

# **BUCKINGHAMSHIRE IN 1327: THE EVIDENCE FROM THE LAY SUBSIDY RETURNS**

KEITH BAILEY

*More than four decades have passed since the publication of Professor A.C. Chibnall's Early Taxation Returns – Taxation of Personal Property in 1332 and Later. The rich array of data contained in the Taxation Returns has not been sufficiently exploited, either in studies of specific localities or in overviews of medieval Buckinghamshire. This paper seeks to fill one of these lacunæ, and is concerned with the returns for 1327 – which are appended to the main body of Chibnall's edition. It begins with a discussion of documents relating to the taxation of personal moveable wealth in the early-fourteenth century, together with details of what survives locally from 1327. There follows a more detailed examination of the information on crops and livestock, together with an analysis of personal names. The latter provide a sample of several hundred names together with invaluable information on occupations and migration at the high point of medieval population just before the Black Death (The 1327 returns for Kingsey have been considered in more detail in a recent paper.<sup>1</sup>).*

## INTRODUCTION

The raising of taxation, in kind or in cash, has preoccupied those in authority at least since Roman times, and probably long before that. Many schemes have been tried, ranging from the straight-forward levying of tribute, including taxes in kind such as livestock or food “rents”, to the taxing of land and wealth, and latterly to individual taxes on a vast range of goods and services. English medieval monarchs were especially interested in taxation. In 1066, the new rulers had inherited a tax system principally based upon the hide, notionally the land required to support a single household. By the time of the Conquest, however, the hide was often a theoretical rather than an actual measure and could hence be manipulated to favour or penalise individuals or even areas. Nevertheless, the system was simple, could be applied across the nation, and formed the principal basis of royal taxation from at least the 7<sup>th</sup> to the 12<sup>th</sup> century. It was based on the number of hides assigned to individual estates, which were required to fulfil county and hundred quotas, and could be collected at any chosen rate per hide. Its main drawback was that the tax base was largely fixed, and, since many landowners obtained relief for themselves (“bene-

ficial” hidation), the yield declined as the years went by. In addition, there were also taxes levied by the church, notably tithes and Peter’s pence.

Apart from civil war in the 1130s and 1140s, the two centuries after 1066 were relatively peaceful, although exactions were made to fund the Crusades. The accession of Edward I in 1272 saw the start of major changes in the taxation system. In the course of his reign, Edward engaged in wars in France, Wales and Scotland, all expensive in terms of manpower, provisions and the building of fortifications. Forced levying of men and materials could only go so far, and Edward’s freedom of action in raising money was affected by the nascent Parliament. In anticipation, new taxation was introduced tenant-by-tenant. The so-called Hundred Rolls were in many ways more detailed than Domesday Book, but it is not clear whether every part of England was actually surveyed, and the surviving records are decidedly patchy. The Buckinghamshire Rolls of 1279–80 cover only four of the Hundreds and the borough of Marlow, and formed the subject of an earlier study.<sup>2</sup>

Following their introduction, taxes on movables – usually known as Lay Subsidies since the clergy was exempt – were levied at frequent but irregular intervals over the next forty years or so as the wars

continued into the reigns of Edward II and III (1307–77), with the principal focus switching from Scotland to France. In 1291, Pope Nicholas IV conducted a survey of the wealth of English churches and monasteries, both ecclesiastical and temporal.<sup>3</sup> The need to raise of revenue though taxation was by then a pressing need, and the 1290s saw the first moves towards taxing moveable wealth across a wide spectrum of the population. Although, like the Hundred Rolls, the surviving Lay Subsidy returns for Buckinghamshire are very patchy, they nevertheless offer some invaluable insights into the local agrarian economy during a crucial period, after the high watermark of medieval activity had been passed, but before the devastating effects of the Black Death pandemic were felt.

The material available for Buckinghamshire essentially relates to the years between 1327 and 1336, and is discussed in Professor Chibnall's *Introduction*.<sup>4</sup> The sheer effort involved in collecting detailed data on individuals' moveable wealth meant that the detailed vill-by-vill assessments – so useful to the local historian – became unsustainable and a new system was introduced from 1334. Now top-down quotas were set, and it was left to the local sub-taxers (*i.e.* collectors) to apportion them amongst local taxpayers. This effectively meant that the tax yield of 1332 was frozen, and it was not until the 16<sup>th</sup> century that moves were made to remedy this problem. Further difficulties arise from the successful efforts of many vills to obtain reductions in their assessments in the aftermath of the Black Death. In other words, the material becomes less informative and there is only a brief period around 1330 in which detailed tax returns survive for a number of Buckinghamshire vills.

We have full lists of total vill assessments for 1332, 1336 and 1446, providing a useful snapshot of wealth across the county. For 1332, there are detailed assessments of individual taxpayers in forty-six vills and lists of taxpayers' names and tax paid in a further forty-eight. Together, these account for between one-third and one-half of the county's vills, although only the Newport Hundreds have details for all vills. Horton and Stone have lists of taxpayers for the 1336 assessment. This paper is concerned with the subsidy of 1327, which contains full details for thirteen vills and taxpayer lists for a further seven. This may seem a meagre

harvest, but students of medieval Buckinghamshire soon learn to be grateful for small mercies!

The rate at which moveables were taxed varied over the years. Thus, in 1327 the rate was one-twentieth (5% before tithe is taken into account), while in 1332 it was the frequently used one-fifteenth (6.7%) for rural vills. Those rural vills that were counted as ancient demesne and still held by the Crown paid one-tenth. Radnage is the only place in this category, although only the rural hinterlands of towns such as Buckingham, High Wycombe and Newport Pagnell are covered. Detailed returns for a few vills appear in both 1327 and 1332, and some are also covered by the Hundred Rolls.

Useful discussions of the nature of the Lay Subsidies can be found in the works of Willard and Glasscock,<sup>5</sup> but it is necessary to clarify some issues before proceeding to a detailed examination of the 1327 returns. In each county the assessment was supervised by two chief taxers, usually landowners with local knowledge. In Buckinghamshire in 1327, the chief taxers were Roger de Tyringham and Reginald de Hampden; Roger served in this capacity five times between 1306 and 1332. Both men were manorial lords but not of the first rank, one from the Chilterns and the other from the far north of the shire.<sup>6</sup> Instructions to taxers issued in 1297 and 1301 required them to choose two or four men for each vill, depending on its size. Generally, two sub-taxers were deemed sufficient for rural vills in this county, despite instructions for 1307–1332 providing for four to six individuals.<sup>7</sup> It appears that the detailed local returns were not routinely sent to Westminster unless there was concern over fraud, evasion or disputed assessments. There seems to have been relatively little corruption in 1327 but the problem was more serious in 1332, which lay behind decision to change the system of assessment, discontinuing the practice of keeping of lists of individual taxpayers and their goods.<sup>8</sup>

The "appointed day" for sub-taxers to make their rounds was usually Michaelmas (29 September), after the harvest but before the winter.<sup>9</sup> There were some blanket exemptions from the Lay Subsidies. Most notable was clerical property and the clergy, and also villeins of the clergy.<sup>10</sup> Basically, it appears that church property listed in Pope Nicholas IV's *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* of 1291 was exempt, but land acquired after 1291 or omitted

from that survey was liable to be taxed, as were the movables of church villeins after deducting their rents and services.<sup>11</sup> Exemptions allowed to ordinary taxpayers are less straightforward. The returns give details of livestock (but not poultry), of grain crops and legumes, and usually of hay and fodder. In a few cases, carts are noted, and very occasionally domestic items like cooking pots.<sup>12</sup> Generally, however, personal effects, together with items necessary for husbandry and trade were apparently exempt, although the instructions to taxers did not specifically refer to them, nor to butter, cheese and poultry, all of which the average household is likely to have possessed.<sup>13</sup> The threshold for paying tax was goods worth ten shillings in rural areas.<sup>14</sup>

It appears, therefore, that the only items considered taxable were genuinely surplus, for sale, and not needed for consumption or sowing during the ensuing seasons. In the great majority of cases, the amounts involved were insufficient either to feed a household for any length of time, or to provide seed for sowing.<sup>15</sup> The case of livestock is less clear cut, although most taxpayers were assessed on a small number of animals, insufficient to provide traction for all the ploughs in a vill for example. Although sheep were much more numerous, they would certainly not have been capable of providing the volumes of wool associated with England's principal industry and export.

