

WHO WAS WHO AND WHO BECAME WHOM: BUCKINGHAMSHIRE LANDOWNERS 1066 AND 1086

K.A. BAILEY

This paper examines the evidence in the Domesday Book as to the nature of land ownership in Buckinghamshire in 1066 and how this had changed by 1086, after the greatest upheaval England had seen for half a millennium, and which has probably never been repeated on such a scale. Domesday Book provides the only county-wide view of Anglo-Saxon ownership, albeit at the very end of several centuries of change and development. Equally, it shows just how complete was the dispossession of Saxon landowners (other than the various churchmen) and their replacement by a variety of Norman and Flemish tenants-in-chief, beneficiaries of the Conquest.

I

The defeat of Harold II at Hastings in October 1066 set in train the greatest change in land ownership that England had seen since the end of the Roman Empire and the subsequent struggle between Britons and Anglo-Saxons for control of the country and its resources. Such was the scale of the post-Conquest upheaval that it has never been matched subsequently. In Buckinghamshire, scarcely one-tenth of the land was held by the same individual or institution when Domesday Book was compiled only twenty years later. If land held by the king and by the church is excluded, the degree of continuity was a mere one percent. About another 2% was held by tenants in 1086 who had been full owners in 1066. The dispossession was therefore all but total in this county, not even the smallest landowners remaining in control in most cases.

Buckinghamshire is a representative, average-sized English county. In 1086 its 476,000 acres were assessed at 2,122½ hides and 6 acres. The list of tenants-in-chief prefacing the county Domesday entries comprises fifty-eight entries, seven of them ecclesiastical. The last item, *Taini regis et elemosinarii*, 'the king's thegns and almsmen', however, subsumes thirteen individuals, most of them English, who represent virtually all the survivors of the tenurial revolution. The average holding was about 31 hides, although there was an extremely wide range, from Walter Giffard, the county sheriff, with about 305 hides, to William son of Constantine, with one virgate and six acres at

Southcote and Godwin the priest with one virgate at Wavendon.

In 1066, on the eve of the Norman Conquest, land ownership had been much more diffuse. The plethora of identical, often unqualified, names among the last Anglo-Saxon owners makes it difficult to be exact, but there were at least 230 named individuals, together with 200 more who were anonymous in Domesday Book. Of these, 114 were described as 'X's man'. This meant that they were commended to a lord in some way, not necessarily his sub-tenants ubiquitous by 1086, when the hierarchy of lordship and service had become much more rigid. Many would have been freeholders, albeit with 'estates' barely sufficient to support the owner and his family.

The highly fragmented ownership in 1066 reflects *inter alia* centuries of partible inheritance, together with two hundred years of ebb and flow between Anglo-Saxons and Danes. It seems that only the church and the crown were more or less immune to such changes, although not entirely so. Scores of holdings recorded in Domesday Book contained less than twenty acres, offering at best a precarious living for their 'lords'. It is surprising how many survived as separate entities in 1086. The lack of consolidation or exchange between the incoming tenants-in-chief, probably reflects the short time since Hastings. The effect of recording the *status quo* in Domesday Book tended to fossilise this fragmented pattern, which persisted throughout the medieval period and beyond.

Indeed, inheritance and other accidents of history meant that fragmentation affected many of the larger estates of 1086, creating a rash of new 'manors' and pseudo-manors.

Unfortunately, Buckinghamshire has scarcely two dozen surviving pre-Conquest charters or other documents touching on land ownership, not all of them fully authentic.¹ Some estates appear several times, but the vast majority are passed over in silence. Also, there are very few references in Domesday Book which enable us to penetrate back beyond 1066, although it is likely that in many ways the land market was as fluid then as it was to become in the later medieval period. Our sources are silent about the existence of a peasant land market in the eleventh century, but that does not mean that there was none.

Of the 393 Buckinghamshire estates listed in 1086, only twenty-five were held by the same person or institution as in 1066 (6.4% of the total), with a total assessment of 221.6 hides (10.4%). Seven were held by the church and six by the king, leaving only a dozen estates whose owners had miraculously escaped the various dispossessions carried out by William I. Their total assessment was only 22.4 hides, scarcely 1% of the county total, giving an average of less than two hides for the 'lucky' survivors. In many cases it is likely that they retained their holdings as much by luck as by judgement. They are summarised below.

TABLE 1 Anglo-Saxon Owners in 1066 and 1086.

Name	Estate	Hides
Godwin the priest	Wavendon 5	0.25
Ketel	Lavendon 10	0.5
Leofwin	Wanden	0.5
Leofwin of Nuneham	Salden 2	2.87
	Mursley 3	4
	Maids Moreton 3	5
	Beachampton 3	4
Leofwin Cave	Wavendon 6	1
Leofwin Wavre	Simpson 2	1.25
Reinbald	Boveney 1	1
A Cripple	Evershaw	1
Three Men	Wendover 2	1

NB:— Numbers after the estate name in this and subsequent tables and text indicate components given the same name in DB.

The only real success among the survivors was Leofwin of Nuneham, who held four estates

totalling 15.9 hides. He had, however, failed to keep his 2¼ hide estate at Drayton Parslow, which had passed to Nigel de Berville through the intervention of the Bishop of Coutances.² Leofwin had retained this estate for a while after 1066, with the Norman Ralph Passwater as his sub-tenant, responsible for providing two mail-clad men for guard duty at Windsor. Leofwin also had five burgesses in the borough of Buckingham. His by-name is assumed to derive from Nuneham Courtenay in Oxfordshire.³ The reason for Leofwin's success is unclear, and all these properties passed into Norman hands during the twelfth century.⁴

The remaining English owners in 1086 were all small fry: Godwin the priest with one virgate at Wavendon; Ketel with half a hide at Lavendon; another Leofwin, with half a hide at Wanden (possibly part of Hampden)⁵; Leofwin Cave ['quick, active'], the king's reeve, with one hide at Wavendon and Leofwin Wavre ['restless, wavering'], who held 1½ hides at Simpson. Most of the survivors were to be found in the highly-fragmented vills of north-east Buckinghamshire, where all the remaining pre-Conquest holders had either disappeared altogether, or been downgraded to sub-tenants. Reinbald the priest, who held one hide at Boveney in both 1066 and 1086, was slightly different. He was one of Edward the Confessor's continental priests, who also held the minster church of Cookham across the Thames in Berkshire, and was an important figure at court.⁶ One wonders how the 'bandy-legged man' (Latin *loripes*) had obtained his land at Evershaw in alms from King Edward, and whether he was resident there.⁷ His single hide, which had been taken from the 'boar's wood', had two villeins and two ploughs, suggesting that it may have been worked as two farms in severalty. It was valued at 20/-, rather low for its resources, perhaps indicating that it had been recently brought into cultivation. The three men who managed to hold on to their hide at Wendover had not belonged there in 1066, but had been brought into the king's farm (i.e. tax liability). This suggests that they held assart land in the Chilterns, which Domesday Book catches in the process of being subsumed by Wendover. There was one plough, worked by a bordar or semi-free tenant. The value had fallen from 40/- to 20/- since 1066. The former seems excessive given that no other assets are mentioned; perhaps it reflects a one-off profit from woodland clearance. Elvey

places this land in Kingshill, partly in Missenden and partly in Hughenden.⁸

II

A second group of Anglo-Saxon landowners managed to survive after 1066 as tenants of Norman overlords. As Domesday Book memorably says of Alric at Marsh Gibbon, 'he now holds it [from William (son of Ansculf)] at a revenue, harshly and wretchedly [*graviter et miserabiliter*].'⁹ No doubt Alric was not alone in this respect. There are twenty-four estates in this group (6.1% of the total in 1086), assessed at 37.6 hides (1.8%). They average only 1.6 hides. Clearly no worthwhile estate was left in the hands of its Anglo-Saxon owner across the whole shire, a testament to William's thoroughness. Those who remained as tenants on their original holdings are listed below. Some were of Norse origin, for example Vicking, Morcar and Thorkell.

