

# GLEBE TERRIERS AND OPEN-FIELD BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

With a Summary List of Deserted Villages of the County

M. W. BERESFORD, M.A.

Lecturer in Economic History in the University of Leeds

## PART II

### I

THE first part of this paper was concerned with the *terriers* or written surveys of the glebe in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Buckinghamshire, and with the description of the open fields which emerges when the glebe of a particular parish had not yet been enclosed when a terrier was drawn up. This second part of the paper moves away from a static description of open fields which has tended to give the impression of a uniform open-field landscape all over the county. There were in fact villages in which the open fields were limited in area and vulnerable to enclosure, so that even the earliest glebe terriers speak only of enclosed fields. In other villages there were open fields as extensive as any in the county: yet the ambition of would-be graziers converted the arable to pasture, destroying the open fields and the village in the process. Other villages lost their open fields within the period for which terriers survive, yet without the wholesale removal of villagers and with the general consent of the property-owners in the open fields. Other villages retained their open fields—with only piecemeal enclosure of small areas—until in the early eighteenth century there began to appear on the Statute Book the first of the long series of Private Acts by which the open fields of Buckinghamshire were finally enclosed.

The locale and chronology of Parliamentary enclosure in Buckinghamshire is relatively well known, thanks to Mr. Tate's List<sup>1</sup> of the enclosures carried out between 1726 (Addington) and the enclosure of 338 acres in High Wycombe by Provisional Order in 1865. Not all the Parliamentary enclosures dealt with open-field arable, and very few were entirely concerned with arable: the Awards have a good deal to say about commons, meadows and woods. Again, the parishes which were enclosed by Act of Parliament had already some portion of their open fields which had been quietly enclosed by agreement in earlier centuries: such areas appear as 'old enclosures' on the maps which accompany the Enclosure Awards. There is still room for a large-scale map, derived from a close study of the Awards, which will indicate exactly what proportion of each parish remained in open field to be enclosed by Act

of Parliament. All that the map (Plate 2) can do is to indicate the parishes in which Mr. Tate's list shows that *some* enclosure of open field took place. It is therefore a distribution diagram rather than a map.<sup>2</sup>

With the Enclosure Acts and Awards easily available, the glebe terriers of the eighteenth and nineteenth century are not prime sources for the history of Parliamentary enclosure. But Plate 2 shows that many parishes had no Parliamentary enclosure; while the fact that their neighbours had open fields to be enclosed is *prima facie* evidence that an enclosure at an earlier period has to be sought. How may the study of glebe terriers be relevant to the dating of pre-Parliamentary enclosure? for how many of the unshaded areas on Plate 2 may an approximate date for the final enclosure of the open fields be given?

It is first necessary to eliminate those areas on the map where the absence of shading indicates not an early enclosure of open fields but a total absence of open fields at any date or else an open-field system so insignificant that it may be ignored for the present purpose. The wooded parishes of the Chilterns and the still heavily-wooded parishes on the Northamptonshire border probably fall into this category. The medieval villagers were able to maintain themselves in these areas by exploiting the resources of a forest economy. The arable played a subordinate part in their lives and the area of cleared land was small in proportion to the total area of the parish. What cleared land there was had probably been taken into cultivation at a later date than the cleared land of the open-field parishes and more by individuals than by village communities. The result was not extensive open fields communally worked, but a patchwork of individually-owned fields. (There is a little evidence for a half-way stage of an "infield-outfield" system in the 'forest' parishes whereby a nucleus of open-field arable was combined with intermittent cultivation of the abundantly-available out-fields.)

## II

These areas apart, there are two principal occasions and motives for early enclosure which would leave no open fields for the Enclosure Acts. One of these occasions is too early for the glebe terrier to be able to record it although terriers occasionally reveal some of the repercussions. These enclosures, too early for the earliest surviving terriers, were the sheep-enclosures, the depopulating enclosures of the period 1470-1520. With these enclosures the open fields and the villages disappeared together. With this type of enclosure the arable fields went down to grass and the village houses and streets were abandoned to the elements, being now no more than a set of grassy mounds where houses once stood and deeply-worn hollows where streets ran. The ruins of a church may point the way to the site (as at Quarrendon) or the church may (as at Fleet Marston) have survived the loss of the majority of its parishioners. The buried stonework of the Manor House may sometimes survive.

I have elsewhere published an account of the economic changes which produced and accompanied these depopulations, together with a gazetteer of lost sites in Buckinghamshire.<sup>3</sup> The list in Appendix 3 brings together the evidence in summary form. There is still much room for local exploration,



PLATE 1. LOWER BURSTON

*British Crown Copyright Reserved. Published by permission of H.M. Stationery Office.*

surveying of sites, recording of field-names, exploration of documents and—above all—the excavation of the sites.

The glebe terrier of Lillingstone Dayrell, with its explicit memory of such a depopulation, has already been cited. The terrier of 1601 reported

touchinge the gleabe of the personage of Lillingston yt is the comon opinion that there hath bene a gleabe but what shoulde be the quantity and where yt should lye noe man can tell bie reason of the pullonge downe of the towne and inclosure of the whole Lordeship aboute som hundred yeres bigon

and the terrier of 1625 added

Thomas Darrell Esquier . . bought out the freeholders, inclosed the Lordship, pulled downe the towne turninge the same into fish pondes and also pulled downe the parsonage house.

The event had been noticed by the Commissioners of Wolsey's Inquiry<sup>4</sup> in 1517, for which the Buckinghamshire evidence has been well preserved. The local jury whom the Inquiry impanelled assigned responsibility to Thomas Darell, knight, and dated the enclosure as February, 1490.

Although there is a gap of three generations between Wolsey's Inquiry and the earliest surviving terriers it seems unlikely that there was a great deal of enclosure in the intervening period as thorough-going as that which produced the deserted villages. For this, the anti-enclosure statutes,<sup>5</sup> the government Inquiries,<sup>6</sup> the hostility of public opinion,<sup>7</sup> the availability of the prerogative courts,<sup>8</sup> and (after 1550) the decline in the relative advantage of wool over corn may all share responsibility. Yet while it lasted, the movement had destroyed one out of every ten villages which had appeared in the tax lists of the early fourteenth century, and while there are no poll tax receipts<sup>9</sup> surviving from 1377 for this county, the analogous evidence from neighbouring shires makes it unlikely that more than a small proportion of these deserted villages fell under the assault of the plagues in the second half of the fourteenth century.

Naturally, this decrease in employment was disliked by the villagers whose legitimate fears were bolstered up by memories of the past and the sight of the abandoned homesteads in the depopulated villages which lay interspersed with the living villages. Agrarian discontent was accentuated by the struggles of landlords and tenants, both caught in the great inflation of the sixteenth century, so that the economic troubles in the second half of the century were centred principally on grievances about high rents and high entry-fines rather than on evictions to make a sheep-walk.<sup>10</sup>

The unpublished evidence from two Government Inquiries bears this out. An examination of the evidence collected in 1565 and 1607 shows that almost every village in the county had something to tell the Commissioners about acres enclosed and houses decayed. But what makes these Inquiries so different from Wolsey's Inquiry of 1517 is that nothing is heard of large-scale depopulation or, for that matter, of large-scale enclosures. The "enclosers" and "depopulators" arraigned in 1565 and 1607 had done no more than enclose



a score or so acres (often much less), with the decay of one or two cottages, never more than a handful in any one village. What the Commissions had caught was piecemeal enclosure; occasionally, where half a dozen men in one village were presented, they had caught an embryo enclosure by agreement such as the Act of 1597 would have permitted had not the Lords struck out the clause.<sup>11</sup>

Enclosure by agreement—the agreement sometimes obtained by cozening—is what Dr. Parker found in his examination of the Returns from 1607 for Leicestershire.<sup>12</sup> It is also what the Buckinghamshire glebe terriers reveal in increasing numbers as the seventeenth century progressed although the anti-conversion acts survived the great bonfire of controls in 1624.<sup>13</sup> The so-called “Depopulation Commissions” of Charles I are no contradiction of this general move towards tacit permission of enclosure by agreement. Charles I’s Commissions were not aimed at the prevention of enclosure any more than his scheme for retail tobacco licences aimed to prevent the smoking of pipes.

