

NOTES

The Notes commence with discussion of an article published in the last issue of Records, to which the author provides a response

THE POPULATION OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE IN 1086 SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE DOMESDAY BOOK EVIDENCE

The Domesday Book (DB) in Buckinghamshire has been the subject of such sustained scholarship by Keith Bailey that one might suppose that there is little more to be said on its interpretation as far as the county is concerned. However, in *Recs Bucks* 42 (2002), Bailey uses DB figures to estimate the size of the total population of the county. His approach is not the only one possible and, in light of studies elsewhere, needs to be questioned. He suggests that Buckinghamshire may have had a total population of between 22,700 and 23,200, and '*seems unlikely to have been much more*'. It will be contended here that a figure of at least 30,000 is likely and that an even higher figure is possible.

The analysis that follows is limited to the estimation of the total population in the county in 1086. It addresses, therefore, what Richard Smith (1990) describes as the 'lure of aggregates'. It should, however, be seen as part of a series of other questions. For instance, estimates of the total population of individual parishes, villages or manors would reveal much about the way that the countryside was utilised. They would put into context the scale of resources available in the next century for the construction of the parish churches that remain such an important part of the county's heritage. How many people were available for construction work? How many worshippers had to be housed?

There are two approaches available for such estimates. One is 'bottom-up' and entails estimates from various sources, like the DB record of individual manors or calculations based on labour

inputs. The other is 'top-down' from national or county aggregates. It is in this latter context that the estimates from DB for the county need to be placed.

Bailey's estimates draw heavily on methods set out by Darby in 1977 (Table 1). The figures he advances for Buckinghamshire are broadly compatible with Darby's estimates for England as a whole that ranged from 1,307,000 to 1,598,000, when slaves were counted as heads of households. While they follow Darby's approach, certain assumptions made by Bailey (see Notes to Table 1) result in final figures at the bottom of any range consistent with the approach.

Since 1977, scholars have come to favour a total for England significantly higher than that Darby proposed. Most place the population in the range 2.0 million to 2.5 million. When suggesting such figures, they have been at pains to point out that the major problems in using DB for population estimates are not limited to the choice of multiplier that is used to convert recorded individuals (or as they are termed here 'heads' because they should be viewed as heads of a household) in DB to an estimate of the total number of persons (i.e. the size of 'family' unit to assume). An even more significant problem is how to allow for those not recorded in DB at all.

Darby made a minimal 5% allowance for such missing people and further allowances for the under-recording of burgesses and the poor coverage of northern counties. Moore (1996), in what is probably the most detailed estimate (Table

TABLE 1 Darby and Bailey's population estimates

row	ENGLAND after Darby	Count* 'Heads'	Population		Bailey's Text rounded figs.
			4.5	5.0	
			multipliers		
1.	Recorded in entries	268,279	1,207,256	1,341,395	
2.	5% addition for omissions	13,414	60,363	67,070	
3.	1,100 tenants-in-chief	1,100	4,950	5,500	
4.	6,000 under-tenants	6,000	27,000	30,000	
5.	Burgesses etc.		120,000	120,000	
6.	?1,800 for Lancashire	1,800	8,100	9,000	
7.	Four northern counties, say		25,000	25,000	
8.	Total		1,452,669	1,597,965	
	BUCKINGHAMSHIRE after Bailey				
9.	Rural population	5,103			
10.	Slaves	845	845	845	845
11.	Rest	4,258	19,161	21,290	21,000
12.	Burgesses, Buckingham	26	117	130	130
13.	Others, Buckingham	29	131	145	145
14.	Total of 10-13		20,254	22,410	22,120
15.	Allowance for unrecorded		1,000	1,000	1,000
16.	Total of 14+15		21,254	23,410	23,120
17.	+5%		1,000	1,107	
18.	Total		22,964	25,515	

Notes (references to rows as numbered in the Table).

* Count is the number recorded in Domesday. It is referred to as 'Heads' as in essence the individuals concerned would be heads of a household.

5. The figure for burgesses as estimated by Darby. No head count was produced, only an aggregate.

6. Lancashire was partly recorded in DB. The figures here are Darby's aggregate estimate.

7. Figures for the four northern counties excluded from DB (Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham & Northumberland) – aggregate estimate.