With the exception of Edeva at Little Linford, doubly unusual in being a woman owning land, all of these survivors were found in subdivided villis,

the great majority in the north of the county. At Beachendon in Waddesdon, the men of Brictric and Azor had lost their independence to the overlordship of the Bishop of Bayeux and Miles Crispin. This failure to consolidate fragmented ownership probably reflects the speed with which the changes were effected after 1066. It was easier to transfer ownership of land and assets on the basis of existing title, in many cases no doubt with now-lost charters or writs.

A third, much rarer, type of Englishmen held no land in the county in 1066, but did so in 1086. The reason for this can only have been a willingness to reach an accommodation with the new regime, to the extent that a reward of land was appropriate. Most obvious of these is Edward 'of Salisbury', who held 26 hides in Aston Clinton, Creslow and an unnamed place in Waddesdon Hundred, which Elvey concludes gelded with Hoggston, but lay in Creslow.¹⁰ All three estates had been held in 1066 by Wulfwen of Creslow, a woman, Edward was the standard-bearer of Henry I at the battle of Breneville

TABLE 2 Anglo-Saxon Owners 1066, Tenants 1086.

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Owner 1066</i>	<i>Tenant 1086</i>
Amersham 4	0.5	Wulfgeat	Wulfgeat
Ashendon 2	2	Vicking	Vicking
Aston Sandford 2?	0.5	Wulfric/Colman	2 men
Beachendon 1	0.25	Brictric's man/Azor's man	2 Englishmen
Beachendon 2	2	Brictric's man/Azor's man	2 men
Broughton 2	1	Morcar	Morcar
Chicheley 1	3	Baldwin	Baldwin
East Claydon 3?	2	2 of Haming's men	2 Englishmen
Cottesloe Hundred	0.5	2 men	2 Englishmen
Emberton 1?	3	Godric/Wulfric	2 thegns
Hardmead 4	1[pt].	2 Baldwin's men	Baldwin
Hardmead 6	1.25	Morcar	Morcar
Hollington 3	1.87	Thorkell	Thorkell
Lamua Hundred	2	Baldwin	Baldwin
Little Linford	4	Edeva	Edeva
Marsh Gibbon 2	4	Alric	Alric
[North] Marston 5	1	Seric	Seric
Little Missenden 2	0.5	Wulfgeat, bishop's brother	Wulfgeat
Shortley 1	1	2 thegns	2 men
Stoke Goldington 1?	1.25	2 thegns	Englishman
Stone Hundred	0.5	Leofwin	Englishman
Swanbourne 2	5[pt].	Aelmer	Aelmer
Upton 2	1.5	Alric	Alric
Wingrave 4	2	Aelmer	Aelmer

in 1100, and was made earl of Salisbury.¹¹ He was clearly a man trusted by the new regime, and it possible that he was of continental, rather than English, origin, despite his name. (It should be remembered that Edward the Confessor spent his exile from 1016 until his accession in 1042 at the Norman court, and his presence may have led to the use of his name.¹²)

The close similarity between many English and continental personal names, as well as the close links existing before 1066, means that one cannot be sure that certain individuals recorded in Domesday Book were in fact Anglo-Saxons. For example, it seems likely that the Thurstan who held 34 hides from various tenants-in-chief was not of English origin. He was perhaps Flemish, or a mercenary from further afield. Of the rest, only Swarting with 6½ hides (two at Bradenham jointly with Harding), Harding by himself (1½ hides) and Godric Cratel (8½ hides at Milton Keynes, previously held by Queen Edith) held land as tenant-in-chief. The others were sub-tenants: Aelmer with 2¾ hides under the count of Mortain, Leowfin with one hide at Beachampton under Roger d'Ivry, and Swarting again with another 4¾ hides under four different overlords.

Swarting had a clutch of small properties at the foot of the Chiltern escarpment: Cheddington 3, half a hide from William fitzAnsculf; Horton 2, three virgates from Gilbert of Ghent; Pitstone 6 (two hides) and Horton 1 (one hide) from Miles Crispin, and Cheddington 7, 2¾ hides in his own right, a total of 6½ hides. Although on record from the early eleventh-century, the name Swarting probably has more of the Norse than Old English about it,¹³ and it seems likely that he was a man-at-arms or knight. Harding also seems likely to fall into the same category. Aelmer may be the same as the Englishman noted as a surviving tenant above – the name is too common to be sure.

Godric Cratel is an obvious anomaly in this group, since he had managed to obtain in his own right the principal estate at Milton Keynes. Again, he seems likely to have been of Norse/Norman origin, since occurrences of the name Godric are concentrated in the mid-eleventh century.¹⁴ His by-name appears to have eluded the various commentators on the Buckinghamshire Domesday. There is no obvious source in Old English, Old Norse, Latin or Norman-French. OE *cræt*, 'cart, waggon', is a possibility, although it is difficult to see its precise significance. Even the king's carter would have

been fortunate to be given an estate of 8.5 hides, although we should not forget that Alric the cook had twenty hides at Steeple Claydon!

III

Of the remaining Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Danish landowners of 1066, no trace remains two decades later. To be on the losing side at Hastings, or to be implicated in one of the subsequent revolts against Norman rule, was sufficient to bring nemesis to the leading families. Many men were of course killed in battle, and the Normans did not have such a high view of the status of women that they permitted the transfer of valuable estates to them. William's army was in large part recruited on the promise of spoils from one of Europe's richest countries. Queen Matilda was less prominent than Queen Edith had been (35 hides in two places, compared with 76 hides in eight). Judith, the widow of Earl Waltheof, held sixteen hides in ten very small estates.

The fact that Harold II was a perjuring usurper in William's eyes, with vast estates which had been assembled by him and other members of the Godwin clan, was a prime factor in the upheaval of ownership after 1066. In Buckinghamshire, for example, Harold, his brothers and other relatives held 215 hides directly, about 10% of the total, and had influence over a further 210 hides. Queen Edith was Harold's sister, and her ownership and influence affected yet another 214 hides. The family, therefore, had some impact on about a third of the county in 1066.

