two kilometres apart – Hill Farm/Manor Farm and Lenborough Farm/Stockingwood.¹⁹

The majority of these multi-manor vills are in the north-eastern Newport Hundreds, the part of Bucks. most affected by Danish settlement and economic influences. Here, many of the vills are extremely fragmented in 1086, and had been even more so twenty years earlier. Like counties to the east, there is evidence of many freemen holding land which they could sell, and who were only weakly controlled by the manorial system. Equally, this was a frontier region in terms of woodland clearance and the extension of arable land in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Fragmentation and individualism combined to produce a plethora of "manors", many of them very small and scarcely more than farms in terms of resources. It is impossible to tell the extent to which open-field farming operated in this region in 1086, but many of the manors are likely to have been severally-cultivated. Woolstone had two manors, of which the 3.5-hide one became part of Little Woolstone.

Lavendon in the far north was divided into no fewer than ten units totalling just over eighteen hides in 1086, of which at least two relate to Cold Brayfield.²⁰ Even though the Bishop of Coutances held four of these, and Countess Judith three, they were still evidently seen as distinct entities by the local jurors and the Domesday commissioners. Possible locations for one of more these estates include Lavendon itself, Uphoe and Snelson. Tyringham had two manors in 1086, but this represents a consolidation from seven holdings in 1066. Tyringham 1 is now Upper Filgrave, and Tyringham 2 includes Lower Filgrave.²¹ Half a hide in the latter was held by Godwin the priest, and most of the rest was held by Harold, a thegn, or his relatives and dependants, suggesting that this like Wingrave was a recently-founded *eigenkirche*.

We have already noted that one of the three equal 'manors' at Chicheley represents Little Crawley, and the others may be identified with the

present village, Up End or Little End. All three were held by William son of Ansculf in 1086, but were not yet consolidated in terms of geld liability. Chicheley 2 had been held by nine thegns in 1066, giving them only one-third of a hide each – perhaps this was a recently-assarted area in which they had acted in cooperation, since it is difficult to reconcile the five-hide threshold for a thegn's holding with these figures. The same is true of neighbouring Hardmead, where there were seven estates, of which four were manors – two of them containing one hide and three-and-a-half virgates, Hardmead 1 and 4-6 have been identified with Great or North Crawley.²² Domesday Book has one of its more tantalising entries which indicates that St. Firmin's church at Crawley was a minster, although as to vintage and with what size of *parochia* it remains silent.²³

IV

We turn now to examine the local applicability of Palmer's Rule 3 ('In divided vills, the manor will be the largest holding'). There are eighty non-unitary vills in Buckinghamshire (Table 2B), of which a large number have more than one manor, as shown in the preceding section. The validity of Rule 3 must also be open to question. Excluding places which had apparently ceased to be manors between 1066 and 1086, there are 26 examples of vills where the largest holding is a manor, as against 46 where it is not, the vast majority of which are places with more than one manor in 1086, rather than where smaller holdings are manors. It would seem appropriate, therefore to rephrase this Rule in the case of Bucks. to read 'In divided vills, the largest holding will be a manor', although even that does not have universal application.

In some cases, vills which had more than one estate did have a manor in 1066 which was the largest holding, although this was no longer the case in 1086: Upton in Stone Hundred, Horsenden, Chesham (where the 8.5-hide Bolbec estate had ceased to be a manor, being replaced by that of Alfsi, assessed at only four hides), Aston Sandford, Ickford, Soulbury, Addington, Marsh Gibbon, Bradwell. In most of these cases the holder of the largest unit in 1086 had other estates in the county

and had no doubt arranged for their liability to tax to be transferred to the *caput* of these estates. In two cases – Saunderton and Crafton – there were two equal sized holdings, both of which had been held as manors in 1066, but neither were so described in Domesday Book.

It would seem that many small estates were capable of retaining their independence in terms of geld and other royal dues, even after the biggest upheaval in landownership for many centuries. The fact that many Domesday estates were lost during the ensuing centuries, however, suggests that the centrifugal tendencies revealed at work in the decades after the Conquest continued to operate. Equally, there are scores of later "manors", often comprising only a few dozen acres, which were carved out of the main estates in Bucks. parishes, by operation of inheritance and the land market, which suggests that this was never a straightforward business.

Palmer's Rule 4: 'Where a vill has no manor, it is subordinated to a manor in an adjacent vill', is another commonsense formulation which we can test against the local data. Buckinghamshire has seven unitary vills whose entries contain no indication that they were manors in 1086, or that they had been in 1066. Although 112 of the 259 entries relating to divided vills also fall into this category, far fewer relate to vills with no manorial presence at all: Waldridge (2 entries totalling 2.75 hides in Dinton parish); Beachendon (2/2.25 in Waddesdon); Burston (4/4 in Aston Abbots); Hollingdon (3/5.62 in Soulbury); Horton (3/2 in Slapton/Ivinghoe); Whaddon (2/1.75 in Slapton). In total, there are only sixteen holdings, assessed at 18.37 hides – less than one per cent of the county total, showing how few loose ends there were by 1086, and incidentally how well-developed the system of manorial control must have been in the late Anglo-Saxon era.