The next general issue to consider is the extent to which sub-taxers undervalued items liable to tax. Although there is a considerable amount of data on medieval market prices for crops, and to a lesser extent for livestock, it is impossible to be sure what prices might have been realised from the sale of the crops and animals listed in the 1327 returns. As we shall see, the values given to crops were very similar across a variety of vills, whereas livestock other than sheep seem to have been valued in a more variable way, sometimes explicitly related to their age and condition. National estimates of livestock values provided by Thorold Rogers offer a limited solution to this problem. For the 1290s, his average values for oxen, cows and "beasts" (working horses) are 10/7, 8/1 and 10/6, respectively.<sup>16</sup> This compares with the most frequently occurring local assessments in 1327 of 10/-, 6/8 and 3/4 (Table 9).

Finally, there is some evidence that, however much the elements making up the individual taxpayer's moveable wealth might vary in number

and value, the totals often display what Willard terms "roundness", that is clustering around certain values, often in marks (13/4), or fractions and multiples thereof.<sup>17</sup> From this it follows that the actual amounts of tax payable fall into a series of steps, rather than a continuum from the minimum of 6d (one-twentieth of 10/-). Assessments in quarter-mark steps give 2d increments in tax paid. However, the evidence for the eighteen Buckinghamshire vills for which we have detailed returns is mixed. Taking individuals with assessments of marks or quarter-parts thereof up to 40/- (three marks) – above which there are relatively few taxpayers – the pattern shown in Table 1 emerges.

The data show that taxable wealth exactly equivalent to quarter-mark steps (multiples of 3/4) accounts for almost 40% of the total. The spectrum is very wide, however, ranging from vills with nobody in these categories to those with almost 80%. It is probable that local sub-taxers were responsible for these variations, perhaps following the precedent of earlier Lay Subsidies, but we cannot know the extent to which they were influenced by their village peers in arriving at rounded assessments. In most vills, however, irregular assessments and tax payments were the norm, with individuals often owing odd halfpennies in tax.

The Lay Subsidy records are of no value when trying to estimate population totals, since their tax-paying threshold of ten shillings worth of moveables only caught the upper echelons of the tenantry and lay manorial lords. Only three vills have data from near-contemporary sources. Ravenstone and Maids Moreton have Hundred Rolls returns from 1279. At Ravenstone, the forty taxpayers of 1327 compare with forty-two villein and free tenants in 1279. At Maids Moreton, the Lay Subsidy returns are clearly defective, since there are fifty-four names in the Hundred Roll, but only ten in 1327. The only vill to have records from the Poll Tax of 1379 and the 1327 Lay Subsidy is Weston Turville. Despite the massive reduction in population caused by outbreaks of plague after 1348, no fewer than 115 individuals are recorded as paying the poll tax, compared with only thirty-seven taxpayers half a century earlier.<sup>18</sup> The newly-devised poll tax was graded by wealth, although the vast majority at Weston paid only the basic fourpence. It is these individuals who fell far below the threshold for the Lay Subsidy. Nevertheless, the

TABLE 1 Proportion of taxpayers assessed in round marks

<i>Vill</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
Astwood	20	40.0
Bow Brickhill	27	62.7
Broughton	13	23.1
Buckland	21	33.3
Cheddington	16	43.7
Creslow/Littlecote	19	26.3
Doddershall/Shipton Lee	27	77.8
Dunton	13	15.4
Kingsey	19	31.6
Linslade	18	11.1
Little Missenden	10	nil
Maids Moreton	10	40.0
Monks Risborough	38	55.3
Over Winchendon	28	39.3
Ravenstone	27	77.8
Upton [Dinton]	16	nil
Weston Turville	37	24.3
Whitchurch	29	24.1
TOTAL	388	38.9

<i>£sd</i>	<i>Marks</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>£sd</i>	<i>Marks</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
13/4	1	14	3.6	30/-	2.25	16	4.1
16/8	1.25	18	4.6	33/4	2.5	13	3.3
20/-	1.5	47	12.1	36/8	2.75	3	0.8
23/4	1.75	7	1.8	40/-	3	15	3.9
26/8	2	16	4.1				

total paid in 1379 was only 54/8, compared with 69/8½ in 1327, a figure which leapt to £6 when the level of subsidy was frozen after 1334.

#### THE TWENTIETH OF 1327

The following Buckinghamshire villis have full lists of taxpayers (total 227) and their property: Creslow with Littlecote (the latter now a deserted settlement in Stewkley parish), Doddershall with Shipton Lee (both in Quainton), Dunton, Kingsey, Linslade, Maids Moreton, Little Missenden, Upton (in Dinton), Weston Turville (with Bedgrove and the Lee), Whitchurch, and Over or Upper Winchendon. A further seven villis appear in the summary rolls with the names of their taxpayers and amounts

payable (total 173): Astwood, Bow Brickhill and its Members, Broughton, Buckland, Cheddington, Monks Risborough, and Ravenstone. Apart from the most of the Chilterns and the Thames Valley, these places provide a reasonable sample across the county, albeit with few contiguous locations. These villis had a total of four hundred taxpayers in 1327.

All but two of the Buckinghamshire villis with surviving records for the 1327 Subsidy had only two sub-taxers apiece, despite having between ten and thirty-eight taxpayers. Doddershall/Shipton Lee and Over Winchendon had three each, although they had only 27-28 taxpayers to assess. Surprisingly, the multi-vill Weston Turville group only had two sub-taxers. Most of the larger number of villis with detailed returns from the 1332 Subsidy

also had only two, rather than the stipulated four to six sub-taxers. Doddershall continued to have three, so that local custom and practice would appear to have more significance than centrally-dictated norms. The sub-taxers for the various villis in 1327 are shown in Table 2.

Some, but by no means all, of these men share surnames with taxpayers in their villis, for example Tony at Kingsey, Dagenhale at Creslow, Alem at Weston Turville and Frensche at Linslade. Six of the thirty-one sub-taxers with identifiable surnames fall into this category, suggesting that in general they were drawn from the upper ranks of the tenantry, men who could both expect co-operation from their peers and also collude with them in deciding what movables to tax and what values to assign to them.

## WEALTH

The principal data on the numbers of taxpayers and their wealth are summarised in Table 3, grouped by Hundred. It should be noted that moveable wealth extends only to crops/seed held in store, livestock, hay and other fodder. Items such as cooking pots and carts rarely appear in these returns. At Weston Turville there were three brass pots and twelve wooden utensils, worth on average 17d and 8d, respectively. In total, only ninety-four vessels are recorded among four hundred taxpayers, worth on average 22d. At Upton, four individuals were

assessed on the contents of their chambers and utensils combined. Only twelve taxpayers are recorded as owning carts (five at Doddershall, six at Kingsey and one (of oak) at Over Winchendon), although they were generally worth little more than the average cooking pot! Any other items which taxpayers might have possessed were ignored.

This may be a small sample, but any information about local society and economy at this period is very scarce. The data for total and average wealth are distorted in those villis where one or more manorial lords are included, or where a disproportionate amount of wealth is in the hands of a single taxpayer or a few individuals (Monks Risborough, Linslade, Dunton, Doddershall, Maids Moreton, Astwood and Ravenstone are not affected by this.). Given that all these places had demesnes, it seems that the apparent exclusion of manorial lords, or their local representatives, probably arises because the lord held multiple manors, and was taxed at some central point.<sup>19</sup> In 1327, Weston Turville had three individuals who accounted for 38% of the total wealth, one definitely and the others probably manorial lords. Other places affected in this way are: Creslow (John de Stretley 19% of the total); Kingsey (Eleanor de Ewelme 21%); Little Missenden (Prior of Bicester 27% [Beamond manor]); Upton (Nicholas Bluet and John le Waleys [lord of Nether Upton] 28%); Whitchurch (Robert Smith and Sir Robert de Vere [lord] 17%); Over Winchendon (Isabel Robin 15%); Bow Brick-

TABLE 2 Sub-taxers in the 1327 Lay Subsidy

Astwood	John Swetesone, Thomas Tofty
Buckland	Robert Taillard, Raplh Elyn
Cheddington	William Gralyn, Peter atte Well
Creslow	John de Hoggebruni, Peter Dagenhale
Doddershall	Christopher de xxx, Robert Maydenesone, John Baron
Dunton	Robert Adekyn, Henry Elys
Kingsey	Gilbert Rolves, John Tony
Linslade	Hugh Frensche, John xxx
Maids Moreton	Walter le Saweyere, William le Cartere
Little Missenden	Richard de Bray, Henry Baldewyne
Monks Risborough	John atte xxx, John le Mason
Ravenstone	Henry le Spycer, Nicholas le Smyth
Upton	Robert Colles, John West
Weston Turville	Robert le Brut, Robert son of Richard Alem
Whitchurch	Robert de Besord, Henry le Vauesor
Over Winchendon	Walter le Frankeleyn, Thomas Travers, Walter Bacon

