

# SOLENT THAMES HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

## RESOURCE ASSESSMENT

### MEDIEVAL BUCKINGHAMSHIRE (AD 1066 - 1540)

*Kim Taylor-Moore with contributions by Chris Dyer  
July 2007*

#### **1. Inheritance**

Domesday Book shows that by 1086 the social and economic frameworks that underlay much of medieval England were already largely in place. The great Anglo Saxon estates had fragmented into the more compact units of the manorial system and smaller parishes had probably formed out of the large parochia of the minster churches. The Norman Conquest had resulted in the almost complete replacement of the Anglo Saxon aristocracy with one of Norman origin but the social structure remained that of an aristocratic elite supported by the labours of the peasantry. Open-field farming, and probably the nucleated villages usually associated with it, had become the norm over large parts of the country, including much of the northern part of Buckinghamshire, the most heavily populated part of the county. The Chilterns and the south of the county remained for the most part areas of dispersed settlement.

The county of Buckinghamshire seems to have been an entirely artificial creation with its borders reflecting no known earlier tribal or political boundaries. It had come into existence by the beginning of the eleventh century when it was defined as the area providing support to the *burh* at Buckingham, one of a chain of such *burhs* built to defend Wessex from Viking attack (Blair 1994, 102-5). Buckingham lay in the far north of the newly created county and the disadvantages associated with this position quickly became apparent as its strategic importance declined. Under Norman rule many of the county functions were transferred to Aylesbury, which already had many urban attributes, such as a market, a mint and a minster church, and which was more centrally located (VCH Bucks III, 1). Apart from Newport Pagnell, where Domesday Book reveals the presence of burgesses, there is no indication that any other place in the county had any claim to urban status by the end of the eleventh century (Reed 1979, 110).

The period of expansion and growth, which had begun in the ninth century, continued into the twelfth and thirteenth, a period characterised by the growth in the number and size of settlements, the bringing into cultivation of marginal land, particularly woodland, and the foundation of most of the towns known today (Dyer 2002, 101).

#### **2. Chronology**

The medieval period is the first for which documentary evidence and standing buildings survive to any great extent and can be used, in conjunction with archaeology, to gain a more comprehensive knowledge of the development and chronologies of individual sites, landscapes and societies.

In a purely archaeological context, finds of coins and other dateable objects are relatively infrequent in Buckinghamshire and ceramics remain the main dating medium. A pottery series was developed for the Milton Keynes area (Mynard and Zeepvat 1992) but one does not exist for the county as a whole and those of neighbouring areas such as the Oxfordshire county type series (Mellor 1994) are generally used.

Scientific dating techniques, such as dendrochronology in standing buildings, for instance at the County Museum (Chenevix Trench and Fenley 1991), Lake End Road Tithe Barn, Taplow (Howard et al. 1997), Manor Farm Barn, Bierton with Broughton (Tyers 1996) and Willow Vale Farm, Steeple Claydon, (Chenevix Trench 1989), and archaeomagnetic surveys of kilns, have sometimes been used but dating remains an issue for many sites, particularly those associated with industries such as metal-working where many bloomeries are known but remain undated.<sup>1</sup>

### **3. Rural settlement.**

Buckinghamshire does not figure very prominently in general surveys or interpretations of medieval rural settlement, yet it deserves to be better known. Its contrasting landscapes were characterised by different forms of settlement, and these provide an opportunity for comparative study. It has been well served by its archaeologists, and has a remarkably large number of major excavations of settlements, thanks to the work on Milton Keynes, and all have been published. The county was one of the four surveyed in an analysis of east midland rural settlement, which recorded 625 villages and hamlets within it (Lewis et al. 2001), and a group of parishes in the north- west of the county were included in the area covered by the Whittlewood project (Jones and Page 2006). A number of historians have worked on aspects of the rural and agricultural history of the county (Campbell et al 1993; Chibnal 1965; Roden 1973).

#### ***3.1 Settlements and landscapes***

The division of the landscape of the county is based on modern maps. Nineteenth-century OS maps were used by Roberts and Wrathmell (2000) to define a Central Province (with nucleated villages) and the South-Eastern Province (where settlements were mainly dispersed). The boundary between them runs through the middle of the county. To the north-west of the Chiltern edge large nucleated settlements predominated; while up on the Chilterns small settlements straggled across the landscape. This division is a generalisation, and there were many small settlements clustered on the edge of the Vale of Aylesbury, towards the edge of the Central Province, and a fair scatter of large settlements in the Chilterns. Roberts and Wrathmell help us to set Buckinghamshire in a broader national context, but their observation was confirming a well-known feature of the county (Reed 1979, 88-104). Nearly a century ago Gray (1915) published a map for the whole country of two- and three-field systems (types of open field), and drew exactly the same frontier, with the two- and three- field systems lying to the north of the Chiltern edge. That is as expected because of the close association between open-field agriculture

---

<sup>1</sup> Dominique de Moulins, English Heritage's Regional Archaeological Science Adviser, has supplied comments on environmental evidence which are integrated within the body of the text.

and nucleated villages. The parliamentary enclosures of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries congregated to the north of the Chilterns, because in that region were the large open fields then ripe for enclosure. Deserted medieval villages, abandoned mainly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, were confined to the same part of the county because, although houses were also deserted in the Chilterns at that time, they were not located in large villages. The county in about 1500 can confidently be divided between a champion region of large villages and open fields in the Vale of Aylesbury and in the clay lands to the north, and in the Chilterns a woodland landscape with hamlets, farmsteads, irregular patches of open field (five or more per village), and much enclosed land. There were smaller areas of wooded and pastoral country breaking up the monotony of the champion north, in Bernwood, Whaddon Chase, Whittlewood, Salcey, Yardley Chase and on the Greensand towards Woburn on the eastern edge of the county. Beyond the Chilterns, on the banks of the Thames, was an area of nucleation and open fields.

With one exception, namely Boarstall (Harvey 1985), we lack maps of villages before the sixteenth century, but we can be confident that the fundamental division of the county goes back to the earlier medieval centuries, as documents (deeds and surveys) in the champion areas depict open fields divided into furlongs and strips in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and in the Chilterns the same types of written sources refer to multiple fields, hedged closes and newly cleared land (Roden 1969). The Domesday survey of 1086 shows a concentration of woodland in the Chilterns, and in the northern corners of the county, with a distinct absence in the centre. Ploughed land was most plentiful to the north of the Chilterns (Darby and Campbell 1962, 180-4). Although we cannot be certain that large numbers of nucleated villages existed in the eleventh century, the landscape features normally associated with them had already been formed.

### *3.2 Settlement forms*

If the earliest comprehensive maps, surveyed in the nineteenth century, reflect the broad pattern of landscapes, and probably settlements, going back to c.1100, they can also be used, with more caution, to identify the morphology of settlements in the middle ages. In the champion country many of the villages were of the cluster type, in which houses were grouped around a junction of roads, without obvious evidence of planning. More than thirty are of the regular row type, in which planning is more clearly visible, with lines of equally spaced houses arranged close together on either side of a street or green, as at Mursley and Maids Moreton (Lewis et al. 2001). A scatter of common edge and interrupted rows (in which houses stood side by side along roads, but separated from each other by a small field or croft) is found in the wooded north-west and north-east. In the southern Chilterns there were many isolated farmsteads and interrupted rows. Further north in the Chilterns, for example in Great Missenden, common edge settlements are found, and these have an air of regularity, as if some authority ensured that the houses were set at roughly equal distances apart. More research is needed into these, and other, settlement forms in the Chilterns.

Excavation, and to some extent documents, can tell us if medieval village plans are really reflected in modern maps. Results so far, from a relatively small sample, gives us a variety of indicators. We know that, in the Chilterns, many of the settlements recorded in the nineteenth century were relatively new, as cottages on wastes had proliferated after c.1600, but some Chiltern farms and hamlets carry names recorded in the thirteenth

century, suggesting the possibility of continuity of occupation and of settlement form (Lewis et al. 2001). An isolated farmstead, occupied in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, has been excavated near West Wycombe (Parker and Boarder 1991). In the champion area the only nucleated village to be completely excavated, Great Linford, had building plots occupied continuously from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries into modern times, so its plan seems to have survived essentially unaltered for many centuries (Mynard and Zeepvat 1992). The complete village plan did not appear, however, on a nineteenth-century map as it was partly depopulated in the seventeenth century. The most common reason for a village to change its shape would be the abandonment of part of the settlement. Earthwork survey, field walking and test pitting at Leckhampstead show that a complex, dispersed village with three 'ends', was once even more complex, and a medieval 'end' has shrunk down to a single farm (Jones and Page 2006). At Akeley the village has changed radically in recent times. The original medieval small cluster near the church, together with a row occupying a strip of cleared land near a wood, has in recent times been infilled with new streets and resembles a large cluster. At Lillingstone Lovell the replanning can be dated to the thirteenth century, when an ambitious lord occupied the central cross roads of a clustered village with a new manor house, barn, dovecot and fish ponds, and a new row of peasant houses was laid out on the eastern side of the new seigneurial enclosure.

### ***3.3 Origins and growth***

When and where did villages develop? And why did nucleated villages not spread uniformly over the county? The model of village origins prevailing in the 1970s and 1980s, which linked the growth of large settlements with the abandonment of small farmsteads towards the end of the first millennium, could be applied in Buckinghamshire because such abandoned sites have been identified from pottery scatters on plough soil at some distance from settlements at Coldharbour Farm near Aylesbury, at Chicheley, and in four cases at Leckhampstead (Stewart 1990; Farley 1980; Jones and Page 2006). There is limited evidence, however, for the type of abandoned hamlets that are found in Northamptonshire. An older idea has now been revived, because of the number of examples of small settlements of the pre-850 period being discovered at the heart of a later village, suggesting that a 'pre-village nucleus' developed during the post-Roman centuries, and houses clustered around it, or were laid out in rows (as at Akeley). There is pottery evidence for such a nucleus at Great Linford, Weston Underwood, Lillingstone Dayrell, Leckhampstead, and Akeley (Mynard and Zeepvat 1992; Enright and Parkhouse 1996; Jones and Page 2006). The dates when these small settlements grew into larger villages vary. A tenth/eleventh century date has been suggested for some of the Whittlewood settlements, and it has been argued, on the basis of manuring scatters, that the open fields were also laid out in the tenth/eleventh centuries (Jones 2004). Some of the Milton Keynes settlements, such as Caldecotte, Great Linford and Westbury seem to have grown in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as did Ashendon in the west (Zeepvat et al 1994; Mynard and Zeepvat 1992; Ivens et al 1995; Slatcher et al 2004). In the same period, Lillingstone Dayrell expanded dramatically, with the addition of a new street, and two settlements in Stewkley each expanded in the direction of the church built between them, resulting in one very long village (Jones and Page 2006; Bailey 2005). Weston Underwood seems to have had a small nucleus near the church in the tenth/eleventh centuries, and the larger village grew after that date (Enright and Parkhouse 1996).

The comparison between the nucleated and dispersed settlements, shows that the two appear to have emerged at about the same time – the hamlet of Bedgrove near Aylesbury apparently grew up in the tenth/eleventh centuries (Macdonald and Gowing 1989), and straggling settlements like Leckhampstead and Hardmead were developing in the eleventh century, with the loosely connected farmsteads at Westbury rather later (Jones and Page 2006; Smith 1985; Ivens et al. 1995). Single farms were founded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries near West Wycombe in the Chilterns and at Haybarn in Lillingstone Dayrell in Whittlewood. But these various types of scattered settlement did not coalesce into a nucleated village, and the reasons for the perpetuation of dispersal needs further research. There were clear environmental contrasts between the chalky soils on the high ground of the Chilterns, and the clay lowlands which supported nucleated settlements. But sometimes adjacent settlements inhabiting similar soils in the north of the county diverged, and the explanation may be cultural rather than economic and environmental. Comparative research must continue, and there is a special need for more work on the Chilterns and around woods. The environmental evidence has the potential to show these differences but few full analyses of plants were undertaken for the medieval period and the few reports on animal bones do not show this contrast.