8. Darby also produced calculations with a multiplier of 4. This gave a total of 1,307,372. He also included calculations that counted slaves as individuals rather than heads of households. They produced a range of 1,218,718 to 1,478,761.

9. Bailey shows the rural population at this figure. His calculations start in effect with rows 10 & 11. He isolates slaves and counts them as individuals and then applies a multiplier to the rest of the rural population.

12. & 13. Figures quoted by Bailey. It is not clear how they were used to get to his total of 22,700 to 23,200.

14. Calculated here.

15. Bailey's rounded figure 'for all contingencies including tenants in chief, sub-tenants, unrecorded retainers and missing persons.

16. The calculated totals, even using rounded figures, do not seem to match Bailey's total precisely.

17. 5% of rows 9+10

18. The rural heads of 5,103 times the multiplier.

TABLE 2 Moore's total estimated population of Domesday England together with new estimates for Buckinghamshire

row		Heads	Total at 4.75 head	Moore's figures	Multiplier	Bucks 1.871% of total	Bucks estimate	Bucks total	Bucks % total	
row		Col 1	Col 2	Col 3	Col 4	Col 5	Col 6	Col 7	Col 8	
1.	Rural manorial tenants	272,700	1,295,325	1,300,000	4.75	5,103	5,103	24,239	1.87	
2.	5% addition for omissions	13,600	64,600	65,000	4.75	254	254	1,208	1.87	
3.	Hidden tenants (level 3)	25,000	118,750	120,000	4.75	468	468	2,221	1.87	
4.	Burgesses	25,000	118,750	120,000	4.75	468	75	356	0.30	
5.	Normal garrisons	500		4,000	8	9	4	32	0.80	
6.	Royal household	1		500	500	—	—	—	—	
7.	Bishop's & abbots' households	93		4,000	43	2	—	—	—	
8.	Greater baronial households	200		34,000	170	4	2	340	1.00	
9.	Lesser baronial households	900		63,000	70	17	5	350	0.56	
10.	Knightly households	6,000		90,000	15	112	60	900	1.00	
11.	Monks & nuns	240		2,400	10	4	2	20	0.83	
12.	Monastic servants	250		10,000	40	5	2	80	0.80	
13.	Canons / collegiate priests	700		3,300	4.75	13	3	14	0.43	
14.	Parish priests omitted	6,000		28,500	4.75	112	75	356	1.25	
15.	Lancashire	1,800		8,500						
16.	Four northern counties	na		25,000						
17.	Totals	352,984		1,878,200		6,571	6,054	30,117	1.72	
18.	Alternative Totals with different % levels of omissions									
19.	omissions at 10%	366,584		1,943,200		6,826	6,308	31,325	1.72	
20.	omissions at 15%	380,184		2,008,200		7,080	6,562	32,533	1.73	

Notes (references to rows as numbered in the Table).

3. See discussion below.

8. & 9. These are the same figures as Darby's 1,100 tenants in chief mentioned in DB.

10. This is the same figure as Darby's under-tenants.

14. Calculated by Moore as one priest for 60% of recorded places in DB.

19. & 20. Figures calculated after replacing those in row 2 by ones that are twice, or three times, those in row 2.

Col. 4. The different sizes of households in each category are discussed in detail by Moore. They have been adopted for the Bucks calculations.

2), adds eight additional missing categories to the calculation and deals with those named as land holders in DB in a far fuller way than Darby. His final calculations produce figures in the range 1.8 million to 2.0 million and so are at the lowest end of recently quoted figures. Making a conservative allowance for missing people Dyer (2002) suggests, a figure of 2.0 million, 'but a more likely estimate would lie somewhere between 2.2 and 2.5 million'. Bartlett (2000) favours 2.25 million and states that it was possible that as much as one third of the population was landless and not included in the DB figures.

The problem of missing people in DB has produced a considerable literature. Given the uncertainties inherent in the hunt for such people, it is not surprising that much academic blood has been spilt en route. Moore, for instance, dismisses an estimate by Hallam (1988) of 2.5mn as a 'wild and quite unsubstantiated guess'.