TABLE 3 Buckinghamshire villis in 1327

<i>Place</i>	<i>Hund</i>	<i>Taxpyrs</i>	<i>Wealth<sup>a</sup></i>	
			<i>Total</i>	<i>Av</i>
Buckland	Ayl	22	702.50	31.93
Little Missenden	Ayl	10	353.91	35.39
Monks Risborough <sup>b</sup>	Ris	42	881.68	20.99
Upton [Dinton]	Stne	16	767.93	48.00
Weston Turville etc. <sup>d</sup>	Stne	37	1373.26	37.12
Creslow/Littlecote <sup>c</sup>	Cot	19	644.06	33.90
Linslade	Cot	18	648.49	36.03
Whitchurch	Cot	30	1341.24	44.71
Dunton	Mur	13	397.32	30.56
Cheddington	Yar	16	814.56	50.91
Doddershall/Shipton Lee	Ash	27	600.93	22.26
Over Winchendon	Ash	28	807.11	28.83
Kingsey	Ixh	19	848.42	44.65
Maids Moreton	Stot	10	376.83	37.68
Astwood	Mou	20	586.65	29.33
Bow Brickhill	Mou	26	1074.98	41.35
Broughton <sup>b</sup>	Mou	13	530.83	40.83
Ravenstone <sup>b</sup>	Bun	40	1316.68	32.91
TOTAL		406	14067.38	34.65

Notes: a – shillings; b – defective MS; c – Littlecote later in Mursley Hundred; d – Bedgrove and the Lee in Aylesbury Hundred

hill (John Frembaud [lord] and Henry de Grey, 24%); Broughton (William Passelewe 21%); Buckland (John de Cromwell [lord] 28%), and Cheddington (Warden of Merton Hall, Oxford [Elsage manor] and Ralph of the Hall, 59%).<sup>9</sup>

There is little difference between the average wealth of taxpayers in the two groups of villis. Those in villis with detailed returns the average wealth is 35.95 shillings, compared with 34.15 shillings where only nominal lists survive, a difference of 5%. The average taxable wealth for all eighteen villis is 34.65 shillings. Overall, the typical Buckinghamshire taxpayer of 1327 possessed between 25 and 35 shillings' worth of moveable property, the great bulk of it in the form of crops.

## CROPS

The data on crops and livestock are of greater value to historians, although they pose problems of interpretation (see Introduction). Table 4 summarises the amount and proportion of crops held in 1327, based on the data given for fifteen villis. These

figures represent corn for sale. With the exception of Little Missenden, none lies south-east of the Chiltern escarpment, while Maids Moreton is the sole representative from the far north of the county. The quantity of each crop is given in quarters, a measure of volume. Trying to convert the volumetric data of quarters into weight is a more intractable problem. Nowadays, a quarter is a fourth part of one hundredweight, or 28lbs. In pre-imperial measures the quarter represented eight bushels or sixty-four gallons,<sup>20</sup> although such measures often varied locally, despite attempts by central government to standardise them. Also, the weight of grain contained in a measure varied between crops. Given all these uncertainties, it is best to present the crop data in the form used by the collectors.

Since these are tax assessments, values are assigned to the various crops. The range in each case is considerably less than for livestock (see below), reflecting standardised, possibly market, values. The use of Roman numerals occasionally leads to problems of interpretation of the data in



Chibnall's transcription. This applies not only to the number of quarters, but also to values. Thus the number of strokes ("minims") involved in the numerals between two and six, while in theory distinct, often seem subject to scribal error and/or misreading. In the majority of vills, there was clearly only one value for a given crop, although there are examples where clearly different values are intended. The average values for each crop are summarised below.

Wheat was clearly the most valuable grain, worth more than twice as much as oats and around 40% more than dredge, barley and rye. Peas and beans were almost as valuable as wheat. Rye is mentioned only at Linslade, where it replaced wheat as the principal crop, rotated with dredge. Pulses occur only at Kingsey and Weston Turville. Legumes were assigned unusually low values at the latter.

Notwithstanding the various problems surrounding the interpretation of these data, they provide

TABLE 4 Crops by type, 1327

<i>Place</i>	<i>Wheat</i> <i>Q</i>	<i>Dredge</i> <i>Q</i>	<i>Oats</i> <i>Q</i>	<i>Barley</i> <i>Q</i>	<i>Rye</i> <i>Q</i>	<i>Grain</i> <i>Q</i>	<i>Beans &amp;c</i> <i>Q</i>	<i>Hay/Fod</i> <i>Pence</i>
Creslow/ Littlecote	18	10	15	22	0	65	13.5	290
%	22.9	12.7	19.1	28.0	0	82.8	17.2	
Doddershall/ Shipton Lee	49	0	48	0	0	97	0	490
%	50.5	0	49.5	0	0	100.0	0	
Dunton	18.5	10.5	12	0	0	41	7	169 <sup>a</sup>
%	38.5	21.9	25.0	0	0	85.4	14.6	
Kingsey	41	0	0	55	0	96	36	447
%	31.1	0	0	41.7	0	72.8	27.3	
Linslade	6.5	40	0	0	32.5	79	0	435
%	8.2	50.6	0	0	41.1	100.0	0	
Lt. Missenden	18	0	15	0	0	33	0	0
%	54.6	0	45.4	0	0	100.0	0	
Maids Moreton	23	17	21.5	0	0	61.5	0	338
%	37.4	27.6	35.0	0	0	100.0	0	
Upton [Stone]	36.0	49.25	0	0	0	85.25	14.75	347
%	36.0	49.2	0	0	0	85.2	14.8	
Weston Turville/ Bedgrove/Lee	81.5	85	4	0	0	170.5	22	645
%	42.3	44.2	2.1	0	0	88.6	11.4	
Whitchurch	69	0	4	74	0	147	0	732
%	46.9	0	2.7	50.3	0	100.0	0	
Over Winchendon	24	2	9	8	0	43	10	403
%	45.3	3.8	17.0	15.1	0	81.1	18.9	
GRAND TOTAL	384.5	213.75	128.5	159	32.5	918.25	103.25	4740
%	37.6	20.9	12.6	15.6	3.2	89.9	10.1	

Notes: Dredge is a mixture of oats and barley; beans &c includes beans, peas and pulses, peas are recorded only at Creslow and Over Winchendon, and pulses at Weston Turville and Kingsey. The total amount of peas is 22¼ quarters, beans 36 qtr. and pulses 52½ qtrs. <sup>a</sup> here described as forage, elsewhere mostly as hay and fodder.

rare insights into the cropping regimes across Buckinghamshire in the early-fourteenth century. Overwhelmingly, the concern was to grow as much grain as possible for human consumption. Although the beneficial effects of leguminous crops in enhancing fertility through nitrogen-fixing were well-known, it seems that in most places little land could be spared for them. Population levels had begun to decline by the 1320s, following crop failures and famine in the 1310s, but it was still close to its medieval maximum, and given the vagaries of weather, disease and crop yield, maximum grain output was vital for food, making beer and fodder, and for meeting the exactions of manorial lords and the church (tithes). The former were often taken often indirectly through money rents funded by grain sales, but the latter took one-tenth of the output directly.

In total, 227 individuals held 1,100 quarters of grain and 110 of pulses, a ratio of 10:1. At several places no legumes were recorded. At Kingsey and nearby Over Winchendon, however, almost a quarter of taxpayers' crop holdings was in the form of beans, peas and pulses, although it is impossible to tell whether this represents a genuine difference in crop-growing strategy or a chance event. The significant variations in the proportion of grains held by taxpayers presumably reflect the local cropping regime, at least in the season immediately before the snapshot provided by the 1327 tax returns.

Wheat was the lead crop in a rotation after the fallow period, invariably winter-sown and the most

demanding of soil nutrients. Barley was probably the two-rowed spring-sown variety, commonly in succession to the winter-sown wheat. It was essentially a brewing grain, as was the oats/barley mixture dredge. Rye, only recorded here at Linslade, was the nearest alternative bread grain to wheat, much used for food liveries of demesne workers, although they were increasingly demanding wheat liveries during the fourteenth century.<sup>21</sup> Oats had the lowest food value, but were vital as fodder for horses, which were increasingly being used as plough beasts in place of oxen (see below). Oats was the standard spring crop sown on cold, stiff and heavy soils, all of which were abundant in the central and northern parts of the county. Legumes were used for household consumption, notably the pottage which formed a vital component of peasant diets, for food liveries and for animal fodder.