Although after 1517 the conditions and the opportunities did not make it easy to depopulate a whole village the word ‘depopulation’ and the fears accompanying it continued to be a powerful emotive word in political and economic argument. The bad harvests at the end of the century aroused all the old fears that the area under corn had been allowed to contract too far. The landlord who wished to enclose his fields without going over entirely to grass or without the complete eviction of husbandmen found himself opposed by those who drew on the experience of the past to cry ‘depopulation.’

It is true that the enclosure of fields for more efficient arable or mixed farming—the ambition of the Elizabethan landlord—might result in some economies of scale which would lessen agricultural employment, and there is evidence that such unemployment did occur in Buckinghamshire between 1517 and 1640. Here and there, one or two cottages in each village were falling into disuse, although the villages as a whole continued in existence. Indeed, the King hoped that enclosure would increase as much as smoking, for his hopes of revenue depended upon sufficient landowners wanting to do the ‘prohibited’ thing and being willing to pay for the permission which was granted after appropriate *finis* had passed to the Crown. The membranes of the Exchequer Memoranda rolls,<sup>14</sup> where the licences to enclose are enrolled, can be viewed in the same light as the enclosures on the Chancery Decree rolls<sup>15</sup> (c. 1630-1730) or the enclosures permitted by private Enclosure Acts (after c. 1730). In each case the consenting proprietors have come—more or less willingly—to sue for the State’s approval and registration of their re-allocation of strips and their new creation of hedged fields individually owned.

### III

The glebe terriers, then, come from a period when enclosure was much sought after as a means to an end. The aim was more efficient and more profitable farming. Not every landlord had such progressive ambitions, and not every landlord with progressive ambitions was able to fulfil them. The long list of Parliamentary enclosures shows how many would-be enclosers



TYPES OF ENCLOSURE IN  
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE




-  with depopulation, mainly before 1600
-  by agreement, 1600-1738
-  (North of Chilterns) by Acts of Parliament, after 1738

PLATE 2 TYPES OF ENCLOSURE IN BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

Bucks County Planning Department.

found themselves foundering on the rocks of unwilling proprietors and forced to wait until the device of the Enclosure Act came to coerce the minority of proprietors in a village who would not consent to the redistribution.

How do the glebe terriers indicate which parishes were able to be enclosed before the period of Enclosure Acts? how do they enable an approximate date to be given to the enclosure? The arrangement of the *List* (below, pp. 14-23) makes it easy to identify enclosure which took place during the period for which terriers have survived. Instead of the names of the two, three or four open Fields there would appear the succinct, 'closes.' This change is a reflection of a very distinct change in the appearance of a terrier at the point when the parish is enclosed. In place of the large, folded sheet or roll needed to list the strips, we find a small, concise document of a paragraph or two, simply naming the closes which replaced them. These closes may equal the former area of glebe; they may be less—when a deduction has been made to meet the expense of enclosure; or they may be more—especially when the village tithe-payers have taken the opportunity each to give up a small allotment of land in perpetual commutation of tithe payable. But even so, the simple naming of a close will obviate the long descriptions of the open-field terriers.

Before we look at examples of these changes in the terriers, we must mention one other occasion on which the glebe might be augmented, so that the area increases from one terrier to the next. Such augmentations may represent the gift of a faithful benefactor, a gift commonly recorded on the walls of the parish church as well as among the glebe terriers. They may represent the augmentation of a wealthy patron, or they may represent Queen Anne's Bounty. At Chearsley the terrier of 1788 records land well in excess of the glebe in 1706. It adds that freehold estates were purchased in 1749 and 1776 to be added to the glebe out of the funds of Q.A.B. There was no glebe at Dorton before 1800, when an estate was purchased from the same endowment. At Fenny Stratford an estate was settled upon the incumbent in 1735 to provide a curacy in St. Martin's. At Fulmer the inhabitants compounded for their tithes in 1625 and augmented the glebe estate thereby. The 1706 terrier of Soulbury records an income from the funds of a legacy. At Water Stratford in 1680 the glebe included

closes in lieu of tythes of 15 li. yerely paid by Mr. Edgerley according to a decree maid in The High court of Chancery.

It does not make clear whether this was an enclosure agreement taking the opportunity to deal with tithes, or a law suit in Chancery over tithes.

For evidence of enclosure we must look in the terriers for strips which in one document lie dispersedly and then later come to be described as "lying together." Indeed, even before all the fields were enclosed, we shall find that the glebe estate (like other estates) was making the best of the old world of open-field farming by having some or all of its strips in compact blocks, even where full release from the open-field obligations of communal husbandry was not allowed. Such was the case at Farnham Royal in 1601 where the glebe was

fyve akers *lying together* in the common feilde,

and we have already seen from our examination of the areas of strips that exchange and purchase had often gathered strips together into parcels made up of one, two, three, four or more adjacent strips. The Drayton Parslow terrier quoted earlier had its glebe grouped in blocks of 2, 4, 2, 2, 5, 4, 1, 1 and 2 strips. Such a grouping was possible while the open field routines continued unchanged, and it solved some of the disadvantages and diseconomies of scattered holdings.

It also made easier the next step, that of formally enclosing a compact block with a hedge. This would allow individual choice of cropping and management. The other villagers would lose pasture rights at fallow-time and these would have to be compensated for: either by an allowance of land or by a number of agreements whereby all or some villagers carried out corresponding enclosure of their blocks. The final step, the re-allocation of all strips (whether in blocks or not) by a grand shuffle, was final enclosure. The operation was in essence the same whether carried out by Act, by Chancery Decree or by private agreement.

We see the process at Great Kimble where the 1625 terrier speaks of

26 acres of arable now severed into four closes one joyning to another

or at Leckhamstead in 1601 where the "great close" of glebe is changed by consent for certain acres of arable land, and even where we have not an earlier open field terrier to prove that a particular close is a recent creation, we have such phrases as that of Wexham (1601) which describe the closes of glebe in terms which imply recent enclosure:

as the same are nowe divided, lying together.

Middle Claydon provided explicit evidence that many enclosures were step-by-step affairs, and that if we give a date for the "enclosure" of a parish, what we are in fact giving is a date for the final step. This seems true both for Parliamentary and non-Parliamentary enclosures. At Middle Claydon the 1639 terrier groups the glebe strips into two open Fields: Whithard Field and Boughton Field. The 1577 and 1601 terriers are also open field terriers. But the next terrier (1706) has the glebe in enclosed parcels. The 1707 terrier offers explanation.

Both these closes or pastures are in the last of the three inclosures of the parish, and mounded out by ye Ld of ye Mann'r. The whole parish was inclosed at three several times . . . the last inclosure being made about 50 years agoe during the Usurpation of Oliver Cromwell without the consent and Concurrence of the then Incumbent Mr. Aris.

The first and second stages of the enclosure are not so precisely dated, but a terrier (itself undated, but *c.* 1659/77) speaks of enclosures in the incumbency of Richard Askew (1608/29) and of John Aris (1632/49).

In the intervals between such steps, the fields would be like those described in the Cuddington terrier of 1707

part enclosed part not enclosed



and the 1703 terrier had spoken of one of these closes as

lately layd down for pasture.

It was at Drayton Beauchamp that we saw post-enclosure cross ploughing obliterating the ridges, and this enclosure was also assigned to the period of the Interregnum. In 1793 we read

the acres named were had in exchange in the yeare 1658 but we beleeve the Exchange was no detriment at all to the Parsonage.

Earlier, in 1706, the terrier had recorded the exchange less precisely and with some eye on legalism, but again without complaint of unfairness

fifty acres of the old glebe lay dispersed in the common feilds which exchange was made before ye Restoration of Charles the Second and has never been allowd of & confirmed by the Bishop or as it should be.

But in 1712 Church Hill Field still appears open.

At Hoggeston the glebe was already enclosed by 1601

being one plotte of grounde all inclosed and beinge at this instante all greene swarde taken in by a generall consent, conteyning threescore and eight acres.

but at Lathbury in 1674 the "field lately inclosed" does not comprise all the glebe, some open field remaining even in the 1709 terrier. At Great Linford there were three open fields in the 1639 terrier, but closes in that of 1674. For the explanation we have to wait for the 1707 terrier which described four glebe closes and

the inclosure of the lordship which was afterwards corroborated by a decree in Chancery immediately after the restauration of King Charles the Second.