Environmental samples taken from peat deposits at Stowe in the wooded north west of the county show that, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the expansion of cultivation and settlement had an impact on the environment and vegetation, as is also suggested by documents and the expansion of settlements (Jones and Page 2006)

### ***3.4 Decline and desertion***

Most Buckinghamshire villages were reduced in size in the later middle ages, with 119 examples of ‘shrunk’ villages. The number of recorded DMVs, eighty-three, is comparable with the belt of midland counties running from Warwickshire to Lincolnshire. In fact the density in Buckinghamshire is very high, when one remembers that the DMVs are almost all concentrated in the champion country north of the Chiltern edge.

Documents show that cultivation was in retreat by 1340, well before the Black Death (Baker 1966). This is reflected in the early shrinkage of villages, as part of Tattenhoe ceased to be inhabited by c.1300, and houses were abandoned at Ashendon and Westbury in the early fourteenth century, accompanied by the amalgamation of crofts in the latter case (Ivens et al. 1995; Slatcher et al. 2004). This slow attrition of houses in villages is apparent in documents (such as the court rolls of Akeley) and from archaeological evidence at Great Linford and the Whittlewood settlements. Also playing a part in the desertion of whole villages was the removal of the inhabitants by the landlord or his agents. At Quarrendon, the Lee family of graziers turned into landed gentry, remodelled the manor house and imposed a large garden next to the village site. In the case of Stowe the village lost its population under pressure from the lords in the seventeenth century (Everson 2001; Page 2005). Deliberate depopulation to make way for pastures or parks was once thought to be the main reason for desertion (Beresford 1953-4), but only a handful of the DMVs, notably Doddershall with twenty-four houses put down and 120 people leaving, were said to have suffered a major loss of houses in the inquisition of 1517 (Dyer 2005). The decay of the corn growing economy and social cohesion in villages could well be a major cause of desertion.

Traces of medieval ploughing in open fields turned over to pasture at this time can still be seen in the form of the ridge and furrow found near many village sites. Its survival in the county was surveyed from maps and aerial photographs in 1995-8 as part of the work commissioned by English Heritage on the remains of open fields in the east midlands. In total forty-three sites were identified where it was found to have survived over significant areas and ten of those were in north Buckinghamshire. Ludgershall, Pollicott and North Marston were three of only six places with survival rates of 40% or above (Hall 2001). Work at Ludgershall, where at least four phases of ridge and furrow have been identified, has indicated that detail in surviving earthworks can help in understanding the development and decline of field systems, and there should be an aim to investigate more of these earthworks structures before they disappear (John Moore Heritage Services 2006).

The focus on deserted villages should not detract from the many examples of abandoned farmsteads and hamlets (such as Haybarn and Hardmead). The whole subject deserves further investigation, and especially the extent to which settlements in the Chilterns experienced the same loss of population as the villages north of the Chiltern edge and the dispersed settlements of Whittlewood.

### ***3.5 Material culture of rural settlements***

The large scale excavations on the Milton Keynes villages has produced a mass of evidence for peasant houses, possessions and trade links. The richness of the metal finds (mostly buckles and other dress accessories) from Westbury and the diversity of the pottery sources remind us of the spending power of the peasantry and the extensive trade connections of a county with a dozen small towns in the later middle ages, and relatively easy contact with London. This material has not received the attention that it deserves, and further comparative material is needed. Similarly the excavated houses cry out for further study. For example, houses at Great Linford, the foundations of which were built in the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries, survived with modification into the seventeenth, providing further evidence that the so-called 'vernacular threshold' is not a valid concept. The excavated village buildings need to be compared with high status structures, and with standing buildings. The county is rich in the latter: for example, Long Crendon has more cruck houses than any other settlement in England (Alcock 1981). Research in association with the Whittlewood project, notably at Akeley, shows that late medieval small cruck buildings lie hidden behind the stone structures of later centuries (Jones and Page 2006). Clearly more systematic surveys are needed.

A number of cottages of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries at Milton Keynes Village, Steeple Claydon, Stewkley and Long Crendon, have been found to have base coats of thatch preserved by soot which give information on the fabric of the buildings and on the crops grown in the fields (Letts 1999; Moulins 2006). Analyses of animal bones from all the crofts were similar in terms of composition, indicating occasional disposal of food remains. There was a great variety of bones on floors and yard surfaces. Cattle and sheep seemed present in equal amounts in the tenth to thirteenth centuries whilst sheep seem to have become more abundant in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries.

## **4. Social Organisation**

Domesday Book, despite its many known inadequacies, gives some idea of the make up of English society at the end of the eleventh century and there have been several published analyses of the relevant information contained in the Buckinghamshire folios (Bailey 1995; Bailey 2002). The proportions of villeins and bordars in the population appear to have been similar to those in neighbouring counties, but there were far fewer sokemen. Conversely slavery, which was generally in decline by this time, seemed still to be common in Buckinghamshire with a high proportion of the population being classified as slaves, particularly in the north of the county (Lewis et al. 2001, 150). The proportion in Rowley hundred, south of Buckingham, was among the highest in the country (Darby 1977, 76) and it is interesting that in the following centuries this area seems to remain largely bare of seigneurial investment in the form of moats, parks and other status symbols. By the end of the thirteenth century the feudal system had begun to break down, slavery had vanished and, although most peasants in the north of the county remained unfree, there were many peasant free-holders in the Chilterns and the south (Lewis et al. 2001, 152-3).

### ***4.1 Manors***

The administrative organisation of land and people was based on the manor, a unit whose primary purpose was to extract revenue from both for the benefit of the lord. This system had its origins in the centuries before Domesday and, although traces of buildings found at the few manorial sites excavated in the county can usually be dated to the twelfth century or later, there are often signs of earlier activity on the site - for example, at Whaddon eleventh century pottery was found below the floors of the later stone buildings being excavated, and at Bradwell it was established that ninth or tenth century wooden structures were replaced by a stone house in the thirteenth (Griffiths 1979; Mynard 1994). Lords in Buckinghamshire ranged from the king, through bishops and the aristocracy, to minor gentry and, increasingly, as time went on, Oxford colleges. Their manorial centres took many forms and although most were probably manor houses, some originated as castles, as at Weston Turville, whilst others were religious houses or monastic granges, as at Gorefields, excavated between 1969 and 1971, and Shipton Lee, the subject of a recent archaeological study (Yeoman 1986; Mynard and Ivens 2002; Kidd 2006). All were involved in exploiting the land, however, as evidenced by the dovecotes, fishponds, mills and rabbit warrens often found near to the centres and which, together with the arable fields, meadows and wastes, made up the manor.

Some manorial sites continue in occupation, although no trace of the medieval buildings usually remains. Rare survivals include the fifteenth century manor-house at Little Loughton, and the fourteenth century home of the bailiff at Milton Keynes now respectively a farmhouse and a cottage (Croft and Mynard 1993, 25). Fourteenth century stone-built undercrofts can still be seen in the manor houses at Chenies and Creslow and at the latter a stair-tower and one truss of the hall roof also survive (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 231, 262). It is on manors held by the church, however, where most building work has been preserved. Remains of fourteenth century timber-framed halls survive at Huntercombe Manor, constructed during the ownership of nearby Burnham Abbey, at Haversham Grange which belonged to Lavendon Abbey and, most notably, at Denham, where Westminster Abbey held a manor. Here the remains of three early

fourteenth century timber aisled halls can be found which originally formed the main manor house (Denham Court), a sub-manor house (Savay Farm) and probably a steward's house (The Old Bakery) (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 52; Chenevix-Trench and Fenley 1979).

Many manorial centres, particularly in the north and centre of the county, have long been abandoned. The reasons for this are many - for example at Castlethorpe the manor was destroyed along with the village when the land was laid to pasture in the fifteenth century; the moated site at Broughton was probably abandoned in the sixteenth century when two manors were consolidated; and at Aston Clinton the moat was filled in and the site of the original manor cleared during the nineteenth century to make way for the kitchen garden of the grander eighteenth century house constructed nearby (Reed 1979, 152; Archaeological Solutions Ltd 2004, 47; Gulland 2003, 197). The royal residences in Buckinghamshire all fall within the category of abandoned sites. The king held seven manors in the county in 1086 and documentary sources indicate that royal residences existed at Aylesbury and Brill, although the exact location of neither is known. Excavations in 1955 at Princes Risborough almost certainly revealed traces of the large manorial complex, held by the Black Prince, within a moat close to the church (Pavry and Knocker 1957) but at Fulmer the substantial hall found was probably the predecessor of that built by Edward II in 1323-4 (Farley 1982a).

The overwhelming majority of manors were held by lay lords but, although the SMR lists many such sites, most are known only from documentary evidence and have not been the subject of any systematic study or synthesis. Deserted manorial sites in the Milton Keynes area, such as those at Simpson and Tattenhoe, have generally been surveyed, recorded and published (Croft and Mynard 1993). Other surviving earthworks can sometimes be identified as manorial sites, but in most cases the lack of detailed investigation means that any such identification can only be provisional as, for example, in the cases of Twyford and Grendon Underwood.

Surprisingly few manorial sites have been excavated and, of those that have, Whaddon (Griffiths 1979) and to a lesser extent Bradwell (Mynard 1994, 2-60) are the most informative. At Bradwell some of the walls of the manor house, which was centrally located within a rectangular moat, were uncovered. The house, which went out of use in the fourteenth century, was found to have been a high quality building of limestone rubble faced with dressed stone, with a tiled roof and at least one decorated tile floor. A stone barn and two stone dovecotes were located nearby. The finds, including imported pottery and a chess piece, suggest that it was the home of a wealthy person. At Whaddon the excavations revealed a hall and seven other buildings, including a kitchen, a barn, a smithy and several workshops, grouped around a cobbled yard. The group almost certainly formed a manorial complex which seems to have been occupied from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, although the smithy may have continued in use for longer, providing a service to the villagers. The buildings were of stone construction with some having roofs of stone slates and others of tiles. Fragments of painted glass and wall plaster were found at the site of the hall.

In the far south of the county, excavations on meadowland in a bend of the River Thames, revealed that between the late eleventh and early thirteenth centuries the area was relatively unpopulated and such settlement as there had been was dispersed, often

transitory in nature, and probably connected with a specialist horse-breeding enterprise belonging to the manor of Dorney (Foreman et al. 2002). At Low Farm, Fulmer, a thirteenth century manor in the Alderbourne Valley, the predominance of pig and the presence of deer in the excavated bones contrasts with the usual medieval assemblages, and indicates woodland and the protection and management of deer by the high-status inhabitants (Farley 1982a).

## ***4.2 Moats***

The building of moats seems to have begun around the middle of the twelfth century, but reached its peak between about 1200 and 1325, a period of growth and prosperity when lords and wealthy freemen were investing in their establishments. Although moats could and did serve many purposes and they undoubtedly had some economic and defensive benefits, their main role seems to have been as status symbols and their proliferation was largely due to fashion (Le Patourel and Roberts 1978).

Lists published in the 1970s identified 162-164 moated sites in Buckinghamshire (County Museum Archaeological Group 1973; Aberg 1978, 3), although more have been discovered since then - for example, those at Brill and Biddlesden identified from aerial photographs. This number is typical for a midland county but the geographical distribution is very uneven. Unlike in neighbouring counties, particularly Bedfordshire, it is in areas of dispersed settlement within Buckinghamshire where the lowest densities of moated sites are found. Although the free-draining soils and lack of streams in the Chilterns and the Burnham Plateau could help to explain the lack of moats in those areas, the same factors do not apply to the area of dispersed woodland settlement to the south of Buckingham, where there is also a noticeable absence. This probably indicates that a combination of factors, some social and economic, influenced the trend for moat-building.

The highest densities of moated sites are found along the northern edge of the Chilterns and immediately below the scarp, where many parishes such as the Kimbles and Dinton with Ford have in excess of four each (Lewis et al. 2001, 114-117). This probably reflects the existence of a lot of small manors in the area but may also indicate prosperous tenants developing social pretensions. Many of the sites are still occupied by farms and none have been excavated, although a double moated site at Broughton, probably containing the site of a chapel as well as several house platforms, was surveyed in 2003/4 (Archaeological Solutions Ltd 2004).

