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Abstract

An inter-disciplinary approach has been adopted for the study of historical process in the landscape of one particular area of south-east Leicestershire. The value of combining archaeological data with documentary evidence is its potential for assessing the long-term interplay between human behaviour and environmental structure. The primary reason for the choice of study area is that it forms a typical East Midland land unit spanning the landscape zones of river vale and hinterland watershed.

The archaeological field survey revealed a densely settled late Iron-Age and early Roman countryside intensively exploited for cultivation but with the late Roman period showing a contraction of settlement in the hinterland. These trends continued into the early Anglo-Saxon period when there was an intensification of settlement in the valeland, whilst a sparsity of finds and the location of minor wold names point to the presence of wood-pastures around the watersheds. The early medieval centuries saw a return to widespread cultivation before the first moves towards enclosure after c.1350.

It is argued that the origin of villages and open-fields should be sought in the social and institutional framework of Anglo-Saxon society. A close relationship between taxation, the number of tenant holdings and township size demonstrates that the fiscal carucate was linked to a late Saxon agrarian reality. The duodecimal carucate was also fundamental for the administrative framework of Anglo-Danish Leicestershire with Langton hundred probably being one of twelve territorial tithings within Gartree wapentake. However, it is contended that the Leicestershire carucate was a twenty per cent revaluation of the Mercian hide pointing to a longer-term continuity of land management.

An attempt is made to relate the reconstituted hidages to a putative regio based on the natural territory of the upper River Welland, but it is more strongly argued that township-sized land units were in place by the 8th century. A dispersed settlement pattern had been transformed into a nucleated one by the late Saxon period, whilst the organisation of the open-fields of Greater Langton suggests that township-wide rights to common arable predate the 10th century. With possible first moves towards nucleation in the late 7th or 8th centuries, the suggestion is that the rise of Mercian royal authority and its related administration was a critical catalyst shaping the evolution of the village and open-fields.
SETTLEMENT, TERRITORY, AND LAND USE IN THE EAST MIDLANDS: THE LANGTON HUNDRED c.150 BC - c.AD 1350

By Paul Bowman

John Tailby's plan of the 'Gartre Bush' the moot-site of Gartree wapentake beside the Roman Gartree Road in Shangton. Reproduced in Nichols (1798) plate cxxvii, facing page 865.
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CHAPTER ONE

LANDSCAPE HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research is to discuss the extent to which archaeology and history can be used to assess the long-term interplay between environmental structure and human behaviour in one particular area of the upper Welland valley in Eastern Leicestershire (Fig. 1). An integrated inter-disciplinary approach has been adopted, with the aim to combine archaeological with documentary data for the study of historical process in the landscape.

The study of the human impact on and relationship with the environment has long been given scholarly attention (Beresford 1957; Crawford 1952; Evans et al. 1975; Fox 1932; Hoskins 1955; Limbrey and Evans 1978; Taylor 1983; Read 1990). This aim of securing an understanding of the processes which have been manifest in past and contemporary landscapes has been the theme for scholars and students of many disciplines, although these various skills have traditionally been associated with aiding the research of the historical geographer or archaeologist. The necessary multi-disciplinary approach to such research has only recently been synthesised into an integrated discipline of landscape history and archaeology.

The landscape historian was, until the 1970s, more concerned with explaining visible or at least documented landscapes and as such their perceptions were diachronically restricted (Hoskins 1956). Landscape history was a fusion of topographical, geographical, ecological, linguistic and documentary research; the role of archaeological fieldwork was to discover and give contextual meaning to the viable remains of fields and earthworks (Aston and Rowley 1974). This initial work was essentially related to the medieval landscape and the recognition in the 1940s of the earthwork remains of deserted settlements and their associated fields was a revelation to most economic historians and historical geographers (Hoskins 1945). The subsequent methodologies used for 'mapping the medieval landscape' were developed from the pioneering work of William Hoskins and Maurice Beresford and led to the formation of the inter-disciplinary Medieval Village Research Group in 1952 (Beresford 1985).
The publication of Hoskins' *The Making of the English Landscape* presented, for the first time to a wider audience, the English landscape as a document to be read which would, if properly interpreted, provide a history of interplay of human activity and differing ecological zones (Hoskins 1955). In this seminal work, although cultural and technological factors were considered, rural settlement and agrarian activity were fundamentally related to the fluctuations in population size so 'marginal environments' were settled later and were the first to suffer a contraction of settlement once resource-stress eased. Given the prevailing views of archaeologists, geographers and ecologists, the prehistoric and Roman impact on the landscape was seen as minimal, with the post-glacial primary woodland dominating the eco-system until the coming of the 'English' in the sixth century AD. Thus Hoskins' imaginative historiography, concluded that "the axe, fire and animals combined to reduce the dense and continuous woodlands of Anglo-Saxon England" (Hoskins 1955:48).

More recently, the integration of more comprehensive diachronic archaeological data with the traditional approaches of the landscape historian has led to a realization that "everything is older than we think" (Hoskins 1977:7). This relatively new picture of the extensive nature of pre-medieval settlement and environmental exploitation has led to a radical reappraisal of English landscape history when compared with the perceptions of just twenty five years ago (Reed 1990; Taylor 1983).

The late arrival of the landscape historian is matched by the relatively recent development of the landscape archaeologist. Until the mid-twentieth century real advances in the investigation of the landscape context of the archaeological record were hindered by the conceptual framework of archaeology which was concerned with typological analysis of artifacts and defining their related 'cultures' in time and space (Childe 1926, 1940). Human relationships with the eco-system were seen simply as a processual sequence of subsistence stages which corresponded to the accepted prehistoric chronological divisions.

Research in the 1920s by Crawford and Fox was the first systematic attempt to relate 'archaeological cultures' to the geography of Britain. Crawford's pioneering air survey work made use of photographic evidence to study the spatial interrelationships of archaeological features within a regional context (Crawford 1953:45-7). Fox analysed the distribution of
archaeological finds or 'cultures' with the geographical environment in two influential studies: *The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region* (1923) and *The Personality of Britain* (1932). Both sought to assess how the background 'personality' or physical geography of Britain determined the patterning and thus the 'history' of archaeological 'cultures'. In particular, Fox's division between 'highland' and 'lowland' zones influenced a generation in their discussion of the interplay between human societies and the landscape in Britain (Evans et al. 1975; Limbrey and Evans 1977). However, the real lasting importance of the work of Crawford and Fox was to awaken British archaeologists to the value of an environmental approach to the interpretation of the archaeological record.

A landmark in the break with the culture-history approach in archaeology came with the publication in 1952 of Graham Clark's seminal study, *Prehistoric Europe - The Economic Basis*. Clark sought to relate prehistoric societies to broad ecological zones: "The economy of any community may be considered as an adjustment to specific physical and biological conditions of certain needs, capacities, aspirations and values. There are two sides to the equation - on the one hand the character of the habitat, itself to a greater or less degree influenced or even conditioned by culture, and on the other the kind of life regarded appropriate by the community and the resources, in the form of knowledge, technical equipment and social organisation, available for its realization" (Clark 1952:7).

For Clark, then, the eco-system resulted from the interaction between culture, biome and habitat. The emphasis of this ecological-economic approach in archaeology was to assess how human society and culture adapted to its environment. This methodology in many ways anticipated the New Archaeology disseminating from America in the 1960s (Clarke 1968). The aims of the New Archaeologists were to explore all the processes at work within societies: relations with the environment, social relations within societies, ideology and belief systems and how these interact together to explain societal change in the past. This functional-processual approach encouraged the use of analytical and empirical techniques to explore the relationship of the archaeological record to the wider landscape, utilising, for example, the use of statistics and spatial analysis (Hodder and Orton 1976:229-36). The stress was upon the dynamic nature of the interplay between human behaviour and environment from which the generalised processes at work in past societies were to be illuminated from rigorous testing of hypotheses.
In the methodology of the New Archaeologists there was little concern for the actions of individuals or of historical context, which were generally rejected as chronicling particularistic events of little import for the underlying processes of societal change (Clarke 1968). This anti-historical bias was a reaction to culture-history archaeology, which was viewed as descriptive and normative. However, since the mid-1970s there has been increasing dissatisfaction with functional-processual archaeology. For example, Hodder has argued that despite the independent existence of archaeology its closest ties are with history (Hodder 1986).

The particular merit of archaeology is its spatial and diachronic nature, which is best able to contribute to a general understanding of the interplay between human behaviour and environmental structure over time. The development of survey strategies involving the systematic collection of field surface data has resulted in an expanded data base from which to test hypotheses of change in human settlement and land use. This temporal perspective has led some archaeologists to introduce the *Annales*’ approach of the French School of Historians into their interpretation of the archaeological record (Bintliff 1991; Hodder 1987; Knapp 1992). One influential *Annales*’ methodology is the Braudelian tripartite perspective of historical processes operating at different time scales (Braudel 1972). These temporal processes are the 'longue durée', long-term structures such as the effects of climate and topography on settlement and land use; 'conjonctures', economic, social and demographic changes operating over the medium term; and 'événements', short-term events of political and military history.

The place of Archaeology in Braudelian *Annales*’ stems from the view that it provides data for the study of the 'longue durée' and the 'conjonctures', and history the study of the event. This holistic analysis of past societies and landscapes demands that, as Moreland argues: "a rapprochement between archaeological and historical data must take place; it is vital to our fuller understanding of those societies which have left material remains in both forms" (Moreland 1992:115). Whether or not the approaches of the *Annales*’ School are found wanting, the central message of recent methodological discussions is that an inter-disciplinary study of the landscape which can connect the archaeological with the historical evidence offers the best opportunities for advancing our understanding of the relationship between past human behaviour and environmental structure.
1.2 APPROACHES TO THE LANDSCAPE IN EASTERN LEICESTERSHIRE

When John Leland travelled to Leicester along the old Roman Gartree road, he described the country around about as "al by chaumpaine grounde" making a distinction, well known to 16th century topographers, between two main kinds of countryside in lowland England (Toulmin Smith 1907:i,13-14). Champion country was a land of nucleated villages with large open-fields, contrasted with the woodland regions of dispersed settlements and numerous hedged fields held in severalty (i.e. held by individuals). Today, this same broad distinction can be made between the 'planned' countryside of villages and late enclosures and the 'ancient' countryside of hamlets and isolated farms with old enclosed fields (Homans 1941:12-16; Rackham 1986:1-5). It is, however, increasingly apparent that there is far more variety to the landscape of lowland England than this basic division into champion and woodland zones would suggest; we are beginning to recognise a number of distinctive countrysides or pays each with their own agrarian and settlement histories (Phythian-Adams 1991).

In the years around 1500, as Leland observed, south-east Leicestershire was champion country, so characteristic of the Midland plain; it is not, however, a physically homogeneous landscape, historical geographies contrast the uplands of High Leicestershire with the valelands of the Welland river (Holly 1971:354-5). The undulating plateaux of High Leicestershire, rising to over 200 metres (656ft), are formed by Liassic rocks and are much covered by Boulder Clays interspersed with sand and gravel patches. Along its southern fringes, spurs of high ground project into the broad lowland plain of the Welland which lies below 75 metres (246ft).

The landscape history of eastern Leicestershire has hitherto been discussed in terms of the interplay between the river vale and its upland hinterland. In particular, the publication of Hoskins' seminal studies of Anglian and Scandinavian settlement was to influence a generation in its persuasive story of pioneering settlers faced with a largely virgin environment of dense oak-ash woodland still dominating the heavy claylands (Hoskins 1935; 1936). Hoskins' essays were early examples of a multi-disciplinary approach using archaeological finds, place-names and environmental considerations to chart the progress of woodland clearance and settlement. The resulting colourful environmental historiography, fundamental to The Making of the English Landscape, can best be read in his Midland England (Hoskins 1949:12-21). The south-east lowlands of the Welland valley were seen as an early focus of primary settlement; High
Leicestershire was only occupied as pioneering farmers pushed out into the woods to create clearings on patches of glacial sands and gravel which provided dry sites for secondary settlements (Hoskins 1935:120; 1957:4-5). As population pressure intensified, arable cultivation expanded onto the surrounding clays until the fields of adjacent villages met to demarcate, for the first time, township boundaries. This thesis also pervades the pioneer work of Holly on The Domesday Geography of Leicestershire, which reflected the view held until recently that Domesday Book was recording a settlement geography of villages and hamlets which, after six centuries of Anglo-Saxon colonization, was virtually complete (Holly 1938:170-4). Such was the debt to Hoskins' work that in 1972 Millward's review of pre-Conquest Leicestershire was, in essence, a rewriting of the 1935 paper, at which time the Roman and prehistoric contribution to the Midlands landscape was still considered minimal (Millward 1972; Pye 1972:195-217).

The assumption that the hinterland claylands were densely wooded in the Anglo-Saxon period has been discredited by researchers in the 1970s and 80s who have pointed to the accumulating evidence for extensive Roman and prehistoric settlements on these soils (Taylor 1983). However, work by the Leicester School of local historians has once again emphasised the importance of woodland and pastoral characteristics of the hinterland environments. In 1979, Everitt extended his pioneering study of the *wold* (a word with 'woodland' connotations) regions of England to suggest that there was once a tract of woodland, or wood-pasture, along the clay uplands of Eastern Leicestershire which was attached to adjacent seminal Anglo-Saxon estate centres in the valley of the River Welland (Everitt 1977; 1979; 1986:345-8). This theme of 'river and wold' settlements has recently been explored in detail by Fox, who uses a small surviving corpus of wold names to identify specifically the claylands of High Leicestershire as a regional wold. Fox envisages the pre-Conquest 'wolds' to be a distinctive class of countryside characterized, in his imagination, by "isolated stands of wood, perhaps amidst pasture and some cultivated land" (Fox 1989:84). Place-name and topographic evidence is used to suggest a relatively late colonization for the establishment of independent vills based on arable husbandry in a region which previously had a "more pastoral and wooded landscape" (Fox ibid.:85-100).

For Hoskins too, the physical character of the "heavy liassic clays of East or High Leicestershire, which were in general more suitable for grassland than for tillage" was a major influence on later medieval conversion to sheep pastures and village desertions (Hoskins 1957:27). Over the longer-term this 'pastoral heritage' of High Leicestershire is reflected in the frequency of
deserted medieval villages and the return to grazing in many hinterland townships after the 14th century. Burton's early 17th century *The Description of Leicestershire* provides the first topographical description of the region: "The South East of the Shire is exceeding rich ground, yeelding great encrease of Corne in adundance of all kindes, and affoordeth many good & large sheepe Pastures" (Burton 1622:2). Burton's comments seem make a clear distinction between enclosed and open townships; by the mid-16th century, there had developed a broad geographical division between the enclosed townships of the uplands and fringes of High Leicestershire and the mainly 'champion' country of the Welland valley. Although unified seignorial control and the property relationships of peasant communities were important causal factors, environmental characteristics in terms of topography and soils were probably a significant contribution in the movement to enclose the open-fields (VCH Leics ii:154-9; Yelling 1977:46-58).

The physical distinction between the river vale and its clay hinterland is, then, still seen as an important influence on the settlement and agrarian history of Eastern Leicestershire. Elsewhere historical geographical research has also viewed valley-hinterland linkages based on the principal river catchment areas as an important influence shaping the long-term social and institutional framework of land management (Barrow 1973; Ford 1979; Jones 1979; Klingelhofer 1992). Biddick, for example, has suggested that adjacent regions linking arable and pastoral farming were interrelated to form a basic system of territorial organisation that persisted from later prehistory to the middle Saxon period (Biddick 1984:106). Similarly Williamson's discussion of the Norfolk landscape builds on the work of Everitt (1977) to argue that the spatially marginal and sparsely-settled watersheds acted as "zones of reduced contact, and thus tended to form boundaries between social groupings based on the principal valleys" (Williamson 1993:17).

This model of land management when applied to the Anglo-Saxon period looks to the *regio*, a district of varying but substantial size made up of subordinate settlements owing dues and services a *villa regalis* or royal vill. Some of these units could be synonymous with the smaller sized 'tribal' groups assessed at 300 hides (the Anglo-Saxon unit employed for the assessment of tax and tribute) or its multiple recorded in a probable 7th century tribute list called the Tribal Hidage, several of which can be located around the lower Welland valley (Courtney 1981). Below the larger *regio* historians have identified 'multiple estates' or smaller units of unified
ownership consisting of a head manor (caput) and a number of contiguous or discontiguous settlements. Most 'multiple estates' rather than being primary territorial entities are probably a product of the granting of bookland estates by royal charter which represented a fundamental change in the concept of land ownership: the grantee was now able to alienate his land at will and receive renders and services once due to the royal vill. But what is perhaps more significant for the development of land management is the suggestion of a systematic and early assessment of settlements which was integrated into the round sum hidage of the larger unit or regio (Campbell 1979:95-6). From the time of our earliest English charters in the late 7th century the hide appears as a territorially based unit of assessment and so the first apportionment of tax lies in an undocumented period before c.AD650. However, the possibility that small township-sized land units were already assessed by the 7th or early 8th centuries hints at an semi-independent antiquity which could well pre-date the formation of 'multiple estates'.

For East Leicestershire there are no surviving pre-Conquest charters with which to reconstruct the administrative organisation of the countryside. The main evidence that can be used are topography, place-names, historic boundaries, ecclesiastical connections, archaeological evidence and, our primary documentary sources, Domesday Book (AD1086) and the Leicestershire Survey of c.1130. The latter furnish information concerning a land units tax assessment which, as suggested above, is likely to have been important influence moulding the development of land management throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. For late Saxon Leicestershire the basic the unit of tax was the carucate, a duodecimal unit of assessment commonly used in the Northern Danelaw. The word carucata, is a Latinised rendering of the English plogsland, 'ploughland', which was notionally the area of land ploughable by one eight-ox team. In this respect the carucate was synonymous with the decimal hide employed as the unit of tax over the greater part of England outside the Northern Danelaw. There is a significant body of evidence to show that in many places the relationship between their Domesday hidage and its pre-10th century counterpart, commonly recorded as 'cassati' or 'manentes' in land charters, was one of numerical stability (Campbell 1986:110-11; Blair 1994:74-9; Stenton 1955:73-4). At present, however, a widely held view of the carucate is that it was a new land assessment imposed in the 10th or early 11th centuries (Finberg 1972:479-82; Hart 1992:295; Phythiam-Adams 1978:20; Sawyer 1978:196; Stenton 1910:88-90; 1927:159-61). Even so, the common sense possibility that the carucate must stand in some fixed relationship to the earlier Mercian hidage should not be dismissed and if demonstrable would
have important implications for any reconstruction of pre-10th century land units in Leicestershire.

One approach commonly employed for reconstructing early territorial units has been to assume a large degree of administrative continuity between the regio and the wapentake or hundred of late Saxon England (Cam 1944:64-106). The wapentake was a Danelaw subdivision of the shire with its own court (moot) for judicial, fiscal and military functions and, as a late Saxon administrative district, was synonymous with the 'English' hundred. From Old Norse vapnatak, 'flourish of weapons', the word wapentake may represent the practise of raising weapons to signify assent at an assembly held at the moot-site. For Leicestershire, four wapentakes were recorded in the Domesday Survey with Gartree wapentake incorporating all of south-east Leicestershire together with some detached portions on High Leicestershire (see Fig. 14). The moot-site of Gartree was located at the 'Gartree Bush' beside the Roman Gartree Road in Shangton and it is possible the word geirtre, 'a tree with a blemish or gash on its bark', describes a well-known feature which could have marked a pre-Conquest meeting-place of long standing (Cox 1972:16-17; Nichols 1798:791, Plate cxxxvii facing p.865).

The bounds of the Gartree wapentake and the royal soke of Great Bowden (a jurisdiction claiming various rights and dues) have respectively been suggested as fossil relics of a pre-Danish regio and villa regalis; the perspective being one of a "remorseless process of fission" before which "the royal centre at Bowden probably once dominated an extensive continuous area that embraced perhaps a dozen or so putative multiple estates" (Phythian-Adams 1986:16-18). However, a criticism of this type of reconstruction when applied to the Danelaw of the East Midlands is the strong possibility that earlier territories were reorganised for judicial and administrative purposes after the 10th century English reconquest of the Northern Danelaw (Loyn 1984:138). Thus Roffe has concluded that the soke of Bowden in its Domesday form is unlikely to relate in any meaningful way to archaic structures (Roffe forthcoming). Gartree wapentake can, therefore, only be understood in the context of Anglo-Danish fiscal administration which created the institutions of shire and wapentake in the 10th century.

A further institutional complication is to be found in the presence of the Leicestershire small hundred, a unit not to be confused with the 'English' hundred. Their existence is only known only from the Leicestershire Survey of c.AD1130 concerning lands which Richard Bassett had
an interest (Slade 1956). However, similar hundredal entities (although of a smaller size) are also
known from other Danelaw shires and they almost certainly represent pre-Conquest administrative subdivisions of the shire between vill and wapentake which functioned as territorial tithings (Roffe 1981; 1992:33; Slade 1956:77). As such they were probably inextricably linked to the pre-Conquest fiscal and administrative structures but as yet no one has pronounced on the particular system around which the Leicestershire wapentake and its constituent small hundreds was organised.

The boundaries of Gartree might, therefore, be no earlier than the institution of the shrieval system which transferred the administration of royal lands from the reeve of the villa regalis to the shire reeve or sheriff. This conclusion also sheds doubt upon the suggestion that the detached portions of Gartree wapentake are vestiges of an earlier transhumance economy from vale to High Leicestershire (Bourne 1986:13; Fox 1989:86-7). A reorganisation for purposes of administrative convenience is perhaps a more convincing explanation of this confused wapentake configuration. On the other hand, an 'original' Gartree, without its detached Domesday portions but incorporating lands south of the River Welland bounded by the Welland-Nene watershed, has a topographical coherency based on the upper Welland catchment which might still reflect the broad outlines of a Mercian regio.

A further problem for any discussion of the evolution of the countryside in East Leicestershire is the nature of the interplay between local communities and the administrative framework of local and national government, lordship and church. The late Saxon and early medieval township formed the basic secular territorial unit of both settlement and community for purposes of tax assessment, the enforcement of public order and the management of husbandry (Cam 1950; Wake 1922). In Leicestershire a township typically contained a settlement nucleus with a common agricultural unity based on a particular open-field system. The processes which created the village and open-field husbandry are still open to debate as is the problem determining the instigators of rural reorganisation, be it communal initiative, the power state and lords, or by a form of mutual co-operation (Dyer 1992). A fundamental and related question is, therefore, how long before the communitas villae of the 13th century had functioned as a co-operative group of neighbours farming their lands within defined boundaries. For some parish or sub-parochial sized territorial divisions already existed in the early Anglo-Saxon period or are even Romano-British or prehistoric in origin (Hingley 1989:102-5; Taylor 1970:49-75; 1983). Others
prefer a mid-to late Saxon context for the township subsequent to the fission of the *regio* into bookland estates (Arnold and Wardle 1981; Foard 1985:204-5). Behind these polemical views, however, what does seem critical for any interpretation of the evolution of pre-Conquest rural society is the question of whether the manor, as defined as a territorial unit of lordship organised for the exploitation of resources, or the township and its community was the primary social institution.

For south-east Leicestershire the integration of archaeological data with historical geography offers a real potential to evaluate the longer-term interlay between human behaviour and environmental structure. Both archaeological field and air surveys have been widely used in the county. The latter has begun to reveal pre-medieval landscape features but this has had only a slight impact on a "relatively unfavourable geological area such as Leicestershire" (Pickering and Hartley 1985:14). In a clayland zone such as Leicestershire, therefore, it is the use of fieldwalking programmes that has produced the most dramatic results since the mid-1970s. In particular, Leicestershire Museum’s own landscape project around the Roman ‘small town’ at Medbourne has demonstrated the ability of field survey to recover settlement data for the Iron Age, Romano-British and early to middle Anglo-Saxon periods (Liddle 1994). The challenge remains, however, to fully integrate the settlement and agrarian data produced by surface artifact scatters with the models of territorial organisation derived from topographical and documentary sources.

1.3 THE LANGTON HUNDRED SURVEY: RESEARCH GOALS.

The principal objectives of this research can be summarised as an investigation into:

1) The contrast between river valley and hinterland settlement patterns and land use over the ‘longue durée’.

2) The extent of continuity or discontinuity of human settlement, land use and territory and its relationship to environmental structure.

3) The interplay between the institutional and administrative framework of territorial organisation, lordship and church with settlement and field-systems.

4) The significance of one particular landscape case study in Leicestershire for the wider region of the East Midlands.
The selection of the specific study area was based on it possessing the following characteristics:

1) A land unit, typical of the East Midlands, spanning the landscape zones of river vale and the hinterland claylands.

2) A survey area large enough to address questions of settlement variation in time and space but of manageable enough size for an intensive fieldwalking survey undertaken by a single person.

3) A territorial unit which probably included the core zone of an ancient estate and one which allowed an investigation into the place of the Leicestershire 'small' hundred within administrative framework of Anglo-Danish society.

4) The existence of documents detailing agrarian organisation and providing an early source of topographical minor-names.

The cornerstone of the project is a programme of systematic field survey. It is crucial for any landscape research to define an appropriate time scale most relevant for data analysis. The chronological focus covers the time spanning from later prehistory to the early medieval period, or approximately the 1,500 years between c.150BC and c.AD1350. This temporal dimension has primarily been determined by a consideration of the qualities of the archaeological evidence: from the last two centuries before the Christian era onwards the surface artifact scatters recovered are sufficient for quantitative analysis which, despite the many problems of interpreting survey data and determining a secure chronology for surface artifacts, allows broad trends to be investigated over a more or less continuous long-term time scale. However, the primary aim is to place the archaeological settlement and land use data in its social, administrative and institutional context derived from the historical sources.

The study area is based on a group of townships called Langton hundred in the Leicestershire Survey of c.1130 (Slade 1956:14). The Langton Hundred includes the ancient parish of Church Langton, consisting of six villages collectively known as the 'Langtons', and the ancient parish of Shangton which includes the deserted medieval vill of Hardwick. Langton hundred stretches eight kilometres north from Welland flood-plain, through terraces gravels up onto the boulder clays on the fringes of High Leicestershire (Fig. 1). The survey area, therefore, traverses the environments of 'wold' down to river vale and is representative of the environmental structure of the whole of the upper Welland valley and its immediate hinterland and as such can be viewed as
Figure 1: General Location Map.
typical of many other river valley territories of the East Midlands.

The decision to choose an historic land unit as the sampling design for this project was that (1) it provides a geographically convenient area for the investigation of human settlement and environmental structure; and (2) it was judged to be the most appropriate, when linked to documentary research, for the study of some specific problems of settlement patterning and agrarian organisation in the first and second millennium AD. Thus, in the medieval period the regional area of Langton hundred lay within a typical open-field landscape of nucleated villages or hamlets and a major concern is to examine the origins of that type of landscape and how it relates to the earlier Saxon, Roman and Iron-Age periods.

A further consideration in the choice of the Langton hundred is the possibility that, at least in part, it formed the core of an Anglo-Saxon 'multiple estate' which are are well known to have been subject to a process of fission in the late Saxon period. Phythian-Adams, commenting on some of the small hundreds recorded in the c.1130 Leicestershire Survey, argued that "in many instances, as with the Langtons, such groupings evidently reflected discrete pre-Conquest estates" (Phythian-Adams 1978:20). Bourne, using the evidence of topography and parochial structure, has also suggested that the Langtons, together with Shangton, formerly constituted a 'multiple estate' (Bourne 1986:13-16). Moreover, Greater Langton land units of consisting of the townships of East, West and Thorpe Langton provide an unusual example of a split-township with shared rights of common whose investigation could cast light on the origins of common arable and open-field farming. Hall has also stressed the potential of research into the field systems of similar land units because, as he states, "an agricultural entity must represent one of the earliest features of organised settlement, no matter how many actual settlement sites are involved within it" (Hall 1985:67).

The place of the study area in the wider regional context of territorial organisation and land use patterns is examined in relation to the hypothesis that valley-hinterland linkages formed natural human territories. Of course the administrative and institutional context of the Langton hundred can only be considered from the point of view of Anglo-Danish society and it is hoped that an investigation into the relationship between this small hundred and Gartree wapentak will shed some further light on the late Saxon administration structures of Leicestershire and possibly the shieval system of other parts of the Northern Danelaw. However, it is equally contended that
Anglo-Danish administrative structures should not be assumed to be totally new creations of the late Saxon period. Signs of continuity with the fiscal and administrative framework of Mercian or earlier territorial units will, therefore, be explored with a working hypothesis that pre-10th century land division was systematically organised reflecting the fiscal and monetary systems of the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

In summary, the central approach of this research is to emphasise the relationship between archaeological data and historical process. A major difficulty in understanding the complexity of processes which are reflected in different settlement and agrarian systems is the need to understand the interplay between characteristics acting over the long term, such as environmental structure, and the shorter term changes in economic, social and political life. It is hoped that this inter-disciplinary research can contribute to this wider debate concerning the evolution of rural society.
CHAPTER TWO

ENVIRONMENT, SETTLEMENT AND LAND USE
IN LANGTON HUNDRED

2.1 THE REGIONAL CONTEXT

Eastern Leicestershire can be divided into two broad landscape zones, the clay vales and the upland wolds. The valley of the River Wreake, which is the only major tributary of the Soar, divides the clay wolds to the north from the uplands of High Leicestershire which are themselves bounded in the south-east by the upper Welland valley. Most of High Leicestershire lie above 122 metres (400ft) and are mainly formed by the Lower Lias, much covered by Boulder Clays interspersed with sand and gravel patches with a central west-facing marlstone escarpment rising to over 183 metres (600ft). This gives rise to Upper Lias clays with isolated cappings of inferior oolite forming the highest points in East Leicestershire at Robin-a-Tiptoe Hill at 222 metres (727ft) and the site of the deserted village of Whatborough on the summit of Whatborough Hill standing at 230 metres (754ft) (Hutchings 1989). These formations have produced an undulating landscape which has been deeply dissected by numerous streams cutting clay floored valleys draining into the Wreake and Soar to the north and west and southwards to the Welland.

The south-east lowlands formed by the River Welland and its tributary streams comprise a "distinct unit to the south of High Leicestershire" (Darby and Terrett 1971:355). The southern fringes of the Eastern uplands are heavily dissected by streams draining into the Welland, forming spurs of high ground projecting into the river vale. The region mainly lies between 61 metres (200ft) and 122 metres (400ft) with a sharp break in relief around the Middle Lias escarpment. The valley floor is formed by wide alluvial tracts and gravel terraces, together with large areas where the Lower Lias is exposed to form broad flat plains. These Lias clays form part of the drainage slope of the Welland, a river which has always been quickly affected by heavy rains, rising rapidly to overflow its banks to form a wide flood-plain (Auty 1943:153-4; Richardson 1931:19). To the southwest, the land rises to the uplands of south Leicestershire and the hills around Gumley. South of the River Welland, the prominent and narrow Jurassic
escarpment of High Northamptonshire forms the watershed between the Rivers Welland and Nene.

2.2 THE LANGTON HUNDRED

The Langton hundred lies approximately eleven miles south-east of Leicester and extends for eight kilometres (five miles) northwards from the River Welland to the fringes of High Leicestershire, being four kilometres (2.5 miles) broad at its widest extent and covering some 25 square kilometres or 9.5 square miles (Fig 2). The topography of Langton Hundred is dominated by a ridge of land forming a spur projecting from High Leicestershire. The land rises from below 75 metres (246ft) by the Welland flood-plain to a plateau reaching over 169 metres (554ft) in the north of the survey area where it forms the Welland-Soar watershed.

The Langton ridge has an undulating and hilly topography resulting from streams draining into the valleys of two tributaries of the Welland which form the principal southern and eastern boundaries of Langton hundred. In the south, the Langton Brook flows eastwards through a broad flat plain to the low-lying ground around the River Welland which was, until recent drainage improvements, still "liable to flood" (Ordnance Survey 1:10560 Map 1884). To the east, a southward-flowing Welland tributary is known, from medieval sources, as the Lipping, an archaic river-name probably coined in the early Saxon period (Cox 1971:95-6; Ekwall 1962:201). The Lipping has cut a narrow valley from which the land rises sharply to the Langton ridge and the hilltop site of St Peter's church at Church Langton (80 to 130 metres). Towards the Welland on its eastern side, the land rises to Langton Caudle (147 metres), which, although never as a whole part of the ancient Langton parish, was joined to Thorpe Langton by a narrow strip of land until 1885 (VCH Leics iii:191). It is possible that this prominent landmark was once intercommuned by the people of Langton and the townships to the east of the Lipping.

The solid geology of the study area is dominated by Jurassic clays. Lower Lias clays are exposed where streams have dissected the Langton ridge and form the broad vale of the Langton Brook. The escarpment around Church Langton is formed by Middle Lias clays, the most important water bearing rock in the area, the junction between the Middle and Lower Lias marking a sharp break in relief and "a wet-line where springs and seepages issue from the more permeable silts"
Figure 2: Langton Hundred: Townships and Topography
The Middle Lias only exposed around Thorpe Langton, Pleistocene deposits and later drift deposits conceals much of the solid geology of the survey area. The River Welland and its tributaries have alluvial tracts mostly composed of silt and clay with gravel bands on the Welland flood-plain. Gravel terraces are well developed by the River Welland with the second terrace rising some ten metres above the flood-plain. The Boulder Clays covering the high ground around Church Langton continue northwards to the hinterland of Shangton where there are several small exposed patches of sand and gravel.

The Langton hundred comprises the ancient parishes of Church Langton and Shangton and formed part of Gartree wapentake, one of the four administrative units of Leicestershire at the time of Domesday. By Leicestershire standards, Church Langton is a large parish, covering some 1,782 hectares or 4,403 acres. The core of the parish comprises the townships of East, West and Thorpe Langton (1,210 hectares or 2,990 acres), which we can collectively call Greater Langton. The mother church of St Peter is situated on the edge of the small village of Church Langton and both church the settlement lay within the ancient township of East Langton (Throsby 1790 ii:343,345). The village of Church Langton lies on the central high ground of the Langton ridge with the church standing at 125 metres (410ft) to dominate the surrounding landscape. Both East and West Langton lie at 100 metres (329ft) on the southern slopes of the ridge overlooking the plain cut by the Langton Brook, being approximately 750 metres apart, with the same distance dividing them from Church Langton. The village of Thorpe Langton lies two kilometres from Church Langton and 1.5 kilometres from East Langton at the eastern end of the Langton ridge nearest to the River Welland and is mainly situated above 90 metres with the chapel of St. Leonard occupying the higher ground. East and West Langton are singularly recorded as Langetone in Domesday, the division of settlement being first noticed in the c.1130 Survey, with Thorpe Langton independently noticed as torp in 1086. The evidence of early fiscal assessments, intermixed township structure and open-field organisation discussed in Chapters Seven and Eight show that Greater Langton formerly functioned as a unified land unit.

It is noticeable how West, East and Thorpe Langton lie on the principal spring-line around the Langton ridge, where the relatively porous Middle Lias clays give way to more the impermeable rocks of the Lower Lias. The settlement at Church Langton is the only one to be unfavourably sited on Boulder clay. Although the Middle Lias constitutes the underlying solid geology, there are no natural sources of water in the immediate vicinity of the church or settlement and such
was the importance of a St Ann's well on the spring line to the community at Church Langton that "at the time of the inclosure, this spring was carefully preserved for the public benefit" (Nichols 1798:656). On the basis of these physical considerations, the village at Church Langton seems to occupy the least desirable choice of location and is an unlikely focus for early settlement.

Tur Langton township (572 hectares or 1,413 acres) takes in all the north of the ancient Langton parish. Although ecclesiastically dependent on Church Langton, its place-name does not derive from *lang + tun. Tur Langton, variously recorded as *Terlintone (1086), *Thurlington (c. 1130), *Turlinton (1166) and *Turlington (1206), has been interpreted as a name containing the genitive -inga- compounded with the OE personal name Tyrlī or *Tyrli and the suffix tun, in the sense of "estate or farm of the people of a man called X" (Cox 1971:262-3; Ekwall 1960:287). This translation rests upon the presence of a medial 'a' (later 'e') in the early place-name and the belief of Ekwall that -ingtun is usually a reduction of -ingatun. However, with only one late spelling with a medial 'e', it is probably better to accept Gelling's rejection of the Ekwall doctrine and to translate Tur Langton as a place-name containing the genitive -ing-, thus producing a probable rendering of "estate or farm associated with a man called X" (Gelling 1978:178; Mills 1991:204).

Tur Langton township conforms to the characteristic regional settlement pattern of a single nucleated village. It is situated four kilometres north of Church Langton on the western side of the Langton ridge lying at above 110 metres (361ft) close to the junction of the boulder clay and Lower Lias. The original chapel of St. Andrew, demolished in 1866 to make way for a new red brick chapel standing on the main street in the village, now stands isolated west of the present village next to the moated manor-house. Earthwork remains to the south suggest an earlier settlement focus in the medieval period.

There is no documentary evidence to connect the parish of Shangton (513 hectares or 1,268 acres) with that of the parish of Church Langton. Occupying all of the northern hinterland area of Langton Hundred, the parish was formerly divided into the townships of Shangton and Hardwick. The village of Shangton has always been small both in terms of population and fiscal valuation, the 17th century enclosure of the township causing a sharp decline in population.
Hardwick, which for valuation purposes was always recorded with Shangton, contained some 300 acres, taking in all of the northwest corner of the parish.

The village of Shangton and church of St. Nicholas, located 1.5 kilometres north of Tur Langton, are situated at 120 metres (395ft) in a valley formed by two streams where the Lower Lias is exposed from the surrounding Boulder Clay. Next to the village is a narrow spur of land projecting from the high ground to the north, and this topographical feature is the usual explanation for the place-name (1086: Sanctone) which probably derives from OE scanca, 'shank, leg' in the sense of 'the tun at the narrow spur of hill' (Cox 1971:250-1; Ekwall 1960:414).