At Milton Keynes the 1625 terrier indicates that the fields were in the transitional state: the glebe is described under headings of three Fields, but the incumbent adds

at my first cominge I findinge the most part of my gleablands before specified inclosed for pasture and allmost all dimised by lease to diverse ye inhabitants (termino 60 a°).

For Oakley there is an Enclosure Act of 1819 for common land (not open-field arable), and the open fields seem to have been disappearing in the sixteenth century and the glebe was exchanged "by consent" in 1612, according to the 1625 terrier. At Shenley the Brook End Field seems to have been open in 1700, but Town End Field was enclosed. At Water Stratford the open fields of the 1639 terrier have become closes by 1680

in lieu of tythes according to a decree made in the High court of Chancery.

Upper Winchendon had no glebe in 1607 and it is likely that this is connected with the earlier sixteenth-century enclosures reported to the 1518 Inquiry and pardoned in 1554.



#### IV

It now only remains to consider what information we have collected concerning the state of open-field Buckinghamshire in the three centuries 1550-1850.

We have found that there were two reasons why a given parish might have lost its open fields by 1550. As at Great Linford, there may have been an agreement among the proprietors; or as at Fleet Marston the will to enclose had not been a collective one, but an individual one, which resulted in the destruction of the village in the act of conversion.

We have found that between 1550 and 1738 other villages moved over to hedged fields, some in one step, others piecemeal. The final movement, that of enclosure by Act of Parliament, must be dated from the Act to enclose Ashendon in 1738. But it would be a mistake to assume that in Ashendon and the 108 other open-fields communities which were to have their Acts of Enclosure the open fields stood untouched till that day when the hedges were aligned and planted. In every one some enclosure had taken place and was recorded in the Award and on the Map as "old enclosure." Some of it must have been very old: some of it falls within the period of our glebe terriers and has been reflected in them.

It is not easy to exaggerate the influence of the Chilterns, although the distribution map shows how far the valley settlements extended their open-field husbandry into the hills. But the very nature of the small and scattered arable fields in such an area made for easy and for early enclosure. A dotted line runs across the map (Plate 1) marking off the scarp of the Chilterns. On the north lies an area which at the close of the thirteenth century must have been almost one complete open field. The map shows the ways in which these fields were replaced by the hedge. It shows in solid black those fields which were enclosed before about 1600, often with the destruction of the village. In line-shading it shows the parishes where open fields finally disappeared by agreement in the period 1600-1738. The parishes left white are those enclosed by Acts of Parliament, 1738-1856.

On the south of the dotted line lie the Chiltern parishes (with a few river-side parishes which share some of the character of the Vale). These are left blank on the map for another reason: in very few are there Enclosure Acts, and those Acts which exist are mainly for enclosure of woods or commons. The dotted line divides champion (or open-field) Buckinghamshire from bocage (or wooded) Buckinghamshire.

The map also shows that the area of early open-field enclosure in champion Buckinghamshire lay in two broad parallel belts, each of which is almost continuous. The first is the belt which crosses the county from Leighton Buzzard to Boarstall, country whose grasslands evoked Leland's admiration in the sixteenth century. The other belt runs along the northern boundary of the county, from Olney to Bicester. From the contiguity of solid and striped shading it will be seen that the areas where sixteenth-century enclosure was profitable and possible were almost exactly those where early enclosure by agreement anticipated Parliamentary enclosure by anything up to 250 years.

It is not difficult to see a soil factor as the common denominator.

This comes out even more closely if one looks outside the bounds of the county. The county is a convenient unit for the administration of an arch-deaconry and so for the collection of terriers: it is a useful unit for local history publications, and so for this study: but many natural features, such as the Chilterns or the limestone hills ignore such administrative boundaries. We must take up such a map as that which H. L. Gray drew for Oxfordshire and fit it alongside ours.<sup>16</sup> We then see our belt of early enclosure stretching across from Bicester almost to Lechlade. It is risky to prophesy about the history of another county, but it is likely that, when the enclosure history of Northamptonshire comes to be written and mapped, the early enclosures of north Buckinghamshire which our map shows will be partnered by early enclosures in adjacent Northamptonshire.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. E. Tate, *A Handlist of Bucks. Enclosure Acts and Awards* (Aylesbury, 1946).

<sup>2</sup> I have published an analogous map for Leicestershire in *Studies in Leics. Agrarian History*, ed. W. G. Hoskins (*Trans. Leics. Arch. Soc.*, 1948), pp. 77-126.

<sup>3</sup> M. W. Beresford, *The Lost Villages of England* (London, 1954); Bucks, distribution map, p. 230; statistics, pp. 237, 251, 397-8, 400, 403 and 407; gazetteer, pp. 340-3.

<sup>4</sup> I. S. Leadam, *Domesday of Inclosures* (London, 1897), pp. 158-214 from P(ublic) R(ecord) O(ffice): C47/7/2.

<sup>5</sup> Acts were passed in 1489, 1515, 1536, 1563 and 1597.

<sup>6</sup> 1517: P.R.O. C47/7/2 for jurors' presentments, printed in Leadam, loc. cit.; C43/28/3 and C43/2-3 for enclosers' answers and pleadings (unpublished); the Inquiry of 1548 has left no Bucks. records behind it.

1565 Inquiry: Commission and original returns, P.R.O. E178/424; enrolled returns, E159/357, Michaelmas *Recorda* (membranes 523 sqq.). A little earlier in the same term (membrane 395) the Attorney General had laid information against Thomas Tyringham for the enclosure of 480 acres and the decay of seven houses in 1563, but I have not found any other proceedings arising from the fifty-two villages in which the jurors reported enclosures.

1607 Inquiry: C205/5; some proceedings in Star Chamber (P.R.O. St. Ch. 8/10-5) probably echo this Inquiry which was itself declared *ultra vires*.

<sup>7</sup> E.g., pamphlet printed in Tawney and Power, *Tudor Economic Documents* (London, 1937), iii, pp. 5-7, with its Bucks. allusions.

<sup>8</sup> E.g., petitions in *Early Chancery Proceedings*; bills in *Star Chamber and Requests*. Informations could also be laid in *Exchequer* against those who decayed houses or who possessed flocks of more than 2,400 sheep.

<sup>9</sup> The fragmentary survivals from 1377, 1379 and 1381 will be found in P.R.O. E179/77.

<sup>10</sup> In January, 1566 the Earl of Leicester wrote to Cecil that nothing had been done in the matter of the Buckinghamshire enclosures and that this would cause trouble. He concluded: 'I never saw so riche a soyle, so many miserable and power people.' (P.R.O. SP12/39/31.) He probably had the Commission of Inquiry in mind.

<sup>11</sup> The deleted clause appears in the engrossed Bill, 39 Eliz. c. 2 (House of Lords MSS.).

<sup>12</sup> L. A. Parker, *Trans. Leics. Arch. Soc.*, xxiii.

<sup>13</sup> 21 Jas. I. c. 28. The Act of 1597 was not repealed until 26-7 Vic. c. 125 (1864).

<sup>14</sup> P.R.O. E159/476-8. I have found no Bucks. victims.

<sup>15</sup> The Decrees have *indices locorum* and *nominorum* in MSS. on the shelves of the Round Room at the P.R.O. Such decrees are often mentioned in terriers: see *List infra*, p. 14.

<sup>16</sup> H. L. Gray, *English Field Systems* (Cambridge, Mass., 1915).

<sup>17</sup> Cp. Northants and Oxon. lost villages mapped in Beresford, *op. cit.*, p. 236. References to enclosure in more than forty Northants. parishes have been found among the Chancery Decree rolls by Miss Joan Wake (W. E. Tate in *Northants. Past and Present*, i, pp. 29-33 (1949)).

# GLEBE TERRIERS OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

## ALPHABETICAL LIST

The *first column* gives the name of the parish under which the terrier is filed.

The *second column* gives the date(s) of the earliest terrier(s) surviving at Oxford or Lincoln (for location, see page 284, *supra*) together with the dates of any other terriers cited to show when the glebe was enclosed. (B=Bodleian, Oxford; L=Lincoln.)

The *third column* indicates whether the glebe in particular terriers indicates open fields (O.F.), closes, gardens, woodland, meadow, etc. Where there is no glebe or the living is inappropriate the fact is stated.

*Column four* gives the names of the *Fields* of the village when the glebe lies in strips. To indicate the number of Fields (usually two or three) numerals precede the names. Variants in spelling between terriers are not given unless there is a radical change or unless the nomenclature of a Field changes, e.g., Edgcott where *Perry Field* is sometimes *Lower Field*.