Overall, wheat accounted for 43% of all grain. There is a considerable range of values, however, from only 8% to 56%, although most places had more than 40%. Creslow/Littlecote and Linslade stand out with significantly less wheat than average. Rye, which is only mentioned at Linslade in this sample, favours poorer soil conditions, such as those to be found on the Greensand-based soils in that area. Rye was rotated with dredge, the latter a spring-sown crop. At Creslow/Littlecote none of the four crops grown provided was dominant, only barley providing more than one-third of the total. It seems probable that the two places, which were only grouped for tax purposes, had

TABLE 5 Crop values by vill, 1327 (Shillings per quarter)

<i>Vill</i>	<i>Wheat</i>	<i>Dredge</i>	<i>Oats</i>	<i>Barley</i>	<i>Rye</i>	<i>Peas</i>	<i>Beans</i>	<i>Pulses</i>
Creslow	2.50	1.77	1.33	2.00		2.53	2.50	
Doddershall	3.00		1.33					
Dunton	2.50	1.67			2.00		2.50	
Kingsey	3.00			2.50			2.50	2.00
Linslade	2.67	1.58						
Maids Moreton	2.50	2.00	1.33					
Lt. Missenden	3.00		1.33					
Upton	3.00	2.37					2.67	
Weston Turville	3.00	2.00	1.67				2.00	2.00
Whitchurch	2.67		2.00	2.07				
O. Winchendon	3.00	1.50	2.00	2.50		3.00	3.00	
AVERAGE	2.86	1.99	1.44	2.05	2.00	2.65	2.60	2.00



TABLE 6 Proportions of crops, 1327 [%]

<i>Place</i>	<i>Wheat</i>	<i>Dredge</i>	<i>Oats</i>	<i>Barley</i>	<i>Rye</i>
Creslow/Littlecote	27.7	15.4	23.1	33.8	0
Doddershall/Shipton	50.5	0	49.5	0	0
Dunton	45.1	25.6	29.3	0	0
Kingsey	42.7	0	0	57.3	0
Linslade	8.2	50.6	0	0	41.1
Little Missenden	54.5	0	45.5	0	0
Maids Moreton	37.4	27.6	35.0	0	0
Upton	41.7	58.3	0	0	0
Weston Turville	47.8	49.9	2.3	0	0
Whitchurch	46.9	0	2.7	50.3	0
Over Winchendon	55.8	4.7	20.9	18.6	0
TOTAL	42.9	27.2	12.2	14.7	3.0

different cropping arrangements on their open fields. Creslow may have grown substantial amounts of barley, in common with neighbouring Whitchurch. This would have been paired with wheat, whereas Littlecote may have specialised in dredge and oats, in line with neighbouring Dunton.

The proportion of the oats-barley mixture dredge varied far more than wheat, with five places growing little or none. At Creslow, Dunton and Maids Moreton, dredge accounted for between one-sixth and one-quarter of tenants' crop holdings, whereas at Weston Turville, Upton and Linslade, the proportion was half or more. Weston Turville and nearby Upton appear to have had a two-crop regime based on wheat and dredge. Little Missenden and Doddershall/Shipton Lee had wheat/oats cropping systems, although they lie on widely differing soils types. Missenden lies on well-drained silty or loamy soils on chalk and clay-with-flints in the Chilterns, and Doddershall on less permeable, seasonally waterlogged clay-based soils in the Vale of Aylesbury.<sup>22</sup>

Several places appear to have had three-crop rotations, indicative either of three or more open fields, or the use of a furlong-based cropping regime. At Dunton, wheat, dredge and oats were grown in the proportion 1:0.57:0.65, which may indicate a two-field system, with one of the fields cropped in equal parts. At Maids Moreton the same crops were grown in the proportion 1:0.74:0.94, perhaps more indicative of three-field or furlong-

based cropping, although the data appear to be defective for this vill. In 1332 nearby Leckhampstead taxpayers held wheat, dredge and oats in similar proportions: 1.0:0.66:1.10, which suggests a regional pattern in an area containing many medieval assarts in dense woodland around a core of open fields.<sup>23</sup>

#### LIVESTOCK

There are four principal categories of livestock: cattle, horses, pigs and sheep, although the proportions vary randomly. (The medieval Latin word *averium/afferus*, sometimes "affer" in English, is here translated as "beast", denoting a draught animal, and also, by association with the word *av[e]ragium*, one associated with carrying obligations, to which many tenants were subject.<sup>24</sup>) The presence of a foal in this category at Linslade shows that horses are meant. The tax collectors identified horses associated with cartage and breeding (*i.e.* mares) separately. Actual numbers of livestock in each vill are given in Table 7, and the percentages of the principal categories in Table 8.

Overall, the 227 taxpayers possessed 2,151 animals, almost ten apiece, although the presence of large flocks of sheep in several places considerably distorts the picture. Excluding sheep, the average is only 1.7 animals per taxpayer. Horses account for about 10% of the total, cattle for 18% (of which three-fifths are steers and oxen and two-fifths cows), pigs for only 4% and sheep for 69%.

In many places most, if not all, of the sheep were owned by only one or two individuals, who apparently had no other taxable assets, arable or livestock. Some of those holding large flocks of sheep were manorial lords, but others may have been the precursors of those graziers who took over large areas of former arable land in the late fourteenth century and beyond. They may also have acted as shepherds for those with only a few sheep. Even though the average value of sheep was only 1/-, by virtue of the size of their flocks these individuals were often among the wealthiest taxpayers in a parish. The individuals listed in Table 9 held twenty-five or more sheep and lambs.

Even though these seventeen individuals represent only 7% of taxpayers, they owned 766 sheep (52%). Meadow was a scarce and valuable commodity, and restricted to high value livestock. Sheep were pastured on the fallow, where they provided valuable fertiliser for the next season's crop, and on rough pasture and common land. In many late-medieval villis there was precious little of the latter categories of land, with the arable often reaching right up to the parish boundaries.

Sub-taxers were obliged to assign values to the various kinds of livestock. These vary quite widely, both within and between villis, suggesting that some attempt was made to take age and condition into account. For example, at Linslade, steers are valued at between 3/4 and 6/8 each, while at

Weston Turville, mares are valued at 5/- or 6/-, and foals at 3/- or 3/4. In view of the limited numbers of each type of livestock in each vill, the data have been aggregated in Table 10. In each case, there is a "typical" value, shown in **bold**. Values are expressed in shillings.

The ubiquitous oxen and relatively scarce cart horses were most valuable (10/-), followed by steers and cows (6/8), bullocks (5/-), and "beasts" (3/4). Values assigned to beasts and mares (3/-) seem rather low. Equally, the number of mares seems suspiciously low with many villis having none present. This is difficult to explain unless evasion and concealment applied especially to these animals. Possibly new stock was acquired from specialised stud farms. Pigs appear to be relatively valuable and were typically worth 2/-. Sheep were almost universally valued at 1/-, apparently irrespective of age, although there are a few exceptions to this rule. At Linslade John de Stagenhoe, the wealthiest individual, had twelve sheep valued at 1/6 each. At Upton in Dinton, seventy sheep and ewes were assessed at 1/6, while the substantial flock of 63 lambs (the largest in this sample) were worth 1/- each. Ewes were not otherwise noted separately, but there were 142 hoggets, yearling sheep yet to breed, at Creslow, Weston Turville and Kingsey, where they apparently comprised the whole flock. At Weston, sheep were valued at 1/6, lambs and hoggets at 1/-.

TABLE 7 Livestock owned by taxpayers, 1327

<i>Place</i>	<i>Steer</i>	<i>Oxen+</i>	<i>Cow+</i>	<i>Beast</i>	<i>Horse</i>	<i>Pig</i>	<i>Sheep/Lambs</i>	<i>Total</i>
Creslow/L'cote	4	19	3/1c/2h	15	1m	8	183/15hog/4L	255
Doddershall	6	4/7bk	15/1h	11	1m	5	91	141
Dunton	8	8	4	14	0	7	87	128
Kingsey	16	7	12/8h	16	2ct	9	106hog	176
Linslade	16	6/4bk	12/3h	20/2f	2m	5/2pl	91/6L	169
Maids Moreton	11	0	0	8	0	0	116	135
Little Missenden	0	0	10/2c	12	3m/2ct	5/1pl	106/12L	153
Upton [Stone]	13/3y	3bk	14/1c/2h	11	0	9	58/12e/63L	189
Weston Turville	14	24/3bk/2y	11/10h	33	6m/2f	9/2pl	64/21hog/14L	215
Whitchurch	9	30	35	31	2ct	19	184	310
O. Winchendon	10	2bl/2bk	19/2h	11	1m	1	224/3hog/5L	280
TOTAL	107/3y	98/2y/2bl 19bk	135/4c/ 28h	182/2f 6ct/2f	14m/	77/5pl	1204/145hog/ 12e/104L	2151

Notes: f=foal; y=young; bk=bullock; bl=bull; c=calf; h=heifer; m=mare; ct=cart; pl=piglet; hog=hogget [a sheep up to the age of 1 year, not yet sheared]; e=ewe; L=lamb

The data for Maids Moreton are probably defective, with cows, oxen and pigs absent.