Before considering the literature further, the arithmetic of Moore's estimates, along with how this might be applied to Buckinghamshire, can be considered. This is done in detail in the notes to Table 2. The basic principle underlying the figures for Buckinghamshire is to start with the recorded

5,103 rural recorded tenants, accounting for 1.871% of the DB total for England. This percentage has then been applied (col.5) to all the other categories in Moore's Table. In many cases the resulting figure would be meaningless, so col. 6 shows a suggested number of heads for Buckinghamshire. For instance, it is assumed that there were four normal garrisons in the county. Given Moore's suggestion that these might consist of 8 persons each this would yield a total of 32 in the county. Most of the categories yield a small figure for the county and so such assumptions have little effect on the total.

The chief features of Moore's approach that need comment are:-

- a) The hidden tenants
- b) The baronial and knightly households
- c) The parish priests
- d) The Slaves and the assumption that they were heads of households
- e) The potential justification for omissions higher than 5%
- f) The use of 4.75 as a multiplier

The hidden tenants are not to be confused with the 5% figure that Darby proposed for missing entries. The element of under-recording includes entries such as that at Leckhampstead where it appears that relevant information was not to hand when the DB scribe was completing the entry and a space is left but never filled. Similarly at Newport Pagnell, to use Moore's words, '*demographic uncertainty reigned supreme*'. '*The burgesses*', number not given, '*have 6 and a half ploughs of the other men*', also unnumbered, '*who work outside the 5 hides of the manor*', who may, or may not, be identical with '*the men who live in the woodland*', again unnumbered.

The hidden tenants are described by Moore as under-tenants and demesne lessees. Bridbury (1992) makes the case for such missing persons, although he questions any attempt to estimate their numbers. Smith suggests that DB would not record under-lessees nor distinguish tenant land holdings occupied by more than one family. It is against this background that Moore concludes that perhaps two missing family groups per manor should be allowed for this 'missing level 3'. Various other interpretations exist. It is thought that the compilers of DB were principally interested in demesne resources of estates and, in particular, what such

estates were worth. Thus, if peasants paid rent, their contributions were likely to have been included in the total value and not be separately distinguished numerically. Alternatively, it has been suggested that those without any connection stood the best chance of being recorded!

Dyer (2002) notes '*there were at least 6,000 mills, but apparently only eight millers or mill-keepers: demesne sheep must have numbered well over a million, but only ten shepherds are mentioned: similarly the hundreds of square miles of woodland must have been supervised by more than four foresters and one huntsman. An important category of people who would not appear in Domesday because they held no land, were the servants who worked on demesnes when slaves were in short supply, and indeed were employed by the better-off peasants. Their presence must explain how the numerous small manors were operated which had a plough a single tenant or slave, or even a plough and no recorded population at all.*' Some of these people, but far from all, will no doubt have been included in DB under a 'status' heading (e.g. slave, villein, etc.) In the Chiltern Buckinghamshire it is worth speculating whether the woodlands, with their hamlets, would have been reported as systematically as places further north.

The baronial and knightly households were not distinguished in DB except in terms of the name of their principals. The migratory life style of the upper end of the baronial class is well documented and it was beyond the scope of DB to record where the household was on any particular 'census' night. How often the principals of Buckinghamshire manors visited their holdings, and what permanent staff they left at their main Buckinghamshire base, must be a matter for speculation. With more work it might be possible to produce a list of candidate locations for such bases. In the calculations made here it has been assumed that Bucks had 7 baronial establishments. Using Moore's multiplier they would produce nearly 700 people. It should not, however, be thought that all 700 were in just 7 locations. With the migratory life style it may well be that it is better to envisage more than 7 baronial households spending only part of their time in the county.

The knightly class is more significant to the argument. The calculation assumes 60 households averaging 15 persons each in the county. That is to say, just over one in four parishes had such a house-

hold. Moore, whose average size figure has been used in this calculation, suggests that such households probably ranged in size from 10–20. They would have consisted of servants who were generally young unmarried men and women with a few married senior servants.

Parish priests were clearly excluded from DB. The calculation uses Moore's suggested multiplier and makes a guesstimate of the number in the county of about one in every three parishes.