Such large holdings were not, however, typical of Anglo-Saxon Buckinghamshire. Only 92 of those who can be confidently identified held five hides or more in 1066, totalling 1703 hides (80% of the total) in 212 estates. Of these, 34 were five-hide estates or multiples thereof and three were of six hides, representing the duodecimal system typical of the Danelaw.¹⁵ The average size of their holdings was 18½ hides. For the rest, 337 individuals held a total of 419½ hides, an average of only 1.24 hides each, little more than a small farm by today's standards. In contrast tenants-in-chief in 1086 with less than five hides numbered only 25, although the average of 1.46 hides was almost the same as that in 1066. The forty-five tenants-in-chief with more than five hides accounted for 2086 hides (average 46.4 hides), scattered across the county in most cases. The situation may be summarised as follows:

	Holders			Average Hides		
	<5H	>5H	Total	<5H	>5H	Ratio
1066	337	92	429	1.24	18.50	15:1
1086	25	45	70	1.46	46.36	32:1
Change	-92%	-51%	-84%	+17%	+151%	

Although the degree of fragmentation of ownership was still high in 1086, it must be remembered that William I had been plagued by rebellion, not only among the conquered English, but also among his own supporters, and had deliberately employed a policy of preventing individuals amassing over-large blocks of territory from which they might offer further challenges to his authority. Even so, the loss of more than three hundred small landowners and almost fifty larger ones certainly tidied up the tenurial jigsaw of eleventh-century Buckinghamshire. It is likely that many of the pre-Conquest owners of whom there is no trace in 1086 were still farming the same land, their identity subsumed in the ranks of anonymous villeins. We know from the Middlesex Domesday that this group of peasants had widely varying landholdings, and that it was not unusual for the more prosperous to have 120 acres or more. The eight thegns who held just over four hides at Lavendon in 1066, might well be have become the seven villeins of 1086. Their position had been one of status, rather than degree. They were certainly not thegns of the sort who held at least five hides, with a hall and bell-tower, and peasant tenants of their own.¹⁶

IV

What of the victors? Since Duke William's enterprise against Harold had been predicated on rewards in the case of success, and since that could only mean land and the financial benefits which flowed from holding it, it was inevitable that new men would be in control in 1086. One of the key factors underlying the Domesday survey was to establish who held what from the King, and what it was worth to him.¹⁷ The upheavals of the preceding nineteen years were probably seen to have reached an equilibrium at the Christmas council meeting held at Gloucester in 1085, a good time for stock-taking. It was a vast task, not least because all of the data which had been collected on a geographical basis – by shire, hundred and location – was reordered on a tenurial basis so as to render the basic questions more easily answered. A detailed

account of the new landowners, their origins and histories is outside the scope of this paper. They, and their successors, are generally discussed in some detail in the manorial sections of the VCH, and also in studies such as those by Chibnall of various parishes in the north-east of the county. Here we are concerned with the way in which they relate to the last Anglo-Saxon owners.¹⁸

Urban centres were difficult to handle within the Domesday framework – London and Winchester were omitted altogether. Buckingham, the only borough in this county, was presented in the usual position, at the very beginning, followed by the 'index' of tenants-in-chief, graded from the King, through churchmen and the greater/medium laymen, to women, and finally the sad remnant of the English landholding classes [see above]. There were, of course, many links between the borough and rural estates in the north of the county, and there were substantial agricultural resources for the support of the townspeople and the minster church.¹⁹ It seems likely that Aylesbury, and possibly Newport [Pagnell] were at least quasi-urban by 1086, but did not have the formal status of boroughs. Equally, any rural markets and fairs handling exchanges at a lower level are passed over in silence.

The King was not a major landowner in Buckinghamshire. William held 118 hides in seven locations, about 5% of the total. Princes Risborough, Swanbourne 1 and Upton [Slough] had been held by Harold, presumably by grants from king Edward. Women fared much less well under the new regime, even Queen Matilda, who appears fifty-second on the list of tenants-in-chief, had only thirty-five hides – at Marlow 4 and nearby Hambleton – both in the hands of earl Ælfgar in 1066.

When considering the tenants-in-chief, it is necessary to move the Norman bishops of Bayeux (Odo, William's half-brother), Coutances and Lisieux from their position in the list of churchmen between the bishop of Lincoln (removed from Dorchester, Oxon. after 1066) and the abbot of Westminster. The role of these men was identical with that of any layman, and all of their holdings soon passed into lay hands, where they remained in subsequent centuries. Bayeux, with 221 hides, about 10% of the total, on 43 estates and Coutances with 101 hides on 21 holdings (almost as much as the King) were substantial magnates, especially

when their holdings in other counties are taken into account. In contrast, the bishop of Lisieux had only 7.5 hides at Crafton and [Bow] Brickhill, both of them taken from Blacman, a man of Harold's brother Earl Tostig.

Walter Giffard, the county sheriff, was the largest local landowner by far in 1086, with 49 estates totalling 305 hides. Other major players were: Miles Crispin [123 hides]; the count of Mortain [113]; William son of Ansculf [107], and Mainou the Breton [106]. With the two Norman bishops, these five held a total of 1077 hides, almost half of the county total, and almost ten times that held by king William. Things were so arranged, however, that even these great magnates held few contiguous estates. Giffard's estates were scattered across the county from Fawley on the Thames to Lavendon in the far north-east. Miles Crispin had to manage thirty-three properties from Dorney to Stantonbury. It was only much smaller fiefs which might be more concentrated, but then the threat of a challenge to the crown was far less.

Many of the owners in 1086 with five hides or less, were Englishmen who held in 1066 and who have already been discussed in previous sections. Equally, there was a substantial group of newcomers who had been awarded estates barely-sufficient to maintain a couple of families. These were hardly in the front rank of the victors, and there was little to distinguish men like Thurstan Mantle, with his three half-hide holdings in the Chilterns, and Hugh son of Gozhere, with two hides at Dadford, held 'in alms' (cf. his neighbour, 'Loripes' at Evershaw), from the relics of Edward's reign. These individuals did not have lands in other counties, nor were they tenants of greater men elsewhere in Buckinghamshire. If associated with the victory at Hastings, they seem most likely to have been men-at-arms (foot soldiers), rather than knights or barons. Their estates usually had only a single previous owner (*antecessor* in Domesday parlance; see Appendix).

In fact, most of those with twenty hides or less in 1086 had only one or two Anglo-Saxon *antecessores*, with a straightforward transfer of control. For example, Walter of Vernon's three estates totalled a fraction less than ten hides and came from Thorgot (Hartwell 5 [possibly Nether Upton] and (?Fleet) Marston) and Godric (Marlow 3), representing all of their holdings in the county.

William de Warenne had Broughton near Aylesbury, and Caversfield (a detached area near Bicester) from Edward, who is described in the former case as King Edward's thegn, and in the latter as Earl Tostig's man, although it seems most likely that they were one and the same person, who owed allegiance to two separate overlords in 1066.

Jocelyn the Breton, with five *antecessores*, and Countess Judith (the widow of Earl Waltheof, who had been executed for rebellion), with eight, were unusual among the smaller tenants-in-chief for their miscellaneous fiefs. All but one of Judith's estates were in Bunsty Hundred, however, the largest of them only three hides. Several of Jocelyn's were in Cottesloe Hundred, but only Cublington, assessed at ten hides, was a worthwhile property in its own right, although even it had been divided between two owners in 1066. Perhaps such minor beneficiaries had to wait for the crumbs from rich men's tables, even though their rewards might be of little real value and uneconomically fragmented. Jocelyn's holdings were said to be worth £10/15/- p.a., of which Cublington contributed £6. Judith had £10/10/- from her ten estates, of which one third came from three hides at Emberton 2.