ADDINGTON	1577 B	O.F.	1 South, 2 Mill, 3 North
	1601 L		
	1706 L		1 Adstock bridge, 2 Middle, 3 Marsh-bushes
ADSTOCK	1693 B	O.F.	No names of Fields, "fower yardlands lying dispersedly in the Fields and precincts of Adstock" an orchard; close of 4 ac.
	1607 L	O.F.	1 West of Newel, 2 Middle or Quilch, 3 Third Field called Breach
AKELEY	1639 B	O.F.	1 Churchill, 2 Stockwell, 3 not named.
	1705 L	O.F.	3 is Lye, 1 and 2 not named but have furlong names, for 'v yeardes'
	1709 L		1 Churchill F. near Leckhamstead, 2 Stockwell alias Stockhold, 3 Ly
AMERSHAM	1607 B	closes	
ASHENDEN	1639 B	curacy	
ASTON ABBOTS	1855 B	closes	
ASTON CLINTON	1607 B	O.F.	1 N, 2 W
	1707 L	O.F.	
ASTON SANDFORD	1639 B	O.F.	1 Middle, 2 Little Burrowe, 3 Long-ridge, 4 Deadhill
	1601 L	O.F.	no names "three comon feildes" [ <i>sic</i> ]
	1707 L	O.F.	1 Middle ("28 ridges"), 2 Redland, 3 Turnlow ("23 ridges") ("32 ridges")
ASTWOOD	1607 B	closes	
AYLESBURY	1680 B	garden	
	1677 L	garden	(see also Walton hamlet <i>infra</i> )
BARTON HARTSHORN	1639 B	curacy	
BEACONSFIELD	1680 L	woodlands	

BEACHAMPTON	1639 B	closes	(meadow may be unenclosed)
	1635 L	closes	
	1707 L		("two roods in the south meadow as they arise by lott")
BIDDLESDEN	n.d. B	house	
BIERTON	n.d. B	gardens	
BLEDLOW	1639 B	impropriate	
	1601 L	impropriate	
BLETCHLEY	1635 L	meadow and	(mentions "common Field of Water Eaton")
	1707 L	tithes	
BOARSTALL	1639 B	no glebe	
BOVENEY	1690 B	?	("two acres called Church Butts in a field at Dorney called North Field")
BRADWELL	1680 B	O.F.	1 Brook, 2 Pasture Hedge, 3 Seckley In n.d. 2 is Staunton and in 1693 is Middle otherwise Stonton 3 is Secley in 1706
	1577 L		1 Brucke, 2 Field next Stenton Pasture, 3 Seckley
BRAGENHAM	1607 B	O.F.?	"one furlong in Great Whitberie Field, six acres. Three acres of wood ground lying in common"
BRAYFIELD, COLD	1674 B	closes	
	1709 L	impropriate	
BRICKHILL, BOW	1607 B	O.F.	1 N, 2 Middle, 3 South
BRICKHILL, GREAT	1640 B	O.F.	1 Apnam Mead, 2 Middle, 3 Smewnes as above
	1625 L		
BRICKHILL, LITTLE	1674 B	O.F.	1 Cutmill, 2 Middle
	1709 L	O.F.	(1625 L reports "nine acres of arable land and one acre of meadowe in an ancient composition temp. Hugonis episcopi but now lost")
BRILL	1639 B	house and meadow	
BROUGHTON	1605 B	O.F.	1 Fen, 2 Middle, 3 Cooksbushe (1 is Fen alias Clayehill in 1639 B.)
	1577 L		1 Fen, 2 Mydle, 3 Koksbusch (another terrier for the same year has 1 Clayhilles)
BUCKINGHAM	1709 L	O.F.	1 Port ("where 33 ridges make 12 acres"), 2 Middle, 3 Little Field of Gawcat
BUCKLAND	1639 L	O.F.	1 E, 2 W, 3 Middle, 4 Ashgrove
	1680 L		3 and 4 as above, but four other Fields named i. Lower next Aston Clynton ii. Lying next Drayton iii. Cradle iv. Stony
BURNHAM	1607 B	closes	(the 1690 B and 1708 L terriers revert to a form which may be open field: "the W. Field in East Burnham; Boars Hads F. in the liberty of Cippenham; Britwell F; Breach F; Lent F")
CALVERTON	1680 B	O.F.	1 Street, 2 Middle, 3 Blacon
CASTLETHORPE	1826 B		
	1724 L	no detail	

CAVERSFIELD	1607 L	no glebe	"There is noe knowne gleebe Lande"
CHALFONT ST. GILES	1607 B	? O.F.	common arable and pasture but no F. names. "In a common called the Outfield (1697 B Noutfield)"
CHALFONT ST. PETER	1607 B 1601 L	? O.F.	There are two pieces of common: "Dewland (1674 B Dufand)" and "Common Downs"
CHEARSLEY	1639 B 1700 L	O.F. no glebe	1 East, 2 Berrie
CHEDDINGTON	1639 B 1625 L	O.F.	1 Downe, 2 S, 3 W, 4 N
CHENIES	1607 B	closes	
CHESHAM (WOBURNE)	1639 B 1601 L	no glebe	
CHESHAM (LEICESTER)	1639 B 1601 L	no glebe	
CHESHAM BOIS	n.d. B	close	two acres
CHETWOOD	1639 B	impropriate	
CHICHELEY	1577 L 1635 L 1693 B	O.F. O.F. ?	furlong names only one close and "one rood of arrable land." L n.d. speaks of a terrier at Bugden (Buckden) 80 years earlier, "given at ye enclosure"
CHILTON	1639 B	no glebe	
CHOLESBURY	1639 B	?	"three small plotts" and a wood in Drayton Beauchamp parish
CLAYDON, EAST	1607 B 1625 L 1639 B	O.F.	"one yardland lost" 1 E, 2 N, 3 Woad 3 is Wood. The lost yardland in 1601 L is reported as lost "iii score or iiii score yeares since." It still appears in 1707 L
CLAYDON, MIDDLE	1577 L 1601 L 1639 B 1707 L	O.F.  enclosed c. 1657	1 Whitey, 2 Boughty, 3 Myllhill 1 Whiter, 2 Boughton, 3 Myllhill 1 Whithard, 2 Boughton see p. 10 <i>supra</i>
CLAYDON, STEEPLE	1601 L 1607 B 1706 B	O.F. O.F. O.F.	fragment only no F names 1 Wood, 2 Windmill
CLIFTON REYNES	1674 B 1690 B	O.F. O.F.	1 New, 2 Stone (3 defective) 1 New, 2 Stone, 3 Middle
CRAWLEY NORTH	1690 B 1693 B	O.F. O.F.	no F names 1 Mill, 2 Park. (Here "lands and Ridges")
CRENDON, LONG	1707 L 1625 L	O.F.	adds 3 Church End and 4 Tindy
CUBLINGTON	1601 L	impropriate O.F.	1 Weyld, 2 Meade, 3 Broncott, 4 Holcombe
CUDDINGTON	1607 B 1601 L	O.F. O.F.	no F names "a yardland contayning xxiiij acres" (in half acres and roods. Furlong names only)
DATCHETT	1703 B	enclosed	see p. 10 <i>supra</i>
DENHAM	1607 B 1639 B	no glebe closes	