On the high ground 1.5 kilometres northwest of the church there are earthwork remains adjacent to the present Shangton Grange farm, indicating the probable location of a moated site and the medieval settlement of Hardwick. Shangton Grange Farm lies on one of the few patches of glacial sand and gravel in this Boulder clay area. The place-name, meaning OE heord(e)-wic, 'the herd-farm', indicates the presence of an early pastoral settlement (Smith 1956:143-4). Hardwick lies on the edge of the high ground at 140 metres (459ft) with the land falling sharply to the Lipping and another watercourse respectively forming the eastern and northern boundaries of the township.

The traditional approach of settlement studies has been to compare the siting of settlements to the map of drift geology and spring-lines. The underlying assumption is that settlements that occupy the best sites in terms of water supply and free-draining soils are primary early settlements while those on heavier soils are secondary and late. Thus, Hoskins' seminal study of Anglo-Saxon settlement emphasised the siting of 'early' villages on the larger tracts of well-drained sands and gravels which cap the Boulder claylands of Eastern Leicestershire (Hoskins 1935:115-8). This geological approach has also been the basis of some place-name scholars work such as Cameron's classic study of Scandinavian place-names in East Midlands and Fellows-Jensen examination of the relationship between settlement names and the drift geology of parts of south Leicestershire immediately to the west of the Langton Hundred (Cameron 1965; Fellows-Jensen 1978:321-24).

In Langton hundred, and south east Leicestershire as a whole, there are few deposits of glacial sand and gravel to offer the 'classic' siting of nucleated settlements on free-draining soils; apart
from some 'valley-bottom' villages most lie on the spring-line. However, this physically
deterministic type of analysis is unlikely to lead to any clear conclusions regarding the process
and pattern of settlement. Moreover, there is now much archaeological evidence for a
pre-nucleation, dispersed settlement pattern characterised by much fluidity of site location

Although the traditional approach can have useful things to say about settlement location,
geographers have long emphasised the importance of relating settlement sites to the surrounding
resources used for exploitation and the external relations of communities. Thus Chisholm has
proposed a model comprising "two sets of space-relationships of the utmost importance": one is
the relationship of the settlement to the resources of its territory and the other is the lines of
communication with other inhabited centres (Chisholm 1962:113-23). Chisholm's model is one
based upon the least-cost location in terms of distance from the five universal economic needs of
an agricultural community - water, arable land, grazing land, fuel and building materials - each
element being allocated a 'weight' according to the importance attached to it by the community.
The stress is upon the possibility of variability in the siting of settlements in time and space
according to the social and economic basis of local communities.

The geographical approach or 'spring-line explanation of settlement location', therefore,
emphasises but one factor in the complex interplay between a community and its local resources
(Fowler 1976:34). Moreover, in addition to the physical characteristics of a particular site, the
working of the subsistence economy and lines of communication, any consideration of site
location must take into account the cultural and socio-political factors such as the nature of the
arable field and its method of working, lord-peasant relations and the possibility of deliberate
planning around new nodal points in the landscape - for example an aristocratic residence or the
site of a church (Roberts 1987:105-26). Thus the siting of the spring-line Langton villages tells
us little about the process of settlement; their position is probably a consequence of a need for
locations which were convenient for the communal operation of the open-field system,
characterised by a townships fields being divided into two or three sectors.

However, perhaps the most important criticism of the traditional model of settlement and land
use based on geology and access to water, is that they have generally ignored the crucial
environmental distinction between valeland and watershed and how far the interplay between
human behaviour and these underlying environmental structures helped to determine the pattern and process of settlement.

2.3 COMMUNICATIONS

The proximity of the community of Langton hundred to major lines of communication and to local market centres emphasises that it is not "sufficient to consider merely the relationship of a settlement to its lands" (Chisholm 1962:120). There has been much previous conjecture over the route, or at least the general direction, of possible prehistoric trackways traversing the area of Langton hundred. The idea that a 'Jurassic Way' traversed the region taking in the course of the higher ground to avoid the damp low-lying clays has led to speculation that this followed the crest of "Kibworth saddle that separates the Soar basin from that of the Welland" and then northwards to High Leicestershire (Hoskins 1972:17-18; VCH Leics iii:57). A similar case could be made for the road following the Langton ridge. The coincidence of the ridge-road following the Soar-Welland watershed with parish and township boundaries for 9.5 kilometres from the north-east boundary of Langton hundred to the plateau of High Leicestershire around Tilton certainly suggests that this route is pre-Conquest in origin and very probably of much greater antiquity. However, whatever the truth of the notion of prehistoric thoroughfares, these ridgeway routes are presently of an indeterminate date (Hooke 1985:58-62).

The Gartree Road, the only certain Roman Road in the survey area, traverses Shangton parish in the north of the survey area connecting Leicester (Ratae Corieltavorum) with the small town of Medbourne on the shire boundary by the River Welland. Another possible early routeway may have followed the course of Debdale Lane, which, together with parish boundaries, may trace the route of a Roman road connecting Venonis on the Watling Street with Medbourne thus traversing the south of Langton hundred. The main Leicester to Market Harborough road (the modern A6), close to the western border of Langton hundred has been also been suggested as broadly following the course of a Roman road. This would be very plausible if the Roman settlement which seems to occupy the area of the ridgeway on Bowden Hill between Great Bowden and Market Harborough turns out to be another market centre (Liddle 1982a:31,37).
There is some evidence to support the view of Hoskins that a through-route running from Great Bowden to Leicester via Foxton and the Gumley hills did approximate to an important pre-Conquest line of communication, although its course may equally have followed the Leicester-Harborough road (Hoskins 1949c:56). In the first place, a major Leicester to Northampton routeway is suggested from the known itineraries of the Mercian kings, with recorded meetings of the Mercian witenagemot at Glen (AD848) and Gumley (AD749,772, and 779), with possible royal residences at Leicester, Brixworth and more certainly Northampton which has has produced evidence of Middle Saxon buildings interpreted as royal palaces (Hill 1981:83; Parsons 1977; Sawyer 1983:294; Stenton 1971:201; Williams 1985:38-42). Gumley, described as 'well known' (in loco celebre) in 749, lies just four kilometres from Langton hundred on the course of the Debdale lane. The status of Leicester during this period is indicated by the fact that it was the see of the Middle Angles from possibly as early as c.680, and certainly from 737 until the 870s (Bailey 1980:6-7). One may also point to the location of the 8th century monastery church at Brixworth just 21 kilometres south of Langton hundred, respectively identified as a daughter house of the monastery of Meceshamstede (Peterborough), the site of Cluesesho, the meeting place of church councils in the 8th and 9th centuries and, most recently, the monastery founded by Wilfrid and his death place in 709 (Davis 1962; Hart 1992:142-4; Parsons 1988:375-78; Stenton 1971:160). This concentration of Middle Saxon royal and ecclesiastical sites between Leicester and Northampton is testimony to an important and perhaps principle line of communication from the Mercian heartland in the Trent valley to London and the southern English Kingdoms.

Langton hundred’s proximity to 'central places' and important lines of communication is also clear in the later Saxon period. At the time of Domesday, Great Bowden was a royal manor and soke centre of Gartree wapentake (Roffe forthcoming). Hoskins suggested that a major pre-Conquest way from Leicester to the Welland at Great Bowden was down the Roman Gartree road to the junction north of Stonton Wyville from where a track "runs directly south to Great Bowden through Stonton Wyville, over the shoulder of Langton Caudle into Thorpe Langton, and so onto Bowden" (Hoskins 1949c:54). The Gartree road was certainly still a major routeway in late Saxon and medieval periods; it was beside this road in Shangton, at a place called the ‘Gartree Bush’, that the moot-site of Gartree wapentake was located (Nichols 1798:791,865). The position of this meeting place follows the pattern for Leicestershire moot-sites which 'suggests deliberate selection of particular places of assembly both central to the wapentake areas and near
Roman roads leading to the nodal borough" (Cox 1972:18-9). The Gartree road was the route chosen by John Leland on his way to Leicester in 1528 but, thereafter, its use declined and, by the end of the 18th century, sections had fallen into disuse (Nichols 1798:431; VCH Leics iii:73).

After the Middle Ages, and possibly since the creation of the market town of *Hauerberga* (Market Harborough) in Great Bowden in 1160-70, the main route south from Leicester followed the Leicester-Harborough Road, the modern A6, which was established in 1726 as the county's first turnpike road (Hoskins 1949c; Russell 1934). This road connects with an important east-west road running through the Langtons linking the medieval market town of Hallaton with Kibworth Harcourt and the villages further west and Leicester to the north (Howell 1983:1-5).

Lines of communication, the second of Chisholm's space-relationships acting upon settlement location, emphasise the external contacts of local communities. The major routeways, either traversing or near to the territory of Langton hundred, are likely to have had an influence on the location and status of settlements. The ease of access that these routes facilitated for the interchange of goods at local market centres are likely to have fostered wealth accumulation and the production of goods and services for distribution.

### 2.4 POST-MEDIEVAL LAND USE

Burton's early 17th century comments on the corn growing lands, "many good & large sheepe Pastures" in south-east Leicestershire hints at a distinction between enclosed and open townships (Burton 1622:2). In a countryside notable for its early enclosure this is a good reflection of contemporary land use. By the mid 16th century, there had developed a broad geographical division between the enclosed townships of the uplands and fringes of High Leicestershire and the mainly 'champion' country of the Welland valley. Although unified seignorial control and the property relationships of peasant communities were important causal factors, the environmental characteristics of these upland townships in terms of topography and soils creating unfavourable physical conditions for arable husbandry were a significant contribution in the movement to enclose the open-fields. By Burton's day the geographical division had become blurred with the penetration of a few enclosed townships into the lowlands (e.g. West Langton) but the main 17th
century enclosures still kept to High Leicestershire (Yelling 1977:46-58). All the townships to the north and east of Langton hundred were enclosed early, either fully or partially: Noseley, 1504; Carlton, 1601; Welham, 1606; Illston, 1614-63; Stонтon, 1638-79 (Beresford 1949; VCH Leics ii:154-9). The Parliamentary Enclosures of the 18th and 19th centuries completed the progress of the movement of enclosure from High Leicestershire. All of the last seven awards, culminating in Medbourne in 1844, involved townships in or adjacent to the Welland valley (Hunt 1957; Yelling 1977:54). When account is taken of the pattern of landholding, this broad view of the geography of enclosure in eastern Leicestershire reveals that "on the whole enclosure began early in those districts least favourable to arable agriculture, and ended in those most favourable" (Yelling 1977:58).

In this conversion from champion to enclosed landscapes, the townships of the survey area largely followed the regional pattern. The hinterland township of Hardwick was taken over to grazing and by the end of the 14th century and in the mid-17th century Shangton had joined the move to the "good and large sheepe Pastures" noted by Burton 30 years before (Burton 1622; Nichols 1798:791; Throsby 1790 ii:464; VCH Leics v:295). With the exception of West Langton which appears to have been largely enclosed by private agreement in the 1650s, the valeland townships held onto a mixed-farming system of convertible husbandry with its mixture of arable strips and grazing, or ley, ground for a while longer (Hoskins 1963:169). Full enclosure of Langton parish came by Act of Parliament in 1791 (LRO QS 79/6/24).

Grazing has dominated the post-enclosure land use of the study area. The lower Lias clays have a high water-table and have given rise to deep rich soils which, together with the heavy clays of the Langton ridge, have produced some of the best permanent grasslands in the country - the "grassy world" of Cramp's evocative portrayal of early 20th century rural life in the Langtons (Cramp 1985). Described in the 1940s as part of "the best fatting pastures of the Eastern region and possibly of England", the study area was still, in the 1960s, a predominantly grazing and stock rearing country (Auty 1943:297; Bowler 1981). The return to arable in the 1970s and 80s has made a major impact on these land use patterns although large blocks of permanent pasture still remain around the low-lying ground of the Welland tributaries.

Since Kerridge's classification of the 'Midland Plain' as a distinct agrarian region in the post-Medieval period, there has been increasing division of this extensive area into smaller units.
Thus Mingay's study of land-use in eastern Leicestershire has divided Kerridge's "disjointed rolling plain" into the agricultural regions of the "clayland vales and alluvial river valley bottoms" with their "arable-fattening systems" and the upland clay wolds with their grazing livestock economies (Mingay 1984:94,103). For eastern Leicestershire, geography and social history mean these contrasting countrysides are not as sharply focused as the Feldon and Arden in Warwickshire or the valelands and Downland of Kent, but it is still possible to recognise in the agrarian changes since the 16th century a distinction between upland and lowland pays.

Around the year 1500, common open-field husbandry was a general unifying feature of vale and upland, a characteristic stressed by Kerridge in his definition of the 'Midland Plain'. Yet, if we look beyond this date into the late medieval period, we can still detect a contrast between these countrysides in the high density of medieval depopulations and the number of townships of small acreages on High Leicestershire. Late medieval village desertions, such as Hardwick in Langton hundred, were essentially for the conversion of the arable to sheep pastures and, in the 16th and 17th centuries, the link between enclosure and depopulation continued with a rapid decline in the population of townships converting to less labour intensive pastoral farming (Yelling 1977:217-8). In this regional context, Fox has argued that "concentrations of small vills resulted, eventually, in concentrations of deserted villages" and that this was ultimately a consequent of the wolds being a "distinctive class of region with its own special characteristics of settlement" (Fox 1989:97). It is, then, possible to recognise in the late and post-medieval agrarian and settlement history of Langton hundred, a broad distinction between the intensively settled vales of the Langtons and the more sparsely populated pastoral wolds around the parish of Shangton. The processes which resulted in these patterns of settlement and land-use can be detected in the late medieval period, although it is likely that the nature of the human response to the environmental background of the region has its roots much earlier.
CHAPTER THREE

FIELD SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND PRESENTATION

3.1 FIELD SURVEY IN LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY.

Since the 1970s there has been a series of landscape surveys in Britain which have adopted the archaeological technique of 'field survey' or 'fieldwalking', the systematic collection of archaeological artifacts in the ploughsoil, as the principal component of their survey methodology (Davison 1990; Foard 1978; Gaffney and Tingle 1989; Parker Pearson and Schadla-Hall 1994; Shennan 1985; Silvester 1988; Williamson 1989). At the same time, there has been much discussion of the problems of collection, classification, and interpretation of field surface data (Haselgrove et al. 1985; Schofield 1991).

Some archaeologists have expressed scepticism over the potential of field survey alone to provide data capable of empirical classification and interpretation (e.g. Branigan 1987: 130-31). Hope Simpson has expressed this pessimism: "survey material alone can never provide a secure basis for interpretation. It is thus debatable whether thorough surveys are significantly more reliable than less thorough surveys as regards extrapolation... all conclusions derived from field surface survey alone must remain tentative and hypothetical" (Hope Simpson 1983: 47). Cherry's rejoinder rightly attacked the inference that excavated data are, in any way, more reliable; both field survey and excavation should be given equal status by archaeologists (Cherry 1983).

Few would now doubt the great potential of field survey for the study of past landscapes; indeed fieldwalking is the principal means of providing sufficient data at a regional scale for a meaningful discussion of past settlement patterns and the diachronic process of settlement. There are, however, limits to what can be asked from material culture, whether derived from excavation or field survey, and this realisation is a reaction to the New Archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s (Gaffney and Gaffney 1987). 'Survey archaeology' and 'excavation archaeology' are best equipped to answer different but related questions from the material record of the past and both present equally complicated problems of interpretation.
An understanding of the relationships between human activity location and its associated cultural and ecological region is a goal of all modern surveys. The sampling strategy is, therefore, the first principal demand of any systematic field survey (Barker 1991:3-4). Most surveys are too large to cover the whole study area so the aim must be to attempt to sample the landscape systematically. The question of the appropriate total areal coverage of a survey must also be addressed. Some survey workers have followed Binford's classic assertion that survey designs should aim to investigate regions which "can be expected to have supported cultural systems" (Binford 1964:426). In Britain, Cherry (1983:386) has echoed Binford: "what we should aim for are natural study regions that have some cultural relevance", and Binford's advocacy of probabilistic sampling has been adopted by some British regional surveys (Shennan 1985). These large scale regional strategies may be criticised, however, for being ineffective in analysing some specific problems of settlement patterning within, for example, discrete land units such as medieval townships, Anglo-Saxon 'multiple estates' or the hypothetical territory of a Roman villa, the subject of some recent small scale British surveys (Davison 1990; Hayfield 1987; Gaffney and Tingle 1989). Any sampling strategy of a survey must, therefore, be related to research goals and the appropriate geographical scale will depend on the contextual framework of a survey. What is more important for our understanding of regional settlement systems is that a survey's parameters "provide satisfactory samples of the ecological diversity of the area in question" (Mills 1985:44). The point is that there is no 'right' sampling design: the objectives of a landscape survey should determine the strategy of its design.

There are a number of basic questions for which field survey may provide at least partial answers and Cherry and Shennan have specifically stressed four types of questions which can be elucidated by a field survey (Cherry and Shennan 1978:22):

1. The number of sites in the area.
2. The number of sites by period and function.
3. The relationship between archaeological sites and environmental variables.
4. The interrelationships between archaeological sites.

These general aims are central to all field surveys. The emphasis is on 'site' archaeology, the prospecting for concentrations of artifacts in the ploughsoil which are interpreted as settlement sites. However, since the 1970s, there has been an increasing recognition of the importance of 'off-site' archaeology, low density artifact scatters found distributed throughout a landscape, for
our understanding of past land use and its relationship with human societies. The background to
off-site surveys lies in the ethnoarchaeological studies of lithic discard behaviour of
hunter-gatherer societies (Foley 1981). Most field workers agree that the majority of the off-site
The investigation of 'off-site' material disseminating from Romano-British farms has, for
example, been the subject of recent field surveys (Gaffney and Tingle 1989; Hayfield 1987;
Williamson 1984; 1989). These studies have interpreted the dispersed Roman artifact scatters of
pot sherds and building material as deriving from manuring activity from settlement middens.
The analysis of manuring scatters from field surveys in lowland Britain, it is argued, can provide
data for assessing "variations in the nature and intensity of contemporary agricultural activities"
and that "off-site discard may provide important evidence for contrasting economic activities
between different regions" (Gaffney and Tingle 1989:244).

A modern field survey, therefore, recognises that the archaeological record is distributed across
the whole landscape and seeks to combine 'site' and 'off-site' data to understand the complexity
of social, economic, behavioural and environmental forces which are reflected in the disposition
of archaeological material.

3.2 THE FIELD SURVEY: COLLECTION STRATEGY AND PROBLEMS OF
INTERPRETATION

The present archaeological survey was based upon two stages of investigation which sought to
balance the quantity and quality of information with the time available for fieldwalking. The two
stages have been called 'extensive' and 'intensive' survey. Extensive survey involved a traverse
and stint collection strategy whereby all the available ploughed fields were walked using
traverses at twenty metre spacing, with each traverse divided into 50 metre stints in order to
locate artifacts close to their findspot. Intensive survey involved the investigation of
concentrations of artifacts identified from the extensive survey using ten metre grid collection
units. All surface scatters were collected from the field for identification. The extensive survey,
on the basis of a one to two metre scan of the field surface, would produce an approximate five
per cent sample of all the artifacts lying on the ploughsoil.
No attempt was made to use the National Grid as a means of marking out the traverses since it was considered that this would not improve the presentation of the data. Moreover, the topography and quantity of pasture in the relatively small study area made a National Grid approach inappropriate. The procedure taken was to choose the straightest field boundary as the base line for the setting out of the traverse and stints, their position then marked on a 6° Ordnance Survey map. This simple but effective methodology follows that adopted by the Leicestershire Museums Survey Team (Liddle 1985:9).

A major consideration when deciding upon the system of artifact collection was the problem of locating material produced by 'sites' which produce low quantities of material or pottery sherds which are difficult to recognise due to abrasion or colour. Thus, low-status Roman settlements may be represented by very small surface scatters of pottery with no building material and Anglo-Saxon sites by even smaller concentrations of small, dark, abraded sherds. Within the local region, a traverse spacing of fifteen metres used by the Raunds survey team in Northamptonshire and a twenty metre spacing by the Leicestershire Museums Survey team in Medbourne has been successful in locating early to middle Anglo-Saxon material (Dix 1987:4; Liddle: 1994). The choice of twenty metre traverses was, therefore, made on the expectation that this would be a close enough spacing for the location of low density artifact scatters and yet wide enough to permit a fairly rapid reconnaissance of the study area.

Problems abound with the interpretation of surface scatters, but, as already stated, these are no more serious than those associated with excavated material. A complexity of factors can effect the collection of artifacts from the field surface. Geomorphological change such as the effects of erosion, colluviation and alluviation may have resulted in movement or covering of ancient material. Artifact visibility is effected by the condition of the ploughsoil and lighting conditions. Generally, a weathered ploughsoil produces more artifacts than freshly ploughed soil. Field surfaces smeared by rain, or dried by the sun, cast in bright sunlight or under dull overcast skies can all produce differential recovery. Time did not permit experimentation through repeated reconnaissance but the survey conditions were noted. The experience of a fieldworker, time of day and motivation can all effect personal capabilities of recognising material. The present survey was undertaken by myself with help from one other fieldworker with equal skills and experience. The data collected can, therefore, perhaps claim to be rather more consistent across the whole landscape than some produced by a larger team of surveyors.
Finds were initially identified by members of the Leicestershire Archaeological Unit but the majority of the artifacts have been classified by the author as the survey progressed. There are, however, a number of factors which limit the inferences that can be drawn from the archaeological data. These include the extent of pottery usage, site status and pottery type resulting in a friable or a hard fabric. Furthermore, pottery chronology is often poorly understood and dating problems are often compounded by conservative pottery traditions. The majority of sherds can be classified as late Iron Age or Romano-British, early to middle Saxon, early medieval etc., but few pottery types can be designated a more precise date range within these broad period divisions. Some particular classes of finds are important exceptions: Roman fine wares, for example, are helpful guides to early or late Roman settlement activity.

There is also the problem of defining what concentrations of surface scatters mean in terms of human activity in the past. There has been much discussion of the relationship between surface archaeology and sub-surface archaeology (Green 1986:71-2; Haselgrove 1985; Schofield 1989). No assumption is made that relatively dense scatters of pottery represent the actual location of a habitation site. Excavations of sub-surface features often produce small quantities of pottery; this is the case with the trial-trench of the West Langton villa when compared with the large quantities of surface finds produced by this survey away from the main building area (Sheppard 1975). A concentration of surface finds indicate the presence of sub-surface features such as ditches or middens, but these are often representative of activities within settlement units if not the habitation itself. Rates of colluviation, alluviation, and the depth and frequency of ploughing can all effect the quantities of pottery on the surface. Caution must, therefore, be applied when suggesting a settlement hierarchy on the basis of the size of surface scatters.

This project has divided surface finds into the two well known categories of 'site' archaeology and 'off-site' archaeology. A 'site' is defined as a distinct concentration of artifacts which represents a peak in human activity within the landscape and are normally assumed to represent the general proximity of human habitation, working or cemetery areas. Specific problems of interpretation are discussed further in the relevant period chapters. Off-site archaeology includes all the thinly scattered material across the landscape. The sedentary populations who inhabited the study area during the period of study would have been engaged in a range of activities including field cultivation, pastoral farming, and woodland exploitation, all of which could have created off-site archaeology. However, it is probable that the majority of the Roman and
medieval off-site scattered material produced by this survey is a result of the spreading of manure containing animal dung mixed with broken pottery or tile. If so, this material is a potential indicator of the extent and intensity of arable farming.

3.3 THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA: QUANTIFICATION AND PRESENTATION

The strength of the Langton hundred as a study area for the relationship of settlement and land use with environmental structure is that it provides a cross-section of adjacent but contrasting landscape zones of the river vale and its hinterland. A further consideration is that it readily breaks down into component Land Blocks which are comparable for the purposes of data analysis.

The sampling strategy was to investigate every available arable field. Of the total 2,465 hectares (including 170 hectares in Foxton parish available for the study of settlement activity along the valley of the Langton Brook), 1,206 hectares were available for fieldwalking, giving a 49 per cent overall coverage. Thus, of the total 24.5 square kilometres some twelve square kilometres were surveyed (Fig. 3). For the purposes of detecting changes in settlement and land use across the landscape, the study area has been divided into four Land Blocks with the aim of investigating every part of the landscape in an equal way. Each Land Block is based on modern Civil Parish boundaries:

**LAND BLOCK A:** East and Thorpe Langton. The total land area is 905 hectares, of which only 316 hectares (35 per cent) were available for fieldwalking. However, some 100 hectares of obscured land is taken up by the River Welland flood-plain, increasing the investigated area of suitable land for settlement to more than 46 per cent.

**LAND BLOCK B:** West Langton and part of Foxton. The total land area is 506 hectares, of which 316 hectares (62 per cent) were available for fieldwalking. The Foxton portion is bounded by eastings 703, northings 910, Debdale lane and the Langton Road.

**LAND BLOCK C:** Tur Langton. The total land area is 572 hectares, of which 294 hectares (51 per cent) were available for fieldwalking.
LAND BLOCK D: Shangton and Hardwick. The total land area is 513 hectares, of which 280 hectares (55 per cent) were available for fieldwalking.

Fortunately, the distribution of obscured land across the landscape provided a sampling constraint which limited the area available for investigation to a manageable enough size for a field survey undertaken by one or two surveyors. In the time available, twelve square kilometres were the maximum which could realistically be covered by extensive and intensive survey. The distribution of obscured land is fairly evenly distributed across the study area, except for one major concentration of permanent pasture on the former flood-plain of the River Welland in Land Block A. However, this low-lying ground was probably unsuitable for settlement throughout the period covered by this project and its presence does not distort the general conclusions made. On the areas of low-lying ground, few finds of any period were made, although the effects of colluviation must be taken into account.

The area of fieldwalked land in each Land Block is approximately three square kilometres and provides convenient subdivisions of the environment progressing from the river vale to the higher ground of the hinterland, thus allowing a comparison to be made of their respective settlement patterns and relative shares of artifacts recovered. The quantification and presentation of the data are generally based on the frequencies of artifacts recovered in each of the four Land Blocks. The aim is to assess contemporary patterns of settlement and land use across the landscape zones and to identify trends in settlement type, density and location operating through time.

The presentation of this research follows a chronological structure, with the archaeological data placed into a series of comparable time units: late Iron-Age and Romano-British settlement (c.100BC-AD400); early to middle Saxon settlement (c.AD450-850); and the early medieval countryside (c.AD1000-1400). Although this chronological arrangement has been given the labels of historical epochs, the divisions have largely been determined by the characteristics of the survey data. The archaeological survey provides the main body of evidence for the three chronological chapters, documentary data being introduced into the discussion where this provides contextual details relevant to the inferences drawn from the survey finds. The themes of these chapters are, therefore, concerned with detecting the long term interplay between human
Figure 3: The Four Land Blocks and Areas Fieldwalked
activity and the environmental structures of vale and hinterland.

**The Mapping of the Archaeological Data.** The initial fieldwalking survey used a scale of 1:10,000 as the base for mapping. This allows the distribution of all finds to be plotted with a reasonable degree of accuracy. However, for the purposes of presenting the chronological structure of this research, a scale of 1:25,000 has been chosen for ease of comparison. Thus this scale allows the whole of the survey area to be presented in a sequence of maps which show something of diachronic shifts in settlement and land use. Finds have been shown in two ways:-

1. A dot representing 1-5 finds. These have been placed centrally within the area of the field to represent a general scatter, or at the approximate point of occurrence when the field scatter was located on one particular area.
2. A shaded area marking the approximate extent of a concentration of finds which could be deemed to represent a 'site'.

An abbreviated summary of finds is offered in Appendix 1. Mention of 'sites' in the text refer to the site codes used in the appendix. These are of two types: (1) a field number corresponding to Civil Parish and arranged in the appendix by their constituent Land Block; and (2) a site code arranged chronologically in the appendix.
CHAPTER FOUR

LATER PREHISTORIC AND ROMANO-BRITISH SETTLEMENT

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The period covered by this chapter spans the late Iron Age to the end of the Roman period (c.100BC - AD400), although some of the settlement data probably stretches further back into the earlier first millennium BC. The latter part of the first millennium BC is generally considered a period of population growth and intensification of agriculture (Cunliffe 1991; Fowler 1983a; Millett 1990.10-11). The survey evidence for the late pre-Roman Iron Age (LPRIA) and early Romano-British (ERB) periods has been treated together since, besides the problems of pottery chronology, the survey results have suggested a broad continuum of settlement and land use which would make any attempt to distinguish the two periods artificial and arbitrary.

The Roman period has strong field survey data which can provide the empirical evidence necessary for the study of the nature and extent of agricultural exploitation and rural settlement. The pottery is both durable and easily recognisable and can often be given a broad date range within the Roman period. The surface finds allow the identification of 'sites' and the investigation of 'off-site' activities. The results of recent surveys have revealed intensive cultivation and a complexity of settlement patterns over a range of environments throughout Britain (Gaffney & Tingle 1989; Hayfield 1987; Williamson 1984).

Field survey in south-east Leicestershire has also produced increasing settlement evidence for the Romano-British period. Work in the 1970s and early 1980s on the clays of High Leicestershire revealed a closely settled landscape. Leicestershire Museum's landscape survey around the small Roman town of Medbourne in the Welland valley (Liddle 1994) was the first systematic survey to address the nature of the Roman land-use since Liddle's 1982 review of Roman rural settlement: "Most parts of the county are revealing Roman sites but what cannot yet
be done is to translate this into Roman landscapes" (Liddle 1982a:41). The Langton hundred
survey had the following specific aims for the LPRIA and Romano-British periods:

1. To identify 'sites' and to investigate the evidence for a settlement hierarchy based on the
   quantity and range of pottery and building material present.

2. To examine the continuity of settlement from the LPRIA to the early post-Roman periods.

3. To test for any changes in the pattern of settlement between the 1st and 4th centuries AD.

At the commencement of the survey the location of two Roman sites was known from earlier
fieldwork in Langton hundred: a villa site at West Langton and a smaller villa-type settlement in
Shangton. The survey has produced evidence for a further eighteen settlement areas with another
two or three potential sites. In the majority of cases, sites were surveyed only once and where
they have been revisited only one collection of finds is included in the analysis. The field data,
therefore, suggest a dispersed settlement pattern. However, the close proximity of a few
concentrations suggests that some sites are part of the same settlement complex, for example, the
sites at WTL RB 1 and FOX RB 1 which together form the West Langton/Foxton villa complex
and SHT RB 1, the 'villa-type' settlement in Shangton.

The majority of LPRIA and Romano-British finds were pottery sherds. The total sherds
recovered from extensive and intensive collection are shown in Table 4.1. Some 45 per cent of
the total sherds were recovered from traverse and stint fieldwalking and, taken as a whole, each
Land Block produced a fairly consistent quantity of LPRIA and RB sherds ranging from 22 per
cent of the total in Land Block C to 27.6 per cent in Land Block A, with an approximate density
of 1.65 sherds per hectare. This does not mean that there was a similar intensity of land use and
settlement across the survey area throughout this long period. To detect changes in the pattern of

Table 4.1 THE LPRIA AND ROMANO-BRITISH POTTERY RECOVERED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND BLOCK</th>
<th>No. of Sherds</th>
<th>Per cent of Total</th>
<th>SHERDS PER HECTARE</th>
<th>No. of Sherds</th>
<th>TOTAL SHERDS</th>
<th>Per cent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td></td>
<td>2591</td>
<td>4701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
settlement and land use it is necessary to give greater chronological precision to the surface assemblage.

4.2 PROBLEMS OF DATING

There are major problems in giving even a broad date range to the later prehistoric and Romano-British surface assemblages. Although the Romano-British pottery is generally high fired and survives relatively well in the ploughsoil, most of the 'off-site' scatters have been subjected to arable farming throughout the medieval period and, in some instances, to years of modern ploughing. Under these conditions friable pottery, such as the calcite gritted wares, will degrade quickly in the ploughsoil while other coarse kitchen grey wares, which are particularly resilient and the most common field finds, have a longevity of form and fabric type which can rarely be given even a broad date range within the Roman period. As a result of these processes, many of the sherds can only be recognised simply as 'Roman' and it is to be expected that only a small fraction will be of a diagnostic pottery type which can be used as a chronological indicator. The best we can hope for from the archaeological data is a simple chronological division into pre-Roman Iron-Age (PRIA), LPRIA-early Roman (ERB), and later Roman (LRB), but a degree of overlap is to be expected for most pottery types.

PRIA Pottery
Evidence for settlement in the 1st millennium BC takes the form of domestic pottery and occasional finds of loomweight fragments. Given the objective to show general trends in settlement intensity across the four Land Blocks of the study area, it would be ideal to be able to divide the pottery into broad chronological phases: Early Iron Age c.700 to 400 BC, Middle Iron Age c.400 to 100 BC and the Later Pre-Roman Iron Age (LPRIA) c.100 BC to c.AD50. The LPRIA might also be subdivided into late Iron-Age for the 1st century BC and very late Iron Age for the 1st century AD to first decades of Roman occupation although the quantity and quality of the surface data recovered from this survey makes such chronological refinement impossible (Elsdon 1989:31-46). However, the majority of the Iron Age sherds are found juxtaposed or overlying Romano-British sites, suggesting that most of the prehistoric pottery dates to the LPRIA.
A possible fragment of an Early Bronze Age urn found in Tur Langton is the only sherd recovered which might be assigned to the pre-Iron Age period (c.1400-1000BC). Some six locations have produced sherds of coarse gritty pottery which might be of late Bronze Age or early Iron-Age date (c.700 to c.400BC). Similar wares have been found around the Soar Valley in Leicestershire at Glen Parva, Barkby Thorpe and Rothley for which a c.400BC date has been proposed (Liddle: Pers.Comm.). However, little can be said of the Langton hundred material before a stratified assemblage is excavated.

Eight sites (ETL IA5,6; FOX IA1,3; TUR IA2,3; SHT IA3; HDW IA2) have produced deeply scored pottery of the Ancaster-Breedon tradition which is known elsewhere in the East Midlands from 4th and 3rd century BC contexts (Cunliffe 1991:73). One site (TUR IA2) has produced scored shell-tempered wares, with sherds showing finger-nail impressions around the rim or finger impressions on the carination. These features are typical of the late Bronze-Age to early Iron Age period (Elsdon 1993). However, East Midlands Scored Ware (EMSW) of the Ancaster-Breedon type seems to have continued into the 1st Centuries BC and AD on rural sites in the Welland valley and cannot be taken as certain evidence for middle Iron-Age settlement (Elsdon 1992:86). Thus four of the eight sites producing EMSW are associated with Romano-British settlements suggesting a longevity of occupation or a late usage of this pottery type.

**LPRIA and ERB Pottery**

For the 1st century AD, calcite-gritted and early coarse wares are the dominant pottery types identifiable from the field survey. Early coarse wares include grog-tempered and sandy wares. Both calcite-gritted and early coarse wares have origins in the late Iron-Age and some are EMSW types which probably pushes chronology back to, at least, the 1st century BC. Since there was a transitional phase spanning the mid-1st century AD in which hand-built LPRIA pottery was replaced by wheel-thrown wares, the calcite-gritted and early coarse wares finds are simply classed as LPRIA/ERB, indicating 1st century BC to 1st century AD occupation (MacRobert 1985).

Samian is the most readily identifiable early Roman fine ware. Found in small quantities on the majority of sites, its production period is mainly of the late 1st to later 2nd centuries AD (Webster 1987). After the 1st century AD, grey wares are dominant, but in most instances
cannot be closely dated. Black Burnished wares (BBI) can generally only be given a mid-late 2nd to 4th century date range. For the mid-second to mid-third century, the diagnostic fine and shelly wares, in addition to being composed of friable fabrics, are on present evidence rare on rural sites. Nene valley grey wares may be of this period. However, it seems probable that the majority of mid-2nd to mid-3rd century pottery is, at present, unidentifiable deriving from local coarse ware kilns.

LRB pottery
The later Roman period covers the mid-3rd to late 4th or early fifth centuries AD. Nene valley and, to a lesser extent, Oxfordshire colour-coated wares have been used as the main indicator of late Roman settlement (Howe et al. 1980). The assemblages of Nene valley-colour coat, increasingly utilitarian in the course of the 3rd century, are commonly found on Romano-British sites in south-east Leicestershire regardless of their size or status.

4.3 PRE-ROMAN IRON-AGE SETTLEMENT
The largest group of possible early Iron Age sherds was recovered from a ridge of high ground on the Tur Langton and West Langton township boundary (TUR-WTL ElAl). This pottery is associated with Anglo-Saxon material. The other finds of single sherds are widely dispersed at East Langton (ETL ElAl), Tur Langton (TUR ElAl2,3), and Shangton (SHT ElAl, HDW ElAl). These sites suggest sites along the valley floors of the Welland tributaries and around the ridges of higher ground in the mid 1st millennium BC. Later PRIA settlement is equally likely to be under represented from the survey evidence with most sites producing little pottery. Whereas a few sites are found located some distance away from Romano-British settlements, others are found with the artifact concentrations of these later sites. Longevity of occupation is probable but a settlement hiatus is impossible to detect from surface finds.

The distribution of surface scatters of middle to late Iron Age material is similar to the suggested pattern of the preceding period, but there does appear to have been an intensification of settlement. However, given the inadequacies of the data, it is not possible to be certain if this implies an increase in population although, over the longer term of the 1st millennium BC, this does seem to be the most likely conclusion. Some 25 middle to late Iron-Age 'sites' have been
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located by the field survey, twenty of which are associated with Romano-British sites. What
does appear to be the case from the distribution of later Iron Age finds, is a landscape consisting
of many valley settlements cultivating the liassic clays, but also well placed to cultivate or utilise
the wood-pasture resources of the upland boulder clays. Indeed, some settlement sites are to be
found on around the margins of the boulder clay or even possibly even on the clay plateau.
While some PRIA sites did not continue into the Romano-British period and were perhaps
short-lived settlements, it seems that the trend in the two centuries preceding the Roman
conquest was for an intensification of settlement and land use and rising population. If so, the
landscape was a fully exploited one, with large areas taken over for cultivation and the
remaining land systematically used for their woodland and pasture resources.