V

Given the small size of most pre-Conquest estates in the hands of the laity, and the fact that territorial blocks were deliberately avoided, it is not surprising that the great magnates of the new regime had large numbers of *antecessores*. There must have been a flurry of title documents changing hands in the years after 1066.

We shall use Odo of Bayeux and William son of Ansculf as examples of great magnates who acquired the lands of dozens of previous owners. Odo had 39 *antecessores* on his 43 holdings, along with a further 2 individuals who are subsumed in anonymous groupings. William had 35 *antecessores* and no fewer than 29 anonymous individuals for 31 estates. In each case, as was normal for large tenants-in-chief, Odo and William had substantial numbers of sub-tenants who held most of their estates, mostly in return for military service, thus completing the three-level hierarchy from the King. The obligations of the peasantry in providing labour services and rent, would have been exacted by the sub-tenants, many of whom were resident and well-placed to get the maximum return from their holdings.

TABLE 3 Odo of Bayeux's Estate: Anglo-Saxon Owners & Post-Conquest Sub-Tenants.

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Owner, 1066</i>	<i>Sub-Tenant 1086</i>
Chesham 2	1.5	Earl Leofwin man/Harold man	In Hand
Shalstone 1	5	Godric/Wiglaf thegns	In Hand
Addington 3	3.75	n/a	In Hand
Stone 1	7	2 brothers: Ulf man, Edeva man	Helto
Dinton	15	Avelin King's thegn	Helto
Hartwell 1	3	3 socmen: Stigand/Earl Leofwin/Avelin men	Helto
Waldridge 1	2.25	Avelin man/Aelfeva, Harold sister's man	Helto
Hartwell 2	1	Avelin King's thegn	Robert
Horsenden 2	0.5	Godwin, Earl Leofwin man	Robert
Ilmer	4	Godwin, Earl Leofwin man	Robert
Aston Sandford 1	2	Avelin King's thegn	Robert
N. Marston 1	1	Azor son of Toti man	Robert
Weston Turville	20	Earl Leofwin/Godric sheriff/2 Godric men/ Earl Tostig man/2 Leofwin men	Roger
Bedgrove	2	Swein, Alwin Varus man	Roger
Broughton	1.75	Alwin Varus man/Earl Leofwin man	Roger
Horsenden 1	0.5	Earl Leofwin man	Roger
Chalfont St. P	4.75	Earl Leofwin	Roger
Amersham 1	0.5	Alwin, Queen Edith man	Roger
Chesham 1	0.5	n/a	Roger
Taplow	8.25	Asgot, Harold man	Roger
W. Wycombe 2	0.5	Stigand man	Roger
Saunderton 1	5	Earl Leofwin man	Roger
Whaddon 1	0.75	n/a	Roger
Drayton P'low 1	0.75	2 brothers, Alward Cild men	Roger
Westbury 1	2.5	Alnoth Cild King's thegn	Roger
Dilehurst	10	Earl Leofwin	Lisieux
Lathbury 1	1	Seric, Earl Leofwin man	Lisieux
Gayhurst	5	Seric, Earl Leofwin man	Lisieux
Hughenden	10	Queen Edith	William
Marlow 1	5	Queen Edith	Theodwald
Radnage	3	Fridbert, Earl Leofwin man	Theodwald
Beachendon 1	0.25	Brictric man/Azor man	2 Englishmen
Dunton	10	Earl Leofwin	Thurstan
Foxcote	6	Leith King's thegn	Thurstan
Little Brickhill	1	Alwin, Estan man	Thurstan
Stowe	5	Thorgils, Baldwin man	D'Oilly/Ivry
Leckhampstead 2	18	Earl Leofwin	Gilbert
Lenborough 1	7	Wiglaf, Earl Leofwin man	Arnulf
Barton Hartshorn	10	Wiglaf, Earl Leofwin man	Arnulf
Preston Bisset	15	Wiglaf, Earl Leofwin man	Ansgot
Chetwode	10	Alnoth Kentishman King's thegn	Robt. Thaon
Tingewick	10	Alnoth King's thegn	Ilbert
Addington 1	6	Godwin, Earl Leofwin man	Robert

Odo held only three small estates assessed at 10% hides directly in hand, and it is likely that this was only a temporary measure, pending allocation to sub-tenants. Despite holding 10% of the hides in Buckinghamshire, Odo had no local interest, and would have been concerned solely to maximise his return in the form of knight service and rents/dues of various kinds. On the other hand, many of his sub-tenants would have had to rely solely on these estates for their living, and some are quite substantial fiefs. It should also be noted that some of his sub-tenants were also tenants-in-chief in their own right: the Bishop of Lisieux, Robert D'Oilly and Roger Ivry, who held Stowe jointly. Sometimes, the sub-tenants had compact holdings which would have conferred greater benefits than estates scattered widely across the county. Helto, with land at Dinton, Stone, Hartwell and Waldridge totalling 27% hides, is a good example. He was Odo's steward, and held estates in other counties, of which the principal was at Swanscombe in Kent.²⁰ His lands passed to the Munchesney family. Robert had only 8½ hides in five places, of which Ilmer and Aston Sandford 1 formed the essential core, with six hides. The descent of his lands is obscure, since they were mostly in divided vills and easily absorbed into other holdings. The lack of logic in the transfer from pre- to post-Conquest ownership is clearly evidenced by Helto and Robert. Although all of Avelin the king's thegn's lands assessed at 19 hides passed to Odo, Dinton (15 hides) went to Helto and the rest to Robert (Hartwell 2 and Aston 1). Several of their other acquisitions had been held by Avelin's men, although usually shared with other owners. For example, Hartwell 1 had been in the hands of three sokemen: Archbishop Stigand's, Earl Leofwin's and Avelin's, by implication a single hide apiece.

By far the most important of Odo's sub-tenants was Roger, who held thirteen estates ranging from Weston Turville to Westbury, although most of them lay in and around the Chilterns. They totalled 47% hides, of which 20 were at Weston Turville and 8% at Taplow. These properties passed to the Bolbec family through Roger's great-granddaughter.²¹ Several of the estates had been in the hands of Earl Leofwin or his men, but there is no particular pattern to the transfer from Anglo-Saxon ownership. For example, the estate at Weston Turville had been consolidated from five ownerships to one between 1066 and 1086, while the holding at

Broughton represented the merger of two small entities. The Bishop of Lisieux held sixteen hides from Odo, more than twice his own holdings from the King. Dilehurst, in the Cippenham area of Slough, was a ten-hide manor. Lathbury 1 and Gayhurst both came from Seric, a man of Earl Leofwin, and it is probable that the single hide of Lathbury represents the detached portion of the parish which includes Bunsty Farm, the meeting place of the Hundred.²²

William, son of Oger, was the sub-tenant of the Hughenden estate, which had belonged to Queen Edith, as had that at [Little] Marlow, which was subinfeudated to Theodwald, along with nearby Radnage. Rare survivors, albeit now merely tenants, were the two Englishmen at Beachendon, whose single virgate was Odo's smallest estate. Thurstan de Giron held three widely-scattered estates, of which Dunton was the most significant. It had been in the hands of Earl Leofwin. It is difficult to see why Robert D'Oilly and Roger of Ivry should wish to sub-lease the estate at Stowe, which was neither large nor especially valuable. They both had land nearby – D'Oilly at Shalstone and Ivry at Westbury and Dadford – although none was a major estate. Much more important was Odo's manor at Leckhampstead 2, assessed at eighteen hides. This too came from Leofwin, and was sublet to Gilbert. The King was evidently not the only person who sought to avoid the concentration of blocks of land in the hands of a single tenant. Odo had three estates which had been owned by Wiglaf, a man of Earl Leofwin. Of these, Lenborough 1 and Barton Hartshorn went to Arnulf (17 hides) and Preston Bisset to Ansgot (15 hides). Two further estates in this area, Chetwode and Tingewick, each of ten hides, came from Alnoth the Kentishman, and were let to Robert Thaon and Ilbert, respectively.