TABLE 8 Percentage of livestock type by vill, 1327

<i>Place</i>	<i>Steer/Ox</i>	<i>Cow+</i>	<i>Horse</i>	<i>Pig</i>	<i>Sheep</i>
Creslow/Littlecote	9.0	2.4	6.3	3.1	79.2
Doddershall/Shipton Lee	12.1	11.3	8.5	3.5	64.5
Dunton	12.5	3.1	10.9	5.5	68.0
Kingsey	11.9	10.8	9.7	7.4	60.2
Linslade	15.4	8.9	14.2	4.1	57.4
Maids Moreton	8.1	0	5.9	0	85.9
Little Missenden	0	7.8	11.1	3.9	77.1
Upton [Dinton]	10.0	9.0	5.8	4.8	70.4
W. Turville/Bedgrve/Lee	20.0	9.8	19.1	5.1	46.0
Whitchurch	12.6	11.3	10.6	6.1	59.4
Over Winchendon	5.0	7.5	4.3	0.4	82.8
TOTAL	10.7	7.8	9.6	3.8	68.1

TABLE 9 Major sheep owners in 1327

Creslow/Littlecote	Henry Mauncel [lord]	80
	John Wylegod	60
Doddershall	Walter de Aylesbury	25
	Agnes Wille	30
Dunton	Matilda Adekyn	25
	Stephen de Eye	40
	Robert Hunes	46
Kingsey	William Sulles	40
	Adam Skyret	30
	Prior of Bicester [lord]	40
Maids Moreton	Roger Bakere	35
	John le Waleys [lord??]	50
Little Missenden	William le Butiller [lord]	61
	Robert Smith [lord]	30
Upton	John Herberd	30
	John Dawe	60
	Isobel Robin [lady]	84
Weston Turville		
Whitchurch		
Over Winchendon		

## TAXPAYERS' NAMES IN 1327

The Lay Subsidy returns of 1327 provide a substantial corpus of 433 personal names. In this case, there are 395 men and 38 women (9.6%), generally representing the upper echelons of the tenantry, together with a small number of minor manorial lords. By this time, virtually all personal names had evolved into their present form of fore-name + surname. In this sample only three individuals have names in the old "Y son of X" form, although there are still substantial numbers whose

surname is preceded by de or le, signifying "of or from" and "the". In most cases, the former are place-names, either local topographical features, or the places from which these people or their ancestors originated. The second group generally comprise occupational names, or occasionally nicknames of some kind. It should be remembered that surnames were still not entirely fixed in succeeding generations and, more importantly, large numbers of names disappeared as a result of the mortality caused by the Black Death of 1348–9 and ensuing outbreaks of that pandemic.

TABLE 10 Livestock values in shillings in 1327

Type: Value	Steer	Ox	Bullock	Bull	Cow	Beast	Mare	Cart Horse	Pig	Sheep	Total
10		<b>65</b>			1			<b>4</b>			70
9		1									1
8	14	3		1	1						19
6.7	<b>44</b>	14	2	1	<b>103</b>	2		2			168
6	7	10			16	2					37
5	25	6	<b>9</b>	1	9	45	5				100
4	8		2			23					33
3.3	4		1		2	<b>65</b>	2				74
3	7	1	3		2	19	<b>6</b>		1		39
2.7					1		1				2
2.5						10					10
2.2									1		1
2	1					13			<b>38</b>		52
1.7									8		8
1.5						3			13	146	162
1.2									2		2
1									13	<b>1319</b>	1332

Female taxpayers represent several groups, notably widows, many of whom will have remarried, and some of whom were the mothers of male heirs too young to have inherited their fathers' holdings. The most important is Eleanor of Ewelme, lady of the manor at Kingsey. About one-eighth of the 1327 taxpayers have origins outside the place where they are recorded, although some may have been absentees. Not all of the places are readily identifiable from the spellings, and it is impossible to say whether the individuals concerned were the first of their family to migrate to their various Buckinghamshire homes, nor whether the migration was direct or the result of successive short-distance moves. There is a mix of localised and long-distance migrants, and in some cases it is difficult to see why they had acquired topographical surnames, for example Missenden at Little Missenden and Morton at Maids Moreton. Of those places which can be definitely or probably identified, twenty-seven are in Buckinghamshire and nineteen in other counties or overseas, a ratio of about 6:4.

Local topographical names are not especially common in this sample, and generally serve to pinpoint the location where these people or their ancestors lived within the community. Most are

simply expressed as "at the X", thus *atte Brok*, *atte Strete*, and so on. All are in English with the exception of William ad Fontem in Ravenstone, meaning 'at the well or spring', corresponding to *atte Welle* names in Creslow and Upton. The latter is the most common of these names, occurring six times in five villis. The most interesting name is that of Robert *atte Pleystede* in Upper Winchendon. This is an Old English compound, meaning a place where games were played. It occurs rarely in field-names, examples noted so far are at Ashendon, Haversham, Long Crendon, Thornton and Thornborough, to which the the Winchendon example is a useful addition.<sup>25</sup>

Occupational names are equally uncommon among these taxpayers, although it is impossible to tell whether the individuals concerned were still so employed in 1327. The relevant names are summarised in Table 13, in their modern form.

Many of these names relate to minor manorial officials and to those engaged directly in the lord's service, although it is noteworthy that none of the four reeves' names is attributable to the individual who was the *de facto* leader of the peasantry in their dealings with the manorial lord, but to members of his family. Two of the sub-taxers, Henry the Vavasour at Whitchurch and Walter the

TABLE 11 Summary of personal name data in 1327

<i>Place</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Migration</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Occupn</i>
Astwood	22	20	2	4	0	2
Bow Brickhill	26	25	1	5	0	7
Broughton	13	13	0	2	0	0
Buckland	23	21	2	3	4	2
Cheddington	17	15	2	1	2	2
Creslow/Littlecote	21	20	1	4	2	2
Doddershall/Shipton Lee	30	28	2	3	1	6
Dunton	15	12	3	2	0	0
Kingsey	21	18	3	4	2	0
Linslade	18	18	0	3	2	0
Little Missenden	11	10	1	3	0	4
Maids Moreton	12	12	0	3	0	0
Ravenstone	42	36	6	5	1	7
Monks Risborough	44	42	2	4	9	4
Upton	18	15	3	2	1	2
Weston Turville	38	35	3	5	4	3
Whitchurch	31	31	0	1	4	5
Over Winchendon	31	24	7	2	3	3
TOTAL	433	395	38	56	34	49

Notes: Multiple occurrences of the same location/occupation surname in one parish are counted separately; "Migration" includes surnames containing identifiable place-names. Surnames like French [Weston Turville] and Waleys [Upton and Kingsey] are ambiguous, and excluded.

TABLE 12 Taxpayers with topographical surnames in 1327

Astwood	Beverley [Yorks.], Brittany, Caldecote [prob. Newport Pag.], Ekeney [local hamlet]
Bow Brickhill	Kempston [Beds.], Ludlow [Shropshire], Radcot [Oxon.], Soulbury
Broughton	Loughton, Towcester [Northants.]
Buckland	Cromwell [Notts.], Kendal [Westmorland], Stoke [?Stoke Mandeville]
Cheddington	Oving
Creslow	Dagnall, Hogbourne [poss. Hagbourne Berks.], Soulbury, Streatley [Berks.]
Doddershall	Aylesbury, Cranford [Waddesdon??]
Dunton	Alton [Hants.], Turville
Kingsey	Ewelme, Eye, Upton, Saunderton
Linslade	Kimble, Stagenhoe [Beds.], France
Maids Moreton	<i>Aete??</i> , Bayeux, Mor[e]ton
Little Missenden	Bray [berks.], Missenden
Monks Risborough	Aston [prob. A. Sandford or Mullins], Chalveley [prob. Chalvey], Emmington [Oxon.], Medmenham
Ravenstone	Gayhurst, Lyford [Oxon.], Moulsoe, <i>Nowers</i> [Normandy or Aldbury Nowers, Herts.]
Upton [Stone]	<i>Kingsbridge??</i> , Thame [Oxon.]
Weston Turville	Bovingdon [Herts.], Caldecote, Habton [Yorks.], <i>Hardeshull</i> [?Warwicks.], Ludgershall
Whitchurch	Halton
Over Winchendon	Haddenham, Hardwick

Franklin at Over Winchendon, have names indicative of higher status than those they assessed. Occupations not directly related to agriculture are found, although it must be remembered that many millers, smiths and carpenters may not have had goods worth more than the ten-shilling threshold of tax liability. Village craftsmen such as weavers and shoemakers were even less likely to feature among the ranks of subsidy payers. Among the nicknames, Richard cum Barba (“the bearded”) of Broughton stands out; it would be interesting to know whether he gave rise to a Beard lineage!