In the north east of the county the concentration of moats is again high but there are generally fewer in each parish - typically one or two - and most have been abandoned. Three moated sites in the area have been subject to modern investigations. At Willen a rectangular moat enclosing an area of 26m x 20m was excavated in 1973. This revealed that the island formed by the moat, which was probably in existence by the early thirteenth century, had never contained a substantial structure and was probably used as a garden or a secure area for raising stock such as geese or ducks (Mynard 1994, 108-120). In contrast, the moated site at nearby Bradwell, which measured 158m x 54m, had contained the manorial complex previously discussed (Mynard 1994, 2-42). The moat at Gorefields, Stoke Goldington was probably dug in the first half of the thirteenth century as part of a more general refurbishment of the hall, chapel and yards of a grange or small

nunnery. Part of its purpose may have been to provide protection from the deer in the nearby park which had been created in 1214 (Mynard and Ivens 2002, 30, 88).

The central and north western parts of the county also contain many moated sites but, as previously noted, there is a noticeable absence around Buckingham particularly to the immediate south. A high proportion of moats in these areas lie next to a church, suggesting that they were originally dug around manor houses. In other cases they are some distance from the church, often close to streams, and water supply seems to have dictated the position of the moat. In some such instances there is no evidence that the sites were ever inhabited and the moats may have been connected with water management or used as fish ponds (Lewis et al. 2001, 114-117).

Few moated sites are recorded in the Chilterns away from the northern edge, although the presence of a number of other medieval earthwork enclosures, perhaps related to small woodland settlements, has been noted (Pike 1995). Excavations of sites at Bray's Wood and Fillington have indicated that the buildings within the enclosures were of manorial status but the documentary evidence suggests that they were probably occupied by wealthy tenants (Secker 2005; Parker and Boarder 1991). Further south the density of moats remains low in the heathlands of the Burnham Plateau but increases again in the Thames valley where the parishes of Iver, Wexham, Burnham and Denham each possess two or three sites.

The whole topic of the occurrence and location of moats within the county raises a lot of questions and presents many problems which require further investigation.

### ***4.3 Fishponds***

A gazetteer of Buckinghamshire fishponds and fisheries published in 1988 identifies 183 such sites, most of which are known from field surveys, aerial photographs or documentary sources (Croft and Pike 1988). About 128 of these have direct manorial connections, and fourteen were monastic in origin, such as that at Bradwell Abbey which was cleaned in the 1970s and still survives as a pond (Croft and Mynard 1993, 31).

The construction of fishponds was often closely related to that of moats and, unsurprisingly, the distribution patterns are similar, with the free draining Chilterns and Burnham Plateau being largely empty of both. The main difference between the two distributions is related to the presence of many river fisheries on the Ouse, Ousel and Thames, which would have supplied freshwater fish to the adjacent manors and which are known from both documentary sources and the discovery of concentrations of stone fishing basket weights during river dredging (Mynard 1979). Their presence seems to have reduced the need for fishponds in these areas but not removed it altogether, and many ponds were constructed close by. Ponds built near the Ousel were often fed both by the water table and by channels leading from the river itself but this was not the case in the south where none of the ponds were fed by the Thames (Croft and Pike 1988, 232-235).

The types and sizes of fishponds recorded on the SMR vary considerably and many can only be tentatively dated or identified as such. They range from the small, single fishpond provisionally identified from aerial photographs at Grendon Underwood, to the complex

of six ponds linked by sluices surviving as earthworks at Drayton Beauchamp. Only the fishponds in the Milton Keynes area have been systematically surveyed and recorded as part of the individual village surveys published in 1993 (Croft and Mynard).

#### ***4.4 Deer parks***

Deer parks, which were common all over medieval England, particularly in woodland areas, formed part of the lord of the manor's demesne lands. As well as being status symbols their purpose was to provide a securely enclosed area for the keeping of deer, usually fallow deer, to supply the lord with venison (Rackham 1986, 125). The larger parks were, in effect, private hunting grounds, but deer in smaller parks were probably culled by a keeper on demand.

There has been very little archaeological investigation of deer parks but a gazetteer published in 1977 (Cantor and Hatherly) lists fifty-six dating from the medieval period which documentary sources indicate existed within the modern county boundaries. This is likely to be an underestimate, however, as topographical and field name evidence suggests that there were many more (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 51). They were to be found all over the county, with a particular concentration in the north east, but with gaps to the south of Buckingham and to the south east of Aylesbury.

Parks at Oakley and Long Crendon, both within the royal forest of Bernwood, were recorded in Domesday Book and those at Lavendon and Newport Pagnell were known to have existed in the twelfth century. It is in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, however, when most seem to have been created and at this time they were generally fairly small, the forty acres emparked at Little Linford in 1278 being typical for the county. Later, many were enlarged, often by taking land out of cultivation, as happened at Fingest and Princes Risborough (Cantor and Hatherly 1977). The land emparked was generally wood pasture and often stretched to the boundary of the manor. It was usually enclosed by a ditch surrounded by an external earth bank topped with a wooden paling fence, and traces of such earthworks can still be seen at Olney, Newton Blossomville, Bradenham and elsewhere (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 51). More surveys of such earthworks need to be done.

The few parks formed after the Black Death tended to be large amenity parks such as those at Great Hampden (600 acres) and Stockholt (300 acres) (Cantor and Hatherly 1977).

## **5. Towns and Trade**

### ***5.1 Markets and fairs***

A listing of Buckinghamshire's markets and fairs, together with the date of their foundation, or earliest recorded reference, was published in 1978 (Reed) although parts of this have now been superseded by the national gazetteer available on-line (Letters 2006). Many markets, such as those at Olney and Buckingham, continue to be held in what was the medieval market-place and evidence of long defunct markets remains in several villages like Whitchurch and Great Horwood (Read 1993, 51-3; Pevsner and Williamson

1960, 192, 747; Reed 1979, 108-9). It is from documentary sources, however, that the overwhelming majority of our knowledge comes.

No fairs or markets in Buckinghamshire are recorded in Domesday Book, which is known to be incomplete in this respect, although the tolls of £10 recorded in Aylesbury almost certainly related to a sizeable market (Darby 1977, 318; Morris 1978, 1:1). There are records of nine markets and six annual fairs being held in the county before 1200 (Letters, 2006) but the following century and a half saw a rapid rise in their number as lords wishing to profit from the tolls and have an outlet for the sale of produce from their demesnes, rushed to acquire grants from the Crown (Britnell 1981, 311-4; Dyer 2002, 145-6). By 1350 there were fifty-two fairs and thirty-four markets in the county (Letters, 2006), although, in practice, some of these may never have been held. Topographical evidence indicates that markets may also have been held in villages without market charters as has been proposed for Akeley (Jones and Page 2006).

The timing of the fairs indicates that it was mainly agricultural produce that was bought and sold there - fifteen were held in September, when livestock would have been sold ahead of winter, and sixteen in July and August, when wool would have been traded. Other higher value goods, such as pots and pans, would also have been available but it was the weekly markets that would have supplied most of the day to day needs of the local population (Reed 1978, 572). Markets often grew up on pays boundaries and certainly the bigger, more successful, ones in Buckinghamshire occupied such a situation, along the edges of the Chilterns and on the fringes of woodland areas. Most, however, were to be found in the north-east and the south of the county, with very few in the Chilterns and none at all in an area in the west of the county between Buckingham to the north and Brill to the south. There could be several explanations for this - markets were often absent near to relatively large centres and the presence of Buckingham, Brill and Aylesbury could have inhibited their foundation. Alternatively economic demand could have been low in what was predominantly a woodland area and markets across the border in Oxfordshire, such as that at Bicester, could have been meeting the needs of the population.

The numbers of both markets and fairs was reduced by about one half with the crises of the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. By 1500 fairs were still being held in twenty-two places, six of which had lost their market (Reed 1978, 575). Only fifteen markets survived (Reed 1978, 574), nearly all of them in places with some pretension to urban status.

## **5.2 Towns**

There were probably between eleven and twenty towns in the county in the medieval period, the number varying over time and with the precise definition of a town adopted, but of these only Aylesbury has seen any significant archaeological excavation or survey (Allen 1982; Allen and Dalwood 1983; Bonner 1996; Farley 1974; Farley 1979). All towns have at least one published history but these are of varying quality with most taking the form of short introductions to collections of old photographs, and very few covering the medieval period in much detail. The potential of all of the county's towns to yield information, both individually and as a group, has been recognised, however, with the development of the Buckinghamshire Historic Towns Project, currently in the design

stage. This suggests thirty sites for study but includes some places which almost certainly never became more than market villages in order to enable the market village / town distinction to be explored (Kidd 2005).

Buckingham and Newport Pagnell were the only towns in the county recorded in Domesday Book but Aylesbury's important minster church and large market almost certainly mean that it too was an urban centre by this time (Morris 1978, B1-13, 1:1, 17:17, 3a:1). Little is known about the early development of Newport Pagnell, whose name shows that it had been a trading centre before the Norman Conquest, or of Buckingham, as its defensive significance decreased and it evolved from a *burh* into a fully-fledged town. Archaeological investigations in Aylesbury have revealed very little about the eleventh century town but there is copious evidence for activity from the mid twelfth century onwards, including the digging of a boundary ditch probably dividing Church Street into burgage plots (Bonner 1996, 3-4, 85; Allen and Dalwood 1983, 5, 53). This apparent increase in activity coincides with documentary evidence which suggests that it was at about this time that Aylesbury began to take over many of the functions of a county town from Buckingham (VCH Bucks III, 1). The topography of the medieval town remains obscure, however, as no further boundary features were recovered and very few buildings have been located (Bonner 1996, 4). An excavation at High Street, Marlow (BCAS 1996), the first in the town centre, has hinted that it may also have been an early urban centre, with the site showing signs of continuous, non-domestic occupation from the tenth century to the present. The High Street was confirmed as a major medieval street which had probably been about four metres wider than it is currently, the subsequent encroachment testifying to later growth.

Most of the county's towns seem to have developed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries when lords, as well as founding markets, established new towns where tenants could hold land for fixed rent and without labour services (Reed 1979, 109-112; Dyer 2002, 145). None of these 'new' towns seem to have been founded on green-field sites, but were, rather, developments of existing settlements. The street plan of Olney shows clearly that development there in the thirteenth century was in the form of new burgage plots laid out in a regular plan to the north of the market square, which linked it to the existing village centre (Reed 1993, 51; Reed 1979, 110). At Wendover, the parish church was left isolated as the success of the borough founded about half a mile away attracted new settlement to it (Reed 1979, 110). Limited excavations have shed some light on the early development of other towns. The focus of settlement in Chesham appears to have been the church, until the fourteenth century, when the first evidence of buildings fronting the High Street appears (Armour-Chelu 2001, 19). Areas quite close to the centres of Winslow and Princes Risborough were shown to have been peripheral to the main settlements in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, suggesting that these places did not expand significantly in their early years (Network Archaeology Ltd 2003, 7; John Moore Heritage Services, 2002, 12). Other investigations have been less successful, as at High Wycombe, where it is unlikely there was a nucleated settlement before the twelfth century but which had become a prosperous town by the thirteenth. Excavations, in a part of what was the business quarter of the town, revealed that no deposits of medieval date survived there, having been destroyed by later activity (Bourn 2000, Moore 2001).

There were no specialised industries associated with any of Buckinghamshire's towns, other than pottery at Brill, and the production of simnel bread for the London markets at

High Wycombe (Read 1979, 114-5; Keene 1995, 223-38), and it seems that it was a position on a busy main route that was crucial to successful development. Olney, Newport Pagnell, Stony Stratford and Buckingham are all located where main roads cross the Ouse, and Great Marlow occupies a similar position on the Thames. Princes Risborough, High Wycombe, Amersham and Wendover are all situated at the ends of the two main routes through the Chilterns and, although Aylesbury lies close to where Akeman Street crosses the River Thame, its success was probably due more to its being ideally situated as a place of exchange for goods and provisions from the clay vales, the heavily wooded Chilterns, and the rich lands at the foot of the Chiltern scarp. Excavations in the town have confirmed its role as a marketing centre for the local area but have failed to find much evidence of longer distance trade (Allen and Dalwood 1983, 55; Bonner 1996, 86). In contrast, items found from one site in Olney testify to successful long-distance trading there, the assemblage including a Norwegian ragstone whetstone, lava querns, of possible German origin, and an Anglo-Gallic jetton (Thorne and Walker 2003, 88).