Slaves are a critical issue with 845 listed in DB in the county. As seen above, Bailey assumes that they were individuals and so not subject to a multiplier. Both Moore and Harvey (1988) conclude, on balance, that slaves had families. It was a status that was inherited. A DB total of 28,000 in England cannot have emerged solely through the accidents of war, law breaking or even destination. The question of the appropriate multiplier to use to convert the head count of slaves to a total population is a more significant issue. As will be seen below, Nash (1991) has suggested the use of 3 for slaves. Excluding the effect that this would have on the gearing of allowances for omissions, this would suggest a total in Buckinghamshire of 2,535 rather than the 4,014 implied in the figures in Table 2. However, Nash's figures for other categories in Buckinghamshire imply a higher total than that which emerges from the use of 4.75 for all categories (i.e. 25,399 instead of 24,239).

This summary of the various arguments deployed by various scholars on the missing level 3, and other categories of people not explicitly included in Moore's calculations, may suggest that 5% is the

absolute minimum addition to the rural population. It is intended to allow for categories of people that DB did not intend to cover. Indeed, even 15% might be too low an allowance. Moore's conclusions seem very conservative in light of the literature. He states that the omissions figure was 'probably the most dubious of all my calculations', not to argue for more than 15% but to limit his overall total to something marginally below 2 million. However, when his argument is examined in detail, there are places where he takes an even more conservative view than Darby. For example, on the question of large numbers of censarii not listed in DB but found, for instance, in the Burton Abbey records of 1114 and 1126, Moore thinks that they represent colonisation post 1086. Darby states that such a view would have required a prodigious effort of cultivation in the post 1086 period, and concluded that it would be wrong to imagine that all the extra people were a result of colonisation or that all were simply missing entries in DB. Such qualitative arguments may indicate a population rather higher than that suggested by Moore.

Table 3 looks in greater detail at the recorded rural population, and applies different multipliers to the various categories distinguished in Domesday. This follows an approach used by Nash (1991) in studying a group of southern counties that did not include Buckinghamshire. It is worth noting that, by using Nash's multipliers, the rural total, with no allowance for omissions, is 1000 higher than that shown in Table 2.

Although they add little to the problem of population estimates, other aggregates suggest that it

TABLE 3 Darby's count of Domesday Book with Nash's multipliers

	Bucks	England	% Bucks	Multiplier	Total
	Heads				
Villeins	2,899	109,230	2.65	6	17,394
Bordars	1,321	81,849	1.61	4	5,284
Slaves	845	28,235	2.99	3	2,535
Sokeman	20	23,324	0.09	6	120
Freeman	0	13,553	0.00	6	0
Cottars	10	5,205	0.19	3	30
Buri	4	65	6.15	3	12
Francigenae	1	259	0.39	6	6
Fabri	1	64	1.56	6	6
Vasassores	2	3	66.67	6	12
Total-rural categories	5,103	268,984	1.90		25,399

would be wrong to rank Buckinghamshire too lowly in the total for England in 1086. (Table 4)

TABLE 4 Miscellaneous Statistics

	Bucks	England	% Bucks
Named places	206	13,418	1.54
Plough lands	2,296	82,630	2.78
Plough teams	2,056	81,184	2.53
Mills	135	6,082	2.22
Churches	4	2,061	0.19
Priests	0	127	0.00
Population (estimates)	32,000	2,000,000	1.60

When reviewing the above, and all the studies of both DB and later sources, to check DB, there is a general point that is seldom mentioned. Many of the latter records come from church sources. These, and indeed DB figures themselves, can be expected to be fuller and more accurate than those that related to lay-land holding. If church records suggest omissions that lay-records for the less well organised manors, if they were available, might well show far greater rates of omission.

Finally it is worth returning to the question raised earlier, namely what population might be

expected in individual places or manors. Bailey's account (1995) of slavery in Buckinghamshire contains a useful summary of the numbers of heads listed in each parish (his Appendix 1). It indicates figures ranging from 107 in Marlow down to 3 at Gawcott and Waldrige. How should these be manipulated to provide an estimate of the total population in each case requires a more detailed assessment than is attempted here. Simply to multiply them by 4.5, or other multiplier, and then to add 5% for omissions would considerably underestimate a local population total. It is likely that omissions were unevenly distributed between places and so to follow Moore's arithmetic even at a local level would be very dangerous. However, simply to illustrate the sensitivity of the calculations it is convenient to apply it to a parish with 20 heads listed in DB (Table 5). The most important point here is that the 5% allowance for omissions amounts only to one household. This puts into context the possibility that 15% might be too low.