In the 1327 Subsidy rolls, there are thirty-five male and fifteen female forenames. Most names are relatively rare, however, with fifteen male and eleven female names occurring only once or twice in this sample (43% and 73%, respectively). Some names were especially fashionable in early fourteenth-century Buckinghamshire. Five male names account for almost two-thirds of the total: John and William 36%, plus Richard, Robert and Thomas with 26%. Alice is by far the most popular female name (40%), with Isabella and Agnes accounting for another 26%. There is some evidence of local fashions, for example two of the four Christophers lived at Monks Risborough, and both the Julianas at Ravenstone. There appears to have been a conscious avoidance of current kings’ names, with no Edwards in the sample, although

Henry, with sixteen, shows that the upper echelons of the peasantry were not constrained when it came to former rulers. This also seems to have been the case among those listed in the Hundred Rolls half a century earlier.

## CONCLUSION

Although the detailed 1327 Lay Subsidy returns for Buckinghamshire cover only 7% of the county’s vills, they nevertheless provide invaluable information about agrarian activity in the period between the medieval peak of population *c.*1300 and the onset of the plague in 1348–9. By 1400 the population had decreased by up to one-half, and the shortage of labour, combined with the weakening of the need to maximise arable acreage, led to a dramatic shift from crop-growing to pastoral farming in many parts of the county. In the 1320s and 1330s, however, many areas not especially suited to crop production were still under the plough, as witnessed by the survival of ridge and furrow across whole parishes.

Even though those who were liable to the taxation of their moveable goods generally represent the upper echelons of the peasantry, together with some manorial lords, the Lay Subsidy returns provide a rare source of information for research into a spectrum of local medieval communities. In

TABLE 13 Taxpayers with occupational surnames in 1327

Astwood	Butler, Cooper
Bow Brickhill	Hayward, Miller, Poulterer, Reeve [wife], Summoner, Weaver
Broughton	Smith
Buckland	Dancer, Gardener
Cheddington	Chapman, Smith
Creslow/Littlecote	Carter, Steward
Doddershall/Shipton Lee	Carpenter, Reeve [son], Shepherd, Smith
Little Missenden	Baker, Woodward
Maids Moreton	Carter, Sawyer
Ravenstone	Cook, Mason, Smith, Spicer, Sutor [shoemaker], Tailor, Weaver
Monks Risborough	Aleconner, Mason, Smith
Upton [Stone]	Cook, Smith
Weston Turville	Butler, Carpenter, Reeve [son]
Whitchurch	Bond [husbandman], Gardener, Reeve [son], Shepherd, Vavasour
Over Winchendon	Franklin, Palmer, Parson

Note: Summoner – one who calls people to meetings, Chapman – trader/pedlar, Aleconner – tester of ale quality, Palmer – pilgrim/itinerant monk; Vavasour – superior vassal, who has tenants of his own; Franklin – superior free tenant



addition, the lists of personal names contain much of value for local and family historians, with many hundreds of names in 1327, and many more in the 1332 tax returns. The Lay Subsidies offer the possibility for a variety of different studies of Buckinghamshire at its medieval peak. They may be combined with other records, albeit rarely extant in every case for any given parish, including government-inspired material like the Hundred Rolls, and local-generated sources such as court rolls, extents and surveys. It is hoped that the present study, based on the fruits of Professor Chibnall's labours, will attract more attention in local studies across the county than has hitherto been the case.

## REFERENCES

1. K.A. Bailey, 'Medieval Kingsey and Tythrop, 1086–1335', *Recs. Bucks.* **51** (2011), 169–188.
2. K.A. Bailey, *Economy & Society in Medieval Buckinghamshire: The Hundred Rolls 1254–1280* Bucks. Papers no.7 (2006); W. Illingworth (ed.), *Rotuli Hundredorum temp Henr. III et Edw I* (2 vols., 1812–1818).
3. S. Ayscough & J. Caley (eds.), *Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae auctoritate P. Nicholae IV c. AD 1291* Record Commissioners (1802).
4. A.C. Chibnall (ed.), *Early Taxation Returns*, Bucks. Record Soc. **14** (1966), xi–xvi.
5. R.E. Glasscock (ed.), *The Lay Subsidy of 1334* British Academy Records of Social & Economic History [RESH] new series II (1975); J.F. Willard, *Parliamentary Taxes on Personal Property 1290 to 1334* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934).
6. Willard *op. cit.*, 44; Chibnall *op. cit.*, xi; for the taxers see VCH Bucks., vol. 2 (1908), 288 [Hampden] and vol. 4 (1927), 482–3 [Tyringham].
7. Willard *op. cit.*, 56, 61.
8. Willard *op. cit.*, 67; Glasscock, *op. cit.*, xv.
9. Glasscock, *op. cit.*, xiv; letters were sent out to shire taxers between 23 Sept. and 12 Oct. in 1327, Willard *op. cit.*, 52.
10. Willard *op. cit.*, chap. VI; Glasscock, *op. cit.*, xvii.
11. *Taxatio Ecclesiastica* note 3; Glasscock, *op. cit.*, xviii.
12. Willard *op. cit.*, 73–7.
13. Willard *op. cit.*, 75, 79; Glasscock, *op. cit.*, xxv.
14. Glasscock, *op. cit.*, xxii.
15. Willard, *op. cit.*, 82–3.
16. Willard, *op. cit.*, 140.
17. *Ibid.*, 146–7.
18. C.C. Fenwick (ed.), *The Poll Taxes of 1377, 1379 and 1381, vol. 1 Bedfordshire to Leicestershire* RESH new series 27 (Oxford, 1998), 67.
19. Vols. 2, 3 & 4 of the *Victoria History of the County of Buckingham* (VCH) provide succinct summaries of the manorial history of each parish from 1086 onwards, including the creation of new manors and sub-manors in the centuries after 1100.
20. R.E. Zupko, *British Weights & Measures: A History from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century* (Madison 1977) is a good introduction to this complex subject, with data on medieval and "imperial" measures at pp. 153 and 166. See also Zupko, *A Dictionary of Weights & Measures for the British Isles* Memoirs of the American Philosophical Soc. vol. 168 (1985).
21. B.M.S. Campbell, *English Seigniorial Agriculture 1250–1450* (Cambridge, 2000) discusses food liveries (payments in kind for work on the demesne), esp. at p. 218 ff.
22. *Soil Survey of England & Wales, Sheet 6 South East England* (1983) and its Legend provides details of soils across the county, and a description of their characteristics. Little Missenden lies on soils of the Coombe 1 and Batcombe series [511f and 582a], Dodershall on the Denchworth series [712b].
23. R. Jones & M. Page, *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape: Beginnings and Ends* (Macclesfield, 2006), 144.
24. R.E. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List* (1965), 40.
25. K.A. Bailey. 'Buckinghamshire Field-Names', *Recs. Bucks.* **50** (2010), at 98–9.