The Ansculf fief extended over twelve counties, with its centre at Dudley castle in the west Midlands.²³ Like Odo, William had only a small proportion of his Buckinghamshire holdings in hand (14 out of 103 hides). They formed a compact block centred on Newport Pagnell, a nascent borough with substantial agricultural assets, worth £20 per year. Ralph, who held one of the two main estates at Ellesborough, was the founder of the Pagnell family, which gave its name to Newport, and also took over the Ansculf fief.²⁴ Originally, this estate had been granted to Ralph Taillebois,

TABLE 4 William son of Ansculf's Estate: Anglo-Saxon Owners & Post-Conquest Sub-Tenants.

<i>Estate</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Owner 1066</i>	<i>Sub-Tenant 1086</i>
Newport	5	Ulf King's thegn	In hand
Caldecote 2	3.25	2 Ulf men	In hand
Bradwell 2	0.75	Alfward, Goding man	In hand
Tickford	5	Ulf King's thegn	In hand
[Stone Hundred]	0.5	Leofwin, Alfsi brother	Englishman
Ellesborough 1	13.5	Harold	Ralph
Ellesborough 2	1.5	Baldwin, Stigand man	Odbert
Hampden	3	Baldwin, Stigand man	Odbert
Ditton	5	Sired, Harold man	Walter
Stoke Poges	10	Sired, Harold man	Walter
North Marston 3	6.5	Leofric, Earl Edwin man/ A man/Brictrwīn, Earl Tostig man	Ranulf
North Marston 4	1	Alwin, Brictric man	Bernard
Hoggeston	8.62	Aelmer, Bondi man/Abess of Barking man/Edeva Fair man	Payne
Soulbury 1	5.5	11 freemen	Payne
Hollingdon 1	3.5	3 men Brictric/Wicga men	Payne
Littlecote 2	1.5	2 men of Brictric	Payne
Swanbourne 4	0.25	Oswy, Brictric man	Payne
Chicheley 3	3.75	9 thegns	Payne
Hardmead 3	0.12	Godric, Oswy man	Payne
Cheddington 3	0.5	Leofing King Edward's man	Swarting
Thornborough 2	2	Baldwin	Baldwin
Chicheley 1	3	Baldwin	Baldwin
Hardmead 4	1	3 brothers: Toki man/2 Baldwin men	Baldwin
Little Woolstone 2	1.5	Ulf King's thegn	William
Great Linford 3	0.25	Grimbald, Bisi man	Robert
Tyringham 2	7.31	Harold/Godwin priest/Estan/Godric, Harold man /Aelfeva, Harold wife	Acard
Emberton 3	4	Harold/Alwin thegns	Wibert
Chicheley 2	3	Athelstan, Alnoth Kentish man	Andrew
Hardmead 2	0.87	Godwin, Ulf man	Harvey
Milton Keynes 2	1	Saeward, Wulfward Cild man	Osbert

sheriff of Bedfordshire, but had been exchanged with Ansculf for half of Princes Risborough.²⁵

Some of the changes in ownership and subtenancies were straightforward, others less so. For example, Sired, Harold's man, had held Stoke Poges and Ditton TRE, a total of fifteen hides. Both passed to Ansculf, who sublet them to Walter. His descendants took the name de Stoke. Baldwin, of Flemish origin, who had been a man of Archbishop Stigand, had more mixed fortunes. On the one hand, his holdings at Ellesborough 2 and the Hampdens were lost to Ansculf, and then sublet to Odbert, while on the other, he retained Thorn-

borough 2 and Chicheley 1, as well as gaining Hardmead 4, which had been divided between three brothers and two of his own men in 1066.

Since William fitzAnsculf had many estates in the north-east of the county, where fragmentation of villas was commonplace, it is not surprising that he had numerous *antecessores*. For example, at Chicheley 3, nine thegns had held 3¾ hides between them, while at Tyringham 2, there had been five Anglo-Saxon owners of 7.3 hides, including Godwin the priest with half-a-hide. Three of these micro-estates had been manors in 1066, compared with only one twenty years later.

William's largest sub-tenant was Payn, who had 23¼ hides scattered across seven estates from Swanbourne to Hardmead. The most fragmented of these had been Soulbury I, where eleven sokemen had had 5½ hides TRE – two virgates each. This estate lay at Liscombe,²⁶ and it seems possible that their regular holdings represent a conscious act of planning, perhaps involving the creation of a common field system. It was a well-populated estate in 1086, with twelve ploughs at work and fourteen villeins, five bordars and three slaves. The villeins are likely to have included the former sokemen among their ranks, a typical status reduction resulting from post-Conquest changes in ownership.

VI

There are some clues scattered through the Buckinghamshire Domesday, however, which show that the process was not always as smooth and uncontroversial as the generally bland statistical details would have us believe, although they are not as detailed as the so-called *clamores* in certain eastern counties.²⁷ Sometimes the arithmetic of Domesday goes awry, although that is not surprising given the scale of the enterprise and the re-ordering of data from a topographical to a tenurial basis. At Weston Turville, the total of the pre-conquest holdings comes to twenty hides, the same as the 1086 assessment, but there is a reference to the Bishop of Lisieux holding 'one of these hides', worth only 5/-, compared with an average of 15/- per hide for the whole estate.²⁸ Perhaps this was land newly-assarted in the Chiltern part of the estate, as there was said to be land for one plough, but none at work. It is possible that the anonymous 'man of Earl Tostig' who held two hides at Weston in 1066 was the same Blacman who had been Lisieux's *antecessor* on his own estates. A further ambiguous note in the entry for Weston states that 'the men whom Roger [tenant of the Bishop of Bayeux, who held it from the crown] holds in Weston did not belong to Earl Leofwin before 1066'. Leofwin had held the principal component of the fragmented estate, assessed at 9½ hides, but it is not clear why the men, who were either commended to him (sokemen) or his slaves – of which Weston with twelve had a disproportionately high number in 1086 – did not follow the land.

It seems that the active clearance and settlement of new land in the Chilterns caused problems for

the Domesday commissioners, and that some of the entries refer to land which was detached from the main estate, often remaining as a detached portion of the parish until just over a century ago. For example, Archbishop Stigand had a man with one hide at Taplow in 1066,²⁹ although this had been absorbed into the main holding by 1086. The very large woodland associated with Taplow (enough for 700 swine, perhaps 1,000 acres) lay in what is now Penn, and this hide may well represent the first permanent, as opposed to seasonal, settlement there. Baldwin, another of Stigand's men, had holdings at Ellesborough 2 and the Hampdens, which might represent similar expansion.