4.4 ROMANO-BRITISH SETTLEMENT CATEGORISATION

The quantity and range of Romano-British artifacts collected allow a more detailed discussion of
settlement types and land use than for any period until the post-Norman Conquest period. Some
archaeologists, however, have expressed doubt over the potential to extract meaningful evidence
from the large catalogue of Romano-British 'sites' discovered through archaeological survey.
Thus Branigan, when considering evidence from the South Midlands, has summarised the
difficulties of interpreting surface finds:
"The problems facing the archaeologist trying to study, sort and analyse these settlements are
frankly insurmountable...Even when one considers only the known 'sites', attempts to classify
them are doomed to failure because it is impossible to draw the line in many cases between a
farmstead and a hamlet, a hamlet and a village, an industrial or craft settlement and a farming
village and so on. Furthermore, many 'sites' merge into one another so that it is difficult to say
where one begins and another ends. Beyond these problems are those of chronology" (Branigan

This is perhaps an over pessimistic view: while caution is needed in our interpretation of surface
finds where sites discovered by fieldwalking have been excavated, the surface and sub-surface
assemblages are often very similar (Cooper et al. 1989:15; Greene 1986:71-2). So, assuming that
sub-surface features are not deeply buried, it is likely that intensive survey can provide a
reasonably accurate indication of the extent and date of a buried site.
It is usual to discuss Romano-British rural settlement in terms of a hierarchy of 'sites' which may be placed into the following broad categories: small towns or local market centres; 'Romanised' villa complexes; nucleated 'villages' or 'hamlets'; and isolated farmsteads or 'native' sites (Hingley 1989). Although any classification of 'sites' based on field surface finds is inevitably open to differing interpretations, it does, nevertheless, help the organisation of a discussion of the surface data. Thus Hayfield's parish survey of Wharram Percy divided Roman settlements into two main forms: villas and 'native' farmsteads, distinguished by the the extent to which they show evidence for 'Romanised' building traditions (Hayfield 1987:176). Villas were identified as large artifact-rich areas including debris from mosaic floors, tiled roofs and plastered walls and having high class pottery; farmsteads were recognised as markedly smaller, less artifact-rich settlement areas and, although some traces of ceramic roof-tile can often be found, it is unlikely that many farmsteads would have had tiled roofs.

The surface data in the study area produced a very basic distinction between sites indicating a 'Romanised' building as defined by the presence of durable building material - tiled or slate roofs, plaster, brick and flue tiles - and sites which may be classed as 'native' settlements producing little or no building material. From this basic division it is possible to recognise three settlement types:

**Villa** - I have defined this as a large settlement area covering more than 100 square metres. Finds include a high proportion of fine ware pottery and tessellated floors, tiled or slate roofs, plaster, brick and flue tiles from heating systems.

**Small Villa-Type Settlement** - a smaller settlement area, with a concentration of finds covering no more than 100 square metres and commonly represented by a tight concentration of finds. Evidence for tiled or slate roofs, plaster, brick and flue tiles from heating systems. This type of settlement could be described as a 'cottage villa'.

**Farmstead** - generally a small settlement area commonly covering no more than 50 square metres. Finds are mainly by pottery scatters with little or no evidence for durable building material. This type of settlement can be classed as a 'native' settlement.
A basic three-tier settlement hierarchy is, therefore, proposed and a suggested chronology of occupation is shown in Fig 6. However, the recognition of both from surface finds is limited by the quality of the evidence and relies on a degree of subjectivity. For instance, the villa and farmstead distinction is clearly visible, but the divisions between villa-type settlements and farmsteads often less apparent. Furthermore, factors other than status are likely to have affected the wealth and architectural features of a site. Proximity to favourable land may have been important, as would have been the longevity of occupation: it is possible that the use of durable building material was related to chronology if more 3rd and 4th century sites adopted Romanised construction methods (Williamson 1989:76). Any socio-economic significance which may be attached to this suggested settlement hierarchy is even more problematical.

LAND BLOCK A - EAST AND THORPE LANGTON

Villa-Type Settlements
ETL RB1 is a possible villa-type site located on the valley floor of the Lipping. This has produced pottery and tile which indicate the presence of a Romanised building but the site has not been intensively fieldwalked and more work is needed to help clarify the picture. Nevertheless, the site assemblage collected produced 16.5 per cent LPRIA-ERB pottery and 6.8 per cent colour-coat, suggesting occupation throughout the Romano-British period. A dense concentration of early 182 Anglo-Saxon sherds (ETL SX1) 250 metres to the north-east shows that there was intense post-Roman activity around the site.

ETL RB2 is another possible small villa-type site located 150 metres from the Lipping on ground rising from the valley floor. Like TUR RB2, this site lies 500 metres south of a possible villa-type settlement (ETL RB1). The area of the Roman building is clearly visible as a tight concentration of pottery, tile and boulders covering an area of some 50 square metres. The ceramic evidence suggests occupation from the 1st century BC to the 4th century AD, with LPRIA-ERB sherds accounting for 9.3 per cent and Nene Valley colour-coat for 10.9 per cent of total site assemblage. The site has produced evidence for a Romanised building; roof tiles are present and six fragments of flue tile suggest a possible central heating system. No sherds of Anglo-Saxon date were located.
Figure 6: Romano-British Settlement: Continuity and Change
Farmstead Sites

Four sites located in Land Block A can confidently be classified as farmsteads, none producing any building material. Three lie on the valley floor of the Lipping. THL RB1 is revealed as a dense scatter of pottery of which 7.4 per cent can be dated to the LPRIA-ERB period, with colour-coat accounting for 9.1 per cent of the assemblage. The site also produced one early Anglo-Saxon sherd. Located some 500 metres from THL RB1, THL RB2 produced a similarly dense concentration of sherds, with 12.7 per cent LPRIA-ERB and 8.2 per cent colour-coat. There is good evidence, therefore, that both farmsteads were occupied in the early and later Roman centuries and that they were probably occupied throughout the Romano-British period. THL RB3 is revealed as a smaller scatter of pottery 150 metres from THL RB2. With 29.4 per cent of the assemblage dated to the LPRIA-ERB period and with no colour-coat present, it seems that this site was abandoned before the 4th century.

By contrast, ETL RB3 lies on the high ground of the Langton ridge. This farmstead site again produced good evidence for LPRIA-ERB occupation (11.4 per cent of the total), but, with colour-coat only accounting for 2.9 per cent of the assemblage, evidence for 4th century occupation is relatively poor. Although ETL RB3 has produced the best evidence for settlement on the plateau of the Langton ridge, scatters of pottery were found in all the fields surveyed and there were probably other farmstead sites located beside the ridge road. Some of these scatters might indicate potential sites as opposed to manuring scatters, but these have not been included in the catalogue of Romano-British settlements due to the inconclusive evidence.

LAND BLOCK B - WEST LANGTON AND FOXTON

The West Langton-Foxton Villa Complex

WTL-FOX RB1 is the only settlement located within the survey area which can be classed as a high status site. The villa is located beside the Langton Brook on the first area of dry soils suitable for settlement upstream from the Welland flood-plain. It was originally found in 1970 as "an extensive area of building debris" situated at 80 metres on the alluvial deposits of the Langton Brook (McWhirr 1972:75). A small area was trial-trenched in 1974. This showed that plough damage was very severe, but it also produced evidence for two building blocks at right angles, one fronted by a corridor with a tessellated floor, while the other had two outer corridors and interior rooms which had originally been tessellated. The building materials recovered included "local limestone walling, sandstone, Swithland slate, roof, floor and flue tiles, a variety
of opus signinum, mortar and pebble-concrete floor layers, tufa, painted and unpainted wall-plaster, glass, iron nails and a quantity of loose tesserae" (Sheppard 1975:61-2). Pottery was not abundant with nearly all the sherds coming from the subsoil and destruction layer above the floor layers.

The fieldwalking survey has now shown this site to be a more extensive area of settlement which, in addition to the main villa building, included two further settlement/activity areas. The area of the main villa building produced a dense scatter of building material covering but as in the trial excavations, relatively little pottery. A further dense scatter of tile and a large quantity of pottery, covering an area of approximately one hectare, is located some 100 metres to the west of the main villa building. Yet another dense concentration of building material, pottery and iron slag is situated just 150 metres away from the main villa building on the south side of the Langton Brook in Foxton parish. Both of these artifact concentrations are likely to derive from the same villa complex and probably indicate the position of ancilliary buildings or possibly homes of estate workers or coloni housed close to the villa residence.

The West Langton/Foxton villa complex is certainly the richest and largest area of Roman settlement found within the survey area, and is likely to have been the focus of an agrarian estate. Socio-economic ties with local market centres are to be expected and, while these associations could be related to labour supply and land ownership, they are probably more to do with the sale agricultural surpluses. Access to local market centres would enable the accumulation of wealth necessary for the construction and development of the villa. The West Langton villa lies five kilometres south of the Roman Gartree Road, which would have given access to the markets at Ratae Corieltavorum and the probable market centre or small Roman settlement at Medbourne (Liddle 1995:87). The villa is also sited some 600 metres from two possible Roman roads, one connecting Leicester with Market Harborough (the modern A6), the site of a possible Roman town at Great Bowden, and the other connecting High Cross (Vennonis) on the Watling Street with Medbourne (ibid.:81-2,91). A distance of 25 kilometres is the maximum possible distance it is possible to travel to and from a market in a single day with pack animals or carts and wagons (Hodder and Orton 1976:55-60). The villa could, therefore, have taken advantage of the market at the civitas capital (eighteen kilometres), but was, perhaps, better placed to turn agricultural surpluses into cash at the local market centre at Medbourne and possibly Great Bowden.
Although unbroken continuity of settlement cannot be proven, the ceramic and other artefactual
evidence indicate settlement activity from the late pre-Roman Iron Age continuing throughout
the Roman period and into the Anglo-Saxon period. For the Roman period the datable pottery is
of mainly 3rd to 4th century date. The importance of this late Roman occupation is confirmed by
the evidence of coins found by metal-detector users. Activity around this site is certainly evident
during the 5th and 6th centuries and possibly into the 9th century. A pagan Anglo-Saxon
cemetery overlies the site to the west of the main villa building (WTL SX1) and a large quantity
of early Saxon pottery is also intermixed with FOX RB1. Other early Saxon sites are sited close
by along the valley floor (FOX SX1, SX2, SX3; WTL SX2, SX3, SX4, SX5, SX7, SX8). It is
probable, therefore, that the area of the villa continued to be an important element in the local
countryside into early and middle Saxon times.

Farmstead Sites
Two farmstead sites were located to the south of the Langton Brook in Foxton parish. Strong
evidence for LPRIA-ERB occupation was produced but with little or no finds suggesting later
Roman activity. FOX RB2 is located 350 metres south of WTL-FOX RB1 on a spur of high
ground, capped with boulder clay, rising from the valley floor. Dateable material from the late
Iron-Age and 1st to 2nd centuries AD are well represented accounting for 45.6 per cent of total
site assemblage. No late Roman finds were found which could certainly be associated with the
site. The sherd scatter was intermixed with early Saxon pottery, beads and metal work,
suggesting a pagan cemetery, and this was probably a reuse of an area which had been
abandoned as an occupation site for at least two centuries. FOX RB3 lies further south on a ridge
of high ground overlooking the valley of the Langton Brook. This small tight scatter of pottery
produced 20.7 per cent of the total sherds which could confidently be placed in the LPRIA-ERB
period and with no late Roman finds. The absence of building material from both of these sites
reinforces their farmstead status.

LAND BLOCK C - TUR LANGTON
Villa-Type Settlements
TUR RB1 is the only settlement located in Tur Langton which can certainly be classed as a
villa-type settlement. The site is revealed as a dense concentration of pottery and building
material located on the south of the Kibworth Road on the ground rising from a stream draining
into the Langton Brook. The quantity of roof tile and brick recovered and the presence of flue tiles suggest a building with tiled roofs together with the possibility of a central heating system. This was a long-lived occupation area. Mid to late Iron Age pottery is concentrated just 50 metres from the main Roman building and early Romano-British pottery is represented. The bulk of the finds, however, date to the mid-3rd to 4th centuries, with lesser quantities of 2nd to mid-3rd century material. Nene valley colour coat comprises 8.3 per cent of total finds, emphasising the predominance of later Roman material. Quite a large quantity of early Anglo-Saxon pottery was found providing strong evidence for c.5th to 7th century occupation and perhaps continuous settlement after the 4th century.

TUR RB2 lies close to two small streams which drain into the Langton Brook. This is located 500 metres south of the Tur Langton villa-type settlement (TUR RB1). The site has produced evidence for tiled roofs and a little evidence for stone walls with brick courses. A rise in the field surface, with a concentration of boulders and tile, seems to indicate the building area. One fragment of flue tile might indicate a central heating system. However, this site was certainly less Romanised than TUR RB1 and there can be no doubt that this was a relatively small rural site which, although possibly constructed in part with brick and tile, should probably be classified as a farmstead site. TUR RB2 is a long-lived occupation area: a concentration of Iron-Age sherds (including EMSW) lies approximately 50 metres to the north, and 1st century pottery is well represented together with Nene valley colour-coat providing good evidence for 4th century occupation. Several sherds of early Saxon pottery hint at some post-Roman activity.

Farmstead Sites
Two farmstead sites were located in the east of the township. TUR RB3 is located on the margins of the valley floor of the Lipping. No tile was recovered and the tight sherd scatter produced good evidence for both LPRIA-ERB and late Romano-British occupation (16.2 and 15.1 per cent of the total assemblage). TUR RB4 lies on ground rising from a tributary watercourse of the Lipping. Again no building material was recovered and the chronology of occupation suggested by the pottery is similar to that of TUR RB3 although the proportion of LPRIA-ERB sherds compared with colour-coat is higher (24.8 and 7.9 per cent). Neither site produced any evidence for post-Roman occupation.
LAND BLOCK D - SHANGTON & HARDWICK

Villa-Type Settlements

SHT RB1 is the only site found in Land Block D which can be categorised as a villa-type settlement. The site was first found in 1976 as "two concentrations of building debris" lying at 140 metres on a south-facing slope in an area of Boulder Clay some 500 metres from the Gartree Road (McWhirr 1976:63). A resistivity survey located two areas of building material of ten metres by sixteen metres and twenty metres by fourteen metres (McWhirr 1976:63; 1977:101). The presence of wall plaster and flue tile was also noted. In the present survey, an area of 1200 square metres was intensively walked around a dense scatter of pottery, concrete flooring, brick, roof tile and slate. Some 100 metres to the east in the adjoining field another concentration of pottery was found (first noted in 1976) suggesting an associated site occupied over a similar period to the main villa-type residence.

These finds make SHT RB1 by far the richest site discovered in Land Block D and it is likely to have been the focal agrarian settlement of the hinterland area. Although located on a high exposed site, its close association with the Roman Gartree road would have provided easy access for the marketing of surplus agricultural products at the local market centre at Medbourne (eight kilometres) and the civitas capital (fifteen kilometres).

The ceramic evidence suggests occupation from the 1st to the 4th centuries with Nene valley colour-coat well represented accounting for 10.5 per cent of the site assemblage. Three sherds of probable early Saxon pottery are reported to have been found by the earlier fieldwork in the 1970s but no Anglo-Saxon pottery was noted by this survey. There is, therefore, little evidence that this site, or its environs, were occupied much beyond the end of the Roman period.

Farmstead sites

Four sites in Land Block D can be classified as farmsteads. SHT RB2 is sited beside on the central high ground beside the Ridge Road with the ground falling sharply to a watercourse draining into the Lipping. The site is revealed as a tight concentration of pottery with no tile present. Of the 119 sherds, 18.5 per cent can be dated to the LPRIA-ERB period with only 1.7 per cent colour-coat. SHT RB3 lies on the valley floor of the Lipping. The dense pottery scatter shows good evidence for late Iron-Age and ERB activity (16.1 per cent of the total) but with a relatively small quantity of colour-coat (four per cent of the total). SHT RB4 is sited 150 metres...
from SHT RB3 on the opposite of a small watercourse draining into the Lipping. The Gartree Road lies 200 metres to the north. The majority of the datable sherds recovered can be assigned to the LPRIA-ERB period accounting for the high proportion (44.3 per cent) of the total assemblage. Possible middle-Iron age activity is indicated by the presence of several sherds of EMSW. Evidence for later Roman settlement is again poor with only four sherds of colour-coat (two per cent of the total). HDW RB1 is sited on the high ground of the central ridge in Hardwick. Approximately 18.4 per cent of the total sherds can probably be assigned to the late Iron Age and Early Roman period and settlement may well have continued into the 4th century. However, only four per cent of the sherds are colour-coat and, in comparison with the valeland sites, the evidence for late Roman activity is weak. The recovery of one probable early Saxon sherd at least hints at some post-Roman activity around this site.

4.5 ROMANO-BRITISH SETTLEMENT LOCATION

Concentrations of pottery identify the position of one major villa site, five possible villa-type settlements and some twelve sites which can, on the basis of size of the field scatter and relative absence of brick or tile and fine ware pottery, be classified as farmsteads. With the possible exception of the extensive West Langton-Foxton villa complex, the results suggest a dispersed settlement pattern as opposed to one of nucleated villages or hamlets. The location of these settlement sites can be related to natural physical factors, such as proximity to water, relief and topography, soils and surface geology, and to man-made features in the landscape such as routeways and boundaries.

Close proximity to water was clearly an important influence on settlement location. Ten (50 per cent) of the possible known settlements are sited on the valley floors or the valley sides of the Langton Brook and the Lipping and a further three sites are close to the lower courses of the small streams draining into these Welland tributaries. Romano-British settlements were clearly regularly spaced along the whole course of the Lipping valley. The only gap in this relationship between watercourses and settlement is the avoidance of low-lying ground around the River Welland which, in historic and probably Roman times, were liable to flood (Richardson 1933). This clustering of sites around the major and minor watercourses is in marked contrast with the
medieval and modern settlement pattern which are spring-line sites along the higher ground of the valley sides.

Romano-British sites are also found sited on the higher ground of the Langton ridge. These are located on heavier boulder clays or around small patches of sand and gravel. However, with the exception of the Shangton villa-type settlement (SHT RB1), sites located on the plateau clays or away from the margins of the valleys of the main water courses tend to be smaller in terms of the size (area and quantity) of the pottery scatter, were less long-lived and were of a lower status than the more numerous settlements around the valley floors. Apart from the villa-type settlement at Shangton, all the sites classified as 'villas' are found beside the water courses and the richer soils of the study area. Moreover, in broad terms, the field data suggest that the wealthier longer-lived farmstead sites, which also tend to produce some evidence for brick walls and tiled roofs and possibly heating systems, are beside the watercourses and areas of lighter soils in the valelands. It appears, then, that the topographical distinction between the valley floors of watercourses or their immediate margins and the higher ground of the central ridge is a significant factor influencing site status and duration of occupation.

However, of more importance to the location of settlement is the distinction between the valeland and its hinterland. Sites lying north of the Kibworth/Cranoe Road (or northings 95) show a greater tendency to lower status and less evidence for late Roman and early post-Roman occupation regardless of their relationship to relief and water supply. The relative prosperity and long-lived status of the hinterland Shangton villa-type settlement are probably best explained by its position as an estate centre and its proximity to an important route of communication to local markets. It seems, therefore, that the interplay between the Welland vale and its hinterland is the crucial environmental factor influencing the long-term pattern of settlement in the LPRIA and Romano-British periods.

Proximity to routeways may also have been a criterion which influenced site location. Most of the settlements are close to a known road or track although not all with the course of a Roman routeway. In Chapter two, it was suggested that the routeway following the Langton ridge could date to the prehistoric period. At least two farmstead settlements have been found beside this route and pottery scatters suggest arable land alongside the ridge road (ETL RB2, SHT RB2). The clustering of sites within 500 metres of the Roman Gartree Road suggests its importance as
a line of communication to the markets of the *civitas* capital at Leicester and the small town at Medbourne (SHT RB1, RB2, RB3, RB4; HDW RB1).

When comparing the location of Romano-British settlements with later administrative boundaries, it is noticeable how frequently they are juxtaposed with medieval parish and township boundaries. This may in part be nothing more than coincidental, resulting from the later use of the River Welland tributaries as administrative boundaries. However, the Lipping's archaic river-name suggests an ancient boundary feature which possibly pre-dates the Anglo-Saxon settlement. Moreover, the approach of reconstructing a Romano-British estate framework based on a settlement hierarchy suggested by the archaeological evidence shows an apparent spatial relationship between villa sites and the township land units of Langton hundred. This opens up the possibility of the continuity of some small land units with parts of the medieval pattern being either fossilised or perhaps revived from the Roman period, an issue explored further in Chapter Ten.

4.6 LATER PREHISTORIC AND ROMANO-BRITISH SETTLEMENT: CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

The relative frequencies of pottery in Land Blocks A to D recovered from extensive and intensive field survey are shown in Tables 4.2a and 4.2b. There is a similar distribution of sherds recovered from traverse and stint fieldwalking, each Land Block accounting for approximately 25 per cent of the total. In terms of the proportion of the total pottery recovered (including sherds recovered from the intensive survey), Land Block B stands out as the area with most finds (31.1 per cent) reflecting the the presence of the West Langton/Foxton villa complex. There is little difference between the total quantity of sherds (21 to 23.8 per cent) recovered in the remaining three Land Blocks. In an attempt to detect trends in the pattern of settlement and prosperity across the study area, the proportions of the identifiable LPRIA/ERB (1st century BC to 2nd century AD) and LRB (mid-3rd to late 4th centuries) pottery types found on settlement sites and within each of the four Land Blocks were calculated.

Taken as a whole, the frequencies of total LPRIA/ERB sherds recovered from intensive and extensive field walking show little contrast (ranging from 22.6 to 26.6 per cent of the total)
between each of the four three square kilometre land units. Extensive survey produced a greater difference ranging from 20.3 per cent of the total or 0.25 sherds per hectare in Land Block D to 30.7 of the total or 0.34 per hectare in Land Block A. The distribution of Samian, whose production is mainly 2nd century, is also fairly even. These frequencies of late Iron Age and ERB pottery do not point to any marked contrast between the intensity of settlement or prosperity between the river vale and its hinterland. It seems that the later Iron Age trends of intensification of settlement were continued into the Roman period and population growth and pressure on the land may have peaked around the 2nd century.

For the later Roman-British period, the proportion of Nene valley and Oxfordshire colour-coated wares found in each Land Block has been used as an indicator of settlement intensity and prosperity. Extensive survey produced 46.2 per cent of the total colour-coat in Land Block B and 15.8, 17.7 and 20.8 per cent in Land Blocks A, C and D respectively. Again, the West Langton/Foxton villa accounts for the higher frequency of pottery found in Land Block B. If we
include the pottery recovered from the intensive survey of settlement 'sites' then this results in significantly larger differences in the distribution of artifacts between the four Land Blocks. Given the presence of the West Langton/Foxton villa complex, over 51 per cent of the colour-coat comes from Land Block B. Land Blocks A and C together account for around further 38 per cent of the colour-coat. The remaining 10.7 per cent is found in Land Block C, of which 55 per cent derive from the Shangton 'villa' (SHT RB1). The relatively low proportion of later Roman fine wares found in Land Block D might be seen as a general indicator of lower levels of prosperity of settlement in the hinterland during later 3rd and 4th centuries. This conclusion could be reinforced by the fact that, with the exception of the Shangton 'villa', there is little evidence for Romanised masonry buildings in the lands marginal to the river vale.

Since some samian or colour-coat is found on most sites, the analytical technique of calculating proportions across Land Blocks has been suggested by Hayes to be a more sensitive method than the presence/absence approach for assessing changing levels of prosperity or settlement chronology across landscape zones (Hayes 1987:25). However, although the relative shares of colour-coated wares may be broadly related to prosperity, the utilitarian nature of much of this pottery suggests that low proportions on Roman sites potentially indicate chronological changes in the settlement pattern. Tables 4.3 and 4.4 show the proportion of LPRIA/ERB and colour-coat sherds collected within a 100 metre radius of the core sherd scatter for eighteen of the probable Romano-British settlements. The site classification is based on the settlement hierarchy proposed in Section 4.4. The settlements are arranged into four site groupings according to their relative share of colour-coat. These site groups broadly reflect the proposed settlement hierarchy and are therefore potential indicators of relative prosperity and duration of occupation.

Based upon the frequency of colour-coat present and the percentage of total colour-coat recovered, all settlements classified into site Groups 1, 2 and 3 have produced good evidence for later 3rd and 4th century occupation. With 55 per cent of the total colour coat and 31 per cent of total sherds recovered from all the settlement sites, the West Langton/Foxton villa complex stands as the only Group 1 site, reflecting its relative wealth and intensity of later Roman occupation. The three Group 2 sites have produced relatively large quantities of colour-coat (between 6.6 and 10.2 per cent of the total) and evidence for masonry buildings and probable heating systems. Taken together, the larger proportions of colour-coat and building material found on Group 1 and 2 sites are a rough indicator of both their wealth and later Roman
### TABLE 4.3 SHERD FREQUENCIES AS AN INDICATOR OF SETTLEMENT PROSPERITY AND CHRONOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Group</th>
<th>Romano-British Site classification</th>
<th>Land Block</th>
<th>LPRIA/R Block B % of all sites</th>
<th>LRIA/ER Block B % of all sites</th>
<th>Colour-coat Block B % of all sites</th>
<th>LPRIA/RB Nolla B % of site assemblage</th>
<th>Colour-Coat Nolla B % of site assemblage</th>
<th>Early Saxon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 WTL-FOX RB1 Villa</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ETL RB2 Small Villa</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TUR RB1 Small Villa</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SHT RB1 Small Villa</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 THL RB2 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TUR RB3 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TUR RB1 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TUR RB2 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TUR RB4 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ETL RB1 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SHT RB3 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 HDW RB1 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a SHT RB2 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a SHT RB4 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b ETL RB3 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b THL RB3 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b FOX RB2 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b FOX RB3 Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sherd total from all sites = 3629; * this is a pagan Anglo-Saxon cemetery
TABLE 4.4 SHERD DISTRIBUTION BY SITE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SITE GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF SITES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL SHERDS</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL COLOUR-COAT</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL LPRIA/ERB</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

occupation. Of the six Group 3 sites, four are classed as farmsteads with little or no building material present, with two sites (ETL RB1 and TUR RB2) producing rather more evidence for Romanized buildings. A lower level of prosperity for the Group 3 sites is also suggested by the lower frequencies of colour-coat recovered: colour-coat accounts for between 9 and 13 per cent of all sherds from each site and for between 2.7 and 3.9 per cent of the total recovered from all sites. It is worthy of note that the sites producing the strongest evidence for early Anglo-Saxon settlement are confined to settlements within site Groups 1 to 3.

All of the eight Group 4 sites are classified as farmsteads. Each of these sites have only produced between 0 per cent and 1.5 per cent of the total colour-coat recovered, with colour-coat accounting for no more than three per cent of the site assemblage on any of these sites. This contrasts with the much stronger evidence for LPRIA and ERB activity. LPRIA-ERB sherds account for between sixteen and 46 per cent of the sherds on seven of the eight sites. Given the relatively large quantities of late Iron Age/Early Romano-British sherds, it is reasonable to assume that more later Romano-British finds would have been recovered from intensive survey if they were present.

The eight Group 4 sites have been divided into two sub-groups which seem to be geographically and chronologically significant. Located in the valeland Land Blocks A and B, Group 4.b sites have produced the most convincing evidence for early abandonment in the 2nd or 3rd centuries. Group 4.a sites are located in the hinterland Land Block D, where the lower proportions of colour-coat suggest a cessation of occupation before the late 4th century or might be a reflection of pottery supply and site status. The latter suggestion is perhaps the least likely in the light of the quantities of colour-coat recovered from SHT RB1 and farmstead sites TUR RB3 and TUR RB4 just one to two kilometres away in Land Block C. This does not discount the possibility
that occupation of some of these sites did not continue well into 4th century (SHT RB3 and HDW RB1 are the best candidates), or that they were relatively less wealthy than the valeland farmsteads, but taken as a whole, the evidence from the hinterland does point to a lower density of settlement in the late Roman period. Again it is worthwhile noting that none of these Group 4 Romano-British farmstead sites has produced strong evidence for settlement activity continuing into the Anglo-Saxon period.

The chronological trends suggested by the grouping of sites based upon the relative frequencies of late Romano-British colour-coat are summarised in Table 4.4. As a proportion of the total sherds recovered from all of the eighteen sites, there is little difference between site Groups 2, 3 and 4 (21.5 per cent to 22.3 per cent), with the West Langton/Foxton villa accounting for the remaining 30.7 per cent. However, the eight sites in Group 4 stand out as producing the strongest evidence for LPRIA/ERB occupation but the weakest evidence for later Roman settlement. The remaining site groups show strong evidence for late Roman occupation and a longevity of settlement stretching back into the LPRIA/ERB periods. It is contended, therefore, that this technique of comparing proportions of commonly found and chronologically defined pot sherds produced from field survey can reveal significant trends in settlement duration and relative prosperity (as reflected in the number of settlements in each site group) across landscape zones when sufficient 'sites' have been located. It should then be possible to test the validity of these results with similar field surveys carried out by future researchers.

Table 4.5 summarises the evidence for settlement density in the study area. From a peak of eighteen sites across the twelve square kilometres in the 1st and early 2nd centuries, the numbers may have fallen to around ten or eleven by the mid-4th century but a more conservative estimate of twelve has been used in the calculations. This produces an average density of 1.5 sites per square kilometre in the early Romano-British period, falling to around one site per square in the later Roman period. Both densities are on the high side of the mean figure of 0.8 ± 0.5 sites per square kilometre calculated by Millett from published intensive and non-intensive field survey in England (Millett 1990:184).

However, the overall early and late Romano-British average site densities do not give a clear picture of settlement trends within the Land Blocks of the study area. The low site density in Land Block B is explained by the presence of the West Langton-Foxton villa and a probable
### TABLE 4.5 ROMANO-BRITISH SITE DENSITY PER SQUARE KILOMETRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVIL PARISH</th>
<th>LAND BLOCK</th>
<th>EARLY ROMAN</th>
<th>LATE ROMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THORPE &amp; EAST LANGTON</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST LANGTON &amp; FOXTON</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR LANGTON</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHANGTON</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE DENSITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF SITES</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concentration of population around this site in the later Roman period. It is possible that the early abandonment of FOX RB2 and FOX RB3 was connected with the development of this villa complex. The valeland Land Blocks A and C exhibit the greatest settlement stability. Of the two sites in Land Block A which may have been abandoned before the 4th century, THL RB3 is perhaps the result of a small shift in location on the valley floor of the Lipping leaving only the more isolated Langton Ridge site (ETL RB3) as evidence for a reduced number of sites occupied in the later 3rd and 4th centuries. The four sites in Land Block C seem to have been occupied throughout the Roman period. Putting these two land blocks together gives a high average density of 1.3 sites per square kilometre in the later 4th century. The hinterland Land Block D has the remarkably high early Roman concentration of settlement at 1.8 sites per square kilometre, but falls to below the high average of the lowlands in the late 4th century; from the peak of five sites in the 1st and 2nd centuries, only two produce good evidence for later 4th century occupation giving a low late Romano-British settlement density of 0.7 sites per square kilometre.

In conclusion, the basic pattern of Romano-British settlement seems to have been established by the beginning of the Roman period and all the sites have produced evidence for occupation in the 2nd or 3rd centuries. The relative proportion of colour-coated sherds recovered has been used as an indicator of prosperity across the study area. This suggests a lower level of wealth in the hinterland in the later Romano-British period than the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Analysis of the individual sites reveals that the proportions of colour-coat present in the surface assemblages broadly reflect the settlement hierarchy suggested for the 3rd and 4th centuries. Where very small quantities of colour-coat are present, the results can potentially be used as evidence for a
cessation of occupation well before the end of the Romano-British period. Two broad phases of settlement change are suggested: firstly, in the valeland Land Blocks A and B during the early to mid-Roman period; and, secondly, during the mid-to late Roman period in the lands marginal to the river vale. These trends suggest that, by the late 4th century, there were fewer settlements (or at the very least lower levels of prosperity) in the hinterland, with an intensification of settlement around rural sites in the vales. In short, there seems to have been a change in land use in the later Roman-British period represented by a shift away from intensive exploitation of the marginal and high risk claylands of the hinterland to a more pastoral use of the land.
CHAPTER FIVE

EARLY TO MIDDLE SAXON SETTLEMENT

5.1 THE IDENTIFICATION OF ANGLO-SAXON POTTERY IN FIELD SURVEY

Evidence for early to middle Saxon settlement activity (c.AD450-850) has been provided by the recovery of over 900 sherds from both extensive and intensive fieldwalking. These results are important since advances in our understanding of the settlement pattern of the 5th to 9th centuries are largely dependent on pottery recovered by surface collection. However, any assessment of these finds presents a number of difficulties: the ceramic evidence is still poorly understood resulting in chronological uncertainty and it is difficult to be sure whether the distribution of pottery represents habitation/cemetery areas, rubbish disposal or manuring activities.

The results of previous work have shown that there is regional variation in early Anglo-Saxon settlement as identified by fieldwalking. Thus Williamson's survey of north-west Essex concluded that: "These results...demonstrate once again that traces of Anglo-Saxon settlement can be so meagre as to be virtually irrecoverable by the use of conventional traverse-walking methods of field survey" (Williamson 1985:55). Gaffney and Tingle's work on the Berkshire Downs resulted in a similar conclusion: "The survey located a total of five vegetable-tempered body sherds of possible Anglo-Saxon date...surface evidence for this period is only likely to be forthcoming if intensive collection strategies are employed" (Gaffney & Tingle 1989:245). But the view of Shennan that intensive fieldwalking projects designed to recover Anglo-Saxon settlement may not "justify the effort expended" does not apply to all regions (Shennan 1985,89). There have, for example, been relatively large quantities of pottery recovered in Northamptonshire (Bellamy 1994; Foard 1978; Hall & Martin 1979; RCHM 1979, 1981, 1985; Shaw 1991), the Lincolnshire Fens (Hayes 1988) and Wharram Percy in East Yorkshire (Hayfield 1988).
Figure 7: Distribution of Early-Middle Anglo-Saxon Finds.
There are a number of factors which may account for regional differences in the collection of surface pottery: the quantity and nature of the pottery in circulation; discard behaviour; collection strategies; landscape taphonomy, and agricultural processes (Schofield 1989). Excavations in the East Midlands and parts of East Anglia suggest that pottery was relatively abundant here in the post-Roman period. For example, the recovery of 53,570 sherds at West Stow Suffolk, led West to conclude that "pottery was a common feature of everyday life", while the Raunds project in Northamptonshire has produced over 10,000 sherds of Saxon pottery (West 1985:128). By contrast in southern England, excavations at Cowdrey's Down Hampshire, Barton Court Farm, Oxfordshire, have produced relatively low quantities of pottery (Miles 1984; Millett & James 1983:255; Schofield 1989:461). These regional variations in the quantities of pottery found in excavations are likely to be reflected in the number of sherds found on the field surface.

The survival of sherds once they are in the ploughsoil is related to the nature of the tempering agents in the pottery fabric. Organic tempered pottery, which is soft and friable, has commonly been thought to be characteristic of the early-middle Anglo-Saxon period (Hurst 1976). This is certainly the dominant pottery type recovered from excavation and field survey in the south of England (Millett & James 1983; Miles 1984; Gaffney & Tingle 1989). This fabric would have a poor survival rate in the ploughsoil, thus compounding the problems of surface collection in areas where small amounts of pottery were in circulation. The Langton hundred survey, however, has confirmed the regional predominance of various gritty fabrics. This pottery can, in favourable conditions, survive well in the field and is distinctive enough to avoid serious confusion with local Iron-Age wares. However, even low-fired grit-tempered pottery is likely to abrade fairly quickly once in the ploughsoil so large scatters (100+ sherds) probably indicate sub-surface features which have been badly damaged.

The collection of relatively large amounts of early-to-middle Anglo-Saxon pottery in Langton hundred can therefore be explained by the quantity and nature of the pottery in circulation; but the interpretation of the distribution of surface finds remains problematical. Do concentrations represent a habitation or cemetery site or are they areas of rubbish disposal or manuring? What is the significance of finds of single sherds or discrete concentrations of very small numbers of sherds (say less than five sherds)? The debate is now beginning to move on from Foard's simple dictum that 'locations producing more than five sherds are 'sites', while other locations
producing fewer sherds are potentially 'sites', but possibly indicate Saxon field ditches or even manuring scatter" (Foard 1978:367). The archaeological work at Wharram Percy (East Yorkshire) recovered 'several hundred' sherds from the fieldwalking survey. Hayfield is cautious in his evaluation of this material: "at present it would be unwise to attempt to suggest that these small groups of Saxon sherds (usually less than six sherds from any one location) represent small outlying settlements" (1987:181). A case is made for the field scatters representing manuring activity on the basis of a correlation between Roman and medieval manuring areas. However, as Hayfield points out, the distribution of Saxon sherds often tends to be non-random with a greater tendency for clustering in the field (Hayfield 1987:27,181,195).

Schofield's review of pottery distributions argues that, assuming discard is targeted towards specific areas, concentrations on the field surface, expressed as density per unit area, would follow the proportions: rubbish disposal > habitation > manuring (198:463). According to this hypothesis, greater densities of pottery on the field surface would occur where there has been rubbish disposal in pits and ditches surrounding domestic units. The actual site of habitation, except where sunken-featured buildings predominate, would have lower densities, whilst the manuring of fields is likely to result in yet smaller densities and probably less discrete and abraded sherd scatters.