The period from about the middle of the fourteenth century to well into the sixteenth was a time of decline in many towns, as the effects of the population crisis caused by the Black Death began to be felt (Dyer 1991, 20-36; Dyer 2002, 298-310; Reynolds 1977, 140-50). Written records start to survive in some quantity from this period which help to shed some light on how Buckinghamshire's towns fared, perhaps the most informative of which are the records of the subsidies raised at various times to finance wars with Scotland and France. Although there are many problems with these records they can probably be safely used to indicate broad comparative trends. The 1446 lay subsidy returns for the county indicate that on the whole the towns were getting less relief for 'poverty and decay' than the countryside, and three towns High Wycombe, Marlow and Brill got no relief at all. Apart from these towns, the relief granted seems to be largely inversely proportional to the wealth of the town, which may indicate that it was the smaller towns suffering the most decay and that a group of bigger, more successful, towns was beginning to emerge (Taylor-Moore 2006, 41-7).

Archaeological evidence for this period is mixed. In Aylesbury the digging of new pits near Kingsbury slowed down from the mid fourteenth century and had stopped altogether by the fifteenth, although this is a phenomenon seen in many towns and was probably due to the introduction of night cartage after the Black Death (Allen and Dalwood 1983, 53). Excavations in other Buckinghamshire towns have been limited in number and small in scale, but results from them illustrate the potential for learning more about the development of the county's towns in this period. In the north there is evidence of early decline - for example trial trenches in Buckingham have revealed signs of contraction in the town from the mid fourteenth century, not reversed until the seventeenth (Dawson 2002, 14, 22; Laws 2002, 5-12), and at Olney an industrial site near to the town centre seems to have been in decline before the Black Death (Thorne and Walker 2003, 88). Further south there are few indications of decay at Chesham or Marlow, although a building on Chesham High Street shows signs of having been abandoned for a short period in the early fifteenth century (Armour-Chelu 2001, 20). At Princes Risborough there is evidence of some expansion by the late fifteenth century, with agricultural land becoming used for 'backyard activities' such as rubbish disposal (John Moore Heritage Services 2002, 12).

By the time of the 1524 subsidy the effects on the county of the increasingly dominant London markets can clearly be seen with the towns in the south of the county showing much higher rates of growth than those in the north (Taylor-Moore 2006, 44). This is particularly true of High Wycombe, which had become a significant trading centre for London cornmongers (Campbell et al 1993, 49). Aylesbury also seems to have experienced rapid growth and, with a probable population of between about 1300 and 1700, was the biggest town in the county. It was still small in national terms, however, and probably lay somewhere between fifty-eighth and eighty-third in the list of largest towns in England (Taylor-Moore 2006, 45-6).

All of the county's towns acquired borough privileges without formal charters, except for High Wycombe, which received confirmation of the existence of a borough in the thirteenth century, although it was not formally incorporated until 1558, four years after Aylesbury and Buckingham (Reed 1986, 9). There is documentary evidence for the existence of municipal institutions in Buckingham, High Wycombe and Newport Pagnell, but their influence seems to have been minimal and most towns, including Aylesbury, remained seigneurial towns with little sign of corporate life (Read 1986, 9-110). It is possible, however, that, in some cases, the religious guilds which were known to have existed in most Buckinghamshire towns did have some role in their governance.

The lack of knowledge of Buckinghamshire's towns is disappointing and stands in contrast to the work done on rural settlement. There are no large towns within the county but small towns were an important part of the medieval landscape and need to be understood. There has been little study of towns as settlements, of their economic and social functions, of town plans and topography, or even of surviving documentary records. Only a small amount is known from excavation even about the old and relatively well researched towns such as Aylesbury and virtually nothing has been learnt about the origins and development of smaller and more recent towns like Newport Pagnell, Stony Stratford, Olney or even High Wycombe.

### ***5.3 The urban built environment***

Few medieval buildings survive in Buckinghamshire towns although their footprints are often preserved in the topography. The islands of buildings in the Market Square in Buckingham, the pattern of small streets in part of High Wycombe and the narrowing of the High Street in Marlow all testify to medieval encroachment onto what were originally open spaces.

Excavations in Aylesbury have found limited quantities of building materials including a fragment of daub, a broken piece of building stone and roofing tiles. Despite the latter items, most of the buildings would have been timber framed with thatched roofs. Reeds were an important crop in the wet lands around the town and may have been used for thatching, although long straw of wheat and rye was more common in Southern Britain in the period (Allen and Dalwood 1983, 53-54; Letts 1999). A gazetteer of cruck buildings in the county (Evans 1987) includes three standing buildings in Aylesbury and Wendover; two in Brill and Chesham; and one in Winslow. Fire was a constant hazard and in the eighteenth century there were major fires at Buckingham and Stony Stratford, so that very few early buildings survive there, unlike at Amersham and Wendover where

remains of fourteenth and fifteenth-century buildings can often be found behind Georgian facades (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 193, 552).

One of the oldest remaining structures in the county is the cellar under the King's Head in Aylesbury, which has been dated to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. The cellar was used as a tavern and had a staircase leading up to shops, at ground floor level. In the fifteenth century Ralph Verney, one time steward of the manor of Aylesbury and Lord Mayor of London, acquired the plot next door and built a grand hall, which was square in plan and jettied to the front. Ancillary buildings and stables at the back formed a courtyard replacing what had once been discrete urban strips (National Trust 1993). The King's Head, according to Pevsner, is now one of the best-preserved fifteenth century inns in the country, and retains some of the original glazing.

The fifteenth century was a time of much re-building often financed by wealthy merchants or important townspeople, evidence of which survives in many towns. The King's Arms in Amersham retains parts of the fifteenth century hall house it originated as and at Beaconsfield a wing of the former Crown Inn dates from the same period (Preston 2001; Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 175-6). In Buckingham, a family of wealthy lawyers who held much property in the town built two large houses: 'Fowlers' on Market Hill, surveyed before it was demolished in the 1960s, and Castle House, a stone-built courtyard house of which only part of the converted solar range now survives (Rouse 1977; Elvey 1977; Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 51-2). The latter is the only known domestic building in the county not conforming to the medieval plan of hall with service quarters on one side and parlour and solar on the other.

Institutional buildings, such as hospitals and almshouses, were built in most towns and fifteenth century timber-framed guild houses survive in Aylesbury and possibly, in part, at Fenny Stratford. That at Aylesbury, which now forms part of the county museum, was investigated and recorded during renovations in 1990, when it was revealed to have been a substantial building with a two-storey jettied range of five bays fronting the street and a single-storey two bay wing behind (Chenevix Trench and Fenley 1991). Although the carvings and mouldings that survive demonstrate that the building was of high quality, it had no heating of any form. One large upstairs room could only be reached from outside and this was probably the room used for meetings and fraternity dinners. The Brotherhood House at Fenny Stratford was the subject of a detailed architectural investigation in 1983, ahead of conversion into offices (Giggins 1983). Subsequently, however, part of the building was dendrochronologically dated to the mid-sixteenth century and further work is needed to establish what, if anything, remains of the fifteenth-century guild house.

## **6. Religion**

### ***6.1 Monastic houses, hermitages and hospitals***

Domesday Book records only one minster church in Buckinghamshire, at North Crawley, although there is some evidence to suggest that up to half a dozen others existed, most notably at Aylesbury, Buckingham and Wing (Bailey 2003, 64-5). There is no record that any of these developed into fully fledged monasteries, along Benedictine lines, as the

reform movement spread across the country in the tenth and eleventh centuries, although this may have been the intention behind the gift of Wing church to the Benedictine foundation of St Nicholas at Angers (Gem 2005, 68-9).

In total, sites of only eighteen monastic houses are recorded in Buckinghamshire and none with a foundation date before the late eleventh century (VCH Bucks I, 346). The earliest was probably Tickford Priory, founded c.1100, although alien cells may already have been in existence at Wing and Newton Longville (Knowles and Hadcock 1971, 57, 85, 97). Tickford, intended for sixteen monks, was established as a dependency of the Cluniac Abbey of Marmoutier (VCH Bucks I, 360-5) and was situated close to Newport Pagnell. There has been little recent investigation of the site although part of the church foundations were located in 2000 by a local archaeological society (North Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society 2000).

The twelfth century saw a rapid increase in the number of monasteries in England due to both the increasing desire amongst lords to found houses, and the establishment of new orders concerned with a return to monastic ideals and a more ascetic way of life. There is a noticeable concentration of small houses founded in this period in north Buckinghamshire on the fringes of what was then the heavily wooded area along the Northamptonshire border. By the middle decades of the twelfth century, Benedictine houses had been established at Luffield and Bradwell, Premonstratensian houses at Lavendon and Snelshall and a Cistercian house at Biddlesden. Most, if not all, must have been involved in woodland clearance, as has been documented in the case of Luffield (Lewis *et al.* 1997, 158). Grants of woodland to such houses would have suited both the patrons, who were gifting only marginal land for development, and the orders, who preferred sites that were both remote and free from manorial restrictions (Aston 2000, 133-6). Of this group, only Bradwell Abbey has been the subject of much modern investigation and recording due to its position within the Milton Keynes development area and a full reconstruction and structural history was published in 1994 (Mynard *et al.*), although this is now in need of updating (Ivens 2004). The chapel, once thought to have been seventeenth century, was shown to have been constructed in the early fourteenth century. It was the centre of the, possibly long-standing, healing cult of Our Lady of Bradwell and was found to contain an important series of medieval wall paintings depicting pilgrims approaching a place of healing.

The site of Lavendon Abbey was surveyed in 1983 (Brown and Everson 2005) and has been the subject of several recent evaluations ahead of building work but these have produced no evidence of where the claustral buildings were located. No recent studies or investigations have taken place in respect of Luffield, Biddlesden or Snelshall and the sites are known only from earthworks, cropmarks and aerial photographs.

In the same area, excavations at Gorefields, near Stoke Goldington, which by the thirteenth century had become a grange of Delapre Priory, have revealed what appears to have been a small nunnery (Mynard and Ivens 2002). The moated site was shown to contain a twelfth century hall/chapel with other buildings and a pentice walk added at a slightly later date. Similarities to Grafton Regis have led to suggestions that this site may have originated as a group hermitage. Remains of the material culture found indicated that the occupants had led a simple life closer to that of the peasantry than the gentry.

The wealthiest of Buckinghamshire's abbeys - Missenden and Notley - were Arroasian foundations of the mid twelfth century and both lay in the centre of the county. Missenden, one of the earliest and largest of the Arroasian houses in the country with at least twenty six canons (Knowles and Hadcock 1971, 166), lay in the heavily wooded Chilterns and came to hold much cleared land (Lewis *et al.* 1997, 158). The documentary records are good (VCH Bucks I, 369-76) and remains of monastic buildings survived until 1985 when they were largely destroyed by a fire. Significant archaeological excavations and watching briefs were carried out in the 1980s (Buckinghamshire County Museum 1984; Buckinghamshire County Museum 1985) which resulted in the location of the church being established but these remain largely unpublished. Little is known of the history of Notley Abbey, the early cartularies having been lost (VCH Bucks I, 377-80). About two thirds of the original ranges survive with few external alterations (Oxford Archaeology 2004c) but the most comprehensive archaeological and architectural study remains that produced in the 1940s (Pantin 1941).

No further foundations were made in the northern half of the county until the middle of the thirteenth century, when there was a flurry of activity within the area forming the royal forest of Bernwood, the exact extent of which was under dispute (Harvey 1997, 3-4). An Augustinian priory was established at Chetwode in 1245 and the canons there served the royal chapel at Brill as well as the local churches. The priory was annexed to Notley in 1460 and dissolved shortly afterwards (VCH Bucks I, 380-1). The chancel of the priory church remains in use as the parish church. Four of the five hermitages known from anything other than place-name evidence or single, late documentary, references also lay within Bernwood. (The fifth - Coddimoor hermitage - lay in what was then the royal forest at Whaddon). The Bernwood hermitages were situated at Chetwode, in Finemere Wood, near Quainton and at Brill where there may have been two, the names and records being confusing on this point. The hermitage of St. Stephen and St. Lawrence, founded at Chetwode, but not associated with the priory there, was said to have been 'properly dedicated and was now only called a hermitage by laity on account of its solitude not because a hermit ever lived there' (VCH Bucks I, 380). In addition there are thirteenth century documentary references to hospitals at Ludgershall (VCH Bucks I, 395) and Barton Hartshorn (Hughes 1942, 52), both also within Bernwood, but nothing further is known about either.