DINTON	1601 L	O.F.	furlong names only
	1607 B	O.F.	no F names
	1706 B	O.F.	1 Gooey, 2 Windmill Hill
DORNEY	n.d.	O.F.	1 N, 2 S
	(1633/63) B		
	1706 B	O.F.	25 acres "dispersedly"
DORTON	1639 B	no glebe	1800 B has an estate purchased with Queen Anne's Bounty
DRAYTON BEAUCHAMP	1607 B	O.F.	1 Colfield, 2 Fox (ridges)
	1639 B		1 Cold, 2 Hedge, 3 Turret, 4 Towns- end
	1663 B	partially enclosed in 1658	see p. 11 <i>supra</i>
DRAYTON PARSLOW	1625 L	O.F.	1 Field next Stewkley, 2 F next Saldon, 3 F next Stoke Hammond (1756 B has a column for 'ridges' on the left and one for acres on the right)
DUNTON	1601 L	O.F.	1 E, 2 W, 3 S
	1639 B		1 Michenden, 2 Upper, 3 W, 4 Middle
	1674 B		1 Mead or S, 2 Walmarsh, 3 W
	1707 L		1 Ye Mead on Southfield arable, 2 Walmarsh F arable called otherwise ye upper field, 3 W
EDGCOTT	1572 L	O.F.	1 Perrye, 2 Myddle, 3 W, 4 Hyll
	1608 B	O.F.	illegible
	1639 B	O.F.	1 Perry, 2 Middle, 3 W, 4 Hill
	1674 B		1 Upper, 2 Lower (in each grass and arable are separately listed)
	1706 B		1 Perry, 2 Hill, 3 W
	1709 B		1 Hill, 2 Middle, 3 Lower
EDLESBOROUGH	1673 B	O.F.	1 Robins, 2 Church
ELLESBOROUGH	1625 L	O.F.	furlong names only
	1639 B	O.F.	furlong names only
	1694 B		this is a copy of 1625 L
EMBERTON	1607 B	O.F.	illegible
	1639 B	O.F.	1 Cross, 2 Middle, 3 Stonie
	1694 B		2 is Cross Albans
	1706 B		3 is Nether
FARNHAM ROYAL	1607 B	O.F.	"Farnsam [ <i>sic</i> ] common feilde"
	1625 L	O.F.	1 Farnham F
FAWLEY	1634 L		closes
FENNY STRATFORD	1740 B	O.F.	1 Norrill, 2 Brook, 3 Eaton in West Bletchley (lands purchased in 1735)
FILGRAVE CUM TYRINGHAM	1674 B	O.F.	1 Broad Green, 2 Claworth, 3 Hobs Heene
	1706		3 is Hobs Haine
FINGEST	1601 L	closes	
FLEET MARSTON	1700 L	no glebe	
FOSCOTT (Foxcote)	1625 L	O.F.	1 Barrell, 2 Cater, 3 Manslade; and commons for a yardland
	1639	closes	some meadow "exchanged each year" and 1 acre in (Maid's) Morton Upper F
FULMER	1639 B	closes	
GAWCOTT	1818 L	closes	

GAYHURST	1639 B	O.F.	1 Debdale, 2 Mill, 3 Hoo
GRENDON UNDERWOOD	1601 L	O.F.	1 Mill, 2 Hough, 3 Wood ("ridges")
	1607 B	O.F.	1 Mill, 2 West, 3 Wood
GROVE	1607 B	O.F.	1 Middle, 2 F next Mentmore, 3 Birborowe
	1703 B	closes	
HADDENHAM	1607 B	illegible	
	1674 B	close	
	1703 B	closes	but tithes of 1 Cotswell, 2 Windmill Hill, 3 Downhill
	1707 L		tithes of "ye oppen feildes"
HAMBLEDEN	1680 B	closes	
	1726 L	closes	is a map by Wm. Brasier land surveyor
HAMPDEN, LITTLE	1605 L	closes	
HAMPDEN, GREAT	1601 L	closes	
HANSLOPE	1706 B	no glebe	
HARDMEAD	1680 L	closes	
HARDWICKE	1577 L	O.F.	1 W, 2 E
	1601/7 B	O.F.	"in Hardwicke field"
	1639 B		1 W, 2 E
	1678 B		1 Weedon, 2 E
	1707 L		1a W in Weedon, 1b W in Hardwicke, 2a W in Weedon, 2b E in Hardwicke
			furlong names only
HARTWELL	1639 B	O.F.	1 W, 2 Little, 3 Longfurlong, 4 Wade
	1674 B		furlong names only
HAVERSHAM	167--B	O.F.	1 Brook, 2 Middle, 3 Wood
	17--L		see also Marsworth <i>infra</i>
HAWRIDGE	1639 B	closes	
HEDGERLEY	1601 L	close	
HEDSOR	1639 B	close	
HITCHAM	1601 L	O.F.	1 Hicham, 2 Warren, 3 Westtown F below London hyeway
			recently enclosed (see p. 11 <i>supra</i> )
HOGGESTON	1601 L	close	
HORSENDEN	1629 L	closes	
HORTON	1639 B	O.F.	1 High, 2 Colbrook
	1697 B		adds 3 Lois
HORWOOD, GREAT	1577 L	O.F.	1 W, 2 S, 3 E
	1677 B		2 is "Middle or south F towards Winslow," 3 is "E adjoining to Little Horwood"
HUGHENDON alias Hitchendon	1601 L	close	
HULCOTT	1577 L	O.F.	no F names
	1639 B		1 Fenne, 2 Middle, 3 Hoods
ICKFORD	1639 B	O.F.	1625 L is almost illegible but is O.F.
	1694 B	closes	
ILMER	1601 L	O.F.	no names
	1625 L	O.F.	no names
	1706 B	closes	
ISTMANSTEAD CHEYNES			
see Chenies <i>supra</i>			
IVER	1607 B	closes	
IVINGHOE	1607 B	closes	
KIMBLE, GREAT	1625 L	closes	recently enclosed (see p. 10 <i>supra</i> )
KIMBLE, LITTLE	1607 B	meadow only	

KINGSEY	1601 L	O.F.	1 Stonebridge, 2 W, 3 illegible, 4 Fielde under Aston
	n.d. B (1666/87)	closes	"newly enclosed" (n.d. 17-- B puts ex- change at 1673)
LACEY GREEN	1826 B	close	
LATHBURY	1674 B	O.F.	(part of a F "lately inclosed," but all Fs have not been enclosed)
	1709 L	O.F.	
LAVENDON	1607 B	O.F.	1 Mill, 2 Causley, 3 Tenocke
	16-- B		1 Nether, 2 Causelry, 3 Tinnock
LECKHAMSTEAD	1601 L	O.F.	"al the three fieldes" but some enclo- sure recently. (See p. 10 <i>supra</i> )
	1625 L	O.F.	no F names
	1690 B	closes	
	1707 L	closes	"48 yardlands decreed in Chancery at one pound ten shillings ye yard lande"
LEE	1700 L	no glebe	
LILLINGSTONE DAYRELL	1601 L	no glebe	see p. 7 <i>supra</i> for enclosure a century earlier
LINFORD, GREAT	c. 1580 L	O.F.	1 W, 2 Middle, 3 N
	1607 B		1 Wood, 2 Middle, 3 F next Newport
	1639 B		3 is Newportside F
	1674 B	closes	
	1707 L	closes	"inclosure by a Decree in Chancery immediately after the restauration of King Charles the Second"
LINFORD, LITTLE	1674 B	no glebe	
LINSLADE	1703 B	no glebe	
LOUGHTON	1601 L	O.F.	1 More, 2 Seckloe, 3 Priors Marsh
	1639 B	O.F.	1 Moore, 2 Secklow, 3 Priors Marsh
LUDGERSHALL	1625 L	O.F.	1 Tetchwickside, 2 Mill
	1674 B		adds 3 Middle
MAIDS MORETON	1601 L	O.F.	1 Holloway, 2 Radwell (dfct)
	1607 B		1 Holloweway, 2 Chatwell, 3 Lower, 4 Upper (and meadow—'as it is allotted by the Medow book')
	1691 B		4 becomes Weelmore
MARLOW, GREAT	1601 B	house only	
MARLOW, LITTLE	1601 L	O.F.	1 Church, 2 W
MARSH GIBBON	n.d. B	O.F.	
	1674 B		furlong names only
	1701 L		1 Low, 2 Upper, 3 Middle
MARSWORTH	1639 B	O.F.	1 Church, 2 Long, 3 North
	1680 B		3 is Lower
	1707 L		2 is E. (Hawridge terrier)
MARSTON, NORTH	1745 L	impropriate	
MEDMENHAM	1605 B	?	'In great west ffield an half acre'
MENTMORE	1625 L	close	
MILTON KEYNES	1625 L	O.F.	1 N, 2 Town, 3 Kingsbridge
	1693 B	closes	(enclosed c. 1625 see p. 11 <i>supra</i> )
	1707 L	closes	
MISSENDEN, GREAT	1680 L	no glebe	