None of these small divided vills became a parish in its own right and we seem to have here examples of the quirkiness of Domesday Book. There are examples of equally small places which *did* become parishes (Grove, Dorney), and of other named settlements which were subsumed anonymously under the main (parish) name (Liscombe and Chelmscott in Soulbury), and of yet others

where an entire later parish is unnamed (Crawley in Hardmead). The majority of these small places either disappeared completely in the ensuing centuries, or shrank to a hamlet or single farm bearing the Domesday name. They were probably marginal and insecure from the start in many cases. Many of those places which had been considered manors in 1066, but were no longer accounted for in their own right twenty years later (7 unitary vills and 9 divided ones) fall into similar categories of size and proclivity to shrink or disappear. The roots of late-medieval desertion obviously ran deep, and this should not surprise us as there is much evidence for settlements being abandoned or moved to new sites in the five centuries after AD500.²⁴

V

Just as the distribution of types of estate is not uniform geographically, so it varies between the different types of landowner in 1086. For example, eight of the nine royal estates employ the **M** formula, but it does not appear once in the eighteen holdings of the miscellaneous category of tenants at the end of the county folios (Table 6).

Taking the first three columns of manorial type together, the proportion of estates covered declines from 100% in the case of the King to 83% for the church and 53% for laymen. The seven largest lay tenants-in-chief, who accounted for almost three-fifths of all holdings between them, had only 51% so described, only half of them using the **M** rubric. Conversely, 37% of their holdings were not, nor

had been, manors. The reason for this lies in the allocation of a disproportionate number of small pre-Conquest holdings to these individuals, which were then administered from larger manorial centres. Laymen holding 25-100 hides in total in contrast had 75% of their estates described as manors in 1086, and for those holding 10-25 hides the proportion was 56%. Very small landowners, some of whom were Englishmen such as Leofwin of Nuneham who had managed to retain their lands, albeit in reduced circumstances in many cases, were far less likely to have manors – 54% were not so described at either date, and another 9% had ceased to be so since 1066. How these minute holdings were administered in terms of meeting their geld obligations, usually only one hide or less, is unclear. They were probably covered in an arrangement with the local manorial centre(s).

None of the royal or ecclesiastical estates used the *pro uno manerio* formula, and only four were said to 'answer for' their hidage. Among the laymen, about one estate in six was 'held as one manor' and only 8% used *se defendit*. But whereas only one institutional holding had lost its manorial status since the Conquest, 46 lay estates had suffered this fate as part of the general consolidation of administration (4% cf. 13%).

VI

We have now reviewed the statistical evidence for manors in the Buckinghamshire Domesday, using the framework proposed by J.J.N. Palmer in

TABLE 6

Manorial Type by Tenant-in-Chief, 1086

Landholder	No.	Hides	M	Held As	<i>Se Defendit</i>	(Manor)	None
King/Queen	9	152.75	8		1		
Church	18	207.50	12		3	1	2
Laymen 101H+ (7)	225	1061.25	57	40	18	27	83
Laymen 25-100H (9)	51	349.37	27	5	6	4	9
Laymen 10-25H (12)	43	213.25	13	9	2	11	8
Laymen 0-10H (34)	43	116.88	4	10	2	4	23
Total	389		121	64	32	47	125

1987 as a basis for testing hypotheses. There are 219 estates described by one of three formulae denoting manorial status (56% of all holdings in the county), and a further 44 which had been manors in 1066, but lost their position as fiscal matters were increasingly channelled through the central estates of the post-Conquest fiefs. Three-fifths of the settlements named had only one Domesday entry, of which 89% were manors, thereby fulfilling Palmer's Rule 1 ('undivided villis are manors, unless they are dependencies') – the figure for 1066 was even higher at 94%. It should be remembered that many of these unitary villis contained more than one settlement, although in Bucks. the phenomenon of the multiple-parish estate was virtually unknown by 1086 (Winslow, incorporating Little Horwood, is one of the few examples). Divided villis, on the other hand are much less likely to have manorial status (42% of 259 entries, although this rises to 57% if estates which had lost manorial status since 1066 are included).