The only other foundation of the mid thirteenth century in the north of the county was that of the Augustinian priory at Ravenstone, close to Yardley Chase. There are no standing remains and little is known about the priory, which was in royal ownership for much of its life (VCH Bucks I, 381-2), but an archaeological watching brief in 1984 gave firm evidence for its location and established that the buildings had been substantial and of good quality (Farley 1991).

The monastic houses in the south of the county were founded somewhat later than those in the north, the earliest being Medmenham, a Cistercian house subsidiary to Woburn Abbey, which was established on the River Thames in 1204 (VCH Bucks I, 376-7). A series of small excavations and watching briefs here in the 1990s have cast doubt on earlier reconstructions and have hinted at the existence of an earlier Christian structure on the site (Farley 2001). The only female houses in the county, the Benedictine priory at Little Marlow founded in 1218, and the Augustinian abbey at Burnham founded in 1266, also lay close to the Thames. Little Marlow was excavated in 1902 ahead of road building

and a practically complete plan obtained (Peers 1902). Much survives of the monastic buildings at Burnham, which was built within a pre-existing moat and may occupy the site of an earlier manor house. A history and a plan of the layout, drawn from the remaining features and documentary evidence, was last published in 1985 (Sister Jane Mary et al) but, since that date, there have been many watching briefs and small excavations, the evidence from which remains to be incorporated.

There were two small houses of the military orders in the county. The Knights Hospitallers founded a commandery in c1180 at Hogshaw and the Knights Templars' had a preceptory at Bulstrode. Little is known about either (VCH Bucks I, 391) but walls interpreted as the remains of related buildings have recently been discovered at both sites (Archaeological Services and Consultancy Ltd 2003; Moore 2002).

The only urban monastic house in the county was the small Franciscan Friary established in Aylesbury towards the end of the fourteenth century. The approximate size and location of this is known from documentary sources (Little 1942, Hanley 1976) but the site has yet to be identified archaeologically. Most towns had hospitals, however, which were known to have existed at Buckingham, Aylesbury, High Wycombe, Newport Pagnell, Stony Stratford, Great Marlow and Wendover (Knowles and Hadcock 1971, 313-338). Most are known only from documentary sources, although remains of the buildings of hospitals dedicated to St John the Baptist at Buckingham and High Wycombe survive, and the location of St Margarets in High Wycombe has been established by excavation and skeletal remains analysed (Farley and Manchester 1989).

## ***6.2 Churches***

The century or so after the Norman Conquest saw the continuation and acceleration of the shift from minster churches to local churches and the consolidation of the parochial system. It seems likely that most of what became the county's parish churches had been founded by the end of the eleventh century but only four are recorded in Domesday Book and, apart from the probable minster church of Wing, only a few surviving buildings have visible late Saxon or early Norman elements (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 39-40). In the small-scale excavations and watching briefs that usually characterise the work currently being done on churches, evidence is sometimes found to support earlier foundations than the buildings themselves would suggest - for example at Quainton (Oxford Archaeology 2004a) and Grendon Underwood (Oxford Archaeology 2004b) - but this is rarely conclusive, and a strategy is needed for increasing our knowledge of early churches. This should include sampling churches where there is no historical evidence for a major church at an early date, as well as more complete investigations at one or two sites, possibly in conjunction with wider landscape and settlement studies. Sites of the county's many demolished churches, for example at Akeley and Buckingham, may provide scope for archaeological investigation.

Documentary evidence provides information on the date of foundation for some churches - for example, it is clear that a chapelry of Aylesbury existed at Quarrendon by the early twelfth century when a writ confirmed the acquisition of burial rights from the mother church (Morris 1989, 146). The status of the new churches depended largely on their acquisition of such rights and the graveyards of minster churches probably shrank as burials were diverted to them (Blair 2005, 467). Excavations at the probable minster

churches of Aylesbury and Wing do indeed seem to indicate that parts of both cemeteries had stopped being used for burials and that there had been secular encroachment onto ecclesiastical space by the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, (Allen and Dalwood 1983, 53; Holmes 2005, 52-54) although there could, of course, be alternative explanations for this.

The position of churches with respect to other buildings can be informative as to both the timing and the reasons behind their foundations. As well as having many examples of the more usual combinations of manor and church and motte and church, Buckinghamshire seem to have an unusually high number of medieval churches located within late prehistoric hillforts, which have so far only been the subject of a preliminary study (Kidd 2004).

The small, proprietorial, churches became established as more permanent features, as lords continued to endow them with land and to re-build them in stone, a movement which originated in the south and east of the country in the early decades of the eleventh century and spread outwards (Blair 2005, 420-2). The two hundred or so churches in Buckinghamshire with medieval fabric have largely been built piecemeal, with very few that can be said to be predominantly of one date - notable exceptions being Stewkley (twelfth century) and Hillesden (fifteenth century) (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 38, 398, 645). Whilst architecturally this may be unsatisfactory, it makes them potentially good candidates for analysing the spread and influences behind such movements. Whilst no such analysis has been done on the church buildings themselves, a series of twenty-two twelfth century fonts, inspired by the workshops of St Albans Abbey, centred on Aylesbury but found throughout the Chilterns and to the immediate north, may possibly indicate the source of the influence in that area. Another well-known type of Norman font is found in only three churches in the far south of the county: Denham, Iver and Taplow (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 40).

Most churchbuilding in the county dates from the late thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries when many churches were extended or improved. Aisles were added almost everywhere at the beginning of the period and often later enlarged. In the following centuries clerestories, chapels and towers were built (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 41-4). The exact sequence of building is often difficult to determine, especially where extensive Victorian renovation has taken place, and the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments County Inventory published in 1912-13 remains the best source of architectural analysis in most cases. Where individual architectural studies have been carried out in conjunction with a review of historical records, such as those in respect of Addington (Critchley 2004) and Wing (Gem 2005), they can be particularly informative and provide much information on the changing economic position and social structure of the parish, as well as on the church itself. The improvements were often funded by lords but, increasingly, also by wealthy traders or merchants, who often chose to be buried and commemorated in the churches they had patronised. The resulting monuments have long been studied and an inventory of the county's monumental brasses, including illustrations of many now lost, was published in 1994 (Lack *et al.*). Pevsner highlights wooden effigies at Clifton Reynes and brasses at Thornton and Taplow, where the earliest civilian brass in England is to be found (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 45). Buckinghamshire churches are particularly rich in wall paintings - those at Radnage date from c1200 but the most notable survivals are from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries such as those

found at Little Kimble, Chalfont St Giles and Little Missenden (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 44).

Aisles and chapels were frequently dedicated to saints, sometimes to those forming the focus of long-standing local cults, such as St Rumbold at Buckingham (Elliott 1975, 123), that had survived the re-assessment that seems to have taken place after the Conquest (Hadley 2001, 40). The shrines of such saints were not the only focus of popular devotion, however, and, despite the increasing formalisation of religion, there is evidence that folk religion continued in the county often under a Christian guise (VCH Bucks I, 288). The SMR contains records of four medieval 'holy wells' as well as a list of about forty other possible sites, and documentary evidence attests to thirteenth century well worship at High Wycombe and Linslade. At North Marston the shrine erected over the tomb of John Schorne, the rector there who died in 1314 and who was popularly believed to have trapped the devil in a boot and created a miraculous holy well, continued to attract pilgrims from a wide area until the Reformation (VCH Bucks I, 288).

## **7. Defensive structures**

The sites of twenty three motte and bailey castles and four ringworks are known within Buckinghamshire (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 47), although unidentified mounds and place-names, such as Castle Fee recorded in the fourteenth century in Aylesbury, indicate that there may have been more. Buckingham is the only castle in the county constructed as part of the eleventh-century programme of building royal strongholds to control the newly conquered kingdom. Parts of it survived into the eighteenth century before being demolished and some evidence may still remain within the substrata of the mound now occupied by the parish church. Excavations in 1877 recovered masonry and a fireplace and, more recently, the remains of a large wall or early medieval embankment, perhaps forming part of the castle bailey, were located (Hindmarch 2002).

The remainder were manorial strongholds erected in the troubled centuries after the Norman Conquest and mostly destroyed or abandoned by the end of the thirteenth century (RCHM 1912, 16). They were located in two main areas: along both edges of the Chilterns and in the north-eastern part of the county on both sides of Watling Street. Some such as Bolebec (Whitchurch), Wolverton and Castlethorpe were the heads of Buckinghamshire baronies (RCHM 1912, 17). The latter was subject to small-scale excavations in the 1990s which confirmed the medieval origins of the extensive earthworks and revealed pre-existing water-management features (Bonner *et al.* 1995). Unusually the parish church lay within the inner bailey but it is not known which was the earlier construction.

The only motte to be excavated in the county, at Weston Turville, was found to have been originally over six metres high with a surrounding ditch of similar proportions to that at Bedford Castle. By the end of the thirteenth century the castle had been transformed into a moated manorial enclosure (Yeoman 1986).

The only complete medieval fortified building in the county is the fourteenth-century gatehouse with encircling moat at Boarstall (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 48).

## **8. Crafts, trade and industries**

### ***8.1 Pottery, tiles and bricks***

Buckinghamshire is rich in the raw materials needed for pottery and tile production - clay, wood, and water - and medieval kilns have been found at many sites in the county, for example at Great Brickhill in the north (Beamish 1989) and at Denham in the south (Farley and Leach 1988). Most seem to have been small, rural production sites supplying the local market and the potting was almost certainly a part-time occupation combined with small-scale agriculture (Cherry 1991, 204). Some sites produced both pottery and tiles as at Latimer, where a fifteenth-century pottery kiln was discovered built into a disused roof tile kiln (Farley and Lawson 1990). Tile-making was a seasonal occupation and it is possible that, in some cases, potting was too. At Denham the potters appeared to live elsewhere and the site may only have been used in the summer months.

At Olney Hyde, however, where a deserted medieval settlement and pottery production centre were identified in 1957, excavations revealed a house / workshop close to the kilns (Mynard 1984, 56). The site, which contained at least fourteen kilns, produced roof tiles and a wide range of pottery, much of which was wheel-thrown and well-made. Small fingerprints found on some items showed that children had assisted in its manufacture. Unfortunately, the distribution area for the pots cannot be reconstructed as they are too similar to other wares produced further along the Ouse valley. The kilns were probably in operation from the mid twelfth century to the early fifteenth when they closed and the village was deserted. It is not known whether the demise of the village and industry was connected to the emparking of what was probably Olney Hyde's open fields in 1374.

The most successful of the county's clay-based industries, and the only ones with any significance outside their immediate localities, were the pottery industry based at Brill, and nearby Boarstall, and the tile workshops of Penn. Much has been learnt about the Brill-Boarstall industry since four thirteenth and fourteenth-century kilns were excavated in 1953 (Jope 1954). Reports have been published covering subsequent excavations (Jope and Ivens 1981; Ivens 1981; Ivens 1982; Farley 1982b) and a previously unknown production centre operating in Ludgershall in the fifteenth century has recently been identified (Blinkhorn and Saunders 2002). An account of the development of the industry and the pottery produced is included in a synthesis of pottery in the Oxford region produced in 1994 (Mellor 1994). Documentary sources indicate that pottery production had probably begun in the area by the second half of the twelfth century, and that there were ten kilns in operation by 1254. The industry seems to have reached its zenith in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, when the vast amounts of pottery found in excavations demonstrate that it was a large-scale production site for cooking pots, pans, skillets, herring dishes and glazed jugs. All were of good quality, turned on a fast wheel and hard fired (Jope 1954, 40). The cooking pots and pans were distributed over an area within about a twenty mile radius of Brill, reaching to Oxford in the south west. The more highly decorated jugs, some of exceptional quality, seem to have been marketed over a much larger area, generally within about fifty miles of Brill, but were also to be found in gentry households across England (Jope 1954, 40-42; Mellor 1994, 138).