## APPENDIX 1

## Personal Names from the Buckinghamshire Lay Subsidy of 1327

<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>
Ace, Richard	Bow Brickhill	Bener, Christopher	Monks Risborough
Adam, John	Doddershall/Shipton	<i>Bennis, Isabel</i>	Dunton
Adam, Will	Buckland	Berkerole, Roger	Creslow/Littlecote
Adcock, Hugh	Ravenstone	Besord, Robert de	Whitchurch
<i>Adekyn, Matilda</i>	Dunton	Beuerle, Richard de	Astwood
Adekyn, Robert	Dunton	Bluet, Nicholas	Upton [Stone]
Aete, Edmund de	Maids Moreton	Bluet, William	Upton [Stone]
Aldefeld, Thomas de	Kingsey	Blyk, John	Monks Risborough
Aleconner, John le	Monks Risborough	Boncok, Nicholas	Cheddington
Aleconner, William le	Monks Risborough	Bonde, Ralph le	Whitchurch
Alem, Robert s Ralph	Weston Turville	Borewold, Richard	Whitchurch
Alem, Robt s Rich clerk	Weston Turville	Botyler, Francis le	Astwood
<i>Aleyn, Alice</i>	Over Winchendon	Boueweale, Richard	Creslow/Littlecote
Aleyn, Philip	Over Winchendon	Bouyndon, Robert de	Weston Turville
Aleyn, Richard	Little Missenden	Bray, Richard de	Little Missenden
Aleyn, William	Cheddington	Broc, William atte	Doddershall/Shipton
Alice, William son of	Ravenstone	Brok, William atte	Monks Risborough
Alrych, Robert	Ravenstone	Brok, William atte	Weston Turville
Alton, Henry de	Dunton	Brond, John	Monks Risborough
Ambreye, Roger	Linslade	Brugg, John atte	Monks Risborough
Andreu, Richard	Buckland	Brut, Robert le	Weston Turville
Argent, William	Astwood	Brut, Thomas le	Over Winchendon
Arketel, John	Astwood	Brytayne, Simon de	Astwood
Arketul, John	Astwood	Bulas, Ralph	Doddershall/Shipton
<i>Arnold, Mabel</i>	Astwood	Butiller, William le	Weston Turville
Asselyne, Hugh	Ravenstone	Bygges, John	Linslade
Asselyne, Robert	Ravenstone		
Asselyne, William	Ravenstone	C[h]urch, Robert atte	Over Winchendon
Astone, Richard de	Monks Risborough	Caldecot, William de	Astwood
Atenhasse, Adam	Buckland	Campion, John	Broughton
Atewell, Robert	Creslow/Littlecote	<i>Caperoun, Juliana</i>	Ravenstone
Attehulle, John	Over Winchendon	Cappe, John	Linslade
Attepleystede, Robert	Over Winchendon	Carbonel, Peter	Whitchurch
Aylesbury, Walter de	Doddershall/Shipton	<i>Carpenter, Alice le</i>	Doddershall/Shipton
Aylwyne, John	Buckland	Carpenter, Richard le	Weston Turville
		Carpenter, Walter le	Doddershall/Shipton
Bacon, Roger	Over Winchendon	Carter, Robert le	Creslow/Littlecote
Bacon, Walter	Over Winchendon	Cartere, William le	Maids Moreton
Baiocis, Richard de	Maids Moreton	Cauelyn, Thomas	Monks Risborough
Bakere, Roger	Little Missenden	Chalveleye, Thomas de	Monks Risborough
Baldewyne, Henry	Little Missenden	Chapele, John atte	Whitchurch
Baldewyne, John	Bow Brickhill	Chapele, Nicholas	Whitchurch
Baldewyne, Robert	Astwood	Chapman, Richard le	Cheddington
Barba, Richard cum	Broughton	Charge, John	Bow Brickhill
Baron, John	Doddershall	Chastiloun, Malcolm de	Maids Moreton
Baron, Thomas	Doddershall/Shipton	Chaunterel, John	Kingsey
Baron, Thurston	Doddershall/Shipton	Cheild, John	Broughton
Barum, Geoffrey	Upton [Stone]	Cheval, Hugh	Bow Brickhill
Bate, Hugh	Weston Turville	Child, John	Over Winchendon
Bateman, John	Ravenstone	Cimebelle, Richard de	Linslade

<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>
Beche, Massie de la	Maids Moreton	<i>Cladecote, Alice de</i>	Weston Turville
Clappe, Thomas	Maids Moreton	Frembant, John	Bow Brickhill
Cocin, John	Monks Risborough	Frensch, Geoffrey le	Weston Turville
<i>Codwere, Joan</i>	Cheddington	Frensch, William le	Weston Turville
Coke, William le	Ravenstone	Frensche, Hugh	Linslade
Colderel, Hugh	Weston Turville	Frensche, Robert	Linslade
Coleman, Peter	Bow Brickhill	<i>Fulkes, Christina</i>	Weston Turville
Colles, Robert	Upton	Fulkes, William	Kingsey
Colles, Roger	Doddershall/Shipton		
Colyn, Richard	Doddershall/Shipton	Gardiner, John le	Buckland
<i>Colyns, Elena</i>	Kingsey	Gardiner, William le	Whitchurch
Colyns, John s of Elena	Kingsey	Geffe, Richard	Dunton
Cook, Robert le	Upton [Stone]	Geoffrey, John son of	Weston Turville
Coupere, Walter le	Astwood	Geydlac, John	Kingsey
Craunford, Edmund de	Doddershall/Shipton	Gilbert, Michael	Dunton
Craunford, Walter de	Doddershall/Shipton	Glanuyle, Robert	Cheddington
Cromwelle, John de	Buckland	Gode, William le	Over Winchendon
<i>Croze, Juliana la</i>	Ravenstone	Godefroe, Walter	Over Winchendon
Curbern, Robert	Ravenstone	Goldho[p]e, Geoffrey	Buckland
		Goscare, Simon	Cheddington
Dagenhale, Peter	Creslow	Gothurst, Philip de	Ravenstone
Dagenhale, Roger	Creslow/Littlecote	Gower, Hugh	Monks Risborough
Dancer, Stephen le	Buckland	Gralyn, William	Cheddington
Daubeney, Ralph	Weston Turville	Grene, Hugh atte	Monks Risborough
Dawe, John	Whitchurch	Grene, John atte	Monks Risborough
Dene, Richard	Buckland	Greu, Henry de	Bow Brickhill
Dene/Deye, John le	Broughton	Grot, Geoffrey	Weston Turville
Deye, William le	Bow Brickhill	<i>Groue, Dionise ate</i>	Buckland
Deyte, William le	Over Winchendon	Guche, William le	Monks Risborough
Dobbe, Hugh	Ravenstone	Gundewyne, Richard	Broughton
Draunt, Robert	Over Winchendon	Gundewyne, Thomas	Broughton
<i>Dunnyng, Matilda</i>	Ravenstone	Gyle, William	Ravenstone
Dyuin, John	Cheddington	Gyve, John	Weston Turville
Dyuin, Ralph	Cheddington		
Dyuin, Roger	Cheddington	Habton, Gilbert de	Weston Turville
		<i>Hadenham, Alice de</i>	Over Winchendon
Edmar, Robert	Whitchurch	Hall, Ralph of the	Cheddington
<i>Edrych, Agnes</i>	Astwood	Halleth, William atte	Monks Risborough
Edrych, John	Astwood	Halton, John de	Whitchurch
Ekenheye, Richard de	Astwood	Hammond, Andrew	Monks Risborough
Elyn, Ralph	Buckland	Hamund, Peter	Linslade
Elyot, Stephen	Ravenstone	Hanekyn, Geoffrey	Weston Turville
Elys, Henry	Dunton	Hankyn, William	Weston Turville
Emyngton, William de	Monks Risborough	Hardeshull, Philip de	Weston Turville
Ernald, John	Weston Turville	Hardynge, Roger	Ravenstone
<i>Eue, Emma</i>	Ravenstone	Havel, William le	Weston Turville
Eue, Nicholas	Ravenstone	Hayward, Helias le	Bow Brickhill
<i>Ewelle, Eleanor de</i>	Kingsey	Heldere, William le	Ravenstone
Eye, Stephen de	Kingsey	Herberd, John	Whitchurch
Eyr, William le	Monks Risborough	Herberd, William	Whitchurch
		Herdewyck, William de	Over Winchendon
Felleden, Thomas	Doddershall/Shipton	Hering, Richard	Weston Turville
Fontem, William ad	Ravenstone	<i>Hewe, Alice le</i>	Doddershall/Shipton
Frankeleyn, Walter le	Over Winchendon	Hewes, Hugh le	Doddershall/Shipton