Palmer's 'no vill may contain more than one manor' rule is not, however, widely observed in large areas of the county. There were almost fifty divided villis with more than one manor in 1066, and thirty-five remained two decades later. The reasons for this state of affairs were undoubtedly complex, and it is difficult to be certain about which applies in any given case in the complete absence of any other contemporary data. The situation was obviously dynamic, with substantial numbers of estates losing manorial status as new landholders consolidated the collection of geld on fewer manorial centres, some of which may have been outside the county altogether. The eleventh century was also a time of fluidity in terms of settlement and farming systems, with the replacement of some existing hamlets and scattered farms by new planned villages and field systems attested in several parts of the country (although as yet this is a topic which has attracted little attention in Bucks.). This could have left hitherto separate settlements still assessed as manors. Indeed, these may be areas that would repay further investigation of field and place-names. In some parts of the county a contrary process was taking place at the time of Domesday, in which new areas were being reclaimed from forest and waste and used for arable farming, often on an individual basis. This gave rise to intense subdivision of villis, and the

proliferation of manors – although units of one hide or less so described were evidently very different from the great thirty-hide estates in the south of the county, which encompassed a great array of settlements and resources.

This complexity of tenure in some parts of Buckinghamshire served to undermine the validity of Palmer's Rule that the largest holding in a divided vill would be the manor. While generally true, there are significant exceptions, for example, where there are two or more equal- or nearly equal-sized holdings, or where one of the smaller holdings in a vill has manorial status, but the largest does not. The roots of this situation may lie in the upheavals caused by Danish wars and settlement in the century and a half after 880, or in the fragmentation of the old multiple-estates which covered blocks of territory measured in thousands of acres, or both. In the case of the latter phenomenon, geld and other fiscal obligations were no doubt divided in a capricious way, with favoured grantees of former royal lands having their liabilities reduced, and less fortunate individuals being penalised to preserve royal income. The process of division also produced odd features such as the hawk's eyrie at Chalfont, and the meadow for the horses of the court at Wycombe, which were no doubt soon replaced by money payments.

It is clear from the evidence of Domesday Book that the landscape of Buckinghamshire in the late eleventh century was highly organised in terms of extracting the maximum potential for the Crown and its tenants-in-chief. With virtually no exceptions, and those generally small places within a later parish, every named vill, unitary or divided, had a manor, and many places had two or more. The loss of manorial status at many places since 1066 shows that this was not a static or rigid framework, however, and it remained vital throughout the ensuing centuries. Many great Anglo-Saxon laymen held land in this county in small estates which must have been exploited as part of a wider scheme, often enough including lands in other shires. The Norman Conquest caused a massive transfer of land to new masters, of whom there were generally fewer than before, but whose holdings were no less scattered to avoid the rise of overmighty territorial magnates. William took over an well-established and efficient socio-economic

structure, and if there was a progressive reduction in the status of large numbers in all classes, this was no more than seems to have been going on long

before 1066 as lesser men bound themselves to greater in order to gain protection at the price of freedom.

REFERENCES

1. J. J. N. Palmer, 'The Domesday Manor' in J.C. Holt (ed.), *Domesday Studies* (Woodbridge, 1987), 139-153; J. Bradbury, *The Buckinghamshire Domesday*, (1988).
2. Bradbury, *op. cit.*, 17.
3. *Ibid.*, 17.
4. Palmer, *op. cit.*, 143.
5. *Ibid.*, 147.
6. A. C. Chibnall, *Beyond Sherington*, (Chichester, 1979).
7. Victoria County History of Buckinghamshire (VCH), III, 415-7.
8. G. R. Elvey, 'Buckinghamshire in 1086', *Recs. Bucks.* 14/5 (1960), 359.
9. *Ibid.*, 358.
10. A. H. J. Baines, 'An Old Domesday Crux', *Recs. Bucks.* 36, 161.
11. Elvey, *op. cit.*, 358.
12. A. H. J. Baines, 'The Danish Wars and the Establishment of the Borough and County of Buckingham', *Recs. Bucks.*, 26 (1984), 11-27.
13. A. H. J. Baines, 'Haseley: A Domesday Manor Restored', *Recs. Bucks.* 22 (1980), 53-72.
14. Mawer & Stenton, *The Place-Names of Buckinghamshire*, (Cambridge, 1925).
15. Chibnall, *op. cit.*, 56-61.
16. *Ibid.*, 114-122.
17. List available from Medieval Settlement Research Group.
18. VCH III, 459-461.
19. A. H. J. Baines, 'The Chetwode-Hillesden Charter of 949', *Recs. Bucks.* 24 (1982), 1-33.
20. Chibnall, *op. cit.*, 11; A. H. J. Baines, 'Ealdorman Byrhtnoth and the Brayfield Charter of 967', *Recs. Bucks.* 34 (1992), 30-45.
21. Chibnall, *op. cit.*, 163-171.
22. *Ibid.*, 18-22.
23. R.P. Haggerty, 'The Buckinghamshire Saints Reconsidered 1: St. Firmin of North Crawley', *Recs. Bucks.* 27 (1985), 65-71.
24. C.C. Taylor, *Village and Farmstead* (1983); P.H. Sawyer (ed.), *English Medieval Settlement* (1979).