Wendover, while basically a royal estate assessed at 24 hides, has similar anomalies. Under the main entry we read of two sokemen holding 1.5 hides, who were said to be part of the manor, but who did not lie (*jacuerunt*) there in 1066.³⁰ Wendover had a huge woodland, enough for two thousand swine, perhaps as much as 3,000 acres. Part of this later became the separate settlement and parish of The Lee (OE *leah*, 'clearing'), which contains 502 acres. It seems likely that the sokemen, whose title indicates a high degree of freedom, were engaged in expanding the arable on their own account in King Edward's day, but had been subsumed into the more rigid feudal structures of the new regime. Towards the very end of the Bucks. folios there are another three men, this time holding one hide between them, on which were one plough and one bordar, valued at 20/-.³¹ In 1066 they had held the land in their own right, but were now accounted for as part of the King's farm (i.e. revenue) in Wendover, apparently the nearest estate centre. Elvey identifies this land as Kingshill, partly in Missenden and partly in Hughenden (OS Grid Ref. SU8898).³²

The preceding entry relates to Leofwin, a rare English survivor still holding his land (see above), in this case half-a-hide at *Wandene* in Aylesbury Hundred. On this he had half a plough [team], that is four oxen, one bordar and wood for thirty pigs, valued at 10/- (i.e. at the nominal rate of 20/- per hide). Elvey, following Hughes, takes the name as a misreading of (Little) Hampden, although the latter appears as *Hamdenam* in Domesday Book, and *Ham[e]dene* in various later sources.³³ Others have suggested Wendover Dean as the location of *Wandene*.³⁴ It is possible that his holding was considered part of Ellesborough, whose three

components were assessed at 29½ hides, although for some reason Leofwin had so far escaped being annexed by more important landowners. The densely wooded nature of the Chiltern escarpment and dip slope around the Wendover Gap must have made it difficult for the Domesday commissioners to obtain a straightforward view of land holdings, especially if assarting was in progress. No doubt existing clearings within the woods were favoured for the start of this activity, making it hard to keep track of them from estate centres down in the Vale.

Occasionally, we get a glimpse of changing land ownership before 1066. The entry for *Hanechedene* [Radnage] states that Alric 'Gangemere' and his sister had held half-a-hide, which was wrongfully taken from them in King Edward's time (*TRE eis injuste ablata est*).³⁵ The remaining 2½ hides had been held by one Frithberht, Earl Leofwin's man. It is possible that Alric's land had become the half-hide in demesne, although the record is silent as to who had dispossessed them. Radnage seems to have been in state of flux after 1066, since it had been transferred from Theodwald, a tenant of Odo of Bayeux, to the king's farm [revenue], a fate which had not overtaken Theodwald's other estate at Marlow 1.

Two of the five holdings at Clifton Reynes have 'footnotes' in Domesday Book. Clifton 1 and 2 were held by the Bishop of Coutances, the latter transferred directly from its pre-conquest owner, Wulfwin. The 1½ hides at Clifton 1, however, were said to be in exchange for Bleadon, as were 2½ hides at Tyringham 1.³⁶ Bleadon is in Somerset, at the western end of the Mendip Hills, close to the Bristol Channel. Since the bishop had lands scattered across most of southern England, including Somerset, it is difficult to see the reasoning behind this transfer. At Clifton 3, Robert of Tosny's sub-tenants William Bosclehard and his brother Roger held four hides. Siferth and Thorbert were said to hold three virgates, which the brothers had appropriated and concealed against the king, as the men of the Hundred say (*occupatas et celetas super regem ut homines de hundredam dicunt*).³⁷ In other words, the two Normans had dispossessed two of the few remaining Anglo-Saxon landowners of their small farm. Thorbert held Clifton 2, a one-hide estate, from the Bishop of Coutances, and is probably the same individual who had held one hide at Lavendon 9 in 1066. There is no evidence from the subsequent history of Clifton that the two

Englishmen had managed to get their land back.

The acquisition of new estates by the church was far from being a thing of the past, even in the uncertain times of the late eleventh-century. Westminster Abbey, which Edward the Confessor had lavishly rebuilt, and where he was buried, had been given ten hides at Denham in the 1060s by the thegn Wulfstan. The grant was confirmed in two writs of Edward dated 1065, neither of them very reliable since they refer to similar grants by the monk Siward of one hide at Weedon and half-a-hide at Amersham, neither of which was in Westminster's hands in 1086.³⁸ Siward's land at Amersham passed to the Count of Mortain, and had been identified by Elvey as Wedon Hill Farm, lying north of the Misbourne the in the north-west corner of the parish.³⁹ This offers the intriguing possibility that the name of the farm derives from its earlier link, through Siward, with Weedon. Unfortunately, Weedon is subsumed within the Domesday entries for Hardwick, none of which had been held by a Siward *TRE*. The Count of Mortain did however have two hides at Hardwick 1, whose sub-tenant was Aelmer, the same as at Amersham 2. The English holder had been Saeward, a man of Earl Harold. Given the problems that Norman clerks had with Old English, he may well be identical with Siward. He may also be the same man who held half of the thirteen hides at Datchet, and was also Harold's man. His brother, Saewulf, who held the other half of Datchet, was Leofwin's man. It is not impossible that Siward had become a monk, giving some of his patrimony of ten hides or so to Westminster. For reasons now unknowable, Siward's grants to Westminster did not survive the upheavals after the Conquest, and the abbey appears to have made no attempt to reclaim them.

Mortain had three estates in Pitstone, totalling 8½ hides, held from him by Ralph, Bernard and Fulkhold.⁴⁰ The next entry states that Thorgils, the Count's man, had taken six hides from the manor of Pitstone which Mortain himself wrongfully held in demesne. Unfortunately, this is Thorgils's only appearance in Domesday, so the meaning of the entry remains opaque. Mortain held nine small estates in various parts of Yardley Hundred, as well as land just over the Hertfordshire border, where he had detached seven hides from the large manor of Tring, which suggests that arrangements in this part of the Chilterns were as fluid as we have already noticed around Wendover.⁴¹ Pitstone is a

typical strip-parish of the chalk, reaching from the lowlands of the Vale right up the scarp and down the dip slope as far as Nettleden. It has several settlement centres, which are likely to have existed in 1086, all subsumed under the name Pitstone. None of the Mortain estates in Yardley is assigned demesne ploughs or hides. Mortain held Aldbury (Herts.), which borders Pitstone, and has six of its ten hides in demesne. Given that the salient of Hertfordshire between the two portions of Yardley Hundred has persisted to the present day, it seems unlikely that these are the hides which Thorgils took from Pitstone. Equally, none of the other components of the latter have six-hide assessments or demesnes, so this entry must remain an enigma.