Putting further flesh onto such speculation, it should be noted that the parishes with 20 recorded heads in 1086 were Aston Abbots (1801 population 276), Chalfont St Peter (1174), Great Horwood (450), Maids Moreton (239), Ravenstone (381), Thornton (85) and Weston Underwood (357). In the period 1086-1801 Chalfont St. Peter will have

TABLE 5 Estimating procedures for places with 20 recorded heads

Bailey's procedure						
No. Of slaves	1	2	3	4	5	
No. Others	19	18	17	16	15	
Times multiplier 4.75	90	86	81	76	71	
Total	91	88	84	80	76	
5% allowance for missing	5	4	4	4	4	
Total population	96	92	88	84	80	
Moore's procedure				Heads	Multiplier	Total
Number				20	4.75	95
5% allowance for missing				1	4.75	5
Missing level 3				2	4.75	10
Total basic population						
a. with 5% omissions						109
b. with 10% omissions						114
c. with 15% omissions						119
Parish with knightly household	1		15		15	
Parish with priest			1		4.75	5
Total population						129-139

grown because of its relation to London. Thornton, by 1801, had become a 'closed parish', being the site of Thornton Hall. Clearly the 1801 figures can provide no cross check on those from DB and are only included here for contextual purposes. An alternative crosscheck lies in a comment by Bailey on the density implied by a population of 23,200 in 1086. He estimates that this amounted to 8.9 arable acres per person but that a minimum of 5 acres was required for subsistence, i.e. there was a 78% surplus in Bucks. A population of 30,000 would imply a density of 6.9 persons per acre, a surplus of 38% (one of 33,000 a density of 6.2). 6.9 is a higher density than the figures calculated by Bailey for Berkshire and Hertfordshire. Whatever conclusions the above arithmetic leads to it is clear, as Moore delightfully points out when quoting the following, that the evidence of DB cannot be described in the words of a nineteenth century historian.

"I believe the text of ... *Domesday* to be almost faultless... As *Domesday Book* was a work of man, there are also no doubt... mistakes and omissions, but to acknowledge that the man is living who can point them out and correct them..." (Taylor 1889)

REFERENCES

- Bailey, K.A. 1995, Buckinghamshire Slavery in 1086, *Records of Buckinghamshire*, Vol. 37, pp. 67–78.
- Bailey, K.A. 2002, The Population of Buckinghamshire in 1086, *Records of Buckinghamshire*, Vol. 42, pp.1–14.
- Bartlett, R. 2000, *England under the Angevin Kings*, Oxford, pp.290–7.
- Bridbury, A.R. 1992, *The English Economy from Bede to the Reformation*, p124.
- Darby, H.C. 1977, *Domesday England*, Cambridge, especially pp. 87–91.
- Dyer, C. 2002, *Making a Living in the Middle Ages, The people of Britain 850–1520*, New Haven and London, especially pp.91–99.
- Hallam, H.E 1988, editor *The Agrarian History of England and Wales* Vol. II 1042–1350, especially his own Chapter 5 Population Movements, 1086–1350, Cambridge, pp.508–593.
- Harvey, S, 1998, *Domesday England* Chapter 2 in *Hallam op.cit.*, , pp. 45–136
- Moore, J.S. 1989, Anglo-Norman Slavery, *Anglo-Norman Studies*, XI, pp. 191–220
- Moore, J.S. 1990, Review of Hallam op. cit., *History*, Vol. lxxv. pp. 293–295.
- Moore, J.S. 1992, The Anglo-Norman Family: Size and Structure, *Anglo-Norman Studies*, XIV, pp. 153–197
- Moore, J.S. 1996, 'Quot Homines?' The Population of Domesday England, *Anglo-Norman Studies*, XIX, pp. 307–334.
- Nash, A. 1991, The Population of Southern England in 1086: A New Look at the Evidence of Domesday Book, *Southern Historian*, Vol. 14., pp.1–28
- Smith, R. 1990, Human Resources, in *Astill and Grant (eds)*, *The Countryside of Medieval England*, Oxford, 188–211 esp 189–190
- Taylor, C.S. 1889, *An analysis of the Gloucestershire Domesday*, Bristol.