It has been suggested that at least part of Brill's success was due to it being the location of a favourite royal hunting lodge in the thirteenth century. The requirements of the royal household may have stimulated demand for goods - for example, jugs and pitchers would have been required for decanting the wine that was known to have been delivered from Southampton in wooden barrels - and the potters may have been under royal patronage by the middle of the thirteenth century (Mellor 1994, 132). It is known that some of the pottery was sold at Oxford but it is possible that the potters made use of the royal supply chain to distribute their finer wares (Farley 1982, 117).

Although pottery production continued at Brill throughout the medieval period and beyond, its popularity outside the local area had begun to decline by the mid fourteenth century due to competition from kilns located in Hertfordshire and Northamptonshire, the general economic slump and the king's growing preference for Woodstock over Brill as a base for hunting (Mellor 1994, 138-9).

A full account of the successful tile industry at Penn has recently been published (Green 2005). This concludes that the tile workshops there were probably the most extensive and successful in England between c1350-c1380 'with a near monopoly on supply of vast quantities of decorated floor tiles and roof tiles for royal palaces and major ecclesiastical and secular buildings all over London and the south-east'. As in the case of Brill, an early established industry seems to have expanded rapidly, largely as a result of royal patronage, in this case in the form of the supply of roof and floor tiles to the building works at Windsor Castle, where Penn tilers were kept occupied for over eight years (Green 2005, 118). Tiles were supplied to other royal sites, such as Westminster Palace and the Tower of London, and to other places around Penn, or close to the navigable parts of the Thames (Green 2005, 127, 130). The last reference to decorated floor tiles occurs in 1388, by which time the market had probably become saturated, but the production of roof tiles continued (Green 2005, 118, 145). The remains of a series of five kilns were investigated in 2001 and 2003, although they probably post-date the period of Penn's heyday, but the reports of these investigations remain unpublished (Fell 2001, Abrams 2003). In the north of the county tile kilns at Little Brickhill supplied floor tiles for churches in the area but these were considered to be of far inferior quality to those made at Penn (Hohler 1941, 15,24).

By the end of the medieval period documentary sources record that bricks were also being made in the county, although no kilns or clamps have so far been discovered. In the 1460s bricks manufactured in Brill were being brought into Oxford (Jope 1954, 42) and a contract of 1534 records the supply of 300,000 bricks, made at Tingewick, for the building of Winchester College (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 82).

## **8.2 Cloth**

The cloth trade was never very extensive in the county although attempts were made to attract the industry to towns such as High Wycombe (VCH Bucks II, 128-9) and Buckingham, where a 'Drapers Hall' had been built by 1473 (Elliott 1975, 206-7). Fulling mills are known to have existed at various places in the county - for example, that at Newton Blossomville owned by the prior of Ravenstone in 1378 (Jenkins 1934, 176-7), and the High Wycombe borough records contain many references to weaving, fulling and dyeing (VCH Bucks II, 128-9). The industry is difficult to trace archaeologically,

however, and cloth production sites can generally only be tentatively identified as such, as at Olney in 2003 (Thorne and Walker).

### ***8.3 Corn milling***

Domesday Book records 134 mills in Buckinghamshire at 93 separate locations, with the most valuable being situated along the Ouse, the Thames and the Colne (Bailey 1997, 67). A gazetteer of the county's watermills, published in 1982, records 118, known from documentary sources other than Domesday Book, by 1500 (Buckinghamshire County Museum Archaeological Group 1982). It seems likely that, in many cases, there was continuity of site, due to the investment required in the construction of leats and ponds, but this can rarely be proven. Archaeological investigations of medieval watermill sites are rare, the only recent one being at Pann Mill, High Wycombe in 1997, when traces of mid fourteenth-century mill buildings were revealed (Cauvain and Cauvain, 1997). In excavations at the former Spital Mill in Aylesbury the fourteenth century mill channel was located indicating that the site of the medieval mill, which was rebuilt and relocated in the seventeenth century, was probably nearby (Humphrey 2004).

Some areas, such as the north-central part of the county, recorded few mills in 1086, presumably because of the lack of suitable streams, and, although the total had increased slightly by the mid-thirteenth century, many parishes remained without a mill (Bailey 1997, 68-9). Some grain would have been transported to other sites for milling but much must have been milled by hand or by animal power.

Windmills were an early introduction to the county with one of the earliest in the country being recorded at Dinton by about 1180 (Pevsner and Williamson 1960, 83). Much is known about some of these early post-mills, both from the accounts kept of their construction - for example, that at Ibstone, built at great expense by Merton College in 1293/4 (Roden 1966, 52), and from the excavation of the mound of a late thirteenth century windmill at Great Linford (Mynard and Zeepvat 1992, 104-5). Stone built tower mills began to replace post-mills by the end of the thirteenth century and it seems likely that that built at Turweston by Westminster Abbey was an early example in the county (Watts and Langdon 2004). A gazetteer of the county's windmills published in 1978 includes twenty-six medieval mills known to exist from documentary sources, but the list is incomplete, the authors describing it as 'a basis for future work' (Buckinghamshire County Museum Archaeological Group 1978).

### ***8.4 Wood-working and woodland industries***

Carpentry was clearly a very important part of the medieval building trade in the county, as demonstrated by the large number of surviving timber framed buildings. The standard of workmanship found in many buildings such as the Old Manor at Askett (now demolished) (Beresford 1970) demonstrate how skilled many of the carpenters were.

Woodland industries were vital to the Chilterns economy, and evidence of the management of resources can be seen in the surviving woodbanks, originally built to protect coppiced trees from grazing animals, and in ancient coppices and pollards. Much of the wood was grown for fuel, sold both within the county and in London, but there is

some documentary evidence of small-scale woodworking taking place (Hepple and Doggett 1992, 11-13; Roden 1968). The most important archaeological evidence for wood-working, however, comes from Whaddon, in the north of the county, where a late fourteenth century carpenter's workshop forming part of the manorial complex was excavated. Lathe turned bowls at all stages of production were found, supplying much information about both the woodworking process and the range of vessels produced (Griffiths 1979).

### **8.5 Other**

There is some evidence for metal working in the county, for example smithies have been found at Whaddon and Brill and traces of iron smelting and possibly copper working at Olney (Griffiths 1979; Jope 1954; Thorne and Walker 2003). Many bloomeries have been found within the county and, although these largely remain undated, some undoubtedly originated in the medieval period.

The evidence for tanning and leather working is mainly documentary but traces of the industry, possibly dating to the medieval period have been found in excavations in or near to towns for example at Walton, near Aylesbury, High Wycombe and Marlow (Dalwood et al 1989; Bourn 2000; BCAS 1996).

A large number of other crafts and trades must have existed in the county ranging from the masonry, tiling and thatching evidenced by standing buildings to the small scale fur production indicated by the finding of skeletons of skinned cats in Aylesbury (Allen and Dalwood 1983, 54).

## **9. Transport and Communications**

The River Thames was the main route for shipping bulky goods, such as firewood, from the Chilterns and southern half of the county to London, in the middle ages (Galloway et al 1996). By 1300 Henley-on-Thames in Oxfordshire had become the main entrepot for the Thames Valley (Campbell et al 1993, 194-5) but there were important wharves at Marlow and Hedsor, the latter probably being used for the shipping of Penn tiles (Green 2005, 132). Excavations at Hedsor in 1894-5 revealed an oak floor supported by beech and oak piles, identified at the time as a pile dwelling of Romano-British date. In 1968-9 twelve further piles were recovered at the same site and all are now thought to be part of the medieval wharf (Keen 2000, n.p.). It is not known whether the Great Ouse was used for transporting goods. Traces of Roman wharves have been located at Haversham and possibly Thornton (Reed 1979, 48) but none that were in use in the medieval period have been found, nor are there any surviving records of tolls being charged or collected. It is possible that the many mills known to have existed on the river made it virtually impassable.

Although river transport was in many cases cheaper, the overwhelming majority of journeys were made by road (Aston 1985, 138; Hindle 2002, 5) and, even where goods were shipped by river, at least part of the journey would have been overland - for example, in the fifteenth century a boar that was being delivered to the London house of the Earl of Wiltshire from Aylesbury was sent to Reading for shipping on via the Thames

(Elvey 1965, 334). The road system was, therefore, vital to the economy of the county and its study crucial to an understanding of the development of trade, towns and settlement patterns. There is a surprising lack of archaeological evidence in respect of the use of the roads for carrying goods, an important exception being the find of a hoard of fifty-nine thirteenth-century copper alloy brooches at Hambleden. These were probably made in a London workshop and lost or hidden when being carried to High Wycombe or beyond for sale (Babb, 1997). However, much relevant information will inevitably come from documentary sources as roads, many of which were never constructed but evolved over time and remained in use over many centuries, are not generally datable by excavation (Aston 1985, 141).

The earliest evidence for the existence of a national road system, centred on London, comes from the Gough Map, dating from c1360. This shows that three of the main roads radiating out from the capital - those to Bristol, Oxford and Carlisle - passed through Buckinghamshire (Reed 1979, 105-6). The latter route seems to have followed the Roman road of Watling Street, although the map, probably by mistake, shows Buckingham as an intermediate stop between Stony Stratford and Daventry (Stenton 1936, 242). Other Roman roads - Akeman Street; the Ouse Valley roads linking Oxford and the south-west with Cambridge and East Anglia; and the road from Towcester to Dorchester-on-Thames which crossed the Ouse at Water Stratford - are known to have remained in use and the Fleet Marston to Thornborough continued to be the main route from Aylesbury to Buckingham until eighteenth century turnpiking (Reed 1979, 105, 214). There is virtually no evidence of the making of new roads in medieval England and it was probably the increasing traffic, particularly to and from London as its importance grew, that gave rise to the development of generally accepted routes between places, often based on more ancient trackways (Stenton 1936, 238-9). It has recently been suggested that the Icknield Way, which runs along the Chiltern scarp, developed in this way and that before the thirteenth century it was, contrary to popular belief, 'at most a medium range Saxon trackway' (Harrison 2003, 18).

The routes that grew in importance can often be identified by the building of bridges, sometimes with a chapel or hospital attached - for example, the hospital of St John the Baptist which had been built on the bridge at Stony Stratford by 1306 (VCH Bucks I, 394). There were nine bridges along the length of the Great Ouse by the early thirteenth century and this had grown to fourteen by 1350 and seventeen, of which only two were timber built, by 1540 (Harrison 2004, 22, 138). A similar pattern of growth must have occurred along the Thames and other rivers in the area. Many medieval bridges in the county are known from documentary sources, one of the earliest being the bridge of Avice recorded at Barton Hartshorn in 1225 (Hughes 1942, 52), but the only one to survive is the fourteenth-century bridge over the Ouse at Thornborough (Reed 1979, 107). Rivers were not the only obstacles to travellers, however, and parts of the claylands north of the Chilterns were often virtually impassable in wet weather. Causeways are known to have been constructed on well-used routes such as the one that Leland, in 1540, noted ran nearly all the way from Aylesbury to Wendover (Toulmin Smith 1964, 112).

In addition to longer distance routes, there must have been a myriad of local roads and tracks used for the movement of goods, by cart or pack animal, and by people as they went about their everyday business. Identification of such routes is notoriously difficult but, in the north of the county, the SMR records many holloways located by aerial

photographs and field surveys of deserted villages - for example that at Stowe, where the old road from Buckingham to Towcester was traced as a series of tracks, holloways and earthworks. The position of an oak pollard, about 500 years old, suggests that it may have been a way-marking tree. (Riley 2001, 12).

There have been some small-scale studies of individual roads, such as the Saltway from Droitwich to Princes Risborough (Bull 1975), and of the roads and tracks in individual villages, such as those of Padbury studied by map and aerial survey in 1958 (Beresford and St Joseph, 254-7). The latter showed many roads leading out from the village to the open-fields with very few continuing to the parish boundary. In the north east of the county, work at Milton Keynes has identified many of the roads that were in use in the medieval period - for example the routes linking villages to the nearby market towns, known as Portway in every parish through which they passed, and roads linking villages on opposite sides of the rivers which generally crossed the river at mill sites. The best-surfaced roads were found in the villages where use was made of cobbles and limestone, as revealed at Bradwell Bury (Croft and Mynard 1993, 25-6; Mynard 1994, 6).