MISSENDEN, LITTLE	1601 L	?	'pieces' one of which lies in 'Barne furlong'
	1625 L	closes	
	1639 B	closes	
MOULSOE	1577 L	O.F.	1 Younge Wood, 2 Cleyhill, 3 Parke
	1625 L		1 is Wood
MURSLEY	1601 L	?	'seven smale lands and a yerde'
	1625 B	O.F.	no names
	1680 B		1 Southlowe, 2 Wood
NETTLEDEN	1756 B	no glebe	
NEWPORT PAGNELL	1634 L	meadow and close	(but open field in Chicheley—eleventh and twelfth ridge; in Middle F of Tickford; and in F of Caldicutt in Newport)
NEWTON BLOSSOMVILLE	1605 B	O.F.	1 Belland brook, 2 Coster, 3 Mere
	1607 B		1 Bellaine, 2 Clifton Rhynell, 3 Meade
	1680 B		2 is Rynell
	1786 B		1 Belland, 2 Costo, 3 Mead
NEWTON LONGVILLE	1601 L	O.F.	1 N, 2 Wood, 3 S
	1693 B		has 1 Wood, 2 F next to Bletchley, 3 Draiton F
OAKLEY	1625 L	closes	enclosed 1612 (see p. 11 <i>supra</i> )
OLNEY	c. 1660 L	house	
OVIING	1601 L	O.F.	1 E, 2 W, 3 S
	1674 B	O.F.	(yards or ridges)
PADBURY	1607 B	meadow	
PENN	1625 L	O.F.	"commonfield called Horsemorfield"
	1634 B		1 Horsemoor, 2 West
PICHELSTHORN =Pitstone	1625 L	no glebe	"about 40 or 50 yeres past their was . . . three parcellis of earable land lying severly in the comen felde"
PITCHCOTT	1625 L	O.F.	1 Nether, 2 Middle, 3 Hill
	1635 B	O.F.	
	1680 B	closes	
PRESTON BISSETT	1601 L	O.F.	1 Far towards Twiford, 2 F next to Chitwood, 3 F next Preston, 4 Farr
	1625 L		3 is F next Hilseden
	1639 B		1 Far, 2 East, 3 West
QUAINTON	1625 L	O.F.	1 Blackegrove, 2 Hill, 3 Larch
	1706 B		has only 1
RADCLIVE	1625 L	O.F.	1 W, 2 Bawland, 3 Colewell, 4 Haseley, 5 Stow
	1639 B		3 is Goldwell
	1674 B		'1 yardland in Checkmore F' only
	1601 L	close	
RADNAGE	1680 L	orchard	
RAVENSTONE	1715 B	O.F.	1 W, 2 Whitcliefe, 3 Ham, 4 Church, 5 Windmill, 6 Brokenhill
RISBOROUGH, MONKS			
RISBOROUGH, PRINCES	1639 B	no glebe	
SAUNDERTON	1639 B	O.F.	1 Deavon, 2 Foxhill, 3 Crookash, 4 East, 5 Court
	1693 B		1 E, 2 N, 3 Crookash
	1680 B	close	
SHABBINGTON	1625 L	O.F.	furlong names only ('ridges')
SHALSTONE	1680 B		1 W, 2 E

SHENLEY (MANSELL)	1625 L	O.F.	1 Churchend, 2 Brookend, 3 Middle, 4 Nether
	1669 B		1 Moor, 2 Middle, 3 Great (seems closes)
	n.d. B		1 Lower, 2 Middle, 3 Caster
	1700 L		Brookend Fields open; Churchend Fields enclosed
	1716 L		62 acres enclosed in Churchend F; 11 acres 'plowd ground in 'ye Brook End'
SHERINGTON	1625 L	O.F.	'the 3 fleylds' not named
	1700 L		1 Winmill, 2 Littel, 3 Drapwell
SLAPTON	1601 L	O.F.	1 S, 2 W, 3 N
SOULBURY	1674 B	no glebe	
STANTONBURY	1680 B	missing	
STEWKLEY	1639 B	O.F.	1 E, 2 Foxhill, 3 Feldon, 4 Northendmill
	1680 B		3 is Folding, 4a Northendmill, 4b Southendmill
STOKE GOLDINGTON	1607 B	O.F.	1 N, 2 Middle, 3 Mill, 4 S
	? 1625 L		1 N or Hodgmore, 2 East, 3 S or Haxby
STOKE HAMMOND	1625 L	O.F.	1 N, 2 W, 3 S
STOKE MANDEVILLE	1617 L (D/C)	no glebe	
STOKE POGES	1607 B	O.F.	1 Lee, 2 Sawcroft
	1625 L		2 is Southcroft
STONE	1625 L	O.F.	no F names
	1674 B		1 Burronhill, 2 Roverswell
	1706 B		1 Eathorp, 2 Roverswell
STONY STRATFORD	1700 L	house only	
STOWE	1607 B	orchard	
SWANBOURNE	1601 L	O.F.	1 N, 2 W, 3 S
	1607 B		3 is 'south F of tillage'
	n.d. B		1 Hey, 2 Fen, 3 Borne
SIMPSON	1577 L	O.F.	1 N, 2 Middle, 3 S
TAPLOW	1601 L	O.F.	furlong names only
	1639 B		furlong names only
	1680 B		land 'lying in the common feildes of Taplow'
	1703 B		1 Buffin, 2 Upper, 3 Middle, 4 Thames
	1706 B		1 is "above the town" 3 is "below the road"
THORNBOROUGH	1639 B	O.F.	1 Pilch, 2 Egborowe, 3 Mill
	1674 B		'ten ridges of arable land'
THORNTON	1625 L	close	
TINGEWICK	1577 L	O.F.	only furlong names
	1601 L		1 E, 2 N, 3 W
TURVILLE	1601 L	closes	
TURWESTON	1625 L	O.F.	1 N, 2 Middle, 3 S
	1634 B		1 N, 2 Middle, 3 Far
	1639 B		3 is Farmost
			In 1639 L 1 contains 20 acres and is 62 ridges; 2 has 28 acres and is 54 ridges; 3 has 16 acres and 32 ridges

TYRINGHAM see Filgrave



UPTON	1607 B	O.F.	1 Stonebridge, 2 Upton East, 3 Upton West (1706 describes all the lands as in Plow F, which I think is merely 'ploughed' = arable)
WADDESDON	1625 L 1625 L 1706 L	O.F.	1 Staple, 2 Brachfeild, 3 Grassburn adds 4 Warwmstone and 4 is Gosburn adds 5 Farhill. There were three portions of the Rectory here
WALTON	1625 L 1639 B n.d. B (1660/85) 1680 L 1700 L	O.F.	1 Little, 2 Willow, 3 Slade 1 is Portway is open field is open field enclosed
WALTON (Aylesbury)	n.d. B	O.F.	this appears to be a lay terrier of lands of Mr. Giles Burrows. 1 Dean, 2 Bedgrove, 3 Fryer Pitts
WATER STRATFORD	1601 L 1639 B 1680 B	O.F. O.F. closes	1 E, 2 W, 3 Middle  'in lieu of tythes 15 li. yerely paid by Mr. Edgerley according to a decree made in The High court of Chancery'
WAVENDON	? 1625 L  1639 B  1674 B	O.F.	1 E, 2 Wood, 3 'The same F beyond the brooke,' 4 illegible 1 Portway, 2 Ortenden alias Broadmead 2 is 'Ottenden alias . . .', 4 is Wood and 5 The Same beyond the Brook
WENDOVER	1607 B 1639 B 1676 B	O.F.	1 Malme, 2 Nortend of Heath F, 3 S adds 4 Clay adds 5 Hartly
WESTBURY	1601 L 1680 B 1706 B	O.F.	no F names '1 yardland of 20 acres' 1 Huntmill, 2 Middle, 3 F next Turweston
WESTON TURVILLE	1625 L 1639 L 1675 B	O.F.	1 Causeway, 2 Middle, 3 Nether, 4 S adds 5 Bedgrow 1 is 'Bedgrove F inclosed.' Fields 2, 3, 4 and 5 are open
WESTON UNDERWOOD	1674 B		no glebe
WEXHAM	1601 L	closes	recent enclosures? 'as the same are nowe divided lying together'
WHADDON	? 1601 L 1607 B 1625 L	O.F.	1 Oldland, 2 Middle, 3 Oatehill illegible 1 March, 2 Middle, 3 Stonebridge
WHITCHURCH	1601 L	close	
WILLEN	n.d. B (1608/48) 1680 B	O.F.  closes	1 S, 2 Middle, 3 N  orchard
WINCHENDEN, OVER	1607 B	orchard	
WINCHENDEN, NETHER	1700 L	close	
WING	1607 B 1639 B 1674 B 1680 B	O.F. O.F. closes ? closes ?	1 Arbor, 2 Prior, 3 illegible illegible for names  but 'land in Crafton F'