D. Thorpe

THE POPULATION OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE IN 1086: A REPLY

David Thorpe's reflections on my paper in *Records* 42 show that the study of Domesday population is undergoing a period of rapid change as scholars subject the data to ever more refined analysis. It should be noted that the paper was written in the mid-1990s, when much of the work referred to by

Thorpe had not yet been published.

Several general points need to be made. First, the old chestnut of which multiplier to use in getting from the raw data to the total population. I used a multiplier of five, while Moore favours 4.75, a difference which makes little overall impact.

Secondly, the question of slaves and whether they represent individuals in Domesday Book, or whether, like the rest of the peasantry, they had families. I took the traditional view that they were the former, although it is possible that they did indeed have dependants. Two comments: (a) if so, all family members may not have been of servile status, since the institution was in terminal decline in the late-eleventh century, and slaves may have been married to semi-free men or women; (b) if slaves had families, why should the multiplier be only 3.0?

Thirdly, the omission nationally of thousands of millers, woodmen, shepherds and other may be correct, but equally they may have been counted as members of the peasant class to which they were deemed to belong, either by virtue of having land-holdings, or by their occupation commonly being classed in a certain way. It seems that in Middlesex, where more details are to hand, priests were commonly considered as virgate or half-virgate holding villeins.

The assumption made by Thorpe in Table 2, col. 7, line 14 that all priests who may have been

present in Buckinghamshire in 1086 were married with the usual number of dependants is perhaps a little extreme. Although priests were not yet obliged to be celibate, and many will have been married like any other local landholder, with or without children, many parishes will have been served by celibate monks appointed by the religious house which held the manor, and not all the remaining clergy will have been married. At most a multiplier of 2.0–2.5 would seem to be appropriate.

Thorpe's point about the variability of the composition and size of population at the level of individual manors and vills is well made. Given the vagaries of data collection and transmission, it will never be possible to know if numbers and types of person were systematically recorded. A good example is the use of the normally much grander term *thegn* in north-east Buckinghamshire to describe what are otherwise called *sokemen* or *freemen*. And were there really only four *buri* and two *vavasores* in the county in 1086?

K. A. Bailey

THE 'BABY WELCOME' AT LANE END: PIONEER WORK IN INFANT WELFARE

The feeding, health and rearing of babies is not a subject usually associated with the documents held in the County's archives, but a collection deposited in November 1998 highlights these most basic aspects of life in pre-war twentieth-century rural Buckinghamshire.

The Lane End Child Welfare Centre, or Baby Welcome as it was known for many years, was the first children's health clinic to be started in Buckinghamshire and only the fourth of its kind in the country. It was established in 1914 by Angela James (the Hon. Mrs Bernard James) and Miss Elizabeth Johnson. Elizabeth Johnson had been a resident of Lane End for many years, living with her sister, whereas Angela James had moved into Fingest Grove with her husband and four children only in 1912. She described the village of Lane End at this time as a rural village with 1,200 people

where many were employed in the chair factories, others in agriculture. Many of the women worked at home, maybe employed in lace-making or caning chairs. Angela James observed that, although most babies survived early infancy, there was much ignorance and bad practice with regard to childcare. The district nurse found it increasingly difficult to visit the small children in the parish and by the time they had reached school, preventable defects like rickets had already taken hold. With this in mind Angela James and Elizabeth Johnson suggested a Centre where mothers could bring their babies to be checked regularly. 'Schools for Mothers' had been established in London since 1906, and it was proposed to open something similar, but with the more inviting title of 'Baby Welcome'. Angela James was the first Honorary Secretary and Treasurer and

remained so until her death in 1967 at the age of ninety-five. She and Miss Johnson, who became the Welcome's first Chairman, were undoubtedly the mainstay of the Committee which ran the Centre, but from the start they insisted that local mothers representing each hamlet should be elected on to the committee. The Welcome met fortnightly with a break in the winter months and in its early years was funded jointly by a County Council grant and local subscriptions.