Excavation of surface finds or the other means of recovering sub-surface features is needed to test these hypotheses. For example, in Leicestershire a geophysical survey and excavation on the site of fieldwalking finds of early Saxon pottery and iron slag at Blaston, have been carried out to evaluate their significance. This established the presence of "two possible sunken-floored buildings...with 300 sherds of sixth-seventh century pottery and iron slag" (Youngs et al. 1988:259-60). Test pits in the adjacent pasture field confirmed the continuation of the pottery scatter although, because no structures or other features were identified, this was interpreted as infield manuring.

The interpretation of the Anglo-Saxon surface finds in the Langton hundred survey follows those suggested by Schofield (1989). Discrete concentrations of sherds are assumed to indicate the presence of sub-surface features. But except where a Grubenhaus is present, it is unlikely that relatively unabraded sherds indicate the position of dwellings since the settlement features for this period are typically shallow and repeated ploughing and exposure to the effects of
weathering would quickly result in the abrasion of any pottery. Pottery clusters are more likely to indicate the presence of rubbish pits, ditches or, where other artefactual evidence is available, urns from cremation or inhumation cemeteries. As a simple test, two discrete concentrations of relatively unabraded pottery (TUR SX4) were rewalked with the result that the patterning was repeated, suggesting that the pottery does derive from sub-surface features. The term 'site' is therefore used to indicate concentrations of surface finds which are probably representative of discard activities within settlement units if not the habitation itself. The size and number of sherds recovered from a site are likely to be related to the extent of plough damage and cannot necessarily be taken to be a guide to the extent of a settlement.

5.2 CHRONOLOGY

There is still much chronological uncertainty regarding Anglo-Saxon sherds from both excavation and field survey in the region. A dating framework which can distinguish early Saxon (c.450-650) from middle Saxon (c.650-850) pottery would be a significant advance for the study of settlement in the East Midlands. The Anglo-Saxon pottery recovered from the Langton hundred survey is comparable with assemblages found elsewhere in the region such as in Northamptonshire. The demise of early Saxon potting traditions has been demonstrated for Eastern England with the introduction of Ipswich and Maxey type wares in the seventh century (Hurst 1976). But, in the East Midlands, no identifiable middle Saxon industries have been thus far recognised so a conservative early to middle Saxon date range of c.450-850 is usually applied to pottery assemblages. Denham's synthesis of the pottery recovered from St Peter's Gardens, Northampton, is typical: "Evidence for changes in the form and manufacture of locally produced wares between the early and middle Saxon periods is entirely lacking. An examination of assemblages from Odell, Pennylands, Briar Hill and Chalk Lane suggests a conservatism in pottery technology between AD400 and AD850 throughout the area" (Denham 1985:58,62).

There are a number of factors which could affect the recognition of a regional middle Saxon pottery type: a reduction in pottery usage; the restriction of pottery supply to higher status sites; and friable tempering agents resulting in poor sherd survival. Difficulties in recognition have also led to suggestions of an aceramic middle Saxon phase (Gryspeerdt 1981b). There is some stratified evidence, for example at Castor in Cambridgeshire, that the characteristic 'grit'
tempered pottery of the East Midlands was replaced by pottery exhibiting new forms and techniques of production (Green et al. 1987). Work by Vince and Young in Lincolnshire has also suggested that early Saxon pottery was widely traded in the East Midlands, much of it imported from Leicestershire, and that the gritty fabrics were replaced by shelly wares in the middle Saxon period (Vince 1993:4).

It remains to be seen if similar changes can be recognised in Leicestershire. Certainly the gritty fabrics are similar to recovered from excavated pagan cemeteries in the area (Williams 1983). The assemblages from two sites found in the survey are from probable early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries (WTL SX2 and FOX SX2) while other sites have produced stamped and decorated sherds or loom weights of types known to be in use during the early Anglo-Saxon period (THL SX4, ETL SX1, WTL SX7, FOX SX1, FOX SX3, TUR SX3, and TUR SX4). In the present state of knowledge, we can only speculate that it is unlikely that a 400 year conservative pottery tradition lasted from the demise of the Romano-British pottery production until the introduction of Saxo-Norman ware in the late ninth century. It is possible that the majority of the fieldwalking sherds broadly dates to the early Saxon period but it is impossible to say whether or not the occupation of some sites continued into, or had origins in, the middle Saxon period.

5.3 LOCATION

Although the field scatters tend to cluster into discrete concentrations indicating the location of at least sixteen early to mid-Saxon sites, they have been collectively grouped into five broad settlement zones of spatially-associated find-spots. These zones can be interpreted either as a loose association of broadly contemporary sites or as a shifting pattern of settlement over time. With such spatial and chronological problems of site definition, it seems appropriate to treat individual pottery clusters as part of a wider of grouping of 'sites' which help to identify the broad locational characteristics of early to middle Saxon settlement.

i) Welland Valley River Terrace Settlements

In Thorpe Langton there are two discrete concentrations of early Anglo-Saxon pottery on the second river gravel terrace which rises sharply to ten metres above the flood-plain of the Welland (THL SX4 THL SX5). Site THL SX4 lies along the brow of the ridge of high ground
### Table 5.1 Early-Middle Settlement Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement Zone</th>
<th>Land Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i - Welland valley river terrace settlements</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii - The lower Lipping valley settlements</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii - Langton Brook settlement and cemetery complex</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv - Tur Langton settlements</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v - Shangton and Hardwick</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.2 Distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon Sherds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement Zone</th>
<th>Land Block</th>
<th>Min. No.</th>
<th>Extensive Survey</th>
<th>Intensive Survey</th>
<th>Total Sherds</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welland Terrace</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipping Valley</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton Brook</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangton</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

overlooking the River Welland, an area later known as 'Presborow Hill' (the priest's hill). Although producing only thirteen sherds, they are fairly unabraded and the material suggests activity along 200 metres of the ridge. Finds include a stamp decorated sherd with a crescent design and the possibility of a cemetery site cannot be ruled out (Briscoe 1981, 1984). Site THL SX5 is on the southern slope of the terrace some 200 metres from the terrace ridge. This a tight scatter of only four sherds but the area has not been intensively fieldwalked. If these are habitation sites, then the high ground of the terrace would have provided an area of relatively free soils for settlement. At the foot of the terrace, further Saxon sherds and one small and
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heavily abraded concentration close to the Lipping-Welland confluence suggest the possible location of settlement activity adjacent to the alluvial tracts (THL SX3). However, it is possible that these finds are the result of colluviation from the higher ground or perhaps derive from manuring.

ii) The Lower Lipping Valley Settlements
Evidence for early Anglo-Saxon settlement has been recovered along the valley of the Lipping from its course in Tur Langton to its confluence with the Welland. One site lies just north of the Crane road on a prominent ridge overlooking the valley below (TUR SX7). Although only six sherds were produced from this hilltop 'site,' it is the most northerly in the survey area providing good evidence for settlement activity. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity for intensive survey before the fields were put down to pasture. All the other Lipping sites lie on the valley floor. By far the largest of these is a dense concentration of surface finds (180 sherds in a one hectare area) juxtaposed to the East and Tur Langton township boundary suggesting considerable plough damage. This East Langton site (ETL SX1) probably marks the approximate northern limit of intensive early Saxon settlement along the valley of the Lipping and is situated just 200 metres away from the possible Roman villa-type building (ETL RB1). To the south a Roman site in Thorpe Langton has produced a single Saxon sherd (THL RB1, THL SX1).

iii) The Langton Brook Settlement and Cemetery Complex
The valley of the Langton Brook, around the environs of the West Langton villa, has produced the largest concentration of Anglo-Saxon finds in the survey area with eight discrete pottery clusters lying on or adjacent to the alluvial tracts of the valley floor. The ceramic evidence and finds by metal detector users indicate that two of the 'sites' represent mixed inhumation and cremation cemeteries (WTL SX1 and FOX SX2). These are separated by just 400 metres and are situated on the opposite banks of the Langton Brook. The West Langton cemetery, which covers an area of some 1.25 hectares, is within 100 metres of the main residential buildings of the West Langton/Foxton Roman villa and directly overlies a large concentration of Roman pottery and tile, indicating the previous presence of other Roman structures. Pottery finds include stamped decorated sherds and an unusual pot handle rare in English contexts but common on the Continent (Myres 1977:9). Two brooches have been recovered; a small-long brooch and a cruciform brooch fragment belonging to Adberg's Group I (i.e. brooches with full-rounded...
knobs) which can probably be dated to the 5th century (Adberg 1926). The indications are that this is a mixed inhumation and cremation cemetery with origins in the 5th century. The Foxton site lies on a spur of higher ground, capped with boulder clay, which rises sharply from the valley floor. Fragments of probable cremation urns cover an area of one hectare. The decoration on one sherd, comprising a double row of dots among the necklines, closely parallels an urn from Thorpe Malsor, Northamptonshire which is probably from a 6th century context (Myres 1977:54 and Fig.333). Cruciform and annular brooch fragments, together with amber beads, have also been recovered. It is impossible to say whether these are broadly contemporary cemeteries serving different communities or perhaps social groupings; but it does seem possible that the presence of both cremation and inhumation graves suggests that the local early Anglo-Saxon social elite chose this area for their burials.

Six other pottery clusters along the Langton Brook have been located, each separated by between 200 and 400 metres, suggesting that sites were fairly regularly spaced along the valley floor (WTL SX2, SX7, SX8 and FOX SX1, SX3). FOX SX3 is associated with a Roman building (part of the villa complex) and iron slag. The only 'site' situated away from the valley floor is a discrete scatter of three sherds lying on the high ground 500 metres north of the stream (WTL SX5). This is sited on the edge of the ridge, where the Lias clays meet the boulder clay and middle Lias escarpment with its characteristic break in relief. Although these 'sites' are not necessarily contemporary, the sheer density of finds along this 1.5 kilometre stretch of the Langton Brook suggests a remarkable concentration of early Anglo-Saxon activity with settlements and cemeteries lying adjacent. A possible explanation for the intensity of early Anglo-Saxon settlement along this stretch of the Langton Brook is that it provided the first dry site for settlement away from the flood-plain of the Welland. Further downstream, the land adjacent to the Langton Brook is particularly low lying forming part of the Welland flood-plain and, where this can be investigated, only one isolated Saxon sherd has been found.

Finds by metal detector users of a possible 8th century sceat and two 9th century strap ends also provide valuable evidence for possible continuing middle Saxon activity. The finding of the sceat was reported to Leicester Museum but is now in private hands. Drawings of the strap ends are held at Leicestershire Museum. These finds were recovered from the same field as the main villa residence and West Langton cemetery site. If they were not casual losses, they suggest the presence of a relatively high status middle Saxon site. There were certainly Mercian royal
connections with this area on the evidence of three 8th century meetings of the Mercian 
\textit{witenagemot} at Gumley, a hill top site lying just three kilometres south-west of the Langton 
Brook settlement and cemetery complex. The implication is that this area of the Langton Brook 
probably formed a 'central place' in the local countryside throughout the c.450-850 period. The 
possibility that the Langton Brook settlements are to be associated with the 'central place' of an 
early-middle Saxon regiones in south-east Leicestershire is discussed further in Chapter ten.

\textbf{iv) The Tur Langton Settlements}

In Tur Langton, early Anglo-Saxon activity has been located along the ground rising from the 
valley of a small creek which drains into the Langton Brook. The area of these finds is bounded 
by the Kibworth Road to the north and the West Langton Road to the south. On the eastern side 
of the creek, scatters of sherds along the lower slope may be the result of hillwash from the 
higher ground (TUR SX4, SX5, and SX6). Several sherds have also been recovered from a 
Roman farmstead site (TUR RB2, TUR SX2). There are also three discrete concentrations 
located on the ridges of the higher ground \textit{rising} from the narrow valley floor, which provide 
more convincing evidence for early Saxon settlement areas (TUR SX1, SX3, SX4 and WTL 
SX4). Site TUR SX3 is on the the western side of the creek located some 50 metres from the 
residential building of the Tur Langton villa-type settlement (TUR RB1). The main concentration 
of sherds is a tight scatter of unabraded sherds suggesting the presence of a rubbish pit or 
perhaps a sunken-featured building.

To the east of the creek, the land rises sharply to high ground where sites straddle the spring-line 
(TUR SX4 and WTL SX4). The main concentration of TUR SX4 lies along the brow of the 
ridge for some 100 metres. One very unabraded sherd of the neck and rim of a pot is decorated 
with a chevron design and another sherd is stamp decorated. This ridge-edge site is dissected by 
the boundary West and Tur Langton; the boundary hedge along this part of the ridge was 
grubbed out in the 1970s. The presence of the township boundary presumably accounts for the 
unabraded condition of the sherds and it is possible that the finds derive from a former boundary 
ditch. The presence of relatively unabraded prehistoric pottery, possibly dating to the late Bronze 
Age and early Iron Age, adds weight to the suggestion that a ditch once lay across the ridge. The 
Anglo-Saxon and prehistoric sherd scatter continues down the hill slope where finds include an 
annular loom-weight of early Saxon date. The second site (WTL SX4) lies just inside West 
Langton adjacent to the boundary hedgerow approximately 200 metres from TUR SX4 on the
southern slope of the land rising from the liassic plain. These two sites suggest a similar
topographical pairing of sites to those on the Welland gravel terrace, each suggesting activity
along a prominent ridge, where finds include stamp decorated sherds and a second discrete
pottery scatter located on a south-facing slope. On the present evidence, it is impossible to
determine whether this represents contemporary juxtaposed settlement sites, settlement and
cemeteries, or habitation and working areas or simply a change in site location

v) Shangton and Hardwick
The hinterland townships of Shangton and Hardwick (Land Block D) have produced only five
possible early Anglo-Saxon sherds associated with three Roman sites. Three sherds are reported
to have been found in the 1970s on sites of the Shangton villa-type settlement (SHT RB1, SHT
SX1), although the present survey has failed to recover any further pottery. Possible
Anglo-Saxon sherds have been found amongst the concentrations of Roman pottery on the
Roman farmstead sites at Hardwick (HDW RB1, HDW SX1) and on the valley floor of the
Lipping (SHT RB4). These finds at least open up the possibility of some form of early
post-Roman occupation in the hinterland, but the identification of early Saxon pottery from
single sherds is uncertain. In view of the large area which has been fieldwalked in these
townships, the paucity of evidence does indicate less intensive settlement.

This grouping of 'sites' into five zones of settlement points to two broad types of physical
location for early Anglo-Saxon habitation: (1) the valley floors of the two Welland tributaries;
and (2) the higher ground around the margins of the valley clays or alluvial tracts which mark
the area of the spring line and a break in relief. Proximity to watercourses and the more easily
worked soils was a prime influence on settlement location. Away from its margins, the heavier
boulder clay plateaux seem to have been avoided.

An apparent avoidance of the claylands by the Anglo-Saxons has been noted by Hall from work
in Northamptonshire where he suggests that "in parishes and townships consisting largely of clay
soils, in which the (medieval) village is sited in the valley of a brook cutting into better soils, no
Saxon sites are found out in the fields because the early settlement was in the same place and is
now buried" (Hall 1988:100). The village of Shangton lies in just such a topographical setting
and it is possible that early Saxon occupation was sited there. Nevertheless, even if this
speculation turns out to be justified, it does not affect the general observation that there is a
marked settlement division between the River Welland valley and its hinterland where evidence for occupation is exceedingly sparse.

The grouping of 'sites' into five zones of settlement cannot be taken to represent a complete picture of early Anglo-Saxon settlement activity in the study area. However, it is considered that a representative sample of land has been surveyed and additional settlement data are unlikely to change the conclusions regarding the general locational characteristics of early Anglo-Saxon settlement. Moreover, the zones are not entirely arbitrary groupings and, with the avoidance of areas of low-lying land and boulder clay, are to some extent dictated by physical geography. It is probable, therefore, that the settlement zones reflect the locational preferences of Anglo-Saxon farmers and may indicate the settlement foci of extended family groups. Each of the four valeland settlement zones has immediate access to a range of resources: light soils for arable cultivation, meadow land for grazing and 'upland' pastures or wood-pastures. These resources could have been shared as part of a wider kinship network or tribal grouping.

The proportions of total sherds found in each zone might be used as a guide to the relative importance of each zone within the overall pattern of settlement. However, any assessment must take into account that sherd qualities also reflect the extent of plough damage and settlement mobility. Even so, the area of the Langton Brook stands out as the largest concentration of early to middle Anglo-Saxon settlement yet found in Leicestershire. The number of discrete sites and quantities of pottery recovered, plus the presence of two pagan cemeteries, hint that this area, in particular, was of some importance within the local settlement hierarchy.

5.4 ROMAN TO SAXON - CONTINUITY OF SETTLEMENT?

Attempts to demonstrate Roman-Saxon continuity of occupation are controversial. Even where sites have been excavated, the chronological uncertainties makes continuity of settlement difficult to prove (Mackreth 1978; Miles 1984). Where Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon material is juxtaposed, we cannot be certain that this results from continuity of ownership by Romano-British proprietors, contemporaneous Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon settlement, a transfer of ownership to Germanic immigrants or the reoccupation of favourable agricultural land which had been temporarily abandoned (Miles 1984:52-3; Millett 1990:223-4). However,
Hall, commenting on work in Northamptonshire, has made a general observation that "nearly all the larger Roman sites yield Saxon sherds either from the results of fieldwork or from the excavation of a Roman site. The interpretation would seem to be that the Saxons accepted what they found, continuing occupation of the major Roman villas and farms and also founding small sites of their own de novo" (Hall 1988:100-1).

Table 5.3 summarises the evidence for the coincidence of Romano-British sites with Anglo-Saxon material. In the hinterland (Land Block D), evidence for continuing occupation is sparse, but where early Anglo-Saxon material might be present, it is associated with later Romano-British sites. The strongest evidence for settlement continuity is found in the valelands (Land Blocks A, B and C). Here it is 'higher status' Romanised buildings that provide the strongest evidence for settlement activity continuing into the early Anglo-Saxon period. All these settlements have produced evidence for later Roman occupation based on the presence of Nene valley colour-coat. Most of the associated Saxon pottery is found adjacent to rather than overlying the Romano-British sites. The main exception to this is FOX SX3, where 130 early

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romano-British site Classification</th>
<th>Land Block</th>
<th>Colour-Coat % of all Sites</th>
<th>Colour-Coat % of Site Assemblage</th>
<th>Saxon Finds within 100 metres</th>
<th>Saxon Pottery Present in Site Assemblage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WTL-FOX RB1 Villa</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX RB2 Farmstead (a)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR RB1 Villa-Type Settlement</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL RB1 Villa-Type Settlement</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR RB2 Villa-Type Settlement</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THL RB1 Farmstead</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>? (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHT EB1 Villa-Type Settlement</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDW RB1 Farmstead</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) FOX 2 is a LPRIA and early/mid Roman site. The Saxon site is a cemetery
(b) A question mark indicates a single early Saxon sherd or a doubt with identification
Saxon sherds were found within the Roman concentration. In the changed economic and social conditions of the 5th century, Romanised masonry buildings would quickly have become unsafe for habitation so that evidence for continued occupation is more likely to be found adjacent to Roman sites. This seems to be the case with sites WTL-FOX RBI, TUR RBI and ETL RBI, where nearby early Anglo-Saxon pottery concentrations suggest the erection of timber-framed halls and ancillary buildings or the laying out of cemeteries close to the ruins of masonry Roman buildings.

Overall it must be said that the evidence for Roman to Saxon continuity of occupation sites is not impressive. There does seem to have been a high incidence of settlement abandonment in the late 4th and 5th centuries. Many of the early Anglo-Saxon settlements are found well away from former Roman buildings and most Roman sites have produced little, or no, evidence for continuing settlement. This type of observation is sometimes taken to be a sign of a tenurial break with the landowning class who had occupied the villas (Esmonde Cleary 1989; Millett 1990:224). However, it is perhaps significant that, where the evidence does point to an association between Roman and Anglo-Saxon material, it is with the Romanised settlements which were most likely to have been the homes of the late-Roman elite and the foci of Roman estates. This relationship may be more than a coincidence of continuing exploitation or reuse of favourable land, but rather a sign that some late Roman sites retained their status as focal settlement areas into the 5th and 6th centuries (Higham 1992:115-18).

In the case of the West Langton-Foxton villa (WTL-FOX RB1), the quantity of early Anglo-Saxon material (settlement and funerary - WTL SX1, WTL SX2, FOX SX2, FOX SX3), suggests that the area around the villa site remained a focal point in the local countryside well into the post-Roman period. Finds of a possible sceatt and two 9th century strap ends close to the villa and the Mercian royal connections with Gumley add weight to the suggestion that there might have been a high status settlement here during the middle Saxon period. This juxtaposition of a Roman villa with Anglo-Saxon settlement and burials has been recognised on a number of other sites, for example, at Brixworth in Northamptonshire (RCHM 1981:29-30) and Meonstoke in Hampshire (Frere 1990:355; Youngs et al. 1985:181). The choice of villas for settlement and burial might be interpreted as a deliberate decision to identify with the Roman past which helped to legitimise status and to defend proprietorial interests (Drewett et al. 1988:272). Even so, the theory that the focal importance of villas within the late Roman estate system was retained
TABLE 5.4 A COMPARISON OF THE PROPORTIONS FOUND OF ROMAN AND EARLY ANGLO-SAXON SHERDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND BLOCK</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL LIA/RB</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL LIA/ERB</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL COLOUR-COAT</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL EARLY SAXON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

during the early-middle Anglo-Saxon period remains difficult to demonstrate with any confidence.

Continuity between Roman and Saxon can be more clearly found in the exploitation of the land. Table 5.4 shows the proportions of broadly datable pottery found in each Land Block spanning the late Iron Age-early Romano-British to the early-mid Saxon period. Presented in this way, the fieldwalking data might show the general trends in the intensity of settlement. What can be said with some confidence is that from the point of view of land use, the valelands are manifestly a landscape of continuity. This countryside had been intensively settled and farmed throughout the Romano-British period and the surviving sub-Roman population would have continued to have worked the land if only on a basic subsistence level (Esmonde Cleary 1989:200-5).

How the sherd quantities or the number of Anglo-Saxon sites relate to population levels is problematical. The chronological uncertainties of the pottery and a probably shifting pattern of settlement make it impossible to assess how many of the sites are contemporaneous (Hamerow 1991). Quite large quantities of pottery might represent no more than a single farmstead. Even so, the quantity of finds and number of sites in the four valeland Land Blocks (comparable with the later Roman proportions) make a relatively high population quite possible. This would be less likely if the pottery is assigned a broad date range of between c.450 and 850 and the habitation areas were short-lived. But if, on the other hand, the pottery is predominantly early Saxon, giving a shorter (c.200-year) chronology, there may not have been such a dramatic drop in the valeland population between the late Roman and early Saxon periods. Moreover, Domesday records Greater Langton and Tur Langton as one of the most densely populated areas
in Midland England, thus making an argument for an even longer term continuity of intense exploitation of the land (Darby 1977:90).

In the hinterland, there does seem to have been a real decline in the number of settlement sites and population levels in the post-Roman period. This might be a function of site status resulting in smaller settlements, which were virtually aceramic, occupying the 'marginal soils'. However, the geographical break in settlement is so sharp that the hinterland clays would seem to be a landscape of discontinuity. Even so, there already may have been a move towards fewer settlements and a more extensive use of the land by the late 4th century. If this interpretation is correct, there would have been less dislocation on the marginal clays in the early post-Roman centuries and a continuation of the trends in settlement and land use suggested for the later Roman period. The pace of change probably accelerated in the wake of the collapse of the late Roman economy and any population decline in the 5th and 6th centuries would have made the contrast between river and wold even more pronounced. Again, it is worth noting that Domesday statistics show the same marked contrast in population densities between Shangton and the valeland townships.

5.5 VALE AND WOLD: CLUES TO THE EARLY ANGLO-SAXON LANDSCAPE

Investigation of the model of contrasting pays was one of the main research aims of the Langton hundred survey. The strong fieldwalking evidence for the Romano-British and early Saxon periods allows some assessment of topographical and historical work which has discussed the distinction between vale and wold countrysides (Everitt 1979; Fox 1989). The observed contraction of settlement towards the river vale begs the question of woodland regeneration but, with the lack of either pre-Conquest charters or environmental data, the retrospective evidence of local nomenclature must be used to gain further insights into the character of the early Anglo-Saxon landscape (Appendix 6).

In the areas adjacent to the River Welland and the lower courses of its tributaries, there is an absence of any field-names indicative of woodland or newly broken-in arable. It is only on the boulder clay plateau of the Langton ridge and along the northern boundary of Tur Langton that there is any evidence for pre-Conquest woodland, and both references may relate to the small
areas of wood noted in the 1086 Domesday survey. In West Langton, a reddon furlong may derive from *ryddan + dun* - 'grubbed out land/woodland on a hill', whilst in Tur Langton, there seem to have been two early woodland areas with the name of one, 'Shangton wood' (i.e. the wood next to Shangton), confirming its boundary location. In the hinterland, although no woodland is recorded in Domesday, field-names mentioned in late 13th and early 14th century deeds suggest areas where once there were woods or wood-pasture. The furlong names of *sorte* and *breche* attest to arable intakes which may have been woodland, whilst a number of minor *wold* names provide the best guide to the character of the pre-Conquest countryside (LRO 34 D 56/1/34 & 41).

All of the *wold* names are restricted to the clay plateau which lies north of the Gartree Road between the 140 and 168 metre contour. This is the highest ground in the survey area so the term must have been applied to a specific characteristic of land in a relatively high place. There was a change in the sense in which the word *wold* was used in the early 13th century, from a former woodland application to a landscape devoid of woods such as 'a plain' or 'open downland' (FOX 1989:81; Gelling 1984:223). This latter meaning is implied by a deed of c.1300 which refers to land 'in the open wold between Shangton and Hardwick' (LRO 34 D 56/1/49). By this date the *wold* names in the survey area were certainly on open ground, although by the use of *"in plano wold"* the scribe may have had in mind an earlier woodland application of the word *wald*.

An earlier presence of woodland is suggested by the minor name *lundhyl* in Hardwick, deriving from ON *lundr + hyll*, 'a small wood on a hill' (LRO 34 D 56/1/47). The adjoining township name of Noseley, an isolated place-name in *leah*, might, in this instance, mean a wood rather than a woodland clearing. In Stonton Wyville, in the area north of the Gartree Road, we find the present-day Stonton wood, which could be a survival of the Domesday record of woodland here, together with 15th century enclosures baring clearance names: a Great and Little Stocking deriving from OE *stoccing*, 'land cleared of tree-stumps' and a Brenwode Close possibly meaning 'burnt wood' (Cox 1971:257; VCH Leics v:310). This pattern is repeated eastwards along the higher ground stretching to the shire boundary with Rutland upon which the entries in Domesday Book record the presence of small woods whilst a few of the place-names (Holt and Brighurst) have woodland connotations. There are also two ancient names in *wald*: Horninghold on the shire boundary and a lost *Breningiswolde* in Skeffington just to the north of Shangton (Nichols 1795: appendix 87, 1800:429). Interestingly, a *longwold* furlong, first
mentioned in c.1270 and later called longholt field (holt and wold tend to be interchangeable),
abuts onto the present-day wood Shangton Holt, a name which is perhaps the last local survival
which recalls the lost regional wold of High Leicestershire (LRO 34 D 56/1/13).

Scattered woodland names are a characteristic feature of attested early areas called wold and
when the minor wold names of Shangton and Hardwick are considered in the wider context of
High Leicestershire, it is a reasonable conclusion that they were originally applied to a woodland
context which later became open country. The usual interpretation of wold (and its alternative
form wald) is 'high dense woodland', suggesting, as Everitt states, "the south Leicestershire
uplands overlooking the Welland valley would have appeared a well-wooded environment to the
Anglo-Saxons" (Everitt 1986:334). However, in the light of the extensive Roman occupation of
the hinterland clays revealed by this research, large scale woodland regeneration in the 4th and
5th centuries and subsequent massive clearances are an unlikely proposition, particularly with
the relative rarity of place-names specifically meaning 'wood'. Some regeneration after the
demise of extensive Roman cultivation is possible but the early wald countryside is more likely
to have been open wood-pasture or scrubland, a conclusion in keeping with Fox's
re-interpretation of wald countrysides as grazing grounds amidst some woodland (Fox
1989:82-4). The pastoral connotation of Hardwick's OE place-name, heorde-wic, 'the herd farm',
might have been originally applied to a settlement lying within the area of wald attached to the
territory later to become Shangton parish.

The identification of the hinterland of the study area as a pastoral resource begs the question of
how this tract of rough pasture and woodland was incorporated into wider regional units. The
identification of a wald as a distinctive class of English countryside, characterised with a
predominantly pastoral heritage, could suggest that they were once part of early to mid-Saxon
territorial units or regions based on intensively developed riverine situations. The less
developed wood-pasture or wald countryside of the hinterland could have formed a marginal
zone used as areas of intercommoning, perhaps even transhumance activity, between adjacent
river valley communities (Everitt 1979; Ford 1979:150-1; Fox 1989). Such linkages, it could be
argued, have left few traces in the topographical and historical record because of their very early
fission.
However, there are reasons why we should not readily accept this linked territorial model for the early *wald* countrysides of Eastern Leicestershire. Everitt has observed that the early tracts of country called *wald* in the Midlands seemed to have formed an integral part of seminal estates rather than regions of seasonally-grazed or detached pastures. Although the general distribution of early names in *wald* tends to be regional in extent, they more often than not suggest the former presence of relatively small areas of wood-pasture sited in the remotest corners and usually on the highest ground of medieval townships. These areas are, therefore, as in case of Shangton and Hardwick, usually marginal watersheds. Moreover, in the heavily dissected claylands of the East Midlands, early Anglo-Saxon settlements and *wald* countrysides can be shown, in almost every instance, to lie in close proximity. Gelling has suggested that "the use of *wald* for large stretches of ancient woodland is likely to have been relatively early, and the term would not be sufficiently fashionable after c.AD750 to acquire the developed senses which characterize *leah*" (Gelling 1984:225). It could be argued that the close geographical association between attested *wald* countrysides and pagan Anglo-Saxon settlements and cemeteries supports the view that *wald* names were coined in the early Anglo-Saxon period but equally the rarity of *wald* names outside the core zone of early Anglo-Saxon settlement could mean that the term was rarely used to describe landscape features after c.700

Tracts of waste or forest can be identified in the region around Charnwood and Hereswode in Leicestershire, and Whittlewood, Salcey and Rockingham Forests, and Yardley Chase in Northamptonshire. Domesday records large quantities of woodland for each, and there are associated clusters of woodland place-names, in particular *leah* and *wuda*. Fox has pointed to the comparative absence of *wald* names in these wooded landscapes, a fact which seems to cast doubt on the proposition that the distinction between *wald* and *leah* is simply "a matter of date rather than meaning" (Fox 1989; Gelling 1984:225). *Wald* countrysides seem, therefore, to be both closely associated with the intensively cultivated valelands and characterised by a mixed land use of pasture and woodland management. However, on the evidence of the Langton hundred survey, much of this *wald* country was densely cultivated and settled in the Roman-British period, with minimal post-Roman woodland regeneration.

In conclusion, the difficulties in detecting early Anglo-Saxon activity in the hinterland *wald* of the survey area is probably a reflection of low population and settlement densities rather than an abandonment of the land for rough grazing by the adjacent valley communities. In this closely
settled landscape it is not surprising to find no evidence to suggest an early intercommoning of 
wood-pastures in the hinterland by the Langton townships. Where shared grazing grounds can be 
topographically detected by, for example, the spoke-like arrangement on Langton Caudle, they 
form part an integral part of local land units. It is likely, therefore, that the absence of any 
vestiges of territorial linkages between vale and wold pays is a real reflection of early patterns of 
land use. In this context, the detached areas of Gartree wapentake on High Leicestershire rather 
than being relic intercommoned lands are almost certainly a consequence of a late Saxon 
administrative reorganisation of the wapentakes.
CHAPTER SIX

THE LATE SAXON AND EARLY MEDIEVAL COUNTRYSIDE

6.1 INTRODUCTION: PROBLEMS AND APPROACHES

The two centuries either side of the Conquest (c.850-1250) were of critical importance for settlement patterns and agrarian organisation throughout England. This is the period within which the majority of scholars now place a reorganisation of the countryside resulting in the development of nucleated settlement and evolution of the Midland open-field system and most now see the origins of villages and open-fields as interrelated phenomena (Taylor 1983; Fox 1981).

There are four main ways to address the study of the medieval countryside: (1) the documentary; (2) the place-name; (3) spatial or morphological; and (4) archaeological approaches (Taylor 1992:5-6). Viewed in isolation, each of these methodologies limit the inferences which can be drawn and, as Taylor has emphasised, there is a danger that interpretations are too often determined by individual preconceptions of the past and by experiences derived from ones own research projects (ibid.). The objective of this chapter is to apply an integrated approach towards an assessment of two interrelated themes: (1) the character of early medieval topography and land use; and (2) the chronology of village origins. The changing configuration of the area of cultivation with remaining areas of wood or pasture grounds is assessed in sections 6.2 to 6.4. The documentary sources providing data on population, wealth and land use is compared with local nomenclature and archaeological evidence. A major question is the extent of the contrast between the valeland and hinterland countrysides in a period of increasing pressure on the land for grain production.

The problem of explaining the nucleated pattern of medieval settlement in the study area is one which can be viewed from the wider context of medieval rural settlement studies in England, where the debate over village origins has long taken a central stage in the research of archaeologists and historians of the medieval landscape (Austin 1989:164). However, given the
limitations of the archaeological data (section 6.5) it will be apparent that surface archaeology alone can give no more than a very broad chronology for village formation. Even so, whilst the timing of particular events is a legitimate objective, of greater importance for our understanding of past societies are the various complex processes which account for regional variations in medieval settlement and agrarian systems (Austin 1985:207-8). The particular merit of archaeological survey evidence in this respect is that it allows a long-term spatial comparison of settlement patterns and intensity of land use between the Roman and early medieval periods.

6.2 THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

From at least the late Anglo-Saxon period the basic rural administrative unit was the 'township' or 'vill'. Both terms are synonymous but the term 'township' has traditionally been used to refer to the rural community as defined for fiscal or judicial purposes, and villa for the territory and villata of the community (Winchester 1990:19). The township was, in essence, an independent rural community, territorially defined and each possessing its own fields and system of regulating husbandry.

The township, rather than the manor, formed the ancient secular unit for the assessment and collection of taxes and it is this unit which appears in medieval sources such as Domesday Book or 14th century Lay Subsidies. An ecclesiastical parish may include more than one township and this, as we have already noted, is the case with the ancient parishes of Church Langton and Shangton which together comprised a total of six townships. East and West Langton were singularly recorded as Langetone in the Domesday Survey with the township and settlement division being first recorded in the c.1130 Leicestershire Survey as Langeton (East Langton), and alia Langeton (West Langton) (Slade 1956:14). The settlement at Church Langton lay within East Langton township and, from the early 14th century, is distinguished from the other Langton settlements by the affix kirk(e) in documentary sources. Thorpe Langton, the third township of the Greater Langton land unit, is noticed in Domesday as Torp. Greater Langton with Tur Langton is referred to as the 'Langtons' in the following discussion. Shangton is first mentioned in Domesday and Hardwick is always included, usually unnoticed, in the assessment for Shangton although Hardwick formed an independent vill with its own field system (Chapter Seven). The following discussion makes use of the documentary data providing information on...
wealth, population and land use. The 'Langton' townships have been combined to ease a
comparative evaluation of the vale and wold countrysides.

The Domesday enquiry allows us to take a snapshot of the state of the countryside in 1086.
Domesday statistics are crude for the purpose but they do offer an approximation of the relative
distribution of population and cultivated land in the late 11th century. Each land unit was rated
in carucates for assessment purposes (Chapter Eight). If tax liability was linked to the
measurement of arable land, then where we find the geld assessment small in relation to a
township's total acreage there probably existed relatively large areas of uncultivated land at the
time of the original assessment. The number of statute acres (taken from the 19th century
Ordnance Survey) per carucate does reveal a contrast between the 'vale and wold' townships
suggesting that there was still a marked difference in the extent of cultivation in the 11th century
(Table 6.1).

Using the more conventional techniques employed by the *Domesday Geographies*, we find that
in the valeland townships of the 'Langtons', a recorded population of 100 was spread over 6.87
square miles giving an average density of 14.6 households or (using a multiplier of 4.5) some 66
persons per square mile, making this one of the most densely populated areas in Midland
England. Taking the number of plough-teams actually employed, the 'Langtons' had a total of
32.5 plough-teams (10 demesne and 22.5 tenant teams) giving a density of 4.7 teams per square
mile exceeding the 'high' average for the country and shire (Holly 1971:332,429; Darby
1977:90,127). In the hinterland, low population and plough-team densities stand in marked
contrast with the 'Langtons'. Moreover, the manorial valuations per plough-team in Shangton
and Stonton Wyville (a township juxtaposed to Shangton) were more than double the average
for the valley townships; there was presumably an important non-arable asset included in the
valuation. The implication of the entries in Domesday Book is that the size of the open-fields of
the 'Langtons' and Kibworth Harcourt were already close to their maximum cultivated limits in
the 11th century. However, the expansion of cultivation seems to have come relatively late for
the wold townships.

There are no historical sources from later centuries which repeat the comprehensive nature of the
Domesday survey. Copies of the 1279 Hundred Rolls survive, recording the distribution of free
and villein tenures but not total population. Useful population and wealth indices come from
### TABLE 6.1. VALE AND WOLD in 1086

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statute Acreage</th>
<th>Carucates</th>
<th>Acres per Carucate</th>
<th>Recorded Population</th>
<th>Population Per sq. mile</th>
<th>Plough-teams</th>
<th>Teams per sq. mile</th>
<th>Value 1066</th>
<th>Value 1086</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langton *</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>62/-</td>
<td>113/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20/-</td>
<td>60/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibworth H.</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>40/-</td>
<td>60/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangton #</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20/-</td>
<td>55/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangton W.§</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>40/-</td>
<td>64/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Recorded population excludes 2 female slaves at Tur Langton.