William, son of Ansculf of Picquigny, has several 'footnotes' amongst his Buckinghamshire holdings. The first concerns Ellesborough 1. This had been held by Harold TRE, and passed to Ralph Taillebois after the Conquest. He had exchanged it with Ansculf for half of Princes Risborough, by order of William I.⁴² Unfortunately, the entry for the royal estate at Risborough contains no information about *antecessores*, so that this cannot be cross-checked. Bradwell 2, a tiny estate of three virgates, with a population of four, worth 10/-, was also the subject of contention. When he was sheriff, Ansculf had dispossessed William of Cholsey of this land. The men of the Hundred [Seckloc] stated that this was wrong, and without the King's or anyone else's deliverer (*libatore regis vel alicuius*).⁴³ Cholsey is in Berkshire, near Wallingford, and it seems strange that William should have acquired such a small property so far away. He was not the pre-conquest owner, and does not feature elsewhere in Domesday Book. Perhaps it was connected in some way with the nascent urban centre at Newport Pagnell, which was also in Ansculf's hands, along with rural estates at Caldecote, Little Woolstone and Great Linford.

Some Domesday 'footnotes' provide us with the only evidence for aspects of administrative and ecclesiastical history which would not otherwise be suspected. One such appears in the entry for the third of William fitzAnsculf's estates at Hardmead. Here a single hide was held by Baldwin, two of whose own men had been part-owners in 1066. There follows a tantalising glimpse, which states that half-a-virgate of this land lay in [the lands of] the monastery of St. Firmin of (North) Crawley.⁴⁴ This indicates that the church at Crawley, with its

rare dedication to an obscure European saint,⁴⁵ was a minster church. We know nothing of its origins and endowments – apart from the few acres at Hardmead, although it fills a large gap in the early church history of north-east Buckinghamshire. A similar throwaway remark is found in the entry for the Westminster estate at East Burnham, where the three thegns who held the property TRE paid five *ora* (80 pence) to the minster at Staines,⁴⁶ which would otherwise be unknown, since there are no records of it in the Middlesex Domesday. It is also an unusual example of a cross-border link, which might predate the formal creation of shires in the early tenth-century, possibly long before.

At Iver, the manor had been held TRE by Toki, a thegn of the King, but there were also three sokemen there.⁴⁷ One of them, Toki's own man, was specifically noted as being unable to dispose of his land without permission. The others, each with 2½ hides, were free to sell or grant their holdings. One was Queen Edith's man, the other Sæwulf's, perhaps identifiable as the joint owner of nearby Datchet. The Iver entry then states that these two individuals and their five hides did not belong to the manor in 1066. Some of this land may have been in the detached part of Iver, between Denham and Gerrards Cross. The rest must have been in one or two of the various subordinate settlements within the main parish boundary. Robert D'Oilly, the holder in 1086, had acquired Iver in exchange for Padbury, from Clarenbold of le Marais. In 1086, however, Padbury was held by Mainou the Breton, with no indication as to its previous ownership history, before or after 1066.⁴⁸ The final enigma in the Iver entry states that it was of Robert's wife's holding (*de feudo suae feminae*). Unfortunately, that lady is not named, nor is she mentioned in connection with other lands in Buckinghamshire, or in Robert's much more extensive fief in Oxfordshire.

Equally interesting is the history of D'Oilly's estate at Oakley. This had one of only two parks mentioned in the county, which had annexed woodland for two hundred pigs (possibly three hundred acres).⁴⁹ It is not clear whether this was a pre- or a post-Conquest creation, since the Brill area was a favoured hunting ground for both Saxon and Norman kings. In addition, two of its hides were held TRE by Ælfgýð, a girl. She held another half-hide from king Edward's demesne revenue, which Godric the sheriff had assigned to her, so that she

might teach his daughter gold embroidery (*aurifrisium operari*). This was a much-prized skill among Englishwomen, who were responsible at the same period for the Bayeux Tapestry. It is not clear whether Ælfgýð lived at Oakley, or merely held these lands there. We are not told who held the balance of 3¼ hides TRE, merely that Robert son of Walter now holds this land, as the Hundred [of Ixhill] testifies. This might indicate that some or all of the estate at Oakley had been acquired with dubious title, although the record is characteristically silent on the subject.

Bertram of Verdun's sole Buckinghamshire estate was ten hides at Farnham (Royal).⁵⁰ It had been held by Countess Goda in 1066. It is then stated that Geoffrey de Mandeville held half-a-hide of this manor in Amersham, of which he disposed Bertram while he was overseas on the king's service (*transmare in servitio regis*). The Hundred [of Stoke] confirms this. The land in question must have been Seer Green, a detached part of Farnham abutting the main estate of Amersham. Clearly Geoffrey thought it was a good opportunity to 'tidy up' this apparent anomaly, although it remained an administrative reality until the nineteenth century. Poor Bertram also had the indignity of Ralph Taillebois building a mill on his land, which was not there TRE. Since Ralph is not associated with any lands closer than Princes Risborough or Soulbury,⁵¹ this is difficult to explain. Neither is any mill recorded at Farnham in 1086! Indeed, the local topography is singularly deficient in even small streams. Taillebois was notorious for annexing and transferring lands in Bedfordshire, where he had been Sheriff.⁵² His wife Azelina was the proud owner of a half hide in Soulbury, with one plough and no recorded population. Given the scattered settlement pattern in the area, and her husband's involvement in the neighbouring estate of Leighton Buzzard, it seems likely that this land lay close to the county boundary. Azelina had a much more substantial estate in her own right in Bedfordshire: 36 hides in thirteen places.⁵³

Nigel of Berville was obviously a small player in the events of 1066, and received only 2¼ hides at Drayton Parslow, albeit with land for eight ploughs, which suggests that it was beneficially hidated.⁵⁴ It had been held before and after 1066 by Leofwin of Nuneham, whom we have already encountered as one of the very few Anglo-Saxon landowners to salvage much from the wreckage of the conquest.

Later, he acquired Ralph Passwater (*passaquam*) as a sub-tenant, who had the duty of finding two mail-clad men for guard duty at William's new castle of Windsor (*loricatos in custodiam de Windesores*). Soon, however, Ralph, and by inference Leofwin, was dispossessed by the Bishop of Coutances, who gave the estate to Nigel, although the latter appears as a tenant-in-chief. Coutances held half of neighbouring Stewkley, but otherwise had no involvement in this area. Nigel's was a shortlived success, however, as the Passwaters (Passelews) were back in possession in the twelfth century, giving the whole village its 'surname'. If nothing else, this brief entry offers a warning that the changes in ownership after 1086 were neither straightforward nor immutable.

VII

The ownership of land in England has never been static for very long, whether through the operation of a land market, the vagaries of family inheritance, or its use as a commodity to reward or ensure the provision of service. From the earliest grants of land to support the newly-important church in the seventh century, land had been changing hands in Anglo-Saxon England. The evidence provided by Domesday Book for the situation on the day that Edward the Confessor died in January 1066 is, like much else in its folios, merely a snapshot. There were very large numbers of landowners at that time, most of them with very small properties, and as little as ten or fifteen acres to their name. By 1066, neither the crown nor the church was a major landowner in Buckinghamshire. The result of Harold II's defeat at Hastings put in train a massive change in ownership, with scarcely one acre in a hundred remaining in English hands. This cataclysm set the pattern for many succeeding centuries, although the ebb and flow of individual and family fortunes continued unabated, so that few estates had the same owners in 1286, fewer still by 1486. Only the dissolution of the monasteries in the 1530s can be compared in scale to the events of the late-1060s, albeit much more localised in its effects.