From the outset, the Welcome aimed to promote good health in babies and their mothers. Mrs James and the Johnson sisters visited families with new babies in Lane End and invited them to the Welcome, where they could have their babies regularly weighed and checked over by a doctor. Shortly afterwards, ante-natal visits began to be encouraged. The Welcome was equally committed to educating the mothers in matters of hygiene and nutrition and in this way to reducing infant mortality and providing help for inexperienced and hard-pressed mothers. The district nurse/health visitor was at every clinic and a doctor attended regularly – from 1918 this was a lady doctor. Children or mothers who needed hospital treatment or convalescence could obtain financial help from the Welcome. The Welcome also subscribed to the Ivory Cross, a scheme for providing low-cost dental treatment, particularly needed by the mothers. Cod-liver oil, milk and cheap baby food could be purchased at the Welcome's sessions. A programme of cookery classes, dressmaking and lectures on child-related subjects such as nutrition, teeth cleaning, sleep, discipline and character development, became a regular feature of the Welcome's programme. Each year a garden party or tea party was held, in the early days in Mrs James's garden at Fingest Grove, at which the prizes for Mothercraft Competitions were presented.

Initially the Baby Welcome met in the Girls Club room next to the butcher's shop and borrowed his scales to weigh the babies. Six mothers attended the first meeting on 9 April 1914, including Angela James and her youngest child, Margaret (later known as Philippa), then just one year old. A total of twenty-seven children came that first year, of whom six required small operations, one required his legs breaking and resetting because of rickets, and three were suffering from malnutrition owing to 'wrong feeding'. Numbers grew and the

Committee employed other incentives to encourage mothers to attend: families where a new baby had been born received an invitation to the clinic and each child who attended received a birthday card and small gift until they were five. In 1921 the Welcome moved to the newly-built village hall, which provided better facilities.

The records show the Welcome repeatedly introducing innovations: the name was changed to Infant Welfare Centre when 'Baby Welcome' no longer seemed appropriate; they introduced a day nursery once a week to give mothers in the village a break; they arranged car transport to bring in mothers from outlying hamlets and farms. Fathers were encouraged to play their part: occasional 'fathers only' talks were given (free tobacco and cigarettes and light refreshments being offered as an incentive!) and each year fathers were invited to submit a written piece on a subject related to child rearing as part of the annual mothercraft competition. Perhaps the greatest innovation was the introduction of diphtheria immunisation in 1932, almost ten years before this was routinely introduced by the government.

The records now deposited at the Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies were collected and stored by Angela James and her influence and drive is clearly reflected in them. They include minute books of the Committee from 1914 to 1970 and log books of the Welcome's sessions 1914–1940. There are Annual Reports, both original typescripts and newspaper reports from the *Bucks Free Press*. A volume entitled 'Doctors notes' records those made by Angela James 1934–1942 at the doctor's check-ups as to the children's condition, and includes what medicines to purchase, action taken, etc. Papers relating to the diphtheria immunisation show the vehemence of the debate, even locally, surrounding childhood vaccination and the real scepticism by many as to whether it worked at all. Copies of Mrs James's talks and articles show her to have been a passionate advocate of immunisation beyond the locality. Printed programmes for mothercraft competitions survive for many years, particularly pre-1940, and there are a few entries from the 1930s represented. They give an interesting insight into the social expectations and instruction for domestic life in the rural community. Her energy and devotion to childcare issues are seen in a selection of published articles and talks she gave.

A full catalogue of these records has been compiled by the Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies (ref. D 235). Informative accounts of the formation and early years of the Baby Welcome are to be found in 'A short account of the 40 years progress at a Child Welfare Centre' (D 235/12/8) and an article 'Maternity and Infant Welfare in the

Country', 1915 (D 235/26/2), both by Angela James. A biography of Angela James has been written by Pennie Denton under the title of *A Very Remarkable Woman*, published privately in 1994.

Sarah Charlton
Centre for Buckinghamshire Studies

CATSBRAINS AND CONINGERS

Work is progressing well on the collection of field-name material which will ultimately be incorporated in a revised edition of the *Place-Names of Buckinghamshire*, although the new edition is unlikely to appear before a full century has elapsed since the original publication in 1925. This note is intended to begin the process of putting some unusual and significant names in print, with the further objective of persuading volunteers to assist in the process of collecting names, both ancient and modern. It should be emphasised at the outset that other examples of the names discussed here may well come to light as data collection proceeds.