* Population and team densities at Langton (East & West) and Thorpe Langton have been collated together due to the intermixed township structure before the 19th century.

# For the two carucates of land at Shangton belonging to the royal manor at Bowden which is not separately recorded in Domesday an estimate of six tenants with one plough-team (the team-tenant ratio for Bowden is 6:1) and a valuation of three shillings T.R.E. and ten shillings T.R.W. has been included.

§ The c.1130 Survey and the 1279 Hundred Rolls assessed Stonton Wyville at six carucates.

14th century subsidy rolls of 1327, 1332, and 1334 but the Poll Tax records of 1377 and 1381 are defective for the study area. The returns for the Poll Tax of 1377, one of the most complete medieval records of population, are missing but the receipts recording the total number of taxpayers survive for Shangton and Thorpe Langton. The more incomplete returns for the 1381 Poll Tax survive for the Langton townships but are missing for Shangton.

The Lay Subsidy of 1334 has been used by Fox to compare the differences between vills in the wolds and *feldon* of Leicestershire (Fox 1989:96; Glasscock 1975:164-6). Fox calculates the mean rural assessment for *feldon* vills at 67 shillings and 39 shillings for wold vills. The low assessment for Shangton and Hardwick (39 shillings) conforms exactly to Fox's wold classification. Tur Langton assessment of 32 shillings seems inexplicably low. Each of the Langton vills are recorded in the subsidy (*Laughton* (i.e. Laughton), is mistaken for Church Langton by Glasscock (*ibid.*:164). The sum total for the three vills is 119 shillings, well above Fox's mean *feldon* value, but comparable with Medbourne (107 shillings), Great Easton with its
soke (134 shillings) and Great Bowden (153 shillings 4d). Langton's collective assessment is clearly comparable with the richest of the River Welland valley townships, and is well above the mean value for the whole of Gartree wapentake.

6.3 FIELD-NAMES AND EARLY TOPOGRAPHY

Furlong names can reflect ancient topography before the peak in cultivation between the 12th and early 14th century (Appendix 6). In cases where the open-fields had reached their maximum extent by the late 11th or 12th century, such names probably describe the landscape in the middle to late Saxon period when the open-fields were being laid out (Hall 1985:63). However, although minor field-names denoting arable intakes are good indicators of expanding cultivation, they can never be used to give anything more than very approximate dates for an expansion of arable. Even so, some rather precise claims have been made on the basis of this evidence. Miller and Hatcher, for example, have stated that "the fields of Wigston Magna only attained the frontiers of the parish around 1300" (Miller and Hatcher 1978:91). This assertion is based on Hoskins' seminal study of Wigston Magna's field-names although there is little to justify the proposed timing of the maximum extent of the open-fields (Hoskins 1937:170-71 and 1957:63).

What is significant about Wigston Magna's field-names is that there are none that imply newly broken-in arable. Similar observations hold for other valeland townships. At Kibworth Harcourt we find only a Breach furlong amidst an area of low-lying meadow land (Howell 1983:84). In the large open-fields of Great Bowden, the only field-names that might suggest arable intakes are Le breche furlong (1471) in the North Field adjoining Greater Langton although this may be a misspelling of le brest, "a convex piece of land", which appears in the same field on several Bowden documents, and stockefurlong (1477), "land cleared of tree-stumps" (Stocks and Bragg 1890:183, 186, 251-2).

In the Langton townships, there is a similar scarcity of minor names which suggest small areas of arable expansion. In Tur Langton, there is a breech furlong and a brant hill, "hill cleared by burning" (1638) but apart from these, and a few names denoting former woods, there are no minor names suggesting former tracts of pasture or woodland. In the Greater Langton townships, there are no arable intake names. The only uncultivated land implied by minor names are the...
large tracts of meadow around the Welland flood-plain and a number of 'moor' names (OE *mor*) which must mean, from their location, a 'marshland' with two cases described as a "wildmore", OE *wilde*, "a desolate or un cultivated piece of land." The evidence of the minor field names suggests that, when the furlong pattern of the open-fields was first laid out, there was little uncultivated land left which could later be put under the plough. It is possible that the limits of arable growth had been reached by the 11th century or 12th century and probably some time before.

Only in the the hinterland of Shangton and Hardwick are there relatively high frequencies of minor fields-names denoting intakes into the open-fields. In Shangton we find a Le braiks and Le breche furlong, deriving from OE. *brec*, "land (newly) broken" although these arable intakes could be very old by the late 13th century. A sorte or sarte furlong which is a shortened form of OFr. *assart*, the Norman word for cleared land, probably indicates a post-Conquest expansion of arable.

Further evidence of former wood-pasture is provided by a number of *wald* names all of which seem to have been located in Shangton's North Field in the area north of the Gartree Road. A c.1300 quit-claim speaks of a Henry, son of Adam de Hardwick, share in half an acre of land "in the open *wald* (in plano *wald*) between Shangton and Hardwick under the Woylgate (Waldgate?)" (LRO 34 D 56/1/49). The possible sense of "in plano *wald*" as a *wald* now cleared of woodland has already been discussed (Chapter Five). An alternative might be the "level ground or plateau" which divided Shangton and Hardwick (Latham 1965:354). It is not clear in which township the half acre of land lay but a pastoral land use is indicated from the use of the word *wald* even though the land might have been cultivated in 1300. A longwold furlong seems to have lain along the Shangton side of the boundary north of the Gartree road, the field being called longholt (LRO 34 D 56/1/13). A c.1300 terrier speaks of land on "the *weld* furlong" and under the "*wodewey*" (LRO 34 D 56/1/17). The use of ME *weld* suggests a dialectal form which derives from the Southern English *weald*, a dialectal variant of *wald* uncommon as far north as Leicestershire (Smith 1956 II:241). This field name is, therefore, likely to be another example of a *wald* name probably lying in Shangton's North Field. The wodewey, "the road leading to a wood," deriving from OE *wudu* + OE *weg*, suggests a wood in Shangton or Hardwick or an adjacent township.
Hardwick's place-name leads one to expect an early pastoral settlement here which had been converted to arable production. The furlong name Lundhyl, deriving from ON *lundr* + OE *hyll*, "a small wood on a hill," points to earlier presence of woodland in Hardwick's North Field. Its name implies land taken into cultivation sometime after the Scandinavian settlement in the late 9th century. A 1305 lease mentions land on *sartecroftes*, another *sarte* name plus OE *croft*, suggesting a post-Conquest intake which had been converted into one or more small enclosures (NRO IL 162). No *wald* names can definitely be placed within Hardwick, but there can be little doubt that Hardwick was sited within a countryside distinguished at an early date as a *wald*. Parts of Hardwick might still have been referred to as a *wald* in the late 13th century as suggested by the grant of "half acre of land in the open *wald* between Shangton and Hardwick" (LRO 34 D 56/1/49).

The frequency of arable intake names found in the hinterland - *brawis, breche, sartecroftes, sorte, longwold, in plano wald, weld* and *lundhyl* - suggests an expansion of arable after the initial laying out of the open-fields. No precise chronology for the final advance of cultivation can be given although it may have come at a relatively late stage for both Shangton and Hardwick, probably during in the 12th and early 13th centuries. In the neighbouring Stonton Wyville, we do find, recorded in 1208-9, small acreages of *assarts* taken in from woodland which were said to be the responsibility of 'the men' of Stonton; it seems that, rather than creating new enclosures held in severalty, the fresh arable was incorporated into the communal open-fields (Raftis 1974:154-5).

Mention of pasture grounds, rare for most open-field townships in the 13th and early 14th centuries, is to be found in Shangton and Hardwick documents. For example, an interesting reference in a Shangton grant of c.1300 speaks of "a half rod above *sorte* furlong with the pasture next to the land of Richard luor" (LRO 34 D 56/1/41). This seems to link an arable intake, divided into arable strips with a remaining area of pasture. In this case, the use of the Norman word for cleared land (OFr. *assart*) is probably being used in the sense of broken-in pasture in an area where there were still some permanent grazing grounds. This arable intake into the open-fields may well have been relatively recent in 1300. Later a 1344 extent of lands in Shangton and Hardwick refers to ten acres of pasture (LRO 34 D 56/1/24). The implication is that small areas of permanent pasture remained in the hinterland even at the peak of intense cultivation in the years around 1300.
In conclusion, the historical and documentary evidence suggests that, whereas the vale townships have all the indications of being a very full landscape offering little room for future arable expansion, we may suspect that, even in the late 11th century, pastoralism still dominated the agriculture of the hinterland.

6.4 THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Some 2,284 sherds were recovered from extensive and intensive fieldwalking which can be dated to the Saxo-Norman and early medieval periods (c.900-1350). Stamford wares, whose production sites lie approximately 32 kilometres to the east of the study area, are the only group of sherds whose production can certainly be assigned to the Saxo-Norman period. The Stamford pottery industry started in the early 10th century and continued until its decline in the late 12th century ending by c.1250 (McCarthy and Brooks 1988:255). The majority of Stamford ware finds probably date from the mid-11th to the late 12th centuries. Shelly wares, accounting for the majority of the medieval pottery finds, date in the main to the 13th and 14th centuries, and most are Stanion-Lyveden type wares from Northamptonshire kilns, lying some twenty kilometres south-east of the study area (McCarthy and Brooks 1988:285-89). Other frequent finds probably derive from the Leicestershire kilns at Potters Marston (c.1100-1300), lying approximately 23 kilometres to the west (McCarthy and Brooks 1988:274-5; Sawday 1991). Most of the remaining early medieval sherds are various sandy and splashed wares (c.1200+).

The chronological range of these finds restricts the inferences which can be drawn from the data. With a dearth of Saxo-Norman pottery which can be securely dated before the 11th century, it is difficult to assess late Saxon settlement patterns and land use and in particular the timing of settlement nucleation. This problem is compounded by the lack of recognisable middle Saxon sherds (c.650-850) in the study area. However, the known chronology of the pottery provides good evidence for the pattern of settlement after the mid-11th century. No concentrations of Saxo-Norman or early medieval pottery are to be found away from the environs of the medieval settlements, so nucleation probably had taken place before the end of the 11th century. What the early medieval surface finds do allow is an assessment of the extent of arable cultivation and intensity of field fertilization from settlement refuse.
Figure 9: Distribution of Early Medieval Finds
The late Saxon and early medieval centuries (c.900-1350) were a period of increasing pressure on the resources of the land with a probable peak in population and production in the late 12th and 13th centuries. Increased grain production could have been achieved by two main means: firstly, by raising the yields from the existing cultivated fields and secondly, by bringing into cultivation land previously used for pasture or woodland (assarting). For the Midland peasant the fertility of the land depended mostly on supplies of manure from stall-fed livestock (Bolton 1980:34).

From an archaeological point of view this can be detected from surface scatters of pottery sherds derived from the manuring of the arable. There are a number of potential explanations for the frequencies of sherds per hectare, the most obvious being differential rates of manuring according to the fertility of the land, areas of meadow or low-lying land rarely or never cultivated, intensively manured fields or gardens surrounding the settlement with the land beyond fertilized by animals, and concentrations deriving from settlement shifts. It has been claimed that fieldwalking around medieval settlements "has produced an even, low scatter of pottery which is regarded as the result of manuring" (Astill 1989b:79). However, the pottery scatters produced by fieldwalking at Wharram Percy were not found over the whole of the townships but mainly on the fields immediately adjacent to the villages (Hurst 1984:99). This partial manuring might be the result of an infield-outfield system or the fertilisation of the arable furthest away from the settlements by the folding of animals.
TABLE 6.3 THE SAXO-NORMAN AND EARLY MEDIEVAL SHERDS RECOVERED BY TOWNSHIP (EXTENSIVE SURVEY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWNSHIP</th>
<th>LAND BLOCK</th>
<th>TOTAL SHERDS</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL SHERDS</th>
<th>SHERDS PER HECTARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANGTON</td>
<td>A &amp; B</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGTON</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHANGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL     | 1770       |

The distribution of total Saxo-Norman and early medieval sherds recovered from extensive fieldwalking in Land Blocks A to D is shown in Table 6.2 and Fig. 9. The results for the three valeland Land Blocks (A to C) present a remarkably consistent pattern with each accounting for around 22.5 per cent of the total sherds recovered and a sherd density of between 1.3 and 1.5 per hectare. By contrast, the hinterland Land Block of Shangton and Hardwick accounts for one third of the total sherds recovered and a sherd density of 2.3 per hectare. However, taken as a whole, the frequencies of finds from the Land Blocks of the study area suggest similar manuring practices in the late 12th to 14th centuries pointing to an intensive cultivation of the land across the whole study area.

Similar results are found in the the distribution of off-site sherd scatters within the boundaries of the historic township units within which local rural communities organised their agricultural activities. Table 6.3 summarises the quantities of early medieval sherds recovered from the townships of the study area, excluding the 170 hectares of Foxton parish included in the survey. The three townships of Greater Langton (East, West and Thorpe Langton), grouped together because of their inter-mixed township structure, cover some 1265 hectares of which 486 hectares (38 per cent) were available for fieldwalking. Tur Langton covers some 572 hectares of which 294 hectares (51 per cent) were available for fieldwalking. Both Greater Langton and Tur Langton produced an average density of 1.5 early medieval sherds per hectare. Potsherds were recovered from most fields but with lower frequencies around the low-lying ground used as meadow land, although even here the evidence points to some medieval cultivation of the land. It is also noticeable that the eastern area of Tur Langton produced relatively low frequencies of
finds. In addition, two adjacent fields in Tur Langton, sited on the land rising steeply from a small creek opposite the site of the moated manor house and earthwork remains of probable medieval tenements, produced no surface finds (TUR Fields 5 and 11). They were called Wood Close in the 18th century and this fact, combined with the negative fieldwalking evidence, may well indicate the location of a medieval wood.

Shangton covers some 390 hectares of which 242 hectares (62 per cent) were available for fieldwalking. The resulting sherd density of 2.5 per hectare is the highest in the survey area. Hardwick covers some 123 hectares of which only 38 hectares (31 per cent) were available for fieldwalking. The early medieval sherd density of 1.8 sherds per hectare is lower than Shangton but this is possibly explained by the higher proportion of meadow land fieldwalked.

There are three likely explanations for the higher frequency of finds in the hinterland townships: (1) more fields contained ploughed out toft sites resulting from settlement contraction; (2) there was a more intense fertilization of this 'marginal' land; and (3) sherds survived differentially in the ploughsoil because of the early enclosure of Hardwick (late 14th century) and Shangton (mid-17th century). However, the greater protection from sherd weathering afforded by early enclosure does not clearly account for the higher frequencies as opposed to sherd condition. Settlement contraction is certainly a factor in the fields adjacent to the village site (SHT Fields 2 and 28) but this does not easily explain the consistently high frequencies of sherds found across Shangton's former East and West Fields south of the Gartree Road and the markedly higher sherd densities when compared with Tur Langton's adjoining East Field. A possible implication is that the fields of the hinterland townships were more intensively fertilized in the early medieval period. This might partly reflect the relatively small size of the open-fields - no fields are more than 1.2 kilometres distant from village site - but it could also be that pressure to increase grain production led a need to fertilize the heavy clay soils more intensely.

To judge from the evidence of sherd densities alone between the 12th and 14th centuries there was intense pressure to increase the corn producing capacity of the land. However, it must be admitted that none of the high ground of Shangton north of the Gartree Road was available for investigation, and in Hardwick only one field (HRD 27) could be surveyed in the north of that township. Significantly, this is the same area for which we find evidence for *wald* names and some 13th and 14th century documentary hints of permanent grazing grounds. The possibility
remains, therefore, that that parts of this plateau remained a pastoral resource even in the period of extensive arable land use.

Although the chronological range of survey finds can only provide very broad evidence for the timing of agrarian change longer-term trends in the ebb and flow of cultivation are observable. In the valelands, it is likely that the open-fields of Greater Langton and Tur Langton were close to the limits of arable expansion throughout the early medieval period. In the hinterland, with rapidly rising population, most of the remaining pasture lands of Shangton and Hardwick would have been taken into cultivation in the 200 years prior to 1300. Some land around the northern watersheds may never have cultivated but in their southern areas at least, the open-fields of Shangton and Hardwick were pressing hard on their boundaries in the 13th and early 14th centuries. At this time there can be little doubt that the pressure on the land for cereal production was so great that never again would so many of the fields be under the plough and we have to look back to the agrarian landscape of the Roman period before there are signs of a similar exploitation of the countryside.

6.5 SETTLEMENT NUCLEATION: THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

The problem of explaining the origin, chronology and processes which resulted in the Midland village is still one which eludes a consensus view. In Northamptonshire, the presence or absence of Saxo-Norman pottery has been used as a terminus post quem for the desertion of the earlier Saxon dispersed settlement (Foard 1977:370; Hall 1988:103; Hall and Martin 1979:5; Parry 1994:40). Here St Neots type wares, introduced in the late 9th or early 10th centuries, are used as the main indicator of late Saxon settlement. Unfortunately, the main market range of this pottery does not seem to have included Leicestershire and comparable late Saxon evidence has not been forthcoming from the study area. Stamford wares are a potential indicator of pre-Conquest settlement but most of the sherds recovered probably date to the 11th and 12th centuries. The extent of late Saxon pottery usage in south-east Leicestershire in rural contexts during this period is uncertain so the survey evidence alone is inadequate for providing a better understanding of the transformation of a dispersed pattern of early-middle Saxon settlements into the known pattern of medieval villages. The absence of recognisable middle-Saxon pottery (c.650-850) emphasizes this chronological uncertainty. To judge from the archaeology alone,
therefore, nucleation occurred in the mid-to late Saxon period and the basic medieval pattern of villages had been established throughout the survey area by the 10th century. However, it has been suggested above (Chapter Five) that the early Saxon gritty fabrics recovered are likely to be broadly early Saxon in date (c.450-650), in which case evidence for middle Saxon settlement could lie buried beneath the medieval village sites.

An early 7th or 8th century date for nucleation would concure with the evidence produced in regions where there is a distinctive middle Saxon pottery tradition. Thus in East Anglia the distribution of middle-Saxon Ipswich-type wares produced from fieldwalking show that very few of the early Anglo-Saxon sites show a continuity of use into the middle Saxon period and that middle Saxon occupation is generally concentrated close to parish churches (Davidson 1980:16,66; Newman 1992:34; Wade-Martins 1980). It seems from these results that a major shift in settlement occurred in the 7th at which time the general pattern of medieval villages could have been first established.

However, the lack of late 11th or 12th century ceramic or structural evidence from excavations of some deserted medieval villages has been used to argue for a 'late' phase of village development (Austin 1989; Taylor 1983). This may, however, reflect only a partial excavation or, as Astill has commented, "a settlement shift rather than settlement absence" (Astill 1988a:37). Other than a large scale excavation of a village site, evidence for the 'late' appearance of villages can be recovered where the ploughed out remains of a deserted village site has been fieldwalked. One example is Faxton, Northamptonshire, lying just fifteen kilometres south of the Langtons, where no pre-12th century pottery was noted from both excavation and fieldwalking (RCHM 1981: Lamport (15); Taylor 1983:126-8, 1992:13). In an increasing number of cases however, early to middle Saxon occupation evidence has been forthcoming, for example at Raunds and Wharram Percy (Beresford and Hurst 1990:82-3; Dix 1987:18-25; Hurst 1984:81-2). Similarly excavations at Goltho in Lincolnshire have produced evidence for late Saxon and possible middle Saxon occupation (Beresford, G. 1987; Everson 1988). What does seem to be apparent, however, is that where pre-10th century pottery and features have been encountered they are unrelated to the later village layout (Taylor 1992:8).

In Leicestershire, there has been little archaeological investigation of village sites. At South Croxton, lying approximately fifteen kilometres north of the study area, excavations at a moated
site adjoining the Church, recovered pottery of the 9th to 11th centuries in some quantity (Stamford and Lincoln wares), together with a mid-to-late Saxon bronze pin and a coin of Aethelred II (978-1016) (Pearce and Mellor 1986:13). Although no pre-Conquest structures were encountered, there can be little doubt concerning the late Saxon occupation of this site. However, the results of the limited excavations around the manor site cannot necessarily be extended to the whole village. Evidence for early to middle Saxon occupation underlying medieval villages has been recovered from fieldwalking at Medbourne and Great Easton in the Welland valley (Liddle 1994). It may be that some village sites were settled in the early to middle Saxon period but medieval village morphology cannot be traced back further than the late Saxon periods.

In the absence of any concentrations of early medieval sherds away from the medieval villages nucleation had certainly occurred before the end of the 11th century and probably before the 10th century. Two relatively large concentrations of Stamford ware have been located in fields adjoining the present village sites at Shangton and Church Langton. The field at Shangton (SHT Field 28) has produced nine Stamford wares and more than 30 other early medieval sherds from extensive survey. A field at Church Langton, adjacent to the wall of the church yard (ETL Field 1), has also produced a concentration of early medieval sherds including five sherds of Stamford ware. The unabraded condition of the pottery from both of these sites suggests sub-surface contexts associated with the medieval settlements. The presence of these Stamford wares may push the village chronology back to the mid-11th century and perhaps into the 10th century. All that can be said with certainty, therefore, is that the origin of the nucleated pattern of settlement in the study area lies between c.700 and 1050.

However, whether or not the actual village sites in the study area are 'new' foundations or had been continuously or intermittently occupied from at least early Saxon times, their presence in the landscape represents a fundamental change in the pattern of settlement. What the survey results have demonstrated beyond doubt is a dispersed early to middle Anglo-Saxon settlement pattern markedly different from the medieval nucleated villages: the position of the medieval villages is points to an abandonment of the 'prime site locations' in the valleys of the Welland and its tributaries in favour of sites closer to the heavier clay soils. Hall's summary of work in Northamptonshire where field survey and excavation have produced very similar results, states that Anglo-Saxon settlements "preferred the rich soils of the river valleys" resulting in a
distribution pattern which "is quite unlike that of the later villages, but exactly like that of previous periods" (Hall 1988:100). The early and middle Saxon period was not a time of settlement stability and this mobility has been called a 'middle-Saxon shift' (Arnold and Wardle 1981; Hamerow 1991). As Hamerow has observed, there was during this period a change from "essentially mobile to essentially stable communities" (Hamerow 1990:17).

This observed hiatus in settlement location in the Anglo-Saxon period contributes towards an explanation of the processes of change. The intensity of land use in both the Roman and early medieval periods noted above suggests that population growth and pressure on the land for cultivation were not by themselves the catalyst for the development of the village. Moreover, the five early and middle Saxon settlement zones identified in by the field survey contrast so markedly with the 'future' village locations that it is difficult to envisage a constant and gradual shifting pattern, moving over short distances towards the final village site. The change to nucleated settlements could have been a relatively rapid if not a cataclysmic change associated with the social and institutional organisation of Anglo-Saxon society. Given that there is as yet nothing in the archaeological record of south-east Leicestershire to contradict the suggestion of a move towards nucleation in the late 7th or 8th centuries, it is tempting to connect the over-riding factor causing settlement nucleation with the rise of Mercian royal authority and its interplay with the cultivators of the land (Chapter Eleven).

Furthermore, given that the early to middle Saxon deserted farmsteads lie beneath the medieval field system, it is probable that two major landscape changes occurred at a similar time: settlement nucleation and the laying out of the open-fields (Hall 1981). Agrarian organisation and settlement structure are very likely to be interrelated so that nucleation would involve both a reorganisation of settlement morphology and a replanning of the way in which the land was farmed. In this context, the dispersed settlements might have been abandoned for centrally-placed sites which were more convenient for the communal operation of the open-fields.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE OPEN-FIELDS

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Studies of British field systems tend to emphasize a regional variation and complexity of types (Gray 1915; Baker and Butlin 1973; Rowley 1981; Sylvester 1969). However, as Hall has stressed, of the many types that exist they can be considered to fall into two major groups: the Midland open-field system and the types lying outside of this group (Hall 1989:192). The defining features of the open-field system in a typical Midland township are well known and have been summarized by Fox (1981:65). Holdings lay in unfenced 'open' strips (roods or selions) which were grouped into bundles or cultura, often called, in the vernacular, 'furlongs'. These were then grouped into two or three sectors called 'fields' or campi. Each field was approximately of equal size with a tenants strips more or less equally apportioned between the fields. Each year, one field was left fallow and communally grazed by all the cultivators of the township and regulation of fallow grazing and other aspects of husbandry, such as the commonable seasons following harvesting, was achieved communally. Fox has made it clear that only two interrelated features mark the Midland system out from all other field systems (1981:66). First, the grouping of furlongs into two or three compact fields, each of roughly equal size among which holdings were approximately equally apportioned; and second, the setting aside each year of one field as common grazing for all occupiers of land.

The focus of this chapter will be upon the arrangement of the field systems of the Langton hundred townships, the degree of symmetry in the distribution of smallholdings, the extent of regularity in the ordering of holdings within furlongs, and the origin of township-wide common arable. In the study area, a standard peasant holding was called a virgate or, in the vernacular, a yardland. For Shangton and Hardwick, a series of early deeds provide details of the open-fields in the late 13th and 14th centuries. A late but important source of evidence for the early disposition of smallholdings is to be found in 17th century glebe terriers. Glebeland is likely to be the most stable smallholding in size and field pattern and so its reconstruction provides a
fossilised form of land distribution casting light on the early medieval field arrangement of peasant smallholdings (Blair 1991:139; Rowley 1982:42-3). The problem of the origins of township-wide common arable for all occupiers of land will be assessed in the context of the unusual split-township structure and open-field organisation of East, West and Thorpe Langton.

7.2 SHANGTON AND HARDWICK

i) Shangton

Shangton’s open-fields had certainly been enclosed by the mid 17th century. A 1679 terrier of Shangton’s glebe lands states that they were allotted when Shangton “was inclosed and settled by a decree in Chancery” (LRO ID 41/2/586). This decree in Chancery is also referred to in terriers dated 1700 and 1745 (LRO ID 41/2/587,589). Nichols states that “the lordship was inclosed in 1638” (Nichols 1798:791). In 1639, Francis Saunders was fined £160 for “depopulation and conversion of houses and lands” in Shangton and since Saunders had sold the manor of Shangton to Sir John Isham in 1637, enclosure had presumably begun before Nichols date of 1638 (VCH Leics v:295).

Some evidence for the arrangement of the open-fields in the decades prior to enclosure are to be found in Glebe terriers of 1601, 1606 and 1625. The earlier terriers give the names of three open-fields although the names and order of lands vary between the terriers. In 1601 they are the Nether or Beck Field, the Middle Field and the Third Field. In 1606, these fields are referred to as the East Field, the West Field and the North Field. Beresford only cites a 1625 terrier which, he states, named two fields: the Beck field and the Middle Field (Beresford 1949:111).

The Beck Field (‘land by a brook’) or East Field took its name from the watercourse flowing south-eastwards to the Lipping (Field 1989:17). It was probably bounded by the Harborough to Melton and Gartree Roads to the west and north and the Lipping to the east. A Beck Close and Meadow are recorded on the Tithe Award map east of the Harborough to Melton. The West Field or Middle Field lay around the village. In 1606, one acre in this field is described as "lying against the village of Shangton." The North Field or Third Field probably included all the arable furlongs north and immediately south of the Gartree Road (Fig. 10).
Figure 10: Shangton and Hardwick: Open-Fields and the Medieval Landscape.
A series of medieval deeds provides some 40 field or furlong names of the 13th and 14th centuries (LRO 34 D 56 and NRO IL). A grant of 1320 refers to an East Field (Camp' Oriental') and a North Field (Camp' Borial') (LRO 34 D 56/1/65). The assertion made by Field that there is mention of a South Field in the Leicester series of deeds seems mistaken (Field 1961:233). Another early 14th century grant of one acre of land in Shangton Field refers to In camp' versus Lipping - "one rod under Stanegate in the Field towards Lipping" (LRO 34 D 56/1/48). This must have lain east of the Harborough to Melton road and thus refers to the East Field. The medieval deeds, therefore, confirm only two of the three open-fields known in the early 17th century although the rarity of field names in the documents makes it possible that a third West Field existed in the 13th century.

Most of the Shangton deeds record the transfer of small parcels of land, odd acres or roods (1 rood = 1/4 acre), but they are consistent in showing holdings scattered in plough ridges (selions) across the open-fields. These small land transfers are not necessarily evidence for an active peasant land market breaking up standard holdings and the drawing up of a deed suggests they were atypical. A full tenant holding tended to be hereditary by custom and so their succession usually required no cartae. However, there are a few Shangton deeds which record the transfer of full or half-standard holdings. Thus a 13th century grant consisted of "one virgate in the town of Shangton which William le Mercer once held" and in a later grant this holding is defined as "a toft and croft in the town of Shangton and one virgate of land in the field at Shangton" (LRO 34 D 56/1/6,106). Another messuage with an attached virgate of land was subject to a number of grants and confirmations between 1414 and 1491 while a 1429 grant and 1439 quitclaim refer to a messuage and a half virgate of arable land (LRO 34 D 56/1/70,79,88,91,94,96,99).

The mention in these grants of a 'toft and croft' is a common legal phrase which denotes "the land occupied by a farmyard and building (the toft) and an attached small enclosed field (the croft)" (Smith 1956 II:182). The toft (ODan, late OE toft) would often lie along the village street, with the croft (OE croft) between the toft and open-fields. To judge from the terriers, crofts were often farmed in selions for cultivation but could equally serve as paddocks. It is possible that some crofts included in land exchanges were farmed by a number of tenants rather than severally. Alternatively, the word "croft" might be applied to lands which were farmed like a standard furlong in the open-fields. Thus a 13th grant speaks of "four selions in Shangton Field in Westcrofts extending from my court by the lake half an acre in extent" (LRO 34 D 56/1/104).
Another grant of c.1300 of land in the "Fields of Shangton" included "one rod in Barlicroft" (LRO 34 D 56/I/27). Some tofts were split between owners. A mid-13th grant concerned "one part of a toft in the town of Shangton, being the north part of that toft which Hugo the Hul held there...stretching from the highway to the court of William Baldlike" (LRO 34 D 56/I/40).

No early terrier survives for a full holding to show the disposition of component lands or selions lying in the open-fields. However, some of the small transfers reveal a remarkable degree of regularity in tenurial layout with the plough ridges of the same neighbours lying side by side within the furlongs of each field. Thus, in a transfer of c. 1270, we find a grant of:

"Three selions of arable land in Shangton fields, one lying upon the Longwold next to the church land and that of Henry Campion, one upon Heinouhull between the land of the church and the said Henry's land, and one under Menelagath between the church land and that of the said Henry" (LRO 34 D 56/I/13).

Each standard holding had appurtenant rights to meadow and these rights could be separated from a full tenement. A grant of c.1300 speaks of "five rods of arable land and a half-virgate of meadow which Adam Le Ridere once held" (LRO 34 D 56/I/34). This seems to be an example of the break up of a holding together with the amount of meadow rightfully going with a half-virgate holding. On the whole, however, pasture and meadow rights are likely to be kept intact with the tenement (Hoskins 1957:67-8). It is apparent from some of the terriers that meadowlands were subject to the same regular ordering as some of the arable selions. Thus seven doles of meadow included in a grant of c.1300 were listed as:

"One dole of meadow in Stillpolholem next to the land of the church and another dole lies in the same place under Le Sty and another dole lies in Sobellemore next to the meadow of the church and one dole in Grenesclade next to the meadow of the church and one dole in Smalesike next to the meadow of Vestmedneif next to the meadow of the church" (LRO 34 D 56/I/41).

A few deeds record the disposition of larger portions of full virgate holdings. A grant of c.1270-90 from Philip, son of William de Felton, to his brother William Pim records a four acre
TABLE 7.1 TERRIER OF 4 ACRES OF LAND IN SHANGTON (c.1270-90)

1 headland lies upon Scorfurlongis
a half rod upon Le Brakis
a half rod above the boundary between the land of William Campion and that of the said Phillip
1 rod between the 2 ways below the church land
a half rod in the same cultura
1 selion upon the Carr on the east of Heynowil next the church land
1 selion upon Stapillowil? against Heynolike?
1 selion above Peseylmor next the church land
1 rod above Le Stangowil on east side
1 headland on the other side of Le Wadsike
1 selion above Le Ferdgate? next to the land of the said Phillip
a quarter rod against Fontes de Stapillowil?
1 selion upon Farmanishil? next to the land of the said Phillip
1 selion upon Tochar next to the land of the said Phillip east side beginning from Harudale and proceeding as far as Tocharsike 1 selion next to the lord's cultura upon Baconishakis
1 selion upon Brinblibrinc next to the land Reginald Baceler
1 headland next Aluordilwong
1 rod above Melogate between the land of William de Weleham and that of Simon lainv'
1 selion upon Blakemildhil
1 selion next Alwordilsike? and the land of William Liuld
He also grants his ?:
a half a rod of meadow at Le Waud and another part of a meadow at Scorfurlongis and 1 part of meadow beyond Stillepol

parcel of a full virgate holding "which Matilda his mother held in dowry" (Table 7.1; LRO 34 D 56/I/55). The terrier reveals the scattering of selions although, in the absence of field-names, the degree of regularity cannot be determined. The Felton virgate is last heard of in a quitclaim of 1293 in which the grandson of William de Felton gave up all rights to "a virgate of land in Shangton fields with a toft and croft belonging thereto excepting four acres of land which Phillip Le Schetere gave William Pim and his heirs" (LRO 34 D 56/I/18). The holding had originally come into the hands of the de Felton family sometime before 1234 when the lord of Shangton, John Lestrange (fl.1178-1234), granted to William de Felton "a virgate of land in Shangton
which Roger Albus held to be held by him and the heirs he shall have from Matilda daughter of Walter Sacerdotis" (LRO 34 D 56/156,74). It is a commonplace of local studies to be able to trace a full standard holding back to the late 12th century and the Shangton evidence agrees with what is demonstrably true in other vills for the 13th century (Hoskins 1957:34-49). Holdings were assessed in uniform land units like virgates and bovates (half-virgates) with appropriate shares in the meadows which were held from the manorial lord in return for regularly apportioned rents and labour services.

ii) Hardwick

The small vill of Hardwick has now been absorbed in Shangton but until the 17th century it formed a distinct manor taking in all of the north-east corner of the parish. Its boundary was formed by the Gartree and Harborough to Melton Road in the south and west and the course of the Lipping and a small stream to the east and north. Hardwick covered some 300 acres of land: Hardwick Close is said to have contained 300 acres in 1464 and according to White's directory of 1846 "311 acres form the estate of Shangton Hardwick" (Cal. pat. 1377-81:205; White 1846:523).

The site of the medieval settlement of Hardwick lies on the edge of the high ground at 140 metres (459ft), with the land falling sharply to the valleys of the watercourses forming the township's northern and eastern boundary. Hoskins was the first to suggest that the area around Shangton lodge was the site of a deserted village (Hoskins 1950:72). On the basis of Hoskins' brief remark, it is recorded as a deserted village by the Ordnance Survey and the VCH in 1954 (VCH Leics ii:205). However, Hardwick was ignored by the DMVRG 1964 listing of Leicestershire's deserted medieval villages and the VCH volume covering Gartree Hundred published in the same year stated that "there is no evidence that there was ever a village of Hardwick, and only Shangton Grange now stands in that part of the parish" (DMVRG 1964:25; VCH Leics v:293).

There are, in fact, a series of grants relating to Hardwick surviving from the 13th to mid-14th centuries which show that there were a number of tenants living in Hardwick and farming lands organised as a separate field system. In a lease of 1304, for example, the lands of Shangton and Hardwick are located separately: William Lestrange granted to John de Wileby "all his arable land in Shangton and Hardwick for one year on the condition that John cultivates the said land
and that William shall receive third half the fruits of the Shangton land and a third of the fruits
of the Hardwick land" (LRO 34 D 56/I/61). Other documents point to the existence of a number
of tenements in Hardwick around the year 1300. Thus, a mid-13th deed of exchange refers to a
"toft and croft in Hardwick" together with "land there by the road from Stangate", and a grant of
c.1300 speaks of "a certain meadow and toft in Hardwick" (LRO 34 D 56/I/47; NRO IL 164).
What seems to be clear from these grants and witness lists is that there was a community of
several families living in the settlement at Hardwick in the 13th and early 14th century.

For example, the Henry de Hardwick who appears as a free tenant in the 1279 Hundred Rolls for
Shangton is probably the same man who, together with his son Richard and brother William de
Hardwick, witnessed a grant of 1295 and a number of other undated documents (LRO 34 D
56/I/52). Members of the Le Ridere family were also prominent residents and holders of land in
Hardwick: Robert le Ridere of Hardwick and his son's Thomas and Richard, Adam le Ridere of
Hardwick and his uncle Richard le Ridere (NRO IL 163,164,154; LRO 34 D 56/I/47). Other
Hardwick residents included Adam de Hardwick and Amice his wife and his sons William and
Henry, Henry Page of Hardwick, William, son of Adam, Richard, son of Henry, and Henry, son
of William de Hardwick (LRO 34 D 56/I/59,64). In 1329, we find Henry, son of Adam de
Hardwick, granting lands lying in five furlongs of Hardwick's open-fields (NRO IL 172). Henry
de Hardwick also appears on the 1332 lay subsidy roll and as a witness to two grants drawn up at
Hardwick in 1333 (LRO Farnham MS. notes; NRO IL 170,171). The first of these concerned
lands granted by Alice, daughter of "John de Newby de Hardwick", to her brother who appears,
in the later deed, to have granted all his lands to Roger de Newby, chaplain and his sister Alice.
Their father had leased land in Hardwick in 1305 when he was described as "John de Newby de
Langetone" (NRO IL 162).

To judge from these land transfers, people were still residing and cultivating lands in Hardwick
into 1330s. A William de Hardwick is the last person known to be described as "de Hardwick" in
the 1360s. In 1360, "William son of Henry de Hardwick, chaplain" was granted a messuage in
Shangton opposite the rectory and, three years later, the same William granted all his lands and
tenements in Shangton and Hardwick with buildings and pasture (LRO 34 D 56/I/39,67). A
William de Hardwick, chaplain, first appears as witness to a 1315 Shangton grant (56/I/53) and
it is possible that this was the same man. What does seem to be probable, is that the William de
Hardwick recorded in the 1360s was the last of his family holding land and possibly residing in
Hardwick.