The pattern of roads in the Chilterns would have been very different, with the main arterial routes passing through the river valleys and many lesser used tracks linking dispersed settlements to the commons on higher ground. A pilot study mapping the character of roads in a small section of the Chilterns is currently underway as part of the Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation project. Whilst this is still in its early stages, there is some indication that roads and tracks used in the medieval period may have had much earlier origins, their alignment being cut across by the building of Akeman Street in the Roman period. This gives some support to the theory of the survival of a pre-Roman, co-axial road network across the Chilterns and the north of the county (Bull 1993).

## **10. Legacy**

England had changed considerably by the first decades of the sixteenth century. The population remained low after the crises of the fourteenth century, meaning that land and resources were concentrated in the hands of fewer people, and the grip of feudalism was weakening. Lords no longer farmed directly and some peasants had acquired large land holdings, becoming wealthy on the profits of pastoral agriculture. High wages fuelled the demand for goods available at markets or in towns and a group of wealthy merchants and tradesmen was beginning to appear. Evidence of these changes can be seen in the Buckinghamshire landscape - in the replacement of arable open fields in the north with the enclosures of wealthy graziers, in the deserted villages and in the wave of new building in the towns.

An urban network was in place, consisting largely of towns which had grown up in the optimistic times of the thirteenth century and which had proved strong enough to survive the troubles of the fourteenth and fifteenth. The influence of the London markets was increasing and the south of the county, particularly the area around High Wycombe, was prospering more than the north where transport to the capital was more difficult and expensive.

A stone built church was present in virtually every parish, and most had had towers added or been enlarged, embellished or improved in other ways. Chapels of ease had been constructed to serve communities distant from the mother church and, in many cases, had been raised to parish church status. The wave of enthusiasm for monasteries had passed, however, and several Buckinghamshire houses were dissolved before the Reformation, most of their estates going to endow Oxford colleges. The last religious house in the county, Burnham Abbey, surrendered to the king in September 1539.

## **Bibliography**

- Aberg, F A, 1978 *Medieval moated sites*, CBA Res Rep **17**, London
- Abrams, J, 2003 Rose Cottage, Elm Road, Tylers Green, Buckinghamshire, unpublished report
- Alcock, N W, 1981 *Cruck Construction. An Introduction and Catalogue*, CBA Research Report 42, London
- Allen, D, 1982 Salvage excavations at 13-19 Buckingham Street and the Bull's Head redevelopment site, Aylesbury, in 1979 and 1980, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **24**, 81-106
- Allen, D and Dalwood, C H, 1983 Iron Age occupation, a Middle Saxon cemetery, and twelfth to nineteenth century urban occupation: excavations in George Street, Aylesbury, 1981, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **25**, 1-59
- Archaeological Services and Consultancy Ltd, 2003 Watching brief and salvage recording: Claydon Road, Hogshaw, unpubl. report
- Archaeological Solutions Ltd, 2004 Business/Science Park, Aston Clinton Major Development Area, Aylesbury Buckinghamshire. Archaeological desk-based assessment and earthwork survey, unpubl. report
- Armour-Chelu, R, 2001 128 High Street, Chesham, Buckinghamshire. Archaeological excavation on the site of supermarket development and associated parking, unpubl. report
- Aston, M, 2000 *Monasteries in the Landscape*, Stroud
- Babb, L, 1997 A thirteenth-century brooch hoard from Hambleton, Buckinghamshire, *Medieval Archaeology* **41**, 233-6
- Bailey, K A, 1995 Buckinghamshire slavery in 1086, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **37**, 67-78
- Bailey, K A, 1997 Mills in Domesday Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **39**, 67-72
- Bailey, K A, 2002 The population of Buckinghamshire in 1086, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **42**, 1-14
- Bailey, K A, 2003 The Church in Anglo-Saxon Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **43**, 61-76
- Bailey, K A, 2005 Early medieval Stewkley: settlements and fields, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **45**, 93-114

- Baker, A R H, 1966 The Evidence in the Nonarum Inquisitiones of Contracting Arable Lands in England during the Early Fourteenth Century, in *Economic History Review* 2nd ser 19, 518-32
- BCAS, 1996 Interim report on an archaeological excavation at the Brewery Site, High Street, Marlow, Buckinghamshire, unpubl. report no. 384
- Beamish, H F, 1989 A medieval pottery production site at Jack Ironcap's Lane, Great Brickhill, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **31**, 88-92
- Beresford, G, 1970 The Old Manor, Askett, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **18**, 343-66
- Beresford, M W, 1953-4 A Summary List of Deserted Villages in the County' in *Records of Buckinghamshire* **16**, 26-8
- Beresford, M W, and St Joseph, J K S, 1958 *Medieval England - An Aerial Survey*, Cambridge
- Blair, J, 1994 *Anglo Saxon Oxfordshire*, Stroud
- Blair, J, 2005 *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, Oxford
- Blinkhorn, P, and Saunders, M J, 2002 A late 15<sup>th</sup>-century manufactory of the Brill/Boarstall pottery industry at Ludgershall, Buckinghamshire, *Medieval Ceramics* **26/7**, 131-41
- Bonner, D, 1996 Investigations at the County Museum, Aylesbury, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **38**, 1-89
- Bonner, D, Parkhouse, J, and Smith, N, 1995 Archaeological investigations of the medieval earthworks at Castlethorpe, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **37**, 79-99
- Bourn, R, 2000 Arhaeological desk based assessment - The Courtyard, Frogmoor, High Wycombe, unpubl. report
- Britnell, R H, 1981 The proliferation of markets in England 1200-1349, *Economic History Review*, **34**, 209-21
- Brown, A, and Everson, P, 2005 Earthworks at Lavendon, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **45**, 45-64
- Buckinghamshire County Museum, 1984 Missenden Abbey, *South Midlands Archaeology* **14**, 10-11
- Buckinghamshire County Museum, 1985 Missenden Abbey, *South Midlands Archaeology* **15**, 26-8

- Buckinghamshire County Museum Archaeological Group, 1978 Buckinghamshire windmills, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **20**, 516-524
- Buckinghamshire County Museum Archaeological Group, 1982 Buckinghamshire watermills, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **24**, 34-45
- Bull, E J, 1993 The bi-axial landscape of prehistoric Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **35**, 11-18
- Bull, L, 1975 The ancient saltway from Droitwich to Princes Risborough, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **20**, 87-92
- Campbell, B M S, Galloway, J A, Keene, D, and Murphy, M, 1993 *A Medieval Capital and its Grain Supply: Agrarian Production and Distribution in the London Region c. 1300*, London
- Cantor, L M, and Hatherly, J, 1977 The Medieval Parks of Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **20**, 430-50
- Cauvain, S, and Cauvain, P, 1997 Investigations at Pann Mill, High Wycombe, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **39**, 18-44
- Chenevix-Trench, J, and Fenley, P, 1979 A base-cruck hall in Denham, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **21**, 3-10
- Chenevix Trench, J, 1989 Willow Vale Farm House, Steeple Claydon, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **31**, 13-32
- Chenevix Trench, J, and Fenley, P, 1991 The County Museum buildings, Church Street, Aylesbury, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **33**, 1-43
- Cherry, J, 1991 Pottery and Tile in *English Medieval Industries*, (eds J. Blair and N. Ramsay), 189-209, London
- Chibnall, A C, 1965 *Sherington: Fiefs and Fields of a Buckinghamshire Village*, Cambridge
- County Museum Archaeological Group, 1973 Moated sites in Buckinghamshire - a list, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **19**, 336-339
- Critchley, D J, 2004 *Addington Church. An Architectural and Historical Study*, Buckinghamshire Papers **4**
- Croft, R A, and Mynard, D C, 1993 *The Changing Landscape of Milton Keynes*, Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society Monograph Series No. 5, Aylesbury
- Croft, R A, and Pike, A R, 1988 Buckinghamshire fishponds and river fisheries, in *Medieval Fish, Fisheries and Fishponds in England* (ed. M. Aston), BAR British Series 182(ii), 229-266, Oxford

Dalwood, H, Dillon, J, Evans, J and Hawkins, A, 1989 Excavations in Walton, Aylesbury, 1985-1986, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **31**, 137-221

Darby, H C, 1977 *Domesday England*, Cambridge

Darby, H C and Campbell, E M J, 1962 *The Domesday Geography of South-East England*, Cambridge

Dawson, M, 2002 Archaeology desk based assessment and trial trench evaluation at the Grand Junction Hotel, Buckingham, unpubl. report

Dyer, A, 1991 *Decline and Growth in English Towns 1400-1640*, Basingstoke

Dyer, C, 2002 *Making a Living in the Middle Ages. The People of Britain 850-1520*, London

Dyer, C , 2005 *An Age of Transition? Economy and Society in the Later Middle Ages*, Oxford

Elliott, D J, 1975 *Buckingham. The Loyal and Ancient Borough*, Chichester

Elvey, E M, 1965 Aylesbury in the fifteenth century - a bailiff's notebook, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **17**, 321-335

Elvey, E M, 1977 The history of nos. 1 & 2 Market Hill, Buckingham, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **20**, 301-7

Enright, D, and Parkhouse, J, 1996 Archaeological Investigation at Weston Underwood in 1994 in *Records of Buckinghamshire* **38**, 175-98

Everson, P, 2001 Peasants, Peers and Graziers: the Landscape of Quarrendon, Buckinghamshire, interpreted in *Records of Buckinghamshire* **41**, 1-45

Farley, M, 1974 Aylesbury - a defended town?, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **19**, 429-48

Farley, M, 1979 Burials in Aylesbury and the early history of the town, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **21**, 116-21

Farley, M, 1980 Middle Saxon Occupation at Chicheley, Bucks' in *Records of Buckinghamshire* **22**, 92-104

Farley, M, 1982a Excavations at Low Farm, Fulmer, Bucks: II, the medieval manor, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **24**, 46-72

Farley, M, 1982b A medieval pottery industry at Boarstall, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **24**, 107-117

- Farley, M, 1991 Ravenstone Priory: the church located, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **33**, 114-127
- Farley, M, 2001 Medmenham Abbey, Medmenham, Bucks; results from some archaeological watching briefs, unpublished report.
- Farley, M, and Lawson, J, 1990 A fifteenth-century pottery and tile kiln at Leyhill, Latimer, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **32**, 35-62
- Farley, M, and Leach, H, 1988 Medieval pottery production areas near Rush Green, Denham, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **30**, 53-102
- Farley, M and Manchester, K, 1989 The Cemetery of the Leper Hospital of St Margaret, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, *Medieval Archaeology* **XXXIII**
- Fell, D, 2001 An archaeological evaluation of Rose Cottage, Tylers Green, Buckinghamshire, unpublished report
- Foreman, S, Hiller, J, and Petts, D, 2002 *Gathering the people, settling the land. The archaeology of a middle Thames landscape: Anglo-Saxon to post-medieval*, Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 14, Oxford
- Galloway, J A, Keene, D A, and Murphy, M, 1996 Fuelling the city: production and distribution of firewood and fuel in London's region, 1290-1400, *Economic History Review* **49**, 447-72
- Gem, R, 2005 The Church of All Saints, Wing, Buckinghamshire, in Excavation of a Late Saxon - Medieval Cemetery at the site of the former Victorian School, Wing, Buckinghamshire May - June 1999 (M. Holmes), unpublished report
- Giggins, B L, 1983 A brief history of the site of Valentin, Ord and Nagle's factory in Fenny Stratford, unpubl. report
- Gray, H L, 1915 *English Field Systems* , Cambridge, Mass.
- Green, M, 2005 Medieval tile industry at Penn, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **45**, 115-160
- Griffiths, R, 1979 Rescue excavations of a medieval house at Whaddon, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **21**, 40-76
- Gulland, D, 2003 Aston Clinton Manor House: from moated site to classical mansion, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **43**, 195-207
- Hadley, D, 2001 *Death in Medieval England: an archaeology*, Stroud
- Hall, D, 2001 *Turning the Plough. Midland open fields: landscape character and proposals for management*, Northampton