The name *Catsbrain* occurs across southern England, and signifies a field in which the soil is a mixture of rough clay and stones, or clay overlaid with marl.¹ Twelve examples have so far come to light in Buckinghamshire, suggesting that the name was used sparingly, given the large areas of such soils not least in these parishes, but across the county. The places concerned are (with the date of the earliest reference): Aston Clinton (*Catts Braine* 1639); Wooburn (*Cattesbrayne* 17th); North Marston (*Catsbrains* 1973); Easington in Chilton (*Cattesbrayn* 1220); Oakley (*Cattisbrayne* 1340s); Cheddington (*Catsbraine* 1639); Ivinghoe (*Catsbrain* 1809); Shalstone (*Cattsbreyne* 1288); Turweston (*Catbraines* 17th); Westbury (*Catsbraine* 1607); Newton Longville (*Cattsbreyn* 1310) and Simpson (*Catts Braine Furlong* 1691). Interestingly, the name is very seldom coupled with any qualifying description (Field, Close, etc.). Wooburn (Piece) and Simpson (Furlong, Close; Piece) are the only examples so far.

Although some of the names have been lost and cannot be located, it is clear that the majority were located on calcareous, loamy/clayey soils, precisely the sort which the name *Catsbrain* would lead one to expect.² Most of the soils are either well-drained or slowly permeable and suitable for cereal production, a most important consideration given the amount of heavy clay soils in the county, and the demand for arable land to feed burgeoning numbers before the Black Death. The *Catsbrains* at North Marston, Oakley and Cheddington lie on slowly permeable soil with some seasonal water-logging. The pebbles probably come from glacial tills, vast amounts of clay and rock fragments deposited over much of the county during successive Ice Ages. The soils at Easington, Turweston, Shalstone, Westbury and Ivinghoe are better drained. The Aston Clinton, Newton Longville and Simpson *Catsbrains* also lie on superficial deposits, clay-with-flints in the first case.

It seems likely that the process of Parliamentary Enclosure led to the loss of other examples of the name, although clusters in the far north-west and around the Chiltern escarpment suggest that local sentiment or fashion played a part. (For some reason no other animal seems to have had its brain used to describe a soil type in this way!)

It is generally agreed that the rabbit was introduced to Britain by the Normans, and it was an important source of meat in medieval times. The medieval English name was *coney*, from Old

French *con[n]il* (Latin *cuniculus*). Often, the rabbits were housed (or farmed?) in specially-built warrens, called *conif[n]ger* or *conif[n]gre* in Middle English (Old French *conif[n]inière*),³ although inevitably they escaped into the wider landscape, giving rise to other rabbit-related names. To date, eleven field-names containing this element have been recorded: Bledlow (*Coneygra* 1812); Taplow (*Coneygears* 1787); Long Crendon (*Conygere* 1941); Shabbington (*Conegars* 1840); Pitstone (*Conyngarth* 16th); Stoke Goldington (*Coney Grey* 1881); Great Brickhill (*Conigree* 1634); Sherington (*Coneygree* 1580); Newport Pagnell (*Coney Grey* 1811); Simpson (*Conygree* 1611) and Willen (*Conygree* 1690). The longevity of names which had probably ceased to have formally maintained warrens long ago is notable. There are two examples of the name *coneyburrow/burrough*, containing the word for rabbit and OE *beorg*, 'hill', in Water Stratford (17th) and Great Linford (1641 – now the name of a residential district in Milton Keynes), which were also probably man-made warrens, where the true meaning of the French

word had been forgotten. Although the collection of names is still in its early stages, the cluster of coney-names in north-east Buckinghamshire is noteworthy. Explaining it is another matter, of course. Perhaps it was merely a fashion or status symbol, started by one lord of the manor and emulated by his neighbours, rather in the way that moats and deer parks were. Other *coney* names are found in Great Missenden (*bank*, 1839), Amersham (*hill*, 1838), Eton (*close*, 1797) and Waddesdon (*hill*, 1929), but these seem to relate to later, natural warrens.

REFERENCES

- J. Field, *English Field Names* (Newton Abbot, 1972), 39; A.H. Smith, *The Place-Name Elements* (Cambridge, 1970), vol.1, 83.
Soils of England & Wales, Sheet 6 South East England, Soil Survey of England & Wales, 1983.
 Field, *op. cit.*, 51–52; Smith, *op. cit.*, 106.

K. A. Bailey