WINGRAVE	1607 B	O.F.	1 E, 2 S, 3 N
	1625 L		1 E and 3 N only
WOLVERTON	1625 L	no glebe	
WOORBURN (BISHOPS)	1601 L	O.F.	no F names
(on Thames)	1639 B	O.F.	faded
	1674 B	O.F.	1 S, 2 W, 3 Beanland Common F
	1703 B	O.F.	
	1712 B	? closes	
WOOLSTONE, GREAT	1607 B	no glebe	
WOOLSTONE, LITTLE	1608 L	O.F.	1 Upper, 2 Middle, 3 Nether
WORMINGHALL	1601 L	closes	
(WORNALL)			
WOUGHTON ON THE	1629 L	O.F.	1 N, 2 Middle, 3 S
GREEN			
WRAYSBURY	1639 B	O.F.	1 Old
	1674 B		1 Old, 2 Cambos
WYCOMBE, HIGH	1634 L	close	
WYCOMBE, WEST	1601 L	close	'half an acre'

#### APPENDIX 1

Transcript of part of a Glebe Terrier  
(MAIDS MORETON, 1707 (B)) (Plate I, p. 290, *supra*)

A SCHEDULE or terrar of the glebe land of the Rectory of Maidesmorton in the County of Bucks now in the possession of Matthew Bate Rector there as followeth

IMPRIMIS IN HOLLOWAY FEILD eight acres and a roode by  
estimacon (vizt) Be it more or less.

- Two lands lying together in Short fflexland furlong the land of William Scott on the South and the land of George Grissell on the North.
- One land lying in the same furlong the land of the said George Grissell on the South and William Barrett on the North.
- One land lying in long fflexland ffurlong the land of the said William Barrett on the South and George Grissell on the North.
- One land throughout two furlongs and a hadland lying att fflexland gaules the land of the said George Grissell on the North side thereof.
- One shooting Southward into Holloway and Northward to Church hadland.
- One land lying upon Holloway Hill the land of the said Thomas Scott on the North side thereof and George Grissell on the South.
- One land shooting into Bourton hedge the land of the said George Grissell lying on both sides thereof.
- One land lying att Lyme the land of the said George Grissell on the South and John Attwood sen on the North.
- One land lying on Page Hill the land of the said George Grissell on the South and Edward Bynion gent on the North.
- Two Yeards lying together att fullpitt gaules the land of the said George Grissell on the East and Edward Pomphrett on the west.
- One land and two yeards lying together in Causeway furlong the lands of John Phillpott on the East and William Barrett on the west.
- One land lying att Podsland and shooting against Burrows his Close.
- One roode shooting on both sides of Dirty way.
- Two roods of greenswerd lying together att Waggintree Leyes the land of George Grissell on the East and Robert Phillpott on the west.

(Bodl. MSS. Oxf. Arch. Pap. Bucks., c. 248)

## APPENDIX 2

A first list of pre-Parliamentary enclosures of open field in BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

Addington	1707	<i>Tate</i> , p. 40. <i>V.C.H.</i> has 1710.
Aston Mullins	c. 1504	<i>Leadam</i> , 208.
Aston Sandford	after 1707	No Act in <i>Tate</i> .
Beachampton	1579	<i>V.C.H.</i> , after <i>Willis</i> , 144.
Evershaw in Biddlesden		At its depopulation, early 1500s. <i>V.C.H. PRO</i> : ECP 11/395. Probably also Gorrell, <i>V.C.H.</i> and <i>Willis</i> .
Boarstall	before 1639	Glebe terrier. <i>V.C.H.</i> , iv, 9 has plan of the vill in 1944. H. L. Gray refers to 3 open fields here, 1449. See <i>Boarstall Cartulary</i> ed. H. E. Salter.
Boveney	n.d.	
Bragenham	1504 and 1514	<i>Leadam</i> , 170.
Brill	16th century?	<i>V.C.H.</i> No Act in <i>Tate</i> .
Broughton in Mentmore	1511	<i>Leadam</i> , 212. Now depopulated.
Broughton	1748	Glebe terrier. No Act in <i>Tate</i> .
Buckingham	n.d.	Bourton hamlet in 1518: <i>Leadam</i> , 199.
Burcott in Wing	1512	<i>Leadam</i> , 173.
Burnham	n.d.	An 18th century glebe terrier has "common fields." These may be the woodland commons which are still open, but it is unlikely. <i>Tate</i> quotes a Report of 1790 as placing 800 acres of open field here.
Burston in Aston Abotts	1488	At its depopulation "Totaliter et integre in pasturam ovium modo utitur," <i>Leadam</i> , 162. First-rate pasture land according to Leland.
Chalfont St. Giles	n.d.	
Chenies	n.d.	
Chesham	n.d.	Hyde Heath, 1807. <i>Tate</i> , 40.
Chetwode	c. 1480?	<i>V.C.H.</i> Some non-open field commons in 1812. <i>Tate</i> , 37. <i>Leadam</i> , 201.
Chichelley	between 1635/93	Glebe terriers.
Chilton	n.d.	
Cholesbury	n.d.	
Claydon, East	after 1639	Glebe terriers.
Claydon, Middle	c. 1657	Glebe terriers.
Cranwell in Waddesdon	1495	<i>Leadam</i> , 174.
Creslow	between 1486 and 1554	<i>V.C.H.</i> , iii, 365. It is not in <i>Leadam</i> , which argues for a date after 1518 or before 1485. It does not appear to be in 1563 list.
Cuddington	after 1707	Glebe terrier. No Act in <i>Tate</i> .
Denham	c. 1514	<i>Leadam</i> , 187.
Doddershall	1494	<i>Leadam</i> , 162.
Dorney	n.d.	Open 1707 glebe terrier; 1794, <i>Tate</i> , 24, but no Act.
Dorton	n.d.	
Drayton Beauchamp	1658	Glebe terrier.
Edgcott	after 1794?	Open in 1794? <i>Tate</i> , 16. Open 1709, glebe terrier.

Eton	after 1794?	<i>Tate</i> , 24, 26, 27.
Eythorpe	at depopulation	Vill here 13th century, vide Gray.
Fawley	n.d.	
Filgrave	after 1706	Glebe terrier.
Fingest	n.d.	Common land enclosed for Park 1330/ 43, <i>V.C.H.</i> , iii, 43.
Finmere Warren and Northend		By agreement, 1760/73 and 1771/84. <i>Tate</i> , 40.
Fleet Marston	c. 1510-1551	<i>Leadam</i> , 171: at its depopulation. 1551 from 1566 Inquiry.
Foxcote	after 1625	Glebe terrier: no Act in <i>Tate</i> .
Fulmer	1625?	Glebe terrier.
Gayhurst	1515	<i>Leadam</i> , 195.
Grove	1607/1703	Glebe terrier. No Act in <i>Tate</i> .
Hambleden	before 1680	Terrier. Terrier, 1726 L, is a map of closes. But 1790 says open, <i>Tate</i> , 2511.
Hampden, Great	n.d.	
Hampden, Little	n.d.	
Hardmead	n.d.	
Hawridge	n.d.	
Hedgerley	n.d.	
Hedsor	n.d.	
Hillesden	some 1493	<i>Leadam</i> , 203,
Hoggeston	before 1601	Glebe terrier, 1601 L. "Never . . by Act," Gilbert Slater.
Hogshaw with Fulbrook	1487	At depopulation, <i>Leadam</i> , 192, 490/1.
Horsenden	n.d.	
Horwood, Great	n.d.	1842 Act is not for open-field. <i>Tate</i> , 38.
Ickford	between 1634/1694	Terriers.
Ilner	between 1625 and 1706	No Act in <i>Tate</i> .
Kingsey	1662	Glebe terrier.
Langley Marish	n.d.	Commons not open field by Act 1809.
Lathbury	after 1709?	Terrier. No Act.
Leckhamstead	c. 1690	Terriers.
Lee	n.d.	
Lenborough	1500	<i>Leadam</i> , 205.
Lillingstone Dayrell	1445 1490 says <i>Leadam</i> , 198	1625 Glebe terrier, "tota villa de lul- lyngton darell . . totaliter devastata."
Linford, Great	1649/60	Glebe terrier.
Linford, Little	n.d.	
Linslade	n.d.	
Liscombe in Soulbury	1505	<i>Leadam</i> , 169.
Littlecote, nr. Dunton	1494, 1498, 1507	<i>Leadam</i> , 164-6.
Medmenham	n.d.	
Milton Keynes	n.d.	
Missenden, Great	n.d.	1855 Act is commons only. <i>Tate</i> , 39.
Missenden, Little	n.d.	
Okeney	15th century?	<i>V.C.H.</i> , i, 318. But not in PN.
Olney Hyde	14th or 15th C	<i>V.C.H.</i> and refs.
Oving	after 1680	Terriers.
Petsoe	late 15th or early 16th century	<i>V.C.H.</i> , i, 318. 1561: "nec ecclesia nec populus."
Pitchcott	1674-80	Terriers.