By the late 1370s, most of Hardwick's lands had been put down to pasture. In 1378, we hear of a
complaint made by Ralph de Hastings that in the late reign (i.e. before June 1377) a group of
men had "mowed his grass at Hardwick...arrested eight horses, eighteen oxen, six cows, eight
calves and three hundred sheep at Hardwick" and that in the present reign (i.e. sometime in
1377-8), the same men "broke his closes and houses at Hardwick...took away timber from his
said houses... and depastured his corn and grass at Hardwick" (Cal. pat. 1377-81:205). Later, in
1404, the king granted "certain lands and pastures" in Hardwick and elsewhere (Cal. pat.
1401-5:452). In 1452, "land called Hardwick Close in Shangton" was the subject of another
grant and in 1464, "Hardwick Close in the parish of Shangton, containing 300 acres of land" was
granted by the King to Ralph Hastings (LRO 34 D 56/1/86; Cal. pat. 1461-67:369). By 1623
Hardwick Close seems to have been divided into two main closes: "the old Upper Hardwick and
Nether Hardwick" (Farnham MS. notes). In 1723 they are recorded as being further sub-divided
with an "Ash Close" and "Mare Pen"s lying within Upper Hardwick (Nichols 1798:794).

The medieval deeds also provide some details of the organisation of Hardwick's open-fields
before their enclosure (Fig. 10; Table 7.2). The most important is a terrier of c.1300 recording
"four acres of land in Hardwick with meadow and pasture" with the sixteen rods making up the
four acres distributed symmetrically across three named fields: 'the Field against Shangton', 'the
Field against Stonton' and 'the North Field' (LRO 34 D 56/1/47). Hardwick's 300 acres were
evidently divided into a standard three-field system. The arrangement of the three fields focused
on the settlement. In the 'Field against Stonton', one rod lay on "the headland of Hardwick town"
and the nuclecroft, in the 'Field against Shangton', is described in other grants as "by the
entrance to the town" (NRO IL 152,155). Both fields clearly stretched from Hardwick to the
boundary with Shangton and Stonton Wyville taking in the whole of the southern area of
Hardwick. The North Field covered an area of undulating ground rising to the high plateau
around Three Gates. It is in the northern sector of the township that we find the furlong name
landhyl, and perhaps "the open wald (in plano wald) between Shangton and Hardwick" and
sartecroftes suggesting that this was the last to be put under the plough. The mention of pasture
in the grant suggests that some permanent grazing grounds still survived in the north of the
township. Other furlong and minor names recorded in the surviving Hardwick documents are
TABLE 7.2 Terrier of 4 Acres of Land in Hardwick (c.1300)

Grant and confirmation from Thomas son of Robert Le Ridere of Hardwick to Henry son of Adam de Hardwick of 4 acres of land in Hardwick with meadow and Pasture and a certain meadow and toft in Hardwick which Richard his brother held.

In the field against Shangton five rods:
In Muclecroft: 1 acre between the land which was Henry son of Adam and the land which was Richard Le Ridere's
1 rod between the land of Adam de Hardwick and the land which was Richard Le Ridere's

In the Field against Stonton five rods:
1 rod in the headland of Hardwick town in the East part between the land of Adam de Hardwick and that of Henry son of Adam
3 rods in the same plot between the land of the said Adam and that of Henry Page
2 half rods in the same plot between the land of the said Adam and that of Henry his brother

In the North Field six rods:
half an acre on Lundhyl between the land of William Le Strange and that of Henry son of Adam
1 rod in the same cultura between the land of the said Adam and that of Henry Le Ridere
1 rod in the same cultura between the land of William Le Strange and that of the said Adam

Annual rent of 1 1/2d (silver) at Christmas and 6d (silver) to St Mary's lamp in Shangton church. Foreign service reserved. Consideration 8 silver marks.
Witnesses:- Reginald Le Grant of Shangton, Peter son of Roes of the same, Richard Clerico of Shangton, Ivo Ianidevilo(? of same, Adam de Hardwick, Henry Page of same, William Le Ridere of Shangton, William de Glen, clerk.

discussed in Appendix 10. In summary, Hardwick conformed to a typical open-field township with a three-field system in the 13th and early 14th centuries. However, this intensity of arable cultivation was short lived with most of the land being converted to pasture before the end of the 14th century
7.3 TUR LANGTON

The main source of information on the pre-enclosure fields are the series of 17th century glebe terriers of the rector of the Church Langton (Appendix 5; LRO 41/2/386-90). The size of the glebe was one yardland and its stability as a small land unit is illustrated by the reference in the 1279 Hundred Rolls to the rector of Langton holding a virgate of land in Tur Langton (VCH Leics v:200). There were three fields recorded in the glebe terriers: 'the field toward Shangton' or 'North Field,' 'the field toward Kibworth' or 'West Field' and 'the field toward Stonton' or 'East Field' (Fig. 13). These same three fields are also listed in a damaged 1653 terrier of a quarter of a yardland (LRO DE/560/8). An equality of the disposition of tenant holdings is suggested by these documents together with the probability that the medieval fields of Tur Langton conformed to a typical three-field system.

7.4 GREATER LANGTON: EAST, WEST AND THORPE LANGTON

Shangton, Hardwick, and Tur Langton are typical townships of the core area of the Midland open-field system where it was normal for township, field-system and village to form a single integrated land unit in the medieval period. However, within the multi-vill parish of Church Langton, it is the uncharacteristic inter-mixed township structure of Greater Langton (i.e. East, West and Thorpe Langton), which causes the greatest problems of interpreting earlier open-field organisation.

The documentary evidence for the medieval field systems of East, West and Thorpe Langton has to be gleaned from post-medieval sources. The relevant sources are: (1) the 1792 Enclosure Award and Map (LRO EN/A/335/1); (2) the 1791 Enclosure Act (LRO QS 79/6/24); (3) a 1744 Act confirming Articles of Agreement to exchange certain rights of common (Appendix 2: LRO En/AP/68/1); (4) copies of 17th documents relating to West Langton in the Rawlinson collection held at the Bodleian library, Oxford (Appendix 3A-E; MS Rawl. D 116); (5) a series of 17th century terriers (1638-1700) referring to three yardlands of glebe in the fields of East, West and Thorpe Langton (Appendix 4; LRO 1041/2/381-85); and (6) 16th century Thorpe Langton terriers cited by Nichols (Nichols 1798:669-70).
The nomenclature of the Langton villages show they are classic case of township fission. Dodgshon has explored split-townships in detail and he is of the conviction that they have important things to say about the evolution of settlements and field-systems (Dodgshon 1980:108-150). Dodgshon claimed that "in the Midlands, there are quite a number of townships that were split into two or more settlements, but continued to share the same field system, settlements like East and West Langton in Leicestershire, or the Baldons in Oxfordshire" (1980:117). What Dodgshon had in mind is that the fields "remained shared in a sub-divided field complex" or conversely "it could be that when settlement-groups like the Baldons are scrutinised closely, it will be found that whilst their fields remained intact as a single, consolidated system, there were other rights, such as those over grazing land or stubble, that were split or differentiated between the different settlements" (1980:148).

There are three basic questions which must be addressed to test Dodgshon's hypothesis:
1. Did the Langtons share a single integrated field system where each holding's arable was scattered throughout three or more great open-fields or were the arable strips concentrated in distinct open-fields around the townships villages?
2. What was the extent and agrarian significance of the intermixed township structure?
3. Did the holders of land in the Langtons enjoy shared rights of common over arable and/or meadow land irrespective of their place of residence?

A resolution of these questions could have implications for the wider issue of the timing and origins of nucleation and the adoption of the open-field system and the antiquity of small land units as a functioning community of farmers.

What is certain is that the settlement at Church Langton was never the centre of a distinct township with its own field system. The church of St Peter's, together with most of the settlement at Church Langton, lay within the ancient township of East Langton (Throsby 1790 ii:343,345). The immediate post-enclosure bounds of the Langton townships are shown on the 1792 Enclosure Award Map. These 1792 divisions were themselves a tidying up by the enclosure commissioners of "the limits of the hamlets of West, East, and Thorpe Langton, which were greatly intermixed" (Fig. 11). The exchange of one intermixed and detached township portion is recorded in the Enclosure Act: "about three roods' of the glebe lay in an area of "old inclosure called Purgate Close" which were said to "belong solely to the hamlet of East Langton"
but was "henceforth to be part of the hamlet of West Langton". The location of Purgate Close is known to be on the western boundary of West Langton. In the 1744 Act, Purgate Close lay in West Langton, so this exchange of a few roods between townships implies that some of the inter-mixing was within furlongs as opposed to being detached blocks of furlongs. It is the Articles of Agreement and records of dispute concerning rights to common that provide an insight into the complex Langton field system.

The 1792 Enclosure Award dealt with 3,718 acres including Tur Langton. However, there had already been some considerable moves towards enclosure and the names of "old Inclosures in the lordship of West Langton" are listed in the Enclosure Act. These old enclosures, shown as a blank area on the Award Map, comprised a group of coterminous fields lying to the west of West Langton Hall (Fig. 12). In 1743, the same closes had been the subject of Articles of Agreement drawn up to exchange certain rights of common, later confirmed by Act of Parliament in 1744. The closes, then held by Sir Edward Pickering, holder of West Langton manor, were said in the Act to contain "by estimation 368 acres...at West Langton". Pickering's closes were still subject to rights of common at "commonable seasons", the agreement's objective being to exchange these rights so as to avoid the annual costs repairing hedges and fences and to "render the said closes more capable of improvement". Pickering also held ten yardlands of arable dispersed in the open-fields of "East Langton, West Langton, Church Langton and Thorpe Langton" together with two yardlands of common for "all manner of cattle in the said respective field". By the terms of the agreement, Pickering was to put his ten yardlands of arable down to permanent pasture and to relinquish his rights of common including the two yardlands of common ground, in return for other occupiers foregoing their rights of common over his closes in West Langton.

The names of the landowners and tenants in the agreement included all those who had rights of common over the closes in West Langton. In effect, it is an almost complete list of the owners and occupiers of land in Greater Langton together with their respective rights of common (Table 7.3 and Appendix 2). The apportioned common right was without limitation for horses but the stint for sheep and cows works out at 30 sheep and four cows per yardland. This compares with the stint at Wigston Magna, "dating to at least the 16th century", of 40 sheep and eight cows per yardland, the same as at Great Glen, while at Cottasbach there were 30 sheep per yardland (Hilton 1954:211; Hoskins 1957:174). At Kibworth Harcourt, adjoining the Langtons, a
TABLE 7.3 HOLDING SIZE DISTRIBUTION IN 1743 EXCHANGE OF COMMON RIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Distribution of Holdings</th>
<th>Total Holdings Yardlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25 - 0.875</td>
<td>1 - 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Langton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Langton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Langton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East &amp; Thorpe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East &amp; West</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demesne</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yardland in the 17th century was generally entitled to a stint of 24 sheep and four cows and a two-cow holding (half a yardland) was common in the 14th century (Howell 1983:99,103,106).

Even so, what the 1743 agreement demonstrates beyond doubt is that rights to common in the open-fields of the Greater Langton were shared by all of the land holders in East, West and Thorpe Langton.

Further evidence for shared rights of common in the Greater Langton can be found in a copy of Articles of Agreement, dated 1650, between Arthur Staveley, holder of the Manors of West and East Langton, and "the freeholders and landholders in West Langton and East Langton ...and in Thorpe Langton" whose purpose was to proceed with the enclosure and division of lands already agreed upon in 1633 (Appendix 3A; MS Rawl, D 116). Staveley's objectives were clearly to convert lands into several holdings, but was hindered by the shared rights of common. The Articles of Agreement stated that "the lands arable, meadow and grass ground...with the farms and houses in the said three towns do lye intermixed one with another". To redress this each of the parties to the agreement were to survey "what grounds he hath in the fields now belonging to the said towns". It was thereafter to be lawful for any of them "to inclose and hold in several any ground which he hath or shall receive in exchange for abating common in the rest of the field". The expectation was that after enclosure "each town shall common by themselves and not one
TABLE 7.4 SIR EDWARD PICKERING'S CLOSES IN WEST LANGTON 1743

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHEAT FIELD</th>
<th>Est. Acres</th>
<th>BEAN FIELD</th>
<th>Est. Acres</th>
<th>FALLOW FIELD</th>
<th>Est. Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roundhill</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hither End of Purgate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Eighteen Acres</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow Wrong</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Further End of Purgate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Little Bells</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax Close</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nether Spinney Hill</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Great Bells</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettle Close</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Upper Spinney Hill</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Salt Pitts</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow Close Meadow</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>New-Laid Down Close</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nether Ground</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spinney Leys</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lamb Coats</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two Little Closes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>called Lord Closes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td>136?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres are by "by estimation 368 acres"

with another”. However, as the 1743 agreement demonstrates, the extinction of common rights remained a problem long after these early enclosures.

The 1743 agreement grouped the nineteen closes into "three parts or parcels" which were "distinguished and known by all the inhabitants, landowners and occupiers of lands" as the Wheat, Bean and Fallow Fields (Table 7.4). These field-names obviously refer to a three-field cropping cycle which, by the 1740s, must have been theoretical rather than actual. However, the rights of common were stated as if the fields were cultivated and rotated in the usual manner. It is well known that wheat was traditionally grown almost exclusively as the winter grain, while the Bean or Peas Field is a name commonly applied to the field assigned to the spring crop although, in Leicestershire, peas and beans were often a late winter sown crop (Hoskins 1957:154-57, Orwin and Orwin 1967:142-3). This was clearly the intent of the common seasons claimed over the closes at West Langton. The common for sheep, cows and horses were, in the Wheat and Bean Field, from the time of harvest until the 11th of November while sheep were allowed on the Bean Field until Candlemas-day (2nd February). On the Fallow field, sheep were allowed "during the whole year in alternate rotation". In the 17th century, the times of harvest and periods of stint were similar in the adjoining township of Kibworth Harcourt where wheatlands remained stubble until ploughing on the 11th November with February the time for the first ploughing of the peas field (Howell 1983:99).
Figure 12: West Langton: Early Enclosures.
It is probable, therefore, that the three blocks of coterminous closes reflect an earlier three-field, open-field system. More evidence can be found in a 1650 valuation of four yardlands held by Nicholas Strelley of West Langton at which time the greater part of his arable was clearly still dispersed in the open-fields (Appendix 3B). More details of the disposition of this holding are found in two terriers, one for a single yardland in 1652 and the other for 1.5 yardlands in 1653 (Appendix 3E). The 1.5 yardland, contained 40 acres and three roods by field measure, made up of fourteen acres in closes and some 26 acres of open-field arable, ley and meadow ground. Almost all of the lands in these terriers can be located in furlongs or closes surrounding the settlement at West Langton. The only certain parcel of land which is detached from this pattern, is specified as "two rood leyes in the Nether Moore beneath East Langton". In short, there was no scattering of Strelley's holding across the whole of Greater Langton fields.

In another 1652 terrier, 11.5 acres undergoing enclosure are grouped into the Wheat, Peas and Fallow fields (Appendix 3D). The area of fallow contained Purgate, the Spinney and Lords Close, grouped together as the Bean Field in 1743; Round-Hill Close, the furlong containing peas, is one of the five closes making up the Wheat Field in 1743; a Rundles furlong, itemised as if it was distinct from the rest and located, on the evidence of the glebe terriers, to the east of West Langton Hall outside the area of 'old enclosures'. This suggests there was a three-field crop rotation system based on West Langton, the major part of which was recorded as the three groups of closes in the 1743 agreement. Confirmation is probably provided by a 1607 probate inventory of John Strelley of West Langton who had seventeen acres under wheat and barley in one field, thirteen acres under peas and beans in another with a third field presumably being fallow (Hoskins 1963:156-7). The conclusion must be that the lands around West Langton were organised as a distinct field system so as to maintain the balance of tenant farms.

Glebe terriers provide the main source of evidence for the open-fields surrounding the villages of East, Church and Thorpe Langton. Beresford is mistaken in stating that the earliest Langton terrier (1638) only gave the name of three open-fields, the names of five fields are listed: the West Field, Thorpe Langton Field, North Field, Mill Field, and the Redow Field (Appendix 4; Beresford 1949:108). Apart from the anomalous 1674 terrier, all the later terriers follow the same general order of lands but give further sub-divisions of the Fields. Thus, the West Field is split into the West and Nether Field in 1690, 1694, and 1700 terriers; the North Field becomes
the Whorle Field in 1690 and 1694 which then appears split into the Whorle and North Field in 1700 at which time the Redow Field is also referred to as the Over Field.

Except for a few furlongs headed "Thorpe Langton" or "Thorpe Field", the terriers do not specify the township in which the glebe lay. However, the mention of a Thorpe Field and the probable existence of a field system around West Langton mitigates against concluding that the same arable fields served for all three Greater Langton townships. The identification of many of the glebe furlongs from later field-names reveals that the lands listed in the terriers move anti-clockwise around Langton: starting with the West Field then to the Nether Field covering the land south of East Langton, next comes Thorpe Langton Field which is followed by the Whorle or North field along the Lipping valley and then to the Mill Field on the high ground around East and Church Langton and, finally, to the Redow Field either side of the road to Tur Langton (Fig. 13).

What is striking about the disposition of the glebe's arable is how little arable or ley lands can be located in furlongs around West Langton and east of Thorpe Langton. The few parcels that are listed under a West Field in 1690 must refer to the church lands lying in the fields around West Langton. The bulk of the glebe, therefore, lay in the fields surrounding the villages of East Langton and Church Langton. Not all the lands in these fields necessarily pertained to East Langton, but the apportionment of the glebe around East Langton does suggest a distinct field system. The disposition of the glebeland is, more or less, equally divided between the Nether Field, North Field and Mill Field plus the Redow Field and these may represent an original three field system based on East Langton.

The references to "Thorpe Field" and "the parsons headland in Thorpe Langton Field" suggest that Thorpe Langton also had its own distinct field system. Nichols cites 16th century terriers of land held by Thorpe Langton landholders: a 1529 terrier of "a considerable land-owner at Thorpe Langton" contained a "minute description of his several parcels of land, chiefly in Presborow Field and Cawthorpe Field" and, in a terrier of 1588 "the lands in Presborow and Cawthorpe and West Fields, are again described" (Nichols 1798:669-70). The location of the Cawthorpe Field is lost but its name (ON Kalfr or Kali + torp) suggests a habitation name perhaps located near to the present village of Thorpe Langton (Cox 1971:260). However, the Presborow Field must have been in the area of 'Presborow Hill' ('the priest's hill') on the first
River Welland gravel terrace. The name is probably also remembered by a small enclosure called "Prest Croft" on the valley floor below Presborow Hill.

Thorpe Langton’s fields featured as part of a 1545 dispute when it was contended that the boundary between Thorpe and Welham did not everywhere follow the "Water of Lyppyng" and that land lying to the east of the stream called "Pendyng", "Peyldyng", or "pellyng Holm" and grounds called "Nethercaldwell" and "Overcaldwell" were part of Thorpe Langton Field. Three years earlier certain inhabitants of Thorpe had asserted their claim by sinking mere stones in holes which were said to have been already "known and kept open" (VCH v:331).

Brief details of the lands contained in some Thorpe terriers are quoted by Nichols: "the town-house Lands of Thorpe are often mentioned", "a rood and a half at East Langton butting on Leveryche-well", also noted are "Cleyhill, Debedale, Muswell hill, Maugville’s Gate, Goddin’s bridge and Rowghsote Hooke". The Rowghsote Hooke might be remembered by two field names in Thorpe Langton containing the word "Hook". Muswell Hill and Cleyhill are known to have been part of The Nether Field (or West Field in 1638) and both are within the post-enclosure bounds of Thorpe Langton. Debdale might be the furlong of that name in the Redow Field. The best interpretation of these details is that, although most of the lands lay within Thorpe's Fields, some other lands were held in East Langton or in detached portions of Thorpe. Thus the reference to a West Field might have been used to describe lands held outside of the two open-fields surrounding Thorpe Langton.

The conclusion regarding the disposition of the bulk of the arable land of the small holders of East, West and Thorpe Langton is that it lay in open-fields adjoining their respective villages. Although each township had shared rights of common, the division of Greater Langton into three cropping areas would provide the most convenient access to the land compared to a dispersed scattering of strips across the whole of Langton. However, this standard arrangement was made more complex by the fact that some parts of a holding lay detached. However, the majority of detached lands seem to have been parcels of meadow or pasture. Of the glebe meadow land, only one dole in the Little More and possibly an acre in Over Greenham can be assigned to the Nether Field in East Langton. The remaining fifteen portions lay within the area of Thorpe Langton. It is probable that all, or most, of this meadow land formed the detached areas of East Langton, possibly the result of an original and deliberate allotment designed to
provide a more equitable allocation of resources. The name Mickle Meadow, "the big meadow", illustrates the importance of the tracts meadow by the River Welland. It is probable, then, that the origins of much of the intermixing of townships lay in the allotting of meadow and pasture rights.

There are few medieval references to each of the townships and their lands: "one acre, 1 rood in East Langton" (1281), "a virgate of land in East Langton" (1281), "a messuage, 70 acres of land, 10 of meadow and 100 of pasture in East Langton" (1330), "a messuage and virgate of land in West Langton (1286, 1307), "common pasture at West Langton" (1282), "a messuage and land in Thorp juxta Langton" (1277) (LRO Farnham MS. notes). The close social ties between the settlements resulted in some tenants holding lands more than one vill thus: "William Walkeyn, of East Langton (defendant of), a virgate of land in West Langton" (1302). A 1276 plea by John de Langton claimed that he had rights of way over land in West Langton held by Thomas, son of Ivo de Langton, "for carrying hay and grass with carts and going with his oxen, cows and other cattle from his house at West Langton beyond the land of the said Thomas, which is called Depedale, to his own land in Depedale" (LRO Farnham MS. notes). In the 17th century this furlong was part or the Reddow Field (1638), its location in West Langton indicated by a Debdale Close and Meadow (1872) along the boundary with Tur Langton.

In summary, the documentary evidence for the agrarian organisation of Greater Langton allows for reasonably confident answers to the questions asked at the beginning of this section. These are: (1) although some arable strips could have been detached and intermixed with other township lands the majority lay in open-fields adjoining the three settlements; (2) township intermixing was mainly a consequence of detached portions of meadow; and (3) townships shared rights of common on meadow grounds and arable land. The important implication is that these common fields originated from a time when Greater Langton as a whole (i.e. East, West, and Thorpe Langton) functioned as a community of farmers.

7.5 TOWNSHIP SPLITTING AND FIELD SYSTEMS

It is suggested here that the exceptional nature of Greater Langton's settlement morphology and open-field organisation provides an insight into the timing of nucleation, the adoption of the
mature Midland open-field system and the character of pre-Conquest rural communities. It is proposed that: (1) inter-township rights to common arable originate to a time before the adoption of the mature open-field system; (2) the likely chronology of fission for the majority of split-townships is pre-Conquest and in the case of Greater Langton before the late 10th century; (3) Greater Langton's irregular lines of fission also point to the tenurial break-up of a unified land unit which had functioned as a community of farmers in the sense of the co-operative sharing of resources; and (4) the shared commoning of arable between the Greater Langton townships (as opposed to shared meadow or pasture ground) is an unusual feature whose origins lie in the territorially unified Greater Langton 'township'.

A comparative study of other Leicestershire villages shows that other land units comparable in size with Greater Langton's 3000 acres consist of a single nucleated village and a unified open-field system. These include Wigston Magna, Great Bowden, Hallaton and Husbands Bosworth and in each case a two or three field system is organised around a single nucleated settlement. The case of Wigston Magna, a large nucleated village surrounded by three open-fields, has been discussed by Hoskins' (Hoskins 1937, 1957b). The total acreage of 2944 compares with Greater Langton's 2990, as does the Domesday assessment of 24 carucates. At the time of the Conquest, Wigston Magna was a single proprietary unit held by Ralph, earl of Hereford, after which it formed one of the estates of Hugh de Grandmesnil. The vill only split into two manors in the late 12th century but no such division showed itself in the village fields or patterns of settlement. As Hoskins states: "The lands (of the manors) lay intermingled everywhere in the three fields. There was no separate field-system for each. Such a system would have been unworkable and the field-system of the vill, in any event, ante-dated by centuries the division of the Domesday manor into two separate parts. In other Leicestershire villages, there were three or more manors but only one field-system. The village and not the manor was the essential form of rural organisation in the Danelaw" (Hoskins 1957:62).

It is usual, therefore, that when proprietary fission followed nucleation and the adoption of a township wide open-field system, it was organised within the existing settlement and agrarian framework. Reorganisation of fields and settlement, subsequent to a proprietary split, is technically possible but the agrarian life of a village community would not easily be disrupted by any seigneurial authority resulting from the separation of fees. In short, the adoption of a two or three-field system around a nucleated settlement, with its associated rights and customs of
cultivators, would tend to prohibit any further radical reorganisation which would upset the balance of peasant holdings dispersed in the fields. A nucleated village would have better served the administration of the estate and organisation of the open-fields. As a general, if not universal rule, fission after nucleation and the adoption of a mature Midland open-field system would be organised within the existing framework of settlement and field layout. The conclusion is that common grazing rights had developed before Greater Langton's propriety break-up and that the community of Langton had maintained these rights of common after the tenurial fission of Greater Langton into three distinct townships.

i) The Chronology of Township Splitting

Maitland's seminal discussion of the distinctive prefixes of shared place-named settlements, which he called "the surnames of English villages", drew two main conclusions (Maitland 1889). First, given that Domesday usually treats split vills under a singular name or occasionally by the "clumsy nomenclature" of *alia* ('the other place'), their division is likely to be post-Domesday in origin or not long before 1086. Secondly, he argued that the evolution of these settlements was the product of the fission of a single settlement into two or more villages, "the co-heirs among whom the lands of the ancestor have been divided" (1889:91-3). Until his own extended discussion of split-townships, Dodgshon observed that "despite their overwhelming importance to the history of the countryside no scholar has thought it worthwhile to consider their origin in depth" (Dodgshon 1980:109). Dodgshon contended that "a strong case can be marshalled in favour of Maitland's interpretation of split settlements," and that the majority of English split townships "were probably formed in the two or three centuries after 1086" (1980:110,115). The evidence he uses for this conclusion is (1) the record of Domesday; (2) changes in the designation of townships in early charters; and (3) charters announcing the division of an estate or township was to be carried out (1980:112-16).

The emergence of distinguishing qualifiers in the course of the 13th century, such as East, Great or North, was a development of the diplomatic. Before this time, *alia*, 'the other place', is the usual distinguishing affix. Notices of Leicestershire's fifteen shared place-name settlements in Domesday and the c.1130 Survey plus other early references to a qualifier are shown in Table 7.5. These have been divided into five groups. The single 'pair' of Group 1 is not a true split township: the two Ashby townships lie detached and it is no doubt for this reason that the unique distinguishing prefix of *Parva* for Ashby Parva has been applied (DB I 234b). This leaves
# Table 7.5 The Distinguishing Qualifiers of Shared Place-Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>1086</th>
<th>c.1130</th>
<th>Other Early Notices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1 (1086)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Magna</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magna (1209-35, 1266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Parva</td>
<td>Parva</td>
<td>Parva</td>
<td>Parva (1179, 1251); Little (1347, 1441).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2 (1086)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Marefield #</td>
<td>Marefield</td>
<td>Marefield</td>
<td>Feudal affix (1227); North (1252).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Marefield #</td>
<td>alia</td>
<td>alia</td>
<td>South (1177, 1276).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherseal</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>Nether (1200); Magna (1247); Kirk (1362).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseal</td>
<td>alia</td>
<td>alia</td>
<td>Parva (1243); Over (1313).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peatling Magna</td>
<td>Peatling</td>
<td>Peatling</td>
<td>Magna (1224, 1243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peatling Parva</td>
<td>alia</td>
<td></td>
<td>alia (1166); Parva (1225, 1226, 1227).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 3 (Shire)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleby Magna (Db*)</td>
<td>Appleby</td>
<td></td>
<td>AEppelby (1002); Magna (1506).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleby Parva</td>
<td>Appleby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parva (1282, 1327).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bowden</td>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magna (1180-1200).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Bowden (Nh*)</td>
<td>Bowden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parva (1219, 1247, 1274).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Broughton</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nether (13387, 1449).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Broughton (Nt*)</td>
<td>Broughton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feudal affix 13th century; Over (1601).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 4 (c.1130)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleorton</td>
<td>Overton</td>
<td>Overton</td>
<td>Feudal affixes in 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibworth Harcourt</td>
<td>Kibworth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Over (1209-35); feudal affix (1242).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibworth Beuchamp</td>
<td>alia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feudal affix (1306).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Langton</td>
<td>Langton</td>
<td>Langton</td>
<td>East (1211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Langton</td>
<td>alia</td>
<td></td>
<td>West (1211); alia (c.12997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Dalby</td>
<td>Dalby</td>
<td>Magna</td>
<td>Feudal affixes in 13th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Dalby</td>
<td>Dalby</td>
<td>Parva</td>
<td>Parva (1212, 1216).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 5 (Later)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claybrook Magna</td>
<td>Claybrook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magna (1261, 1285); Nether (1399).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claybrook Parva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parva (1261, 1285).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>c.1130</td>
<td>OTHER EARLY NOTICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kilworth</td>
<td>Kilworth</td>
<td>North (1288, 1295).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kilworth</td>
<td>ailia (1209-35); South (1237).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepy Magna</td>
<td>Sheepy</td>
<td>Machele (1223); Magna (1276, 1277, 1285).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepy Parva</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parva (1209-35, 1277).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Stretton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magna (1275, 1283, 1301).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Stretton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parva (1290, 1327).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Early notices are taken from Cox (1971).
- * Db: Derbyshire; Nth: Northamptonshire (Gover et al. 1933:110); Nt: Nottinghamshire (Gover et al. 1940:231).
- # Both Marefield's were assessed at three carucates in Domesday. The association of ailia to South Marefield is arbitrary.

Fourteen paired split township names of which three (Group 2) are distinguished in Domesday with the affix ailia. Three more paired settlements (Group 3) are divided by the shire boundary in 1086 so their settlement division must also pre-date the Domesday Survey. Four 'paired' settlements (Group 4) are separately noticed in the c.1130 Survey and it would take special pleading to argue that they had split in the intervening 40 years since the Domesday Survey. The remaining four 'paired' settlements (Group 5) are first noticed in documentary sources in the late 12th or 13th centuries. Documentary evidence and administrative geography, therefore, prove that ten out of fourteen Leicestershire 'paired' settlements had split before the period 1086 to c.1130 and, very probably, the fission of all of Leicestershire's split-townships is pre-Conquest in origin. Domesday's treatment of shared place-names makes it a very incomplete record of these settlements. A single locational entry should cause us no surprise and would not have, as Dodgshon argues, "confused the Domesday Book's contemporaries" (1980:112). It is well known that Domesday often ignores naming minor places in a multi-settlement vill or sometimes, as with Shangton and Hardwick, groups a minor vill with another for assessment. In its feudally arranged breves, there would have been little reason to record a loosely applied affix, such as ailia, to a township which still had no permanent qualifier distinguishing them from the primary estate name. However, there is a consistency in the way Domesday has treated the three settlements which have been given a qualifier. The Marfields and Seals form consecutive entries in the breves of the King and Henry of Ferrers respectively (DB I 230c,233c). A qualifying description was probably applied to avoid confusions over the geld liability of split-townships.
held by a single lord. A regular duodecimal geld, as with the two Peatlings assessed at twelve carucates and the Marfields, at three carucates, might also indicate a more ancient division of the land.

The administrative history of Greater Langton is explored in the next chapter but it can be stated here that the process of tenurial fission was probably well under way by the late 10th century. According to the chronicler Hugh Candidus, Peterborough Abbey had acquired its West Langton holding from a donation from "Frane of Rockingham", a grant which can be dated from other sources to c.980 (Hart 1975:70,335; Mellows 1949:67-8). A similar chronology has been proposed for the two Claybrooke's by Phythian-Adams who, on the evidence of a 962 charter suggested that "the fission of the Claybrooke's and the accompanying creation (though not necessarily the completion) of a new field-system may be dated with some precision to the end of the Anglo-Saxon period" (Phythian-Adams 1978:22).

In conclusion, the Maitland-Dodgshon view of the chronology of township fission is unconvincing in the context of Leicestershire. The 12th and 13th century saw the formation of few, if any, split settlements in Leicestershire and a pre-Conquest origin for the tenurial fission of the majority of shared-named townships is likely. However, post-Conquest examples of tenurial and physical fission of settlements can be found particularly in areas outside the heartland of Midland open-field system. In Surrey, for example, a c.1210 charter records the partition of Betchworth and Brockham into two separate manors, "by a line running from north to south along hedges and other landmarks" (Blair 1991:34), and the later Northumberland examples cited by Dodgshon are also of interest (Dodgshon 1980:115-16). But it is probable that this type of fission was exceptionally rare once a township adopted the mature Midland open-field system, a development tending to coalesce the framework of settlements and townships.

ii) Township Splitting, the Community of the vill and the Open-Fields

Reynolds is right to remind us that "almost everything that can be said about neighbourhood communities before 1100 is speculative" (Reynolds 1984:121). However, the exceptional township structure and inter-township common arable of Greater Langton provide a real insight into its pre-Conquest community. There can be little doubt that the townships of Greater Langton evolved from a unified pre-Conquest proprietary estate but Greater Langton was much
more than a tenurial unit: it was a community of peasants which had rights of common which embraced the whole of the arable, meadow and pasture grounds of the 'seminal' township. Although this conclusion is inferred from inter-township communal grazing rights and the inter-mixing of township structure documented in the 17th and 18th centuries, it is very unlikely that these characteristics had developed after a tenurial and/or physical division. The important point is that the event of fission into three townships failed to extinguish the rights of common claimed by the whole community of Greater Langton.

Greater Langton is a very uncommon example of a multi-vill land unit which can be shown to have had an integrated field system. Split-townships normally conform to the typical Midland pattern of nucleated village and independent field system. One such example can be found in the adjoining split-townships of Kibworth Harcourt and Beauchamp, which, like East and West Langton, were distinguished for the first time in the c.1130 Leicestershire survey as Chiburd and alta Chiburd, "the other Kibworth" (Slade 1956:14). Both Greater Langton and the two Kibworth townships cover a similar area, 2,787 acres and 2,996 acres respectively, and the same late Saxon fiscal assessment of 24 carucates and the Kibworth place-names imply they formed a split 'township' pair along the same lines as East and West Langton (Dodgshon 1980:139). However, unlike Greater Langton's irregular tripartite division, the Kibworths were split into equal halves each possessing their own independent field-system with no shared rights of common (Beresford 1949:108,112; Howell 1983:78-94)).

It is not necessary to assume that the event of tenurial fission is always the cause of a split-township in the sense of a physical division of a land unit. As Blair has observed in his discussion of Surrey 'paired named' settlements, "township division sometimes preceded that of ownership" and this would be more probable where a land unit could be organised into "linear blocks creating natural lines of fission" (Blair 1991:34). The tenurial division of Kibworth could have followed a pre-existing land division within a unified property. Moreover, their regular duodecimal assessment of twelve carucates, contrasting with the irregular rating of the Greater Langton townships, suggests that the land units of the two Kibworths had an independent territorial identity long before Domesday which was unconnected with late Saxon property rights. It seems likely that, once co-operative husbandry was established (i.e. shared common grazing of the arable), a local community would be territorially bound to the extent that even lordly power would find it difficult to sever a community of farmers. Thus it is possible that in
Greater Langton a late Saxon tripartite tenurial break-up failed to follow linear lines of fission because the community of farmers had a high degree of agrarian integration within an already clearly defined territory.

In conclusion, the origin of the common fields of Greater Langton must have preceded the time of township fission, an event which occurred no later than the late 10th century. The existence of common arable in the 10th century elsewhere in the country is alluded to in charter evidence (Finberg 1972:487-97; Fox 1981:83-88; Hooke 1981:58-9; Kerridge 1992:17-23). References to arable lands lying "acre under acre" show that the holdings were by then intermixed while the use of the phase *gemaene land* (Latin: *communis terra*) translates as 'commonland'. Fox, commenting on this 10th century evidence for common arable, considered that it makes it "by no means improbable that a Midland system had been or was about to be adopted" (Fox 1981:84). The fact that in Greater Langton it was probably in place in the 10th century suggests that the open-fields were functioning at this time. Furthermore, if the argument that the open-field system is likely to have been adopted after proprietary fission is correct, then a 10th or early 11th century date is the probable time of field reorganisation. This suggested chronology also concurs with the field survey evidence for the timing of settlement nucleation.

How long before the 10th century Langton functioned as a community, in the sense of communal use of resources, is a moot point. However, it is probable that the co-operative basis of the mature open-field system had a much greater antiquity and could connect in some way to the 'community of neighbours' inhabiting the early Saxon settlements as revealed through the field survey. If so, the territory of Greater Langton, which defined the limits of co-operative use of the arable from at least the 10th century until the time of final enclosure, may have already had an identity in the early and middle Anglo-Saxon period. In the absence of large tracts of wastes and woodlands, it is probable that Anglo-Saxon communities in south-east Leicestershire co-operated as groups of economically independent cultivators from at least the 7th century and that common grazing rights were a feature of agriculture from the beginning of these communities (Ault 1972:17).
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK TO SETTLEMENT AND FIELDS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

It is at the level of the township community that we are at once confronted with the issue of the organisation of Anglo-Saxon rural society. Many of the townships recorded in Domesday would have formerly been a constituent land unit of estates encompassing a number of vills, and it has been these 'multiple estates' which have dominated discussion of pre-Conquest land management (Jones 1979; Aston 1958:75-8). By 1086 the process of estate fission had obscured much of the earlier estate system. Although some aspects of the collective responsibilities of late Saxon and early medieval rural communities were imposed from above the co-operative activities of the *communitas villae* of a typical Midland township were primarily concerned with the management of husbandry (Ault 1972; Cam 1950; Wake 1922). One approach, therefore, which can potentially shed further light on the interplay between peasant farmers and the higher authorities of state and lords is to consider the origins and characteristics of the tenurial structure of a township community.