- Hanley, H, 1976 The Friarage, Rickfords Hill, Aylesbury, *Aylesbury Society Newsletter* **7**, 5-6
- Harrison, D, 2004 *The Bridges of Medieval England. Transport and Society 400-1800*, Oxford
- Harrison, S, 2003 The Icknield Way: some queries, *The Archaeological Journal* **160**, 1-22
- Harvey, I M W, 1997 Bernwood in the middle ages, in *Bernwood. The Life and Afterlife of a Forest* (eds J Broad and R. Hoyle), 1-18, Preston
- Harvey, P D A, 1985 Mapping the Village : the Historical Evidence, in *Medieval Villages* (ed. D. Hooke), 33-45, Oxford
- Hepple, L W, and Doggett, A M, 1992 *The Chilterns*, 2 edn, Chichester
- Hindle, P, 2002 *Medieval Roads and Tracks*, Princes Risborough
- Hindmarch, E, 2002 Church Hill, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire. An archaeological evaluation for Buckingham Town Council, unpubl. report
- Hohler, C, 1941 Medieval paving tiles in Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **14**, 1-49
- Holmes, M, 2005 Excavation of a Late Saxon - Medieval Cemetery at the site of the former Victorian School, Wing, Buckinghamshire May - June 1999, unpublished report
- Howard, R, Laxton, R and Litton, C, 1997 *Tree-ring analysis of timbers from the Tithe Barn, Lake End Road, Taplow, near Burnham, Berkshire*. AML Report New Series 76/97
- Hughes, M W (ed), 1942 *A Calendar of the Feet of Fines for Buckinghamshire, 7 Richard I to 44 Henry III*, Bedford
- Humphrey, R, 2004 The Oxford Road Watermill, Aylesbury, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **44**, 67-103
- Ivens, R J, 1981 Medieval pottery kilns at Brill, Buckinghamshire: preliminary report on excavations in 1978, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **23**, 102-106
- Ivens, R J, 1982 Medieval Pottery from the 1978 excavations at Temple Farm, Brill, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **24**, 144-169
- Ivens, R, 2004 Bradwell, Bradwell Abbey, *South Midlands Archaeology* **34**, 28-30
- Ivens, R J, Busby, P, and Shepherd, N J, 1995 *Westbury and Tattenhoe (Medieval villages)*, Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society Monograph Series No. 8, Aylesbury

- Jenkins, J G, 1934 An early coroner's roll for Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **13**, 163-185
- John Moore Heritage Services, 2002 An archaeological investigation at Town Farm Barns, Market Square, Princes Risborough, Buckinghamshire, unpubl. report
- John Moore Heritage Services, 2006 An archaeological recording action of land off Wotton End, Ludgershall, Buckinghamshire, unpubl. report
- Jones, R, 2004 Signals in the Soil: the Use of Pottery in Manure Scatters in the Identification of Medieval Arable Farming Regimes, *Arch J* **161**, 159-88
- Jones, R, and Page, M, 2006 *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape: Beginnings and Ends*, Macclesfield
- Jope, E M, 1954 Medieval pottery kilns at Brill, Buckinghamshire: preliminary report on excavations in 1953, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **16**, 39-42
- Jope, E M, and Ivens, R J, 1981 Some early products of the Brill pottery, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **23**, 32-38
- Keen, L, 2000 Windsor Castle and the Penn tile industry, in *Windsor: medieval archaeology, art and architecture of the Thames Valley* (ed. L Keen)
- Keene, D, 1995 Small towns and the Metropolis: the experience of medieval England, in *Peasants and Townsmen in Medieval Europe* (eds J-M Duvosquel and E. Thoen), Ghent
- Kidd, A, 2004 Hillforts and Churches: a coincidence of locations? *Records of Buckinghamshire* **44**, 105-110
- Kidd, A, 2005 Buckinghamshire Historic Towns. Draft Project Design V2, unpubl. report
- Kidd, A, 2006 The Cistercian grange at Grange Farm, Shipton Lee, Quainton, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **46**, 149-56
- Knowles, D and Hadcock, R N, 1953 *Medieval religious houses England and Wales*, 2 edn, London
- Lack, W, Stuchfield, H M, and Whittemore, P, 1994 *The Monumental Brasses of Buckinghamshire*, London
- Laws, G, 2002 Stratford House, Buckingham, Buckinghamshire. Archaeological evaluation, unpubl. report
- Le Patourel, H E J, and Roberts, B K, 1978 The significance of moated sites, in *Medieval moated sites* (ed. F A Aberg), CBA Res Rep **17**, 46-55, London
- Letters, S, 2006 *Online Gazetteer of Markets and Fairs in England and Wales to 1516*. Available: <http://www.history.ac.uk/cmh/gaz/gazweb2.html> Accessed: 20 July 2006

- Letts, J B, 1999. *Smoke Blackened Thatch: a unique source of late medieval plant remains from Southern England*, London.
- Lewis, C, Mitchell-Fox, P, and Dyer, C, 1997 *Village, Hamlet and Field. Changing Medieval Settlements in Central England*, 2 edn, Macclesfield
- Little, A G, 1942 The Grey Friars of Aylesbury, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **14**, 77-98
- Macdonald, A, and Gowing, C, 1989 Excavations at the Hamlet in Bedgrove, Aylesbury, 1964-5, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **31**, 120-36
- Mellor, M, 1994 A synthesis of Middle and Late saxon, medieval and early post-medieval pottery in the Oxford region, *Oxoniensia* **59**, 17-217
- Moore, J, 2001 An archaeological evaluation at The Courtyard, Frogmoor, High Wycombe, unpubl. report
- Moore, J, 2002 Hedgerley, Knights Rest, Moat farm Barns, Hedgerley Lane, Gerrards Cross, *South Midlands Archaeology* **32**, 16
- Morris, J (ed.), 1978 *Domesday Book: Buckinghamshire*, Chichester
- Morris, R, 1989 *Churches in the Landscape*, London
- Moulins, D. de 2006 The weed of the thatch roofs of medieval cottages from the south of England, *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany*, onlinefirst.
- Mynard, D C, 1979 Stone weights from the Rivers Great Ouse, Ouzel, Nene and Tove, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **21**, 11-28
- Mynard, D C, 1984 A medieval pottery industry at Olney Hyde, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **26**, 56-85
- Mynard, D C, 1994 *Excavations on Medieval Sites in Milton Keynes*, Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society Monograph Series No. 6, Aylesbury
- Mynard, D C, and Ivens, R J, 2002 The excavation of Gorefields: a medieval nunnery and grange at Stoke Goldington, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **42**, 19-101
- Mynard, D C, Woodfield, P, and Zeepvat, R J, 1994 Bradwell Abbey, Buckinghamshire research and excavation, 1968 to 1987, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **36**, 1-61
- Mynard, D C, and Zeepvat, R J, 1992 *Great Linford*, Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society Monograph Series No. 3, Aylesbury
- National Trust, 1993 The King's Head, Aylesbury. An historic building survey 1992/3, unpubl. report

Network Archaeology Ltd, 2003 Land to the rear of 10 High Street, Winslow, Buckinghamshire, unpubl. report

North Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society, 2000 Excavation report for Tickford Abbey dig of 21<sup>st</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> October 2000, <http://www.nbas.org.uk/tickford.html> Accessed 10 June 2006

Oxford Archaeology, 2004a Church of the Holy Cross and St Mary, Quainton, Buckinghamshire, unpublished archaeological watching brief report

Oxford Archaeology, 2004b St Leonards Church, Grendon Underwood, Buckinghamshire, unpublished archaeological watching brief report

Oxford Archaeology, 2004c Notley Abbey, Long Crendon, Buckinghamshire. Historic Buildings Assessment, unpublished report

Page, M, 2005 Destroyed by the Temples: the Deserted Medieval Village of Stowe, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **45**, 189-204

Page, W (ed), 1905 *The Victoria History of the Counties of England. A History of the County of Buckingham*, London

Pantin, W A, 1941 Notley Abbey, *Oxoniensia* 6, 22-43

Parker, R F, and Boarder, A W F, 1991 A medieval settlement site at Fillington Wood, West Wycombe, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **33**, 128-39

Pavry, F H, and Knocker, G M, 1957 The Mount, Princes Risborough, Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **16**, 131-178

Peers, C R, 1902 The Benedictine Nunnery of Little Marlow, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **8**, 419-34

Pevsner, N, and Williamson, E, 1960 *The Buildings of England - Buckinghamshire*, 2 edn, London

Pike, A, 1995 Earthwork enclosures in the Buckinghamshire Chilterns, in *Chiltern Archaeology - recent work. A Handbook for the Next Decade* (ed. R. Holgate), 118-9, Dunstable

Rackham, O, 1986 *The History of the Countryside*, London

Reed, M, 1978 Markets and fairs in medieval Buckinghamshire, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **20**, 563-585

Reed, M, 1979 *The Buckinghamshire Landscape*, London

- Reed, M, 1986 Decline and Recovery in a provincial urban network: Buckinghamshire towns, 1350-1800, in *English Towns in Decline 1350-1800* (ed. M Reed), Leicester
- Reed, M, 1993 *A History of Buckinghamshire*, Chichester
- Reynolds, S, 1977 *An Introduction to the History of English Medieval Towns*, Oxford
- Riley, H, 2001 Stowe Park, Stowe, Buckinghamshire. Survey report, English Heritage Archaeological Investigation Report series AI/21/2001, unpubl.
- Roberts, B K, and Wrathmell, S, 2000 *An Atlas of Rural Settlement in England*, London
- Roden, D, 1966 Field systems in Ibstone, a township of the south-west Chilterns during the later middle ages, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **18**, 43-57
- Roden, D, 1968 Woodland and its management in the medieval Chilterns, *Forestry* **41**, 59-71
- Roden, D, 1969 Demesne Farming in the Chiltern Hills, *Agricultural History Review* **17**, 9-23.
- Roden, D, 1973 Field Systems of the Chiltern Hills and their Environs in *Studies in the Field Systems in the British Isles* (eds A R H Baker and R A Butlin), 325-76, Cambridge
- Rouse, E C, 1977 The wall paintings at nos. 1 & 2 Market Hill, Buckingham, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **20**, 293-300
- Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), 1912 *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Buckinghamshire I (South)*, London
- Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), 1913 *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Buckinghamshire II (North)*, London
- Secker, D, 2005 A survey of earthworks and structural remains at Bray's Wood, The Lee, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **45**, 65-73
- Sister Jane Mary SPB, Miller, D D, and Miller, D M, 1985 The Manor and Abbey of Burnham, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **27**, 94-106
- Slatcher, D, Samuels, J, and others, 2004 Multi-period activity at Main Street, Ashendon: excavations in 1999, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **44**, 1-20
- Smith, P S H, 1985 Hardmead and its Deserted Village, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **27**, 38-52
- Stenton, F M, 1936 The road system of medieval England, in *Preparatory to Anglo-Saxon England* (ed. D M Stenton), 234-52
- Stewart, I J, 1990 Cold Harbour Farm, Aylesbury : an Archaeological Investigation,

*Records of Buckinghamshire* **32**, 91-104

Taylor-Moore, K, 2006 The comparative development of Aylesbury and Buckingham up to c. 1550, unpubl. MA dissertation, University of Leicester

Thorne, A T, and Walker, C, 2003 Excavations at the former Cowper Tannery, Olney, unpublished report

Toulmin Smith, L (ed.), 1964 *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543. Parts IV and V*, Fontwell

Tyers, I, 1996. *Tree-ring analysis of Manor Farm Barn, Bierton with Broughton, Buckinghamshire*. AML Report New Series 10/96.

Watts, M, and Langdon, J, 2004 An early tower windmill? The Turweston 'post-mill' reconsidered, *History of Technology* **25**, 1-6

Yeoman, P A St. J, 1986 Excavations at the motte, Weston Turville Manor, 1985, *Records of Buckinghamshire* **28**, 169-178

Zeepvat, R J, Roberts, J S, and King, N A, 1994 *Caldecotte. Excavations and Fieldwork, 1966-91*, Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society Monograph Series No. 9, Aylesbury