Quainton	after 1700	Terriers, no Act.
Quarrendon		At its depopulation, <i>V.C.H.</i>
Radnage		1858 Act has no open fields.
Ravenstone	1496 and 1506	<i>Leadam</i> , 176.
Shabbington	n.d.	
Shipton Lee in Quainton	1504	<i>Leadam</i> , 199.
Stantonbury	early 16th C	At its depopulation by Nicholas Vaux, <i>V.C.H.</i>
Stow and Lamport	after 1710	In 1710 32 houses and 180 population.
Tattenhoe	by 1586	<i>V.C.H.</i> , iii, 342.
Thornton	n.d.	
Turville	n.d.	
Tyringham	c. 1560	
Walton	between	Terriers.
	1680/1700	
Water Stratford	1639/80	Terriers.
Weston Underwood	n.d.	
Willen	1510	<i>Leadam</i> , 177.
Winchendon, Upper	1513	<i>Leadam</i> , 175. There is a pardon of 1554 to John Goodwyn for depopulations in the parish ( <i>Cal. Pat. Ph. and Mary</i> , i, 103).
Winchendon, Lower	n.d.	
Wolverton	1654	<i>V.C.H.</i> , quoting Exch. Dep. 5 Geo. 1. Mich, 7.
Worminghall	n.d.	Thomley (Oxon.) in this parish appears to have been depopulated.
Wycombe, High	n.d.	Act of 1865 is commons only. Crenodon seems to have been enclosed and depopulated. <i>V.C.H.</i> , iii, 113.
Wycombe, West	n.d.	

### APPENDIX 3

#### THE DESERTED VILLAGES OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE

The summary list which follows is the product of a search for the lost villages of the county which has been carried out as part of an investigation of the lost villages of the country as a whole. In such an inquiry it was not possible to make all those local enquiries which I would have liked nor to examine the local archives and private collections of documents without which the dating of depopulation must be within very broad limits. I have briefly set out the sources which I have employed in the hope that this may assist local enquirers to begin where I left off and to be saved repeating my searches in the records of the central government at the Public Record Office.

For the names of medieval villages I have used the printed Domesday Book (1086) and the *Nomina Villarum* (1316). For manorial and family histories I have used Lipscomb's county *History* and the *Victoria County History* which was luckily a little more aware of lost sites than it has been in certain other counties. Also in print are the findings of the Inquiry of 1517 with its evidence of such large-scale evictions as Burston, Fleet Marston, Lillingston Darrell and Littlecote. These have been supplemented by the pleadings of the depopulators summoned before the Exchequer to answer for the penalties under the Acts of 1489 and 1515 and the record of the hearings of cases resurrected after the Act of 1536 had given wider powers to the Crown. The unpublished returns from the Inquiry of 1565 and the Inquiry of 1607 have also been read. Other Buckinghamshire prosecutions have been



noticed. The published *Lay Subsidy* of 1524 is also relevant, in addition to the unpublished Lay Subsidy (village tax) assessments of 1327, 1332 and 1334.

While these sources give as full detail for the sheep depopulations as any other county affords, it is necessary to examine the tax returns of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to see what other now-lost villages were flourishing, and how their tax assessments compared with their more fortunate neighbours. Neither the surveys of the inquisitions post mortem nor the surviving manorial records have been thoroughly searched, and these would certainly yield other evidence for the size of the abandoned villages and perhaps a more precise dating of their depopulation. A summary of the information from the tax assessments is set out below, together with comparable data from adjoining counties.

Field-work is indispensable in locating the deserted sites and assessing the character, situation and size of the former settlement. I have been able to visit the majority of the sites in the county either in person or through the medium of the air photographs in the R.A.F. collection where I have examined all the Buckinghamshire photographs which were available up to the end of 1951. Since then I have been able to see some of the sites in the photographs specially taken by Dr. J. K. St. Joseph, Curator in Air Photography in the University of Cambridge. It is hoped to publish a list of these sites in the Cambridge collection in our forthcoming volume in the *Cambridge Air Surveys*.

I have profited from information and assistance in local enquiries by Dr. A. Morley Davies, Mr. E. Clive Rouse, Mr. E. J. Davis and Dr. W. R. Mead. From them I have gathered the impression that Buckinghamshire is tolerant and kind to local historians who come from beyond its bounds for short visits and then disappear northwards.

#### SUMMARY LIST OF DESERTED VILLAGES

with Ordnance Survey National Grid References. Villages in *italics* appear in the village tax lists of 1327, 1332 and 1334.

* <i>Aston Mulins or Bernard</i>	769083	Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2436/4038. (R.A.F.)
<i>Bourton</i>	710334	
* <i>Burston</i>	842188	
<i>Cottesloe</i>	860230	
<i>Creslow</i>	812218	
* <i>Denham</i>	758205	Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2483/3261
* <i>Doddershall</i>	721202	Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2483/3269
* <i>Evershaw</i>	636384	
* <i>Marston, Fleet</i>	779159	Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2436/3111. 15 families in 1332
<i>Grove</i>	918225	
* <i>Hogshaw with Fulbrook</i>	739228	20 families in 1327
<i>Lenborough</i>	705300	
* <i>Lidcote (Littlecote)</i>	834244	A village of husbandmen in 1323 (P.R.O. E142/32)
* <i>Lillingstone Dayrell</i>	706398	
* <i>Liscombe</i>	885256	
* <i>Okeney (Ekeney)</i>	920490	By 1459
<i>Olney Hyde</i>	874536	
* <i>Petsoe</i>	919494	15th century
* <i>Quarrendon</i>	800155	Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2540/5098; 2483/3145-6
* <i>Shipton Lee</i>	728213	Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2483/3268
* <i>Stantonbury</i>	835428	
<i>Stowe</i>	678374	After 1710
* <i>Tattenhoe</i>	829339	

<i>Tetchwick</i>	679187	
<i>Tyringham</i>	859467	c. 1560
<i>Waldridge</i>	783073	
* <i>Winchendon, Upper</i>	746145	By 1554. Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2436/4038
<i>Wotton Underwood</i>	868159	Later 17th century. See <i>Geog. Journal</i> , cxvii (1951), pp. 142-3, and <i>Henry Hunt. Lib. Quar.</i> , iii (1939), pp. 43-6.

Other suspect sites, including small hamlets and migrations

<i>Ackhampstead</i>	805908	
<i>Addingrove</i>	665113	
* <i>Ascott</i>	900230	
<i>Averingdown (Hearnton)</i>	827950	<i>P. N. Bucks.</i> , p. 206
* <i>Broughton</i>	900200?	Air: C.P.E. U.K. 2139/3335
<i>Beachendon</i>	759137	
<i>Caldecote (a)</i>	840130	
<i>Caldecote (b)</i>	872421	
<i>Chetwode</i>	640297	
<i>Cublington</i>	843223	Migration, 14th century
* <i>Eythorpe</i>	770140	
<i>Foxcote</i>	717358	
<i>Helsthorpe</i>	887193?	<i>P. N. Bucks.</i> , p. 88
<i>Stoke Mandeville</i>	837095	

<sup>1</sup> Translated in *V.C.H. Bucks.*

<sup>2</sup> Printed in *Feudal Aids* (six vols., 1891-1920).

<sup>3</sup> These sources are described in f.n. p. 13 *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> 1327: P.R.O. E179/242 and 363; 1332: E179/242, 362 and 77; 1334: E179/77/3; 1524, *Bucks. Record Soc.*