<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>
Frebarn, Mathew	Monks Risborough	Hinnie, Nicholas le	Bow Brickhill
Hobekunes, Adam	Doddershall/Shipton	Mauncel, Henry	Dunton
Hobekynes, Michael	Doddershall/Shipton	Mauncel, Henry	Little Missenden
Hoggebruni, John de	Creslow	Maydenesone, Robert	Doddershall
Hoitte, Robert le	Creslow/Littlecote	Medmenham, Thomas de	Monks Risborough
<i>Holle, Isabel</i>	Creslow/Littlecote	Mensyn, Richard	Bow Brickhill
Hoppe, Richard	Monks Risborough	Michael, Hugh	Linslade
Horcharde, Thomas atte	Kingsey	Mile, John	Whitchurch
Hostage, Richard	Whitchurch	<i>Mill, Alice</i>	Over Winchendon
Hoy, Walter	Linslade	Miller, Geoffrey	Bow Brickhill
Hunes, Robert	Maids Moreton	Mody, Hugh	Dunton
Huntwyne, William	Whitchurch	Moreuill, Robert	Whitchurch
Hurne, Elias in the	Monks Risborough	Morton, John de	Maids Moreton
Hurne, Riginald in the	Monks Risborough	Mouse, Robert	Broughton
		Mulsho, Henry de	Ravenstone
		Mussend, Thomas de	Little Missenden
Janekyn, Robert	Weston Turville		
Jay, John le	Doddershall/Shipton	Nassche, Thomas atte	Over Winchendon
Jay, William le	Doddershall/Shipton	Newman, John le	Bow Brickhill
Jones, Richard	Doddershall/Shipton	Newman, Thomas	Bow Brickhill
Jonesone, Simon	Weston Turville	Newman, William	Bow Brickhill
Jordan, Thomas	Over Winchendon	Nicol, Ralph	Cheddington
Juliana, Peter	Creslow/Littlecote	Noby, Hugh	Weston Turville
		North, Alexander	Creslow/Littlecote
Kempston, John de	Bow Brickhill	North, John	Monks Risborough
Kendale, Gilbert de	Buckland	North, Richard	Monks Risborough
Kep, Benedict	Astwood	North, Robert	Creslow/Littlecote
Kep, John	Astwood	North, William	Monks Risborough
Kyng, John	Kingsey	Nowers, Henry de	Ravenstone
Kyng, William le	Cheddington		
<i>Kynggesbdg, Matilda de</i>	Upton [Stone]	Ode, Walter	Ravenstone
		Opton, Richard de	Kingsey
Lambard, William	Ravenstone	Ouvyngge, Maior	Cheddington
Lane, William atte	Weston Turville	<i>Oyn, Isabel</i>	Buckland
<i>Laurence, Agnes</i>	Ravenstone	Oyn, Walter	Buckland
Leasche, Thomas	Little Missenden		
Leye, Richard atte	Buckland	Paen, Walter	Monks Risborough
Lodelowe, John	Bow Brickhill	Palmer, Thomas le	Over Winchendon
<i>Long, Alice le</i>	Over Winchendon	Parkyn, John	Whitchurch
Lotegersal, William de	Weston Turville	Parson, Thomas le	Over Winchendon
Loue, John	Ravenstone	Passelewe, William	Broughton
Loue, William	Creslow/Littlecote	Pat, Hugh	Kingsey
Loughton, William de	Broughton	Payn, Geoffrey	Broughton
Lovekyn, John	Monks Risborough	Payn, William	Linslade
Lyford, John de	Ravenstone	Peygnaum, Gilbert	Weston Turville
Lyford, William de	Ravenstone	Phelip, William	Over Winchendon
		Philip, John s Richard	Buckland
Man, Thomas le	Ravenstone	Philip, John son of	Buckland
Mare, Hugh atte	Linslade	Pileman, John	Buckland
Mare, Robert de la	Whitchurch	Polter, John le	Bow Brickhill
Mare, William atte	Linslade	Polter, Thomas le	Bow Brickhill
Mariot, xxx [def]	Linslade	<i>Polton, Isabella</i>	Upton [Stone]
Mason, John le	Monks Risborough	Pope, William le	Over Winchendon
Masoun, Henry le	Ravenstone	Pour, Richard le	Over Winchendon
Mathew, William	Monks Risborough		

<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>
Mauncel, Henry	Creslow/Littlecote	Steuend, Robert	Whitchurch
Proufot, Roger	Astwood	Stokes, William de	Buckland
Pryk, Richard le	Weston Turville	Stonhulle, John	Buckland
Pymme, William	Upton [Stone]	Stonhulle, William	Buckland
Queynterol, William	Monks Risborough	Strete, Ralph atte	Weston Turville
		Stretle, John de	Creslow/Littlecote
Radecote, William de	Bow Brickhill	Steward, Nicholas	Creslow/Littlecote
Ralph, Robert son of	Broughton	Sulbury, Geoffrey de	Bow Brickhill
<i>Randulf, Alice</i>	Upton [Stone]	Sulbury, William de	Bow Brickhill
Randulf, Henry	Ravenstone	Sulles, William	Maids Moreton
Randulf, John	Upton [Stone]	Sutor, Thomas	Ravenstone
Randulf, Walter	Ravenstone	Swetesone, John	Astwood
<i>Relond, Plesenna</i>	Little Missenden	Swetts, Richard	Dunton
Reuesone, Robert le	Whitchurch	Sweyn, Adonis	Buckland
<i>Reuewyf, Alice le</i>	Bow Brickhill	Syres, Henry	Monks Risborough
Revenynge, John	Kingsey		
Reveson, John de la Lee	Doddershall/Shipton	Taillard, Robert	Buckland
Reveson, John s Walter le	Weston Turville	Tailleset, Henry	Little Missenden
Reynold, Thomas	Bow Brickhill	Talavet, William	Whitchurch
Reynold, William	Whitchurch	Taylour, Ralph le	Ravenstone
<i>Robin, Isabel</i>	Over Winchendon	Thame, Jordan de	Upton [Stone]
Robyn, John	Astwood	<i>Thursteyn, Matilda</i>	Kingsey
Roger, John [def]	Linslade	Ticemersche, Stephen	Dunton
Rokaylle, Robert de la	Astwood	Tofty, Thomas	Astwood
<i>Rokes, Alice atte</i>	Monks Risborough	Tofty, William	Astwood
Rolves, Gilbert	Kingsey	Tone, Hugh	Ravenstone
Roos, Robert le	Upton [Stone]	Tone, Ralph	Ravenstone
Ryes, Hugh de	Little Missenden	Tone, Walter	Ravenstone
		Tony, Christopher	Monks Risborough
Sanredon, Christopher de	Kingsey	Tony, Henry	Monks Risborough
Saueray, Robert	Whitchurch	Tony, John	Kingsey
Saunders, Henry	Doddershall/Shipton	Tony, William	Kingsey
Sawerd, Robert	Creslow/Littlecote	Toucestre, Hugh	Broughton
Saweyere, Walter le	Maids Moreton	Travers, Thomas	Over Winchendon
Schef, William	Buckland	Turville, Thomas	Dunton
Seyhot, Stephen	Weston Turville	<i>Tymme, Agnes</i>	Ravenstone
Shartford, Robert	Upton [Stone]		
Shepherd, Richard	Whitchurch	Unwyne, William	Kingsey
Shepherd, Roger	Doddershall/Shipton	Val, William le	Over Winchendon
Skyret, Adam	Maids Moreton	Valentyn, Richard	Cheddington
Slocshethe, Thomas	Monks Risborough	Vaesor, Henry le	Whitchurch
Smart, John	Whitchurch	Vel, Peter le	Creslow/Littlecote
Smith, Adam	Broughton	Ver, Robert de Sir	Whitchurch
Smith, Nicholas	Doddershall/Shipton	Vynald, Richard	Over Winchendon
Smith, Robert	Whitchurch		
Smith, Robert le	Upton [Stone]	Wackes, Henry	Linslade
Smith, Simon le	Monks Risborough	Wade, Michael	Astwood
Smyth, Nicholas le	Ravenstone	Walder, John	Weston Turville
Smyth, William le	Cheddington	<i>Walder, Matilda [def]</i>	Weston Turville
Solebure, Henry de	Creslow/Littlecote	Waleys, John	Kingsey
Somesatte, Richard	Creslow/Littlecote	Waleys, John le	Upton [Stone]
Sominour, John le	Bow Brickhill	Warde, Roger le	Doddershall/Shipton
Spycer, Henry le	Ravenstone	<i>Waren, Beatrice de</i>	Over Winchendon

<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Vill</i>
Stagenho, John de	Linslade	Webbe, William le	Ravenstone
Sterre, Denis	Upton [Stone]	<i>Wille, Agnes</i>	Dunton
Webbie, John le	Bow Brickhill	Wille, Hugh	Dunton
<i>Well, Alice atte</i>	Over Winchendon	Williames, Richard	Doddershall/Shipton
Well, Peter atte	Cheddington	Wodeward, Richard	Little Missenden
Welle, James atte	Monks Risborough	Wolf, Hugh le	Whitchurch
Welle, John ate	Monks Risborough	Wolf, John le	Whitchurch
Welle, Ralph atte	Whitchurch	Wychcot, Geoffrey atte	Weston Turville
Welle, Richard atte	Upton [Stone]	Wylegod, John	Creslow/Littlecote
West, John	Upton	Wynd, Walter	Kingsey
West, Nicholas	Linslade	Wytloe, John	Doddershall/Shipton
Weste, John	Linslade	Wyzelot, Richard	Dunton
Weste, John le	Monks Risborough	Yue, Henry	Monks Risborough
<i>Weyere, Alice</i>	Monks Risborough		