Although a hierarchical society, with a complex web of rights and obligations between greater and lesser men, Anglo-Saxon England had room still for small, relatively free men to own land and benefit from its fruits. Domesday Book shows that this was not the case after 1066, and many

previous owners had sunk into the anonymous ranks of the peasantry, though many were unnamed in any case. The essential rhythms of the farming year would of course have continued through all these momentous changes, but the creation of many new, larger fiefs, with absentee tenants-in-chief, more interested in yield maximisation than in getting a living from their own small

farms, would have had a significant impact in most parts of Buckinghamshire. These developments were often associated with reordering of settlement and agrarian arrangements, and the provision of individual parish churches, although that process again had begun well before 1066, and requires much further research before its is properly understood.

APPENDIX

Landholding in Buckinghamshire in 1086.

<i>Tenant-in-Chief</i>	<i>Hides</i>	<i>Estates</i>	<i>Owners 1066*</i>
Walter Giffard	304.68	49	46 [+21]
Bishop of Bayeux	221.00	43	39 [+2]
Miles Crispin	123.00	33	27 [+2]
King	117.75	7	2
Count of Mortain	113.37	38	43 [+3]
William fitzAnsculf	107.25	31	35 [+29]
Mainou the Breton	106.50	11	14 [+7]
Bishop of Coutances	101.43	21	38 [+17]
Archbishop of Canterbury	75.00	3	3
Robert d'Oilly	66.25	7	8
William Peverel	55.25	10	3
Walter FitzOthere	44.00	4	3
Bishop of Winchester	39.00	2	2
Geoffrey de Mandeville	37.75	8	7
Hugh of Bolbec	37.25	11	12 [+2]
Queen Matilda	35.00	2	1
Hugh of Chester	34.00	4	3
Abbey of St. Albans	30.00	3	1
Thurstan Rolf	30.00	2	2
Bishop of Lincoln	29.50	6	4
Ralph of Feugeris	27.00	2	2
Edward of Salisbury	26.37	3	2
Roger of Ivry	21.50	7	5
Gilbert of Ghent	20.75	2	1
Robert Gernon	20.00	1	1
Alric the Cook	20.00	1	1
Leofwin of Nuneham	19.87	4	1
Hugh of Beauchamp	19.12	3	4
Giles brother of Ansculf	18.25	3	2
Abbey of Westminster	18.00	2	2
Robert of Tosny	16.50	3	2
Jocelyn the Breton	16.08	5	5
Countess Judith	16.06	10	8
William de Warenne	15.00	2	1
Nigel of Aubigny	14.25	2	2 [+6]
Canons of Oxford	10.00	1	1
Bertram of Verdun	10.00	1	1

(continued)

Tenant-in-Chief	Hides	Estates	Owners 1066*
Winemar the Fleming	10.00	1	1
Alfsi	10.00	3	3
Walter of Vernon	9.87	3	2
Henry of Ferrers	9.00	2	1
Godric Cratel	8.50	1	1
Bishop of Lisieux	7.50	2	1
Barking Abbey	6.00	1	1
Gunfrid of Chocques	6.00	1	1
Martin	5.50	1	1 [+1]
William of Feugeres	5.00	1	1
Swarting	4.75	2	2
Richard the Artificer	2.50	1	1
Hascoit Musard	2.50	1	1
Nigel of Berville	2.25	1	1
William the Chamberlain	2.00	1	1
William son of Mann	2.00	1	1
Hervey	2.00	1	1
Hugh son of Gozhere	2.00	1	2
Swarting & Harding	2.00	1	2
Thurstan Mantle	1.50	3	3
Harding	1.50	1	1
Walter of Flanders	1.25	1	1
Leofwin Wavre	1.25	1	1
Reinbald	1.00	1	1
A Cripple	1.00	1	1
Leofwin Cave	1.00	1	1
Three Men	1.00	1	3
Azelina	0.50	1	2
Leofwin	0.50	1	1
Ketel	0.50	1	1
Godwin the Beadle	0.50	1	1
William son of Constantine	0.25	1	1
Godwin the Priest	0.25	1	1

* Figures in [] are anonymous groups of owners, e.g. 8 thegns, 3 men, etc.

REFERENCES

1. M. Gelling, *The Early Charters of the Thames Valley*, Leicester 1979, 72–9.
2. Domesday Book (hereafter DB), I, 151c, d.
3. J. McN. Dodgson & J.J.N. Palmer, *Domesday Book Index, Part Two Persons*, Chichester 1992, 135.
4. VCH Bucks., *passim*.
5. G. Elvey, 'Buckinghamshire in 1086', *Recs. Bucks.*, 16, pt.5 (1960), 360.
6. DB i, 56d; F. Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066*, 2nd. ed. London 1979, 134–5.
7. DB I, 153a.
8. Elvey, 360.
9. DB I, 148a.
10. Elvey, 358.
11. VCH Bucks., iii, 312.
12. F. Barlow, *Edward the Confessor*, London 1970.
13. W.G. Searle, *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum*, Cambridge 1897, s.v.

14. *Ibid.*
15. K.A. Bailey, 'The Hidation of Buckinghamshire I', *Recs. Bucks.* 32 (1990) 1-34.
16. K.A. Bailey, 'Vendere Potuit: He Could Sell', *Recs. Bucks.* 40 (1998-2000), 73-88, esp. 78-81.
17. G.N. Garmonsway, *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, London 1953, s.a. 1085.
18. A.C. Chibnall, *Sherington*, Cambridge, 1965; A.C. Chibnall, *Beyond Sherington*, Chichester, 1979.
19. DB I, 143a; A.H.J. Baines, 'The Development of the Borough of Buckingham 914-1086', *Recs. Bucks.* 27 (1985), 53-64.
20. VCH Bucks., iii, 272-3.
21. VCH Bucks., iii, 366.
22. K.A. Bailey, 'The Hidation of Buckinghamshire II', *Recs. Bucks.* 34 (1992), 92.
23. VCH Bucks., iii, 331
24. *Ibid.*
25. DB I, 148c.
26. VCH Bucks., iii, 415.
27. H.C. Darby, *Domesday England*, Cambridge 1977, 5, 22.
28. DB i, 144b
29. DB i, 144b.
30. DB I, 143c.
31. DB I, 153b.
32. Elvey, 360.
33. *Ibid.*
34. DB Bucks., ed. J. Morris, Chichester 1978, note 57.10.
35. DB i, 144c.
36. DB i, 145c.
37. DB i, 149b.
38. DB i, 145d; Gelling, *op. cit.*, nos. 242 & 243.
39. Elvey, 356 & Map.
40. DB i, 145d, 146a.
41. DB i, 136c, d.
42. DB i, 148c
43. DB i, 148d.
44. DB i, 149a
45. R.P. Hagerty, 'The Buckinghamshire Saints Reconsidered I: St. Firmin of North Crawley', *Recs. Bucks.* 27 (1985), 65-71.
46. DB i, 145d.
47. DB i, 149b.
48. DB i, 152a.
49. DB i, 149b.
50. DB i, 151c.
51. DB i, 148c, 153a.
52. DB Beds., *passim*.
53. DB i, 218a, b.
54. DB i, 151c, d.