The Church Langton glebe terriers and the Shangton deeds have revealed a uniformity of obligation, size and regular disposition across the open-fields of the standard peasant smallholding. Lacking the subsistence opportunities of fen and wood-pasture regions, peasant smallholdings in south Leicestershire rarely fragmented to a size insufficient for the support of a household, that is below a quarter or a half share of a full virgate holding or in its English form a yardland. The very origin of the term 'yardland' was linked to arable husbandry - a *virga* or yard in theory represented the width of a plough ridge. For Shangton a typical example of a standard yardland holding can be traced back to the early 13th century so in all probability the regular open-field system was operating by the last decades of the 12th century. Before this time use must be made of the fiscal evidence of Domesday Book and the c.1130 survey to see what they
have to say about the organisation of tenurial units of the late Saxon and early post-Conquest
period.

The township (or vill) rather than the manor was the basic unit of assessment for the collection
of taxes. The normal unit of fiscal assessment or land-tax ('geld') in Leicestershire was the
'ploughland' deriving from the Anglo-Danish *plogesland*, latinised into the *carucata terrae* of
Domesday Book (caruca: plough), each of which was divided into four fiscal virgates and eight
bovates or oxgangs. The carucate is characteristic of the northern Danelaw which, unlike the
hidated districts to the south, used a duodecimal system of reckoning although the hide of
Domesday was likewise taken to be the notional arable acreage which could be cultivated by an
eight-ox plough-team, the bovate representing a peasant holding which could supply one-ox to
the plough-team. The fact that the same terms were used for units of land holding and tax
assessment suggests they were related. However, pointing to his discovery of the preeminence of
the five-hide and six-carucate unit, Round argued that carucates and hides were artificial units
designed to apportion geld liability (Round 1895:66-76).

The view that standard territorial fiscal units had little relationship with agrarian reality has
become generally accepted. Thus Stenton concluded that "as the number of hides assigned to a
village can rarely have coincided with the number of arable tenements which it contained, it
must often have been hard to ascertain the amount which each landowner ought to pay when the
geld was taken" (Stenton 1971:646). Similarly Loyn has contended that the hides, carucates and
sulungs of the Domesday Survey "possessed primarily a fiscal connotation, a description of a
unit in a scheme of national taxation" (Loyn 1962:309). More recently, Hart has argued that,
following a 10th century cadastral reform, "there were now two types of virgates, the ancient
agricultural units, or 'real' virgates, and the new 'hypothetical' virgates which were notional units
of assessment" (Hart 1992:303). However, it is argued here that it is time for a reappraisal of the
relationship between fiscal and real tenurial units.

8.2 THE LANGTON HUNDRED COMPLEX AND THE GELD

Although forming a system of land taxation with roots in the pre-10th century, the 'geld' had
been used to buy off the Danish threat so that, by the 12th century, its common name 'dane
geld' commemorated this unique purpose. Despite some historians' reservations, Domesday hides and
carucates, although here and there subject to limited changes, still formed the assessment units upon which danegeld was levied in the 12th century as the broad correspondence between the assessments in Domesday Book and the c.1130 Survey demonstrate. It is clear that after 1086, no new valuation was made with the geld liability of the majority of townships remaining unchanged (Green 1981:242, 251-8, 1986:69-75). However, by the end of the 12th century danegeld had fallen into disuse although some 13th century documents, at, for example, Tur Langton in 1250, still record a township containing so many carucates of land corresponding to that in Domesday (Farnham 1925). Carucates were also a live means of apportioning scutage and tallage, the main source of 13th century royal revenue after the demise of danegeld (Bateson 1899:128; Mitchell 1951:352). But by 1300, taxes on moveables meant that any remaining link between geld liability and national taxation was broken. With the demise of a national land tax, therefore, the 12th century marked a change in the way arable lands were assessed and it might be no coincidence that this was also a time of population growth and assarting.

With regard to reconstructing a land unit's geld liability, the feudally-arranged breves of the Domesday text complicate the relationship between manor and vill. Where a vill contained the holdings of more than one lord, the basic fiscal unit can only be found by the sum of the manorial assessments. In some cases, reconstituting a vill's fiscal liability is rendered more difficult where manorial totals extend over several vills "without specifying how the sum is distributed" (Stenton 1907a:279). For Leicestershire, Domesday assessments can often be clarified by a comparison with the Leicestershire Survey of c.1130, a record which also reveals the existence of small hundred groupings below the organisation of the wapentake and shire (Slade 1956). Previous discussions have confused the identification of the Langton vills with the manorial entries in Domesday and the c.1130 Survey, and although Thorn's recent translation of Domesday has made the correct identification of vill and manor, inaccurate conclusions from Slade's c.1130 Survey translation are still quoted (Morgan 1979; Slade 1956:14, 13, 62; Stenton 1907b:344, Thorn 1990:25 n.7). Table 8.1 compares, for the first time, the correct Domesday entries with those of the c.1130 Survey, thus revealing the regular duodecimal assessment of Langton hundred.

i) Greater Langton and Tur Langton
That the three Langton vills were once part of an estate with a unified ownership is evident enough from their place-names. The use of the prefix 'East' and 'West' is a clear indication of a
Table 8.1 Langton Hundred: Landholding and Assessments in 1086 and c.1130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>1086 Domesday Survey</th>
<th>c.1130 Leicestershire Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Langton</td>
<td>Hugh de Grandmesnil</td>
<td>11c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earl of Leicester</td>
<td>11c 1v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Langton</td>
<td>Abbot of Peterborough</td>
<td>4c 6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry de Port</td>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15c 6b</td>
<td>17c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Langton</td>
<td>Robert de Veci</td>
<td>3c 6b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eustace</td>
<td>3c 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert de Buci</td>
<td>3c 2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Basset</td>
<td>3c 1v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh de Grandmesnil</td>
<td>0.5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5c</td>
<td>7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Langton</td>
<td>= 23c 1v</td>
<td>24c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>Archbishop of York</td>
<td>13c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry de Port</td>
<td>12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangton</td>
<td>Hugh de Grandmesnil</td>
<td>4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earl of Leicester</td>
<td>10c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert de Veci</td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ansketil</td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King, Soke of Bowden</td>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton Hundred</td>
<td>= 44c 1v</td>
<td>48c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c = carucates; v = virgates; b = bovates.

split land unit. The division of the Langton settlements is first recorded in the Leicestershire Survey of c.1130 as Langeton, later East with Church Langton, and alia Langeton, 'the other Langton', later West Langton (Slade 1956:14). The settlement at Church Langton was only distinguished from the other Langton vills by the affix *kirk(e)* in the early 14th century. Thorpe Langton's place-name element *torp*, described in the Sloane Roll of the c.1130 survey as *Torp iuxta* Langton, suggests a dependent vill on Langton which had gained independence for fiscal purposes by 1086 (Slade 1956:27).
The common fields of Greater Langton and the inter-mixed township structure provide even more pressing evidence than place-names for the internal integrity of this seminal unit. Examination of the Domesday and the c.1130 Survey entries leads to the same conclusion: taken individually, each vill is irregularly assessed, but in combination they form a regular duodecimal assessment of 24 carucates, suggesting a once unified proprietary unit which has apportioned assessments to its constituent elements - either pre-existing sub-units or new manors founded subsequent to the original carucation. By 1086, Langton had split into five manors: East Langton held by Hugh of Grandmesnil, West Langton held by the Abbot of Peterborough, with Thorpe Langton tenurally divided into two manors held by Robert de Veci and Robert de Buci respectively (DB i 230d, 231b, 232a, 232d, 234a, 234b). In divided vills, the manor with the largest holding is usually the main manorial centre and, with its relatively high geld rating, population and manorial valuation, Hugh Grandmesnil's holding at East Langton was probably the manorial caput of a once unified Greater Langton estate. This conclusion is made more certain by the location of the pre-Conquest minster church of St Peter which, although isolated from in East Langton's village, lay within the bounds of the vill.

Some vestiges of the former tenurial union of East Langton and its dependant vill of Thorpe Langton are possibly to be found in the diplomatic of Domesday. Entries in Leicestershire's circuit IV which start with the opening formulae "A (the tenant-in-chief) has Y carucates/hides of land in X (the place)" usually point to manors, whereas the formulae "in X there are Y carucates/hides of land" often indicate dependent, usually soke, lands (Roffe 1989:162; Roffe 1990c:316). Thus in Hugh de Grandmesnil's breve, it is stated that "Osbern holds of Hugh eleven carucates of land in (East) Langtone" in contrast to "in Torp there is half a carucate of Land" (DB i 232a,232d). Although the compilation of the breve disguises the fact, the half carucate of land, half a plough, and two men recorded in Thorpe Langton, almost certainly pertained to the capital manor at East Langton. In summary, we may conclude that the fiscal independence of the three Langton vills was a relatively recent administrative feature in 1086 and that the irregularity of the vills geld liability is a consequence of them having been apportioned fiscal ratings as part of a land unit originally assessed at 24 carucates.

Topography and the fact of its ecclesiastical dependency also point to Tur Langton forming a part of a pre-Conquest 36 carucate estate of Greater Langton. The breve of the Archbishop of
York confirms there was a proprietary link between Tur Langton and Langton. The Domesday opening formula "A holds X. There are Y carucates/hides of land" relate to manors whose geld liability usually included land lying in other vills. This is explicit in the Tur Langton entry which states that "The Archbishop of York holds Terlinton and Walkin of him. There are thirteen carucates of land with Lagintone which pertaines there" (DB i 230d). The fiscal rating and location of the Langton sokeland, hidden in Domesday, are made clear in the c.1130 Leicestershire Survey which names Henry de Port as holder of Tur Langton, assessed at twelve carucates, and assigned him one carucate of land in alia Langtone, 'the other Langton', namely West Langton.

It is probable, therefore, the Greater Langton and Tur Langton, formed a discrete pre-Conquest 'multiple-estate'. In its undivided form, the Langton multiple estate is likely to have been the property of an important late Anglo-Saxon lord. The only evidence pointing to the identity of a pre-Conquest lord of Langton is provided by the 12th century Peterborough chronicler Hugh Candidus, who states "Frahne of Rockingham (Frame et Rogingelham) gave Langton in the county of Leicester" to Peterborough Abbey (ECEE:243-47; Mellows 1949:67-8). Domesday states that an Aethelmaer held West Langton libere, 'freely' TRE (DB I 23 lb). However, the use of the term libere does not indicate bookright but often points to sub-tenant or lessee so there is no reason to accept Stenton's contention that Peterborough had acquired its Langton holding after the Conquest (Sawyer 1985:83; Stenton 1907a:289). This Aethelmear was very probably the king's thegn who had held Robert Dispensator's holdings in Tilton, Kibworth Beauchamp and Wistow with 'sake and soke', the later two vills adjoining West Langton (DB I 235a). Aethelmear was also Dispensator's antecessor in Primthorpe and four Warwickshire vills where he held his lands libere (DB I 242d Wa).

That West Langton, an outlying element of the Abbot's estate and yielding little value, should be administered by a sub-tenant should occasion no surprise (Stafford 1985:38). Hugh Candidus's sources are likely to have been original documents rather than a list of benefactors since the list of donations is incomplete and are not listed in any chronological sequence. The identity of the West Langton donor is probably the prominent Danelaw thegn Frane of Rockingham who had acted as surety for the purchase of estates near Rockingham for the endowment of Peterborough in 983 and 985 and witnessed a number of charters and wills between 970 and 1004 (Hart 1975:335). He could also have been the Fraena recorded in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as
fleeing from the Vikings in an encounter on the Humber in 993 (ASC:83). There is, then, good reason to accept Hart's date of c.985 for the grant of West Langton to Peterborough Abbey (ECNENM:No.38).

The origin of the grant of Tur Langton and part of West Langton to the Archbishop of York is unknown but some scraps of evidence are suggestive. The Archbishop's short breve starts with Tur Langton which stands as his largest holding and the only one in which he stood as the sole Tenant in Chief (DB I 231d). The bookright to the other four vills were held by King's thegns TRE and were clearly post-Conquest acquisitions for the Archbishop. His Tur Langton manor, being the only vill in the breve not recording an antecessor, suggests a continuity of bookright and the two houses in Leicester which the Archbishop held "with sake and soke and pertaining to Tur Langton" points to a donation from a prominent pre-Conquest lord or King's thegn (DB I 230a). Given the tenurial links between Tur and West Langton and the otherwise weak and scattered pattern of ecclesiastical estates in Leicestershire, the origins of the Archbishop's Tur and West Langton estate probably lie with a holder of the 'multiple estate' of Langton, perhaps even Frane of Rockingham. A late 10th century milieu for the Peterborough and York donations would fit in well with the known lay patronage of major religious houses during the period of monastic revival.

The pre-Conquest fission of Thorpe Langton from the capital manor at East Langton is made clear from its separate fiscal recognition in the Domesday Survey. In 1066 the Veci manor formed part of the estate of Aethelric, son of Maergeat, who held a total of nine manors in Leicestershire and other properties in Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Warwickshire (DB I 225b Nth,234a Lei,242d Wa, 346a,363a L). However, despite its extent, the estates TRE value was less than £65 (Saywer 1985:74-5). Aetheric is described a libere homme, 'a free man', in Veci's Leicestershire breve and as having 'held freely' in the other county folios. His social standing as a King's thegn with bookright is, therefore, in doubt although the whole estate had passed to Robert of Veci with full title. With its geographically dispersed elements and relatively low value, the Veci estate was clearly not a primary tenurial unit with a discrete identity and had probably been acquired piecemeal. The place-name element torp, 'dependent settlement', emphasises the conclusion that both the Vessey and Buci manors were secondary and relatively late features of the tenurial landscape.
In 1086 the caput manor of the former multiple Langton estate at East Langton was held by Hugh Grandmesnil's under-tenant Osbern. Unfortunately of a total of 57 entries recorded in the Grandmesnil's breve, only twelve name an antecessor and so the TRE holder of the former caput of the Langton estate can never be known (DB I 232a-33a). However, Hugh de Grandmesnil is known to have only succeeded comital holdings in Wigston Magna and Stoughton and it is probable that the bulk of his title derived from king's thegns. The holder of Langton in 1066 had retained the core lands of a discrete multiple estate that had been divided element by element. The tenurial fission of this land unit was probably well under way by the late 10th century and this is provides the upper date for the unified siegnorial control of an estate which was, at the very least, coterminal with the early medieval parish of Church Langton.

ii) Shangton and Hardwick

Shangton's inclusion in the pre-Conquest multiple estate of Langton is mainly based on the topographical logic of a discrete land unit which stretched from wold down to the river vale (Bourne 1986:13-16). Shangton's place in the territorial tithing of Langton hundred in the c.1130 Survey might also suggest a tenurial link in the 10th century. However, when the small hundreds of the Leicestershire Survey are again recorded in a ville intégré of c.1274-1307, we find Langton and Tur Langton still grouped together but Shangton placed with Illston, Noseley, Carlton and Galby (Lees 1926; Nichols 1815:xlviii). Both Shangton and Carlton have, therefore, been separated from their respective small hundreds leaving ville integra forming 36 carucate units. The reason why the vills were thus reconstituted is unknown.

For valuation purposes, Shangton and Hardwick were always recorded together. The assessment of twelve carucates in the Survey of c.1130 is at odds with the eight carucates of Domesday and the 1279 Hundred Rolls which, on grounds of area, are probably the correct assessment. Hardwick's geld liability is possibly represented by the two carucates of land held in Shangton by the King as part of the soke of Bowden, a conclusion supported by a 1314 fine, cited by Farnham, between John de Wyleby and his wife Joan and Robert de Harewson, "defendant of the manor of Shangton and a messuage, two carucates of land in Herdewyke juxta Shangton" (DB I 230c; LRO Farnham MS. notes). A Henry de Hardwick was one of two free tenants recorded in the 1279 Hundred Rolls for Shangton, and his holding could, as the VCH has suggested, have come down from the king's Domesday sokeland (VCH v:295 n.60).
Shangton is divided between three holdings in Domesday: Hugh de Grandmesnil, Robert of Veci and the king's sokeland. Both lay tenants-in-chief held estates in Langton. For the Grandmesnil holding, the omission of the TRE antecessor makes it impossible to prove a pre-Conquest tenurial link with Greater Langton but it is noteworthy that Grandmesnil's estates in Gartree wapentake form a solid block of territory radiating from the nodal borough along either side of the Roman Gartree Road as far as Stonton and then south to East Langton and the shire boundary. The only break in this unity of seigneurial liberty occurring with the Archbishop of York's estate at Tur Langton. It is possibly significant that the moot site of the Wapentake lies alongside the Gartree Road in Shangton parish in the heart of the Grandmesnil estate complex.

In the case of Robert of Veci estate, a pre-Conquest tenurial link between Shangton and Thorpe Langton is provided by Robert's antecessor, Aethelric son of Maergeat, although as noted above this tenurial link is no proof of ancient ties. The origins of the two carucates of royal sokeland is also far from clear. Roffe has argued that, rather than having a close tenurial relationship with the Welland valley, Shangton formed part of a block of coterminous vills containing the King's sokeland in the heart of Gartree Wapentake. The royal sokeland in Shangton, Carlton Curlieu, Illston and Gaulby is mirrored by the estates of Hugh de Grandmesnil in the same vills. Roffe considers that these vills plus Grandmesnil's estate of Noseley and the king's sokeland at King's Norton and Stretton were formerly part of an estate or group of estates which had belonged to King's thegns before the conquest (Roffe 1993:9; Roffe forthcoming). Nevertheless, despite the inconclusiveness of the fiscal and tenurial evidence, the topographical relationship of Shangton to the Langton complex is strong enough to place it within a territorial unit based on the Welland valley.

8.3 TAXATION, PEASANT SMALLHOLDINGS AND TOWNSHIP SIZE

Whatever other functions the reconstituted Langton hundred might have performed it certainly acted as an agency for the collection of fiscal dues. The place of the 48 carucate hundred within the administrative system of Anglo-Danish Leicestershire will be considered in Chapter Nine. The remainder of this chapter is concerned with the relationship between the cadastral units of carucates and the agrarian landscape. The relationship of taxation with, firstly, standard peasant smallholdings and, secondly, township size are explored in this section.
There is no doubt that the standard yardland or virgate holdings of the 13th century refer to real agrarian units and not artificial fiscal entities. The number of yardland holdings in a township often remained constant over the centuries for the simple reason, as Joseph Lee, rector of Cottesbach, Leicestershire, wrote in his 1650s discourse on the merits of enclosure, "the tax of land is after the yardland; a name very deceitful by the disproportion and inequality thereof...and yet there is equality of taxes" (Nichols 1811:93). So, although land transfers led to increasingly irregular holdings, the yardland in open-field townships continued to act as the basic units for the levying of taxes and rates until the time of final enclosure. Thus the 1743 list of landholders in Greater Langton recorded holdings ranging from a half a quartern to over six yardlands each with a fixed stint of 30 sheep and four cows per yardland (Appendix 2). It is for reasons of taxation and open-field management, therefore, that a record of yardlands was maintained and these were often recorded in the final Parliamentary Enclosure Act which provide the most accessible source for the number of yardlands in a township.

All references found relating to the number of yardlands in Leicestershire townships are shown in Appendix 7. It is apparent that their numbers are regularly apportioned and often very close to 48 yardlands - obviously these numbers have not been determined independently by township communities or manorial lords. For Tur, East and West Langton the number of yardlands stated in the 1791 Enclosure Act seem to be related to their respective fiscal carucates of 1086 and c.1130 with a ratio close to 4:1 (LRO QS.79/6/24; Nichols 1798:662). At Thorpe Langton, the relationship is less close with a discrepancy of around ten extra yardlands. This might be a result of an incorporation of non-assessed inland into the yardland structure of the township or possibly an expansion of the external bounds of Thorpe into Welland parish (VCH Leics v: 331).

Some of the other Leicestershire townships which show a close correspondence between fiscal assessments and yardland size are shown in Table 8.2. Most townships were assessed in carucates but a few were wholly or partially assessed in hides. Even so, their agrarian structure can still be shown to be determined by duodecimal system of reckoning based upon the carucate. The usual meaning of the Leicestershire hide is eighteen carucates. Thus the Domesday entry for Kilby and Bruntingthorpe states that they were assessed at "two parts of one hide, that is twelve carucates of land", a relationship which is probably reflected in their respective yardland sizes,
Table 8.2. TOWNSHIP SIZE AND FISCAL ASSESSMENTS (1086 or c.1130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>No. of Yardlands</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Langton, East and West</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Langton</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Langton</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Thorpe Langton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Langton</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109.25</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Bromkinthorpe'</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlton Curlieu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>c.1599</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scraptoft</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>c.1610</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kibworth Harcourt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Fleckney</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sproxton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thrussington</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Glen</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1758-9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Husbands Bosworth</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kibworth Parish</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knighton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilby</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Bruntingthorpe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnesby</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saddlington</td>
<td>13.5?</td>
<td>c.54</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>4.0?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wigston Magna</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A: the Langton townships; Group B: townships assessed in carucates; Group C: townships assessed wholly or partially in 'hides'. With the exception of Saddlington, geld liability has been converted into carucates using the ratio of eighteen hides to one Carucate.
recorded in 1771 and 1777, of 44.5 and 44 yardlands (LRO QS 79/6/14; Nichols 1798:878; 1810:66). Similarly, in Knighton, the common fields contained 48 yardlands at enclosure in 1755 thus conforming exactly to the expected yardland-carucate ratio (Nichols 1810:237). In Arnesby, one holding assessed at 2.5 carucates, one bovate and 0.5 hides and another at three bovates give a standard duodecimal rating of twelve carucates which seems to be confirmed by the 49.5 yardlands recorded at enclosure in 1794 (LRO EN/AP/7/1). Wigston Magna was assessed at one hide and the third part of a hide producing an assessment of 24 carucates which must be related to the 96 yardlands reported at enclosure (Hoskins 1957:22,248). The same yardland-carucate ratio might hold for Saddington but this rests on Hughe's suggestion that the exceptional Domesday entry for Melton Mowbray "in each hide are 14.5 carucates of land" could have been employed for the royal manor of Saddington assessed at one hide less one carucate (DB 235v,230c; Hughes 1968). This would give a 13.5 carucate assessment thus relating to the 54 yardlands which were the approximate size of Saddington's open-fields.

Sometimes, the number of holdings in a township can be ascertained from the apportioning of scutage and tallage which, as a 1200 Leicester charter suggests when speaking of whether the sheriff's aid is taken by hides or carucates, were probably paid at a fixed rate per carucate or hide (Bateson 1899:128; Mitchell 1951:352). Thus a 1264 entry in the register of Croxton Abbey refers to a tallage of 40 shillings on Nether Broughton, Leicestershire, for which four men of vill were appointed to deliver the sum to the king at London after the inhabitants had collected the 40 shillings amongst themselves at a rate of 10 pence per virgate, i.e. 48 x 10 pence = 40 shillings (Nichols 1795:112). These 48 virgates correspond exactly to the twelve carucate assessment recorded in Domesday.

Higham-on-the-Hill is the only Leicestershire township found thus far to exhibit a decimal holding structure. It is probably significant that Higham lies by the Watling Street, the south-west boundary of the shire and the Danelaw. Higham's agrarian structure was detailed by Burton in the early 17th century when it contained 2000 acres and 40 yardlands which corresponds to a 1632 Deed of Covenant where the yardlands totalled 39.5 (Burton 1622:130-31; Nichols 1811:640-1). Higham goes unnoticed in Domesday, but this is probably explained by its inclusion in a complex of pre-Conquest estates held by Harding spanning the shire boundary into hidated Warwickshire (DB I 231c,239c).
As a general rule, however, regardless of whether or not a Leicestershire township was assessed in carucates or hides, the holding structure was a duodecimal one. It seems therefore, that, contrary to Round's view that geld liability bore no relation to real tenurial units, the standard tenant holdings of the type known to exist in Shangton from the late 12th century were often quarter-shares of primary assessed carucates. Although the equation one carucate equals four yardlands was not universal across the shire, assessments of six, eight, twelve, and 24 carucates generally result in the number of yardlands converging on 24, 32, 48 and 96 respectively. Taken as a whole the Leicestershire data presents a remarkably consistent relationship between the number of actual holdings and the geld assessments of Domesday. Rather than a artificial fiscal convention, the late Saxon carucate and hide were fundamental to the yardland structure of a township, and the fact that this relationship can be demonstrated some 700 years after the Domesday Survey testifies to the remarkable stability of these underlying units of tenure.

ii) Taxation and Township Size

If a township's tax assessment was used as the basis for land division and holding structure, with each yardland nominally representing an equal share in a townships arable, then it is possible that the area of arable land was also related to the tax assessment. The mapping of carucates per acre in Leicestershire was first attempted by Holly in 1938, but this methodology was abandoned by Darby in the later Domesday Geographies since taxation was considered to be essentially artificial in character, "throwing no light on the geographical condition of England in the 11th century" (Darby 1977:9-12; Holly 1938:192-4). However, Harvey has successfully correlated township areas to the carucate assessments of Holderness in Yorkshire and Gelling has carried out a similar exercise by mapping Domesday assessments onto township maps for the West Midland shires to show that "woodland areas were lightly assessed" (Gelling 1992:197; Harvey,M. 1981:193-7).

For Langton hundred, the discussion of carucates per acre in Chapter Six revealed a contrast between the valley and hinterland townships. Similarly, for Leicestershire as a whole, Holly's seminal work, although failing to account for hidated vills, concluded that the mapping of carucates per acre showed "quite a close accordance with the facts of economic geography" (Holly 1938:194). If tax was a real assessment of the arable, then a strong correlation between township size and fiscal rating would indicate that the arable occupied a large proportion of
township area whilst a high acreage per carucate would potentially point to townships containing tracts of non-assessed woodland, pasture or and low-lying flood-plain.

Investigation of the relationship between township area and carucate assessments for Gartree wapentake does suggest that, when account is taken of non-arable resources, there is a correlation between taxation and township size (Appendix 8). Moreover, the Lipping seems to mark a clear economic division of the region. To its east, a large acreage per carucate coincides with a preponderance of relatively small townships assessed at three carucates together with most of the Domesday woodland recorded in south-east Leicestershire. This same area was latter included within the the royal forest of Leicestershire and Rutland with the Lipping forming the western bounds of a forest perambulation in 1218 (Nichols 1798:516; Turner 1901: xcvi; VCH Leics ii:265-6). It seems, therefore, that east of the Lipping, taxation reflected the agrarian reality of relatively small arable acreages and the presence wood-pasture.

By contrast, to the west of the Lipping twelve carucate land units dominate and the majority with a relatively low acreage per carucate. This points to many townships being close to the limits of cultivation before 1086. A general absence of recorded woodland in Domesday seems to confirm the arable character of this countryside. There are, however, some exceptions. Shangton and Hardwick, for example, are a continuation of the wold wood-pasture zone lying east of the Lipping. On the other hand, the low Domesday assessments of Great Bowden (12.5 carucates) and Laughton (two carucates) are probable Domesday omissions. Thus, in 1637, it was stated that in the fields of Bowden "were divided into or did contain eighteen carucates of land" (Stocks 1926:320; VCH Leics v:141). Overall, however, the townships west of the Lipping reveal a close relationship between township size and fiscal assessments and this was probably a reflection of the size of their arable acreages.

The correlation of taxation with agrarian structure and township size might also mean that the size of the assessed field-system could have been determined by the tax assessment and that the "internal divisions of these fields, including the strips of individual farms holdings, are likely to have been measured out in a proportional way, again using the assessment" (Harvey, M. 1981:197). In most cases there is no evidence of open-field size until the time of enclosure but it is remarkable how often open-field acreages approximate 1200 acres and, in some townships, this was clearly the expected open-field acreage. Nichols states, for instance, that "the lordship
of Ayleston contains 1900 statute acres; of which 1200 were open and common fields till 1767, when an Act was passed for their inclosure" (Nichols 1810:27).

However, no causal linkage is established by these relationships with taxation. They could have arisen from applying a regular tax quota on the arable of existing townships which were close to their limits of cultivation or had larger tracts of non-arable resources (Harvey, M. 1981:197). This would imply that tax assessment was closely related to an existing agrarian reality and one where the delimitation of township boundaries had already been carried out. However, the frequently regular size of many townships suggests an element of planning across the whole landscape of Gartree wapentake. The stages at which township area, open-field size and the internal regularity of holdings were established are still open to debate but what does seem certain is that an interpretation of the relationship between tax and areal units must be concerned with the date at which the tax assessments recorded in Domesday was first imposed. If, for instance, the Anglo-Norman cadastre can be shown to be an essentially inherited fiscal system from before the 10th century, the possibility remains that elements of the late Saxon and early medieval countryside which seem to be related to taxation are also connected to a much earlier period of planning and land management.

8.4 CARUCATES, HIDES AND THE AGRARIAN LANDSCAPE

There is a real possibility that the agrarian structure of the duodecimally assessed Leicestershire townships are directly comparable with those in hidated areas. If we start from the proposition that the open-field size and holding structure in both hidated and carucated townships sizes was based on a mapping of 1200 'fiscal' acres for assessment purposes, then it would be the system of reckoning geld liability that determined the number and acreage of tenemental units. Thus, assuming that each hide or carucate was divided into four virgates, a township rated at twelve carucates or ten hides would result in their respective hypothetical agrarian structure organised as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 carucate land unit</th>
<th>10 hide assessment land unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48 virgate holdings</td>
<td>40 virgate holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48x25 acres = 1200 fiscal acres</td>
<td>40x30 acres = 1200 fiscal acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order for 48 tenements to fit into a 1200 acre field system the arable of a standard virgate holding would have to be 25 acres with appurtenances, making an 100 acre carucate. This opposes the usual assumption that the carucate, like the hide, was taken to be 120 fiscal acres and agrees with Turner that a 100 acre carucate would offer "a more coherent explanation of the fiscal system of northern England" (Maitland 1898:475-49; Turner 1913:lxiii-lxiv). Turner pointed to the lack of any good evidence to show that the carucate contained 120 fiscal acres and recent discussions have added little to this debate (Hart 1992:309-10). Most scholars have also ignored Turner's proposition that "in the carucated counties a unit of twelve carucates takes the place of the tithing or unit of ten hides of the hidated counties" and his mooted, but discounted, suggestion that "that twelve carucates and ten hides each contained 1200 acres" (1913:lxvii-lxxxviii).

One comparative test case is Kibworth Harcourt which has good documentary evidence for open-field size and tenemental structure (Hilton 1949; Howell 1983; Table 8.3). Kibworth Harcourt is juxtaposed to Tur Langton with which it is directly comparable: both were rated at twelve carucate and have about the same statute acreage. In Domesday and the c.1130 Survey Kibworth's twelve carucate assessment suggests 48 virgate (i.e. yardland) holdings (i.e. one carucate = four virgates). According to an 1265 extent of Saer de Harcourt's lands in Kibworth Harcourt, there were nine virgates in demesne and 18.5 virgates in villeinage. Rents from free tenants and cottars were included but the amount of freeholders land was not stated. However, these freeholdings can be estimated at 9.5 virgates from a 1283-4 Merton College rental. Saer de Harcourt was in possession of the whole of Kibworth except for a block of ten virgates which his grandfather had granted to Laurence d'Aptoft. These ten virgates can probably be identified with the 1279 Hundred Rolls record of 2.5 carucates held by a Hubert de Told. It appears from a 1295 rental, that this property consisted of six villein and four free virgates. Thirteenth century sources, therefore, suggest a total very close to 48 virgates in Kibworth while a Merton College survey of 1635 survey gives a total of 48 yardlands as is predicted by the Domesday assessment (Hilton 1949:22,27-8, 32; Howell 1983:89).

The size of Kibworth's open-fields were estimated to be 1236 acres in 1636 very close to our theoretical size of 1200 fiscal acres (Howell 1983:89). If the geldable lands were expected to contain 1200 acres then the duodecimal assessment would have determined the acreage of a standard holding, resulting in 48 standard holdings divided into half-virgates of 12.5 acres or full
TABLE 8.3 KIBWORTH HARcourt: TAXATION AND PEASANT HOLDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>Domesday Survey</td>
<td>12 carucates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1130</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>12 carucates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Extent:</td>
<td>9 virgates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saer de Harcourt</td>
<td>18.5 virgates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free tenants</td>
<td>9.5 virgates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>Apetoft manor</td>
<td>6 virgates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free tenants</td>
<td>4 virgates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.47 virgates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635</td>
<td>Merton College Survey</td>
<td>31 yardlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copyholders</td>
<td>17 yardlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeholders</td>
<td>48 yardlands (excluding 7.5 acres of glebe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is well known that medieval yardland sizes vary from place to place and can be of various sizes within townships (Harvey 1976; Jones, A. 1979). Nevertheless, Hilton found that "almost all virgates in the Leicester Abbey material contain 24 acres of arable" (Hilton 1947:9 n.1). The virgates at Cossington and Skeffington also seem to have contained 24 acres (Skillington...
1936:16). Similarly, there must have been an average yardland size of around 24 acres in Bromkinthorpe (the West Field of Leicester) for the 31.5 yardlands recorded in 1627 to fit into the field system of around 792 acres (Billson 1925:7). The Langton evidence is late: a copy of a 1653 terrier of 1.5 yardlands totalling 40 acres and 3 roods which would give approximately 27 acres to the yardland including meadowland. Overall the evidence points to Leicestershire yardlands typically below 30 acres, and often around 24 acres. It remains a possibility, therefore, that carucation resulted in more yardlands of a smaller acreage than townships assessed in hides but of a similar open-field size.

A comparison of the Kibworth evidence with Brown's study of the ten hide townships of Daventry and Drayton draws a similar conclusion (Brown 1991). These Northamptonshire townships are located to the south-west of the Watling Street boundary settled by Alfred's treaty with Guthrum (c.886) and therefore never came under Scandinavian control. This is an important point since the hidage ratings in this 'English' area cannot have been a reassessment of any Danish cadestre. In Domesday, Daventry is rated at four hides (excluding Drayton) but, when account is taken of a 60 per cent assessment reduction, the original assessment would have been ten hides (Round 1900; Hart 1970). Brown has demonstrated that both Daventry and Drayton originally contained 40 standard yardland holdings of 30 fiscal acres (a 120-acre hide) but, in reality, actual acres in the field, which led to his conclusion that the open-fields reflected "in their layout the late Saxon hidage assessment" (Brown 1991:83). The fact that the open-field size of Kibworth and Daventry really did contain about 1200 statute acres suggests that the carucates and hides of Domesday were connected to real measured acreages of geld-paying land and not artificial tax units far removed from agrarian regality.

Other Northamptonshire evidence has been researched by Hall and his main published findings of hidage-yardland ratios are given here for comparison with Leicestershire: Great Billing, 48 yardlands (1:12); Great Addington, 42 yardlands (1:12); Wollaston, 84 yardlands (1:12); Cold Ashby and Chilcotes possibly 64 yardlands (1:16); Clipston, 84 yardlands (1:16), divided between 48 yardlands in Clipston and 36 yardlands in Newbold; Elkington 48 yardlands (1:24); Watford, 96 yardlands (1:24) divided between 48 yardlands in Watford (1:24) and 24 yardlands in both the townships of Murcott and Silsworth (Hall 1983:127; 1987:14-7; 1988:116-20, 1989:195-6,201). To this list can be added Little Bowden where 51 yardlands were recorded on the eve of enclosure in 1779 (Nichols 1798:478,n.1). The Domesday assessment of 3 hides 4/9

146
virgates (including the Huntingdon fee recorded in c.1120 but unaccounted for in Domesday) is very close to a 1:16 ratio (VCH Northants i:384). Clipston is adjacent to Little Bowden parish and it is possible that a 1:16 hide-yardland ratio was standard in this part of Northamptonshire.

It is probably significant how similar these duodecimal yardland sizes in Northamptonshire are to the carucated Leicestershire townships north of the Welland. In Leicestershire assessments of six, twelve and 24 carucates result in yardland sizes of 24, 48 and 96 reflecting the common one carucate equals four virgate equation. In Northamptonshire, the recurring hide-yardland ratios of 1:12, 1:16 and 1:24 also reflect a duodecimal tenemental framework and suggest the imposition of a hidage assessment, later reduced, upon an existing duodecimal agrarian structure. Kettering, for example, was said to consist of 48 yardlands in the Enclosure Act of 1804 but as 47 yardlands lying on four hides on the eve of enclosure; Kettering was assessed at ten hides in Domesday so it seems that the reduced assessment was made and, contrary to Hall, 48 yards is probably the correct tenemental size (Hall 1987:16-7; Martin 1977:415). Kettering was also assessed at ten hides in a 956 charter with bounds identical with the later parish, suggesting that, if 12th century scribe has not made an error, the holding structure was created before this date and the hidage reduction came later (ECNENM no.5; Gover et al. 1933:184,n.1; S 592). Kettering's 48 yardlands were scattered around a large open-field of around 1700 acres with about 36 acres per yardland, but that of Great Billing (four hides) conforms to the expected mensuration of a 48 yardland township: 1159 acres out of a total 1386 acres were enclosed in 1778 suggesting an original assessed field size close to 1200 acres (Hall 1978:167; Martin 1977:415,420-1). In terms of its agrarian structure, Great Billing is comparable with the four hides (originally ten) of Daventry and Drayton and the twelve carucates of Kibworth and Tur Langton in Leicestershire.

Scandinavian influence is one obvious explanation for the duodecimal tenemental structure of Leicestershire and those parts of Northamptonshire lying north-east of Watling Street (Gover et al. 1933:xx-xxix). Thus, it is possible that, following the English reconquest in 917, a duodecimal system of land division was allowed to continue or was soon to be established on account of the importance of the support of local Scandinavian holders of land in this 'border county' (ibid.; 1933:xxix). A raid by the "army from Northampton and Leicester" in 913 and again in 917 when "the army from Northampton and Leicester and the north" attacked Towcester shows both military cooperation and the possibility of close administrative ties around their
respective burhs (ASC:62,64). It is even possible to suggest that after the reconquest of the Danelaw the territory that became Northamptonshire was not drawn into the hidated shire system until much later than has hitherto been suspected.

However, the most important conclusion from this investigation into the link between taxation, field size and holding structure must be that Turner's mooted suggestion that ten hide and twelve carucate townships are synonymous in all but their system of reckoning is correct, at least for Leicestershire and Northamptonshire (Turner 1913:xvii-xviii). It follows that this has a bearing on the longer-term relationship between hides and carucates. Scholars are in general agreement that the duodecimal carucate recorded in Domesday is of a relatively recent origin and, as Maitland states, it is "exceedingly doubtful whether we ought to treat this method of reckoning older than the Danish invasions" in the late 9th century (Lennard 1944; Maitland 1896:395). Various dates for carucation have been proposed. The most likely is that it was inextricably linked to the wapentake, an institution first documented in AD962-3 and probably an administrative creation of the mid-10th century rather than, as suggested by Phythiam-Adams, in an earlier pre-918 context under Danish domination (EHD I:1397-404; Roffe 1986:110-11; Phythiam-Adams 1978:20). On the other hand, the use of hides in the early 11th century in areas that were carucated by the time of the Domesday Survey led Stenton, later supported by Sawyer, to argue that the change to carucates occurred in the 11th century (Sawyer 1978:196; Stenton 1910:88-90). However, as the Domesday Leicestershire evidence shows, hides and carucates could co-exist in vills which were duodecimally rated. It seems a reasonable conclusion, therefore, that we should look to the 10th century administrative superstructure of the Anglo-Danish confederacy of the Five Boroughs for the origins of both wapentake and carucation (Hall 1989).

Very few scholars have mooted the possibility that the Anglo-Danish carucate could stand in some fixed proportion to the earlier Mercian hide (Cain 1990:3-4). Even so, there are strong reasons for suggesting such a revaluation. The first of these is based on the similarity of agrarian organisation, with the exception of their system of reckoning, between carucated townships in Leicestershire and ones rated in hides in south-west Northamptonshire where "one would expect to find traces of the initial hidation of the Mercian era" (Hart 1970:40). However, the fiscal artificiality hypothesis of Round, whereby assessments were imposed downwards through an administrative hierarchy has been attacked by McDonald and Snooks (1986). They concluded
that hidage totals were obtained by aggregating from the manorial level, that five-hide multiples result from a natural rounding, and that there would have been inevitable opposition to an arbitrary tax system surviving for long periods of time (1986:51-76). There are a number of objections to these arguments not the least of which is that Round's thesis that hidated Domesday vills were assessed in multiples of five hides has been vindicated (Leaver 1988:Fig.3). Furthermore, round-figure assessments were already a systematic measure of obligations and renders throughout 7th century England and a quantitative stability between Domesday hides and those in pre-11th century charters can often be demonstrated (Campbell 1986:110-11,129; Blair 1994:74-9; Stenton 1955:73-4). This must mean, as Stenton argued, that the late Saxon geld assessments were, in some instances, the same as "the food-rents of early kings" (Stenton 1971:647). Where Domesday figures do not agree with earlier charter hidages, Blair is probably correct to argue that they are usually "more convincingly explained by fragmentation or changes to estate boundaries than by assuming re-assessment of hides" (1994:79).

The implication is that the basis of duodecimal assessments could also exhibit a much longer-term stability that has hitherto been suspected. It is argued here that the carucation of Leicestershire was a simple revaluation of the original Mercian hideage by increasing the decimal units by twenty per cent along with a proportionate remodelling of tenemental structure. Thus, five, ten, twenty, and 30-hide units south of the Welland are the equivalent of six, twelve, 24, and 36-carucate units in Leicestershire. This conclusion opposes Cain's hypothesis that the carucation of Leicestershire represents a 40 per cent reduction from an original hideage calculated, as in the Burghal Hidage, on the circumference of the borough wall, to give the twelve, 24 and 36 carucate assessments an original assessment of twenty, 40 and 60 Mercian hides out of all proportion to a land unit's size (Cain 1990:3-4).

A twenty per cent revaluation of the original Mercian hideage should occasion no real surprise since a total reassessment of the land in the 10th century which bore no relation to the ancient cadestre would probably have been administratively impractical. This point might be demonstrated by the Domesday ploughland data which were probably an attempted assessment revision which failed, since, as Green has pointed out, "they were a dead letter as far as the 12th century exchequer was concerned", when the old hides and carucates of Domesday continued to be the unit upon which danegeld was levied (Green 1986:70; Harvey 1985). One possible reason
for the change to a duodecimal cadestre is to be found in a monetary system based upon the ore and mark.

However, there is little documentary proof surviving from the Mercian period which can used to demonstrate this proposed hidage-carucate relationship. It is worth noting, therefore, a grant of AD677/691 of twenty manentes by princeps Friduric to St Peter's Medeshamstede (Peterborough) for the foundation of a monastery at Breedon on the Hill (Dornier 1977:157-60; ECNENM No.32a; S 1803; Stenton 1933). This is the only authentic pre-10th century grant concerning property in Leicestershire. The Mercian monastery did not survive into the 10th century, but a church at Breedon was given estates in 967/974, including three cassati at both Breedon and Wilson (ECNENM No.37; S 749). Breedon, despite being the mother church of a large parish, is not mentioned in Domesday or the c.1130 survey but was probably, along with Wilson, included in the assessments for Tonge and Worthington. The total Domesday and c.1130 Survey assessment for this group of vills was respectively 25.5 and 24 carucates which probably included Breedon, Wilson, Tonge, Isley and Langley, Worthington and Andreskirk, but not Staunton Harold, a chapel of Breedon (Slade 1956:18,44-5; Stenton 1907b:349). The round-figure 24 carucate assessment of c.1130 is likely to be the primary duodecimal quota levied on a land unit which could well have formed the area of the original twenty hide grant.

A twenty per cent assessment revaluation of the Mercian hidage is a contentious hypothesis because the relationship observed between tax and the areal size of fields and townships could implications for the development of land management and possibly that the pre-10th century hide was primarily concerned with the arable and its cultivators. The mention of non-arable resources in early land grants can best be explained because "the men who drafted the charters, like those who compiled Domesday Book, were interested in the total resources of the estate" (Sawyer 1978:144). A commonly held view, however, is that the early hide was an estimate of the "complete agricultural package" and that there was a 10th century revolution in the conception of peasant smallholdings and their assessments (Finberg 1972:411-16,479-82; Hart 1992:295,319; Phythian-Adams 1978:20; Stenton 1927:159-61; Vinogradoff 1911:162-3). This hypothesis implies that the early hide was qualitatively different from its 11th century counterpart and more of standardised unit of account used to access the render form and royal obligations from an estate. It would follow that the pre-10th century kingdoms were rudimentally organised with kings and subjects prepared to accept rough and ready estimates of
total resources by casting arbitrary assessments across territories rather than upon a quantifiable resource such as the arable.

However, since we have argued that the variability of tax assessment with township area can generally be explained by the balance between arable and non-arable land in the 10th or 11th centuries there is every possibility that this same distribution of resources can be traced to the time of the initial hidation. For the upper Welland valley this argument is even more plausible if it is accepted that the carucate was a twenty per cent revaluation of the Mercian hide and not a new land assessment. This would also concur with the revisionist views of the Anglo-Saxon countryside championed by Sawyer who, pointing to the amount and nature of tribute coming from the land documented in early charters, suggested that "resources were as fully exploited in the 7th and 8th centuries as they were in the 11th" (Sawyer 1978:145; 1979:6). This questions the extent of a major shift to an arable economy during the mid-to late Anglo-Saxon period and rejects the presumption of some scholars that there were largely unsettled areas left for colonisation. Over the longer-term this view does not contradict the archaeological and documentary evidence presented in this research. Thus in Shangton and Hardwick the expansion of cultivation after a late Roman and early Anglo-Saxon decline seems have come late in the Anglo-Saxon period or more certainly in the early post-Conquest centuries. Its relatively low assessment as indicated by a high acreage per carucate (158 compared to 118 acres in Tur Langton and 125 acres in Greater Langton) could also potentially reflect an agrarian reality in the 11th century as well as in the 7th or 8th centuries. This is not to suggest that the hide was a particular measure of arable resources which was applied to all regions or that the rural economy was characterised by inertia. But the conclusion of this argument must be that we should return to the view of Kemble that, even in the pre-Alfredian period, "the hide was calculated upon the arable" (Kemble 1876 i:111,118).
CHAPTER NINE

LANGTON HUNDRED AND ANGLO-DANISH LEICESTERSHIRE

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The Langton hundred, as an example of the Leicestershire small hundred, is only known from the c.1130 Leicestershire Survey of vills in which the Bassett family had an interest (Slade 1956). Even so they these small hundreds represent more ancient entities and as a fiscal and territorial tithing are inextricably linked to the fiscal structure of wapentake and shire (Fig. 14 and 15). Moreover, the possibility that carucation stands in some fixed relationship to the original Mercian hidage rather than being a revolutionary cadestre or new valuation of the land has important implications for the administrative organisation of Anglo-Danish Leicestershire. It would be potentially possible, for example, to reconstruct a framework of assessment groupings which could owe more to a continuity of Mercian administrative organisation than has hitherto been possible to detect. The c.1130 Survey coverage of Gartree wapentake is too fragmentary to determine the framework of Anglo-Danish administrative from these entries alone but Slade, making use of the complete coverage of Framland wapentake, made the vital observation that the small hundreds of that wapentake can be reconstituted into four groupings of 144 carucates, including a detached part of Goscote (Wycombe and Chadwell), to make an original assessment of 576 carucates (Slade 1956:78-9). Slade's important conclusion was that "various factors - personal, political, geographical, for example - had warped what was originally a coherent and logical system" (ibid. 77).

For Gartree wapentake the c.1130 Survey gives complete details for three small hundred groupings in Gartree wapentake: the adjoining Langton and Kibworth hundreds in the main body of Gartree and the detached Knossington hundred consisting of lands intermixed among Goscote and Framland wapentakes. The standard 48 carucate assessment for Langton and Kibworth hundreds suggests a significant pattern of tax apportionment. The detached Knossington hundred, however, seems to be anomalous, its irregular assessment in 43 carucates and 7 bovates appearing to be a relatively recent disruption to a simpler more coherent plan (the form 43c 7b,
Figure 14: Leicestershire's Wapentake Boundaries (1086) and Langton Hundred.
Figure 15: Gartree Wapentake (1086) and Parishes.
where $c=$carucates, $v=$virgates and $b=$bovates, is used similar irregular assessments. Hitherto the key to the puzzle of the detached and fragmented areas of Gartree and Framland wapentakes has been lacking (Thorn 1990b:28-9). The following discussion offers an explanation not only for the detached parts of Gartree but also the original basis of the assessment system for the wapentake. This proposes a reconstruction of the original wapentake and hundredal pattern based on the principal of fiscal symmetry around 12 small hundreds each assessed at 48 carucates. The weightiest argument in favour of this hypothesis comes from the relative ease of mapping a logical 48 carucate hundredal framework for Gartree wapentake and the eastern projection of Goscote wapentake. The pattern thus reconstituted restores a wapentake boundary which is topographically coherent and which largely respects local estate structures.

9.2 KNOSSINGTON HUNDRED AND LAND EXCHANGE

The first problem which has to resolved is the confused wapentake configuration resulting from the detached parts of Gartree wapentake which in the light of the geographical integrity and the logical fiscal symmetry of Framland wapentake are unlikely to have been part of an original scheme of fiscal administration. The detached Knossington hundred consisted of eight members: Knossington, Owston, Newbold Saucey, Burrough-on-the-Hill, North and South Marefield and the 'islands' of Baggrave and Pickwell and Leesthorpe. The most obvious explanation for these detached areas is that they have arisen from a series of land exchanges subsequent to the original carucation. References to land transfers are a common feature of Domesday and it is of interest that the only Leicestershire example concerns property in this area of intermixed wapentakes: Geoffrey de la Guerche's holdings in Stanton-under-Bardon, East Norton, Cold Newton, Little Dalby and Withcote were the result of a land grant "which King William gave in exchange for the vill called Thurcaston". Thus the king's seal had been given to a land exchange between Hugh Grandmesnil, the Domesday holder of Thurcaston, and Geoffrey, who otherwise held no land in Gartree other than the detached vills of Pickwell and Leesthorpe. It is this type of exchange which could potentially result in the transfer of vills between wapentakes for administrative purposes.

Knossington was held in demesne by the King but its jurisdiction lay with the royal manor of Oakham in Rutland (Slade 1956:14,31). The fact that Baggrave and North and South Marefield
are placed in Goscote wapentake as members of the royal soke of Rothley is not significant since Domesday is concerned only with indicating the wapentake of the head manor of such a multiple estate (Thorn 1990:27). The Gartree wapentake head, however, appears above Knossington and it is probable that Owston, together with the royal sokelands, were placed in Gartree by 1086. The Gartree head also appears above the detached Pickwell and Leesthorpe where it is immediately followed by a Bramland head above Godtorp and Burrough-on-the-Hill both parts of the soke of Pickwell. This confused pattern is repeated when the Gartree and Framland head respectively appear above two entries for Burrough-on-the-Hill in the same folio. Both Burrough-on-the-Hill and Newbold Saucy are divided between Framland and Gartree wapentakes in the c.1130 Survey. By the time of the 1334 Lay Subsidy the wapentake position has been clarified with all of Burrough-on-the-Hill and Newbold Saucy together with the other Knossington members placed in Gartree wapentake (Glasscock 1975:165).

The explanation offered here for this confused pattern is that Knossington hundred (Gartree wapentake), Loddington hundred (Goscote wapentake) and Cold Overton hundred (Framland wapentake) in their Domesday and c.1130 Survey form are neither primary fiscal entities or, as a whole, originally constituent parts of their respective Domesday wapentakes. One possible reason for such an extensive reorganisation of the wapentakes and their constituent hundreds might be the transfer of Loddington hundred, less its detached vills of Twyford and Thorpe Satchville, from Gartree to Goscote wapentake for tenurial and administrative reasons. The vills of Skeffington, Tugby and Allenton which lay within Loddington hundred were also members of the royal soke of Rothley so an exchange could have been for administrative convenience. Ecclesiastical ties to the church at a soke centre might also be an indicator of a close tenurial relationship and it is of interest to note that Rothley was the mother church of Chadwell and Wycombe, an isolated 'island' in the heart of Framland wapentake from which it has presumably been drawn into Goscote wapentake, possibly after being taken into royal hands and attached to Rothley soke. It is perhaps significant, therefore, that the church of Skeffington is recorded in 1220 as paying a ten shilling pension *ab antiquo*, 'from of old', to the church of Rothley, an annual payment again mentioned in the *Valor* of 1291 (Nichols 1800:442; 1804:958).

The irregular 70c 6b assessment of Loddington hundred in the c.1130 Survey is more positive evidence of a disruption to an earlier more regular fiscal system. Thus the deduction of the detached Twyford and Thorpe Satchville leaves a 48 carucate unit which is a strong indication
TABLE 9.1 KNOSSINGTON HUNDRED MEMBERS IN DOMESDAY AND C.1130

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domesday</th>
<th>C.1130 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owston</td>
<td>7c</td>
<td>7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickwell and Leesthorpe</td>
<td>14c</td>
<td>15c*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbold Sausey</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>1c 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrough-on-the-Hill</td>
<td>8c 1b</td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggrave</td>
<td>5c 5b</td>
<td>5c 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marefield</td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>alia Marefield</strong></td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48c 6b</strong></td>
<td><strong>43c 7b</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Divided vills in C.1130:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cold Overton Hundred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newbold Sausey</td>
<td>1c 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrough-on-the-Hill</td>
<td>3c*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1c*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Possible duplications: 1c in Pickwell is sokeland hel by Roger de Mowbray; 3c held by Roger Marmium appears in Knossington and Cold Overton hundred. The remaining Burrough-on-the-Hill lands were assessed with Somerby (Cold Overton hundred) in the C.1130 Survey.

that these vills are a late amalgamation to a primary fiscal entity. Significantly the inclusion of the main body of Loddington hundred into Gartree wapentake would restore a topographically coherent wapentake boundary to take in the headwaters of the River Welland tributaries and which follows the watershed of the Eye Brook to the shire boundary with Rutland. This 'original' Gartree also appears to incorporate a putative archaic territory comprising Hallaton, Keythorpe, Tugby and East Norton (possibly the 'north tun' pertaining to Hallaton), which could form a 24 carucate (20 hide?) fiscal and estate entity otherwise bisected by the Domesday wapentake boundary, a problem that has long been noted (Hoskins 1957:8-10; Bourne 1986:13-14).

The proposed Loddington exchange was probably only one of a series of land exchanges. The total assessment of Knossington hundred is 43c 7b in the C.1130 Survey, but this excludes parts of Burrough and Newbold assessed under Cold Overton hundred in Framland wapentake (Table 9.1). If the total Domesday assessment of these divided vills are added to the other members of Knossington hundred the total is 48c 6b including six bovates of waste. Probable duplications and the combined Burrough and Somerby assessment of eighteen carucates in Cold Overton
TABLE 9.2 THE PICWELL AND SOMERBY ESTATE COMPLEX - A PROPOSED ORIGINAL 'PICKWELL HUNDRED' IN FRAMLAND WAPENTAKE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Domesday</th>
<th>c.1130 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pickwell &amp; Leesthorpe</td>
<td>Geoffrey de la Guerche 14c</td>
<td>Roger de Mowbray 15c*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Dalby</td>
<td>Henry of Ferrers 5c m. of Somerby</td>
<td>Robert de Ferrers 5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geoffrey de la Guerche 4c 2v</td>
<td>William le Gras 5c 1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geoffrey de la Guerche 2c 2v s. of Pickwell</td>
<td>Roger de Mowbray 1c 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godtorp</td>
<td>Geoffrey de la Guerche 3c 2v s. of Pickwell and Somerby</td>
<td>Roger de Mowbray 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerby</td>
<td>Henry of Ferrers 3c 2b m. has 5c in Lt. Dalby</td>
<td>Robert of Ferrers 5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Despencer 5c 3b</td>
<td>Robert Marmium 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King 1c 2v s. of Rothley</td>
<td>Roger de Mowbray 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrough-on-the-Hill</td>
<td>Henry of Ferrers 2c 3b</td>
<td>Robert Marmium 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geoffrey de la Guerche 1c s. of Pickwell</td>
<td>Roger de Mowbray 1c*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert King's sgt. 4c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert King's sgt 6b sokeland, waste</td>
<td>48c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18c 1b</td>
<td>-1c*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46c 6b</td>
<td>47c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probable duplication in the Burrough-on-the-Hill assessment. m. = Manor; s. = soke.

hundred (Framland wagentake) makes it difficult to compare the Domesday total with the c.1130 Survey. However, it is possible a 48 carucate assessment for Knossington hundred, including the total geld liability of the divided vills, was the original intended rating and that this fiscal entity was created with an aim, perhaps following a transfer of Loddington hundred from Gartree to Goscote, to maintain a degree of fiscal equilibrium between the wapentakes following an administrative restructuring.

However, it is seems clear form the confused Domesday and c.1130 wagentake structure that the primary hundredal pattern of Framland wagentake has also been disrupted. The fact, for example, that Newbold and Burrough-on-the-Hill are split between Knossington hundred (Gartree) and Cold Overton hundred (Framland) in the c.1130 Survey with Burrough-on-the-Hill similarly divided in the Domesday breves, suggests some real confusion over which wagentake and small hundred some holdings were to be assessed. If the pattern of interlocking estates around the detached Pickwell and Leesthorpe are analysed it appears to form part of a primary fiscal and tenurial complex which has discrete territorial identity (Table 9.2). The assessment of
this estate complex at almost exactly 48 carucates suggests another primary hundredal entity which, on topographical grounds, was probably originally attached to Framland wapentake. A tenurial indication of this is to be found in the Domesday fee of Geoffrey de la Guerche whose lands form a cohesive group in western Framland with most of his other holdings in the area deriving from the Thurcaston exchange, including Withcote, a vill detached from Framland. Geoffrey’s primary fief probably descended from Leofwine and his son Leofric suggesting a pre-Conquest tenurial unity for the Pickwell group which mirrored the hundredal framework.

The hypothesis of a primary Pickwell hundred in Framland does not affect the original fiscal symmetry of the wapentake as reconstructed by Slade (1956:78-9). Slade argued that the assessment of Cold Overton hundred was 48 carucates, a rating required to make up his
TABLE 9.4 PROPOSED ORIGINAL ‘TWYFORD HUNDRED’: GOSCOTE WAPENTAKE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMESDAY</th>
<th>c.1130 SURVEY</th>
<th>Original Quota*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twford and King soke of Rothley</td>
<td>4c 2v Kings soke</td>
<td>5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Satchville Hugh Grandmesnil</td>
<td>2c &quot;of which&quot; Grimbald David King</td>
<td>[2v]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;of which&quot; King David</td>
<td>[1c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard de Rollos</td>
<td>8c 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry de Ferrers</td>
<td>8c 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6c 2v</strong></td>
<td><strong>22c 3v</strong> 24c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowesby Countess Judith</td>
<td>9c King David</td>
<td>12c 12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Newton Geoffrey de la Guerche</td>
<td>6c Roger de Mowbray</td>
<td>8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert King's sgt. 2v Walter de Beauchamp</td>
<td>4c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert King's sgt. 3c</td>
<td>12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9c 2v</strong></td>
<td><strong>12c</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25c</strong></td>
<td><strong>46c 3v</strong> 48c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[48c 1v]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessments in parenthesis substitute "and" for "of which" in the c.1130 Survey

---

proposed original wapentake quota of 576 carucates (*ibid.*:50). However, Cold Overton (meaning the 'higher farmstead') is a township which seems more topographically a part of Knossington and had no tenurial links with the Pickwell complex. In Domesday, Cold Overton formed a single manor held from the King which could have recently been detached from the royal holding of Knossington. If Cold Overton hundred was a late fiscal creation following an inter-wapentake land transfer, the loss of Pickwell and Leesthorpe (14 or 15 carucates) from Framland wapentake could have been compensated by the gain to Framland of Cold Overton and the isolated 'island' of Withcote (12 + 3 carucates).

Following the example of the reconstituted 'Pickwell' and Loddington hundreds, the hundredal pattern of the eastern projection of Goscombe wapentake separating the suggested original bounds of Gartree and Framland can be reconstructed into three 48 carucate hundreds. The first is a primary Knossington hundred which includes the ancient parish of Tilton, including Whatborough's sokeland 'in Burgo', a lost hamlet in an adjoining area of Laund in Loddington parish, the parishes of Owston and Withcote together with Knossington and Cold Overton (Hoskins 1950:95-6; Hutchings 1989). This fiscal entity, therefore, combines the c.1130
Survey’s Knossington hundred, (less the detached Baggrave and Pickwell and Leesthorpe), Tilton hundred (less Cold Newton and Lowesby), together with Cold Overton. This reconstructed fiscal entity is assessed at very close to 48 carucates in Domesday and the Survey (Table 9.3).

This would suggest that the Tilton hundred of the Survey (36c 5b) was a new fiscal creation following the exchange of the greater part of Knossington hundred to Gartree. Thus it seems probable that Cold Newton and Lowesby (recorded in Tilton hundred in c.1130) along with Twyford and Thorpe Satchville (attached to Loddington hundred in c.1130) form another, topographically discrete, primary hundredal entity (Table 9.4). Twyford, being the highest assessed vill of this grouping, is the likely name for this proposed dismembered hundred. In the c.1130 Survey, Twyford is assessed at 22c 3v suggesting that the Domesday rating of 6c 2v is a case of an omission. However, as it stands, the Survey assessment is unusual. If "and" replaces "of which" the total assessment for the first group holdings of the Survey is the same as the Domesday quota while the second group appears to be the equal division of what was once an eighteen carucate assessment area (Slade 1956:36). This points to an original standard duodecimal assessment of 24 carucates for Twyford and Thorpe Satchville which, with Cold Newton and Lowesby, would make up a total assessment of 48 carucates.
TABLE 9.6 PROPOSED ORIGINAL HUNDREDAL GROUPINGS IN CENTRAL EASTERN LEICESTHERHIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOSCOTE WAPENTAKE</th>
<th>FRAMLAND WAPENTAKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN GROUP:</td>
<td>SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY</td>
<td>SOURTHEN GROUP:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knossington Hundred</td>
<td>47c 2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twyford Hundred</td>
<td>46c 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Dalby Hundred</td>
<td>48c 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143c 1b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes possible 1c duplication

The third proposed primary hundredal entity in the eastern extension of Goscote comprises the Great Dalby hundred of the Survey. The assessment of 48c 7b again points to an original 48 carucate small hundred (Slade 1956:17,42). The Domesday and Survey assessments are compared in Table 9.5. Great Dalby township is detached from the rest of the hundred by Kirby Bellars in Framland but otherwise it forms a coherent group along the boundary of that wapentake.

In summary, the reconstituted hundredal framework shows the prevalence of a 48 carucate hundred in this part of Leicestershire and the larger groupings of 144 carucates is probably significant (Table 9.6). The conclusion must be that land exchanges and the resulting disruption to an earlier logical pattern of uniform fiscal hundreds offers the most reasonable explanation for the detached and confused wapentake structure recorded in Domesday and the c.1130 Survey. The inclusion into Gartree of Loddington hundred from Goscote wapentake, less the detached area of Twyford and Thorpe Satchville, has been argued on the grounds of land exchange and topography. However, it is the fiscal symmetry of the reconstituted hundredal pattern of Gartree which provides the weightiest arguments for the inclusion of Loddington. This is based on the fair assumption that Gartree's original hundredal system was based on 48 carucate groupings and it is around the documented Langton and Kibworth and the revised Loddington hundreds that the original fiscal plan for Gartree wapentake can now be reconstituted.
9.3 LANGTON HUNDRED AND GARTREE WAPENTAKE

It is proposed here that Gartree wapentake was originally assessed at 576 carucates quartered into four 144 carucate assessment groupings each consisting of three small hundredal units. These naturally form into an Eastern, Central, Southern and Northern Group. These are discussed below along with some of the more problematical points of this reconstruction.

i) Eastern Group of Small Hundreds

This fiscal grouping takes in all of the land east of the Lipping (Table 9.7). The proposed Medbourne hundred consists of eleven townships each assessed at six or less carucates. Stockerston has often been confused, most recently by Roffe, with Hugh de Grandmesnil's 28 carucate estate at Stoughton (Northern Group) which had descended from the comital holding of Earl Ralph (Roffe: forthcoming). Previous Domesday translations have presumably identified Stockton with Stockerston because vills adjoining Stockerston (Great Easton, Bringhurst and Presgrave) had been granted by Earl Ralph to Peterborough Abbey (Mellows 1980:36; Morgan 1979:5,2; 13,15; Williams and Erskine 1990). The three carucate Domesday holding of Robert de Bucy, held of the Countess Judith, is, then, almost certainly the only Domesday holding in Stockerston whose assessment was still three carucates in 1279 (VCH Leics v:305).

Holyoaks was formerly a chapelry of Stoke Dry in Rutland and part of a pre-Conquest estate centred on Lyddington, but Holyoaks' carucated assessment under the Gartree wapentake head shows its association with Rutland to be a late Saxon tenural feature as the logic of topography demands (contra. Bourne 1986:16). Holyoaks' three carucate Domesday assessment is also repeated in 1279 (VCH Leics v:303,306). The twelve carucate assessment of Great Easton probably includes three carucates each for Drayton and Bringhurst which together formed the ancient parish of Bringhurst (VCH Leics v:49). Holt goes unnoticed in Domesday and its three carucate rating is taken from the 1279 Hundred Roll (ibid.:244). There are difficulties with the assessments of Presgrave and it is possible that the excess of 1c 2v over a round 48 carucates for the Medbourne Group can be accounted for by some duplications in the assessment total around this lost vill (Slade 1956:32).

The proposed Welham hundred forms a topographically discrete unit, stretching from the northern watershed boundary of the wapentake in Billesdon down to the River Welland, with its
TABLE 9.7 EASTERN GROUP OF SMALL HUNDREDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LODDINGTON HUNDRED</th>
<th>Medbourne Hundred</th>
<th>Welham Hundred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loddington</td>
<td>12c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeffington</td>
<td>12c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tugby</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Norton</td>
<td>12c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allextone</td>
<td>6c, 48c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1279 rating

western boundary following the course of the Lipping. The reconstructed hundred can be divided into two groups of vills: first, Billesdon and its chapellies of Rolleston and Goadby, held, along with Keythorpe and Hallaton, by Toki with sake and soke on the eve of the Conquest; and second, Welham, Stonton, Glooston and Cranoe which on tenurial, topographical and ecclesiastical grounds also formed part of coherent pre-Conquest estate complex. Thus the spoke-like configuration of the parish boundaries on Langton Caudle, the reference in the matriculus of 1220 to the church of Welham receiving the mortuaries of the churches of Glooston and Cranoe, and the fact that the Domesday fee of the countess Judith had probably descended from her husband Earl Waltheof, all point to a pre-Conquest comital estate complex (Cain 1990:18-9; Nichols 1798:866; VCH Leics v:334). The Domesday assessment total for the proposed Welham hundred is exactly 48 carucates although later assessments for some of the vills are at variance with their Domesday quota.
ii) Southern Group of Small Hundreds

The Southern Group forms a coherent group of townships along the River Welland (Table 9.8). The reconstituted Great Bowden hundred is headed by Great Bowden, the royal soke centre in Domesday. Great Bowden's low 12c 2v assessment relative to its acreage can possibly be explained by tax exemption: there were said to be eighteen carucates of land in the fields of Great Bowden in the 17th century (Stocks and Bragg 1926:320). For Theddingworth a two carucate estate recorded in the c.1130 Survey, but which cannot be traced in Domesday, has been added to the 16c 1v assessment of 1086 (Slade 1956:27,35). A tenurial association between Theddingworth and Great Bowden is supplied by the two carucates of sokeland, held by William Lovett, which pertained to the royal manor.

The reconstituted Saddington fiscal complex forms another coherent territorial unit. The proposed hundred is likely to have been headed by the royal manor at Saddington which was assessed at one hide less one carucate in Domesday. At eighteen carucates to the hide this would give Saddington a seventeen carucate rating. However, the suggestion of Hughes that the Saddington hide was 14c 2v as stated in the Domesday folio for Melton Mowbray may well be correct on grounds of a possible open-field size of 54 yardlands, and the fact that, when Saddington's proposed assessment is added to the adjoining vills of Gumley, Foxton and Smeeton Westerby, the result is a fiscal unit of 48 carucates (Hughes 1968:21). Smeeton Westerby, although part of the parish of Kibworth, was very probably tied to this unit for fiscal purposes because of its exclusion from the complete Kibworth Hundred recorded in the c.1130 Survey. The Domesday assessment of 9c lb for Smeeton Westerby is increased to 12c lb in the c.1130 Survey, but the manuscript is damaged after the last four carucate entry and it is possible that it could have read "minus one bovate" to give a standard twelve carucate assessment (Slade 1956:34).

The proposed Husbands Bosworth hundred includes the three remaining vills in the south-east corner of Gartree - Husbands Bosworth, Moseley and Laughton. Husbands Bosworth was divided into five holdings in Domesday with a total assessment of 25 carucates, with four holdings totalling 23 carucates in the c.1130 Survey (Slade 1956:23,33). An an original rating of 24 carucates is indicated by Bosworth's open-field size of 96 yardlands recorded at enclosure in 1764 (Nichols 1798:464). Moseley is assessed at seven carucates in Domesday but at twelve...
TABLE 9.8 SOUTHERN GROUP OF SMALL HUNDREDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Bowden Hundred:</th>
<th>Bosworth Hundred:</th>
<th>Saddington Hundred:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Bowden</td>
<td>Husbands Bosworth</td>
<td>Saddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c 2v</td>
<td>24c</td>
<td>13c 2v#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubenham</td>
<td>Moseley</td>
<td>Smeeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c</td>
<td>12c*</td>
<td>12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theddingworth</td>
<td>Laughton</td>
<td>Gumley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c 1v</td>
<td>12c*</td>
<td>13c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47c 3v</td>
<td>48c</td>
<td>Foxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9c 2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on later evidence. #Assumes a 14.5c hide.

carucates in 1279 which is likely to be the original carucated quota (VCH Leics v:250). Laughton’s low two-carucate rating is very probably a Domesday omission; a twelve-carucate assessment is indicated by its 1279 rating and open-field size of 48 yardlands in 1663 (ibid.:214-16). Thus the suggested original assessment of the proposed hundredal unit is again 48 carucates.

One problem with this area, however, concerns the Domesday Lestone which is usually identified as Thurlaston in Guthlaxton wapentake but which seems corresponds to the Leytona of the c.1130 Survey where it is placed in the paragraph headed by Husbands Bosworth without a hundredal heading (Slade 1956:23,33). The spacing of the Domesday Book suggests that Thorn is correct to restore the Gartree wapentake head above Lestone (Thorn 1990:25n.6). The fact that Leytona is placed with Husbands Bosworth makes it possible that both were part of the same hundred. If the low Domesday ratings of Moseley and Laughton are the result of a geld exemption rather than a Domesday omission, then the addition of Leytona would be give a 46 carucates. However, a restoration of Moseley and Laughton to an original round-figure twelve carucate assessment is perhaps the most reasonable reconstruction for the Southern Group of vills. This leaves the possibility that the Domesday Lestone, if it is not as Thorn suggests a lost place within the main body of Gartree wapentake, formed a detached portion of the wapentake attached to a another hundredal unit (ibid). This conjecture is discussed further under the Northern Group of vills.
TABLE 9.9 CENRAL GROUP OF SMALL HUNDREDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGTON HUNDRED:</th>
<th>KIBWORTH HUNDRED:</th>
<th>Great Glen Hundred:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Langton</td>
<td>24c</td>
<td>Great Glen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>12c</td>
<td>Wistow 3c 2v*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangton</td>
<td>48c</td>
<td>Newton Harcourt 10c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIBWORTH HUNDRED:</td>
<td>Burton Overy 12c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wistow</td>
<td>7c 2v*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Glen</td>
<td>17c 1v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wistow</td>
<td>7c 2v*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleckney</td>
<td>12c 48c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1279 rating

iii) Central Group of Small Hundreds

This central group includes the Langton and Kibworth hundreds of the c.1130 Survey (Table 9.9). The map suggests that a third hundred, probably based on Great Glen, was attached to Langton and Kibworth to make up a 144 carucate group. There are, however, complications with the Great Glen unit and the total Domesday assessment of 43c 7b cannot be accepted as it stands. Wistow, a small villa of about 910 acres, was assessed at 12c 5b in Domesday and 7c 2v in 1279 (VCH Leics v:336,338). The large Domesday assessment probably included a portion of a surrounding villa and Fleckney, a chapelry of Wistow church and assessed at only four carucates in Domesday, is the most likely candidate. Fleckney was assessed at twelve carucates in c.1130, a rating compatible with the open-field size of 47.5 yardlands recorded at enclosure in 1769 (Nichols 1798:876; Slade 1956:33-4). If the 1279 rating for Wistow and the c.1130 rating for Fleckney are used, the 'hundredal' assessment total is 46c 3v, close enough to 48 carucates to make it reasonable to suggest that this was the original quota (Table 9.10). If so, and accepting that irregular assessments of odd virgates or bovates are unlikely in the original fiscal scheme, the primary ratings could have been: Great Glen eighteen carucates, Wistow eight carucates and Fleckney twelve carucates, possibly making another eighteen carucate entity, and Newton Harcourt ten carucates, to form a standard 48 carucate unit.

iv) Northern Group of Small Hundreds

The Northern Group (Table 9.11) provides the greatest difficulties in reconciling the Domesday and the c.1130 Survey assessments with a reconstituted hundredal system (Slade 1956:23-4,27,33-5). One problem centres on the assessments for Stoughton. Stoughton, commonly been confused with Stockerston (Eastern Group), had descended to Hugh de
TABLE 9.10 PROPOSED ORIGINAL 'GREAT GLEN' HUNDRED IN GARTREE WAPENTAKE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMESDAY ASSESSMENTS</th>
<th>AMENDED ASSESSMENTS</th>
<th>Original quota?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Glen</td>
<td>Great Glen</td>
<td>17c v 18c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wistow</td>
<td>Wistow</td>
<td>12c 5b 8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Harcourt</td>
<td>Newton Harcourt</td>
<td>10c 10c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleckney</td>
<td>Fleckney</td>
<td>4c 12c*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43c 7b 46c 3v 48c

The Domesday entry for the Grandmesnil holding states that: "the same man holds Stoughton. There are 28 carucates of land", a formula suggesting that lands in other vills pertained to the manor. This multi-vill assessment probably included Bushby and Thumby, the latter being the mother church of the estate complex. In 1279, both Thumby and Bushby consisted of six carucates of land with ten carucates in Stoughton, a total of 22 carucates (VCH Leics v:323,328). It is possible that a Domesday rating of 28 carucates included parts of other vills but it is difficult to see which these could be although the six carucate difference between 22 and 28 carucates might be significant given that this is a standard township assessment.

Problems are also encountered with the assessment for Great and Little Stretton. For Great Stretton, although an ecclesiastical dependency of Great Glen, the evidence of topography, fiscal administration and its shared place-name suggest that it should be linked with Little Stretton. It is also significant that the open-fields of Great Stretton were partly intermixed with those of Little Stretton and the 703 acres in Great Stretton and 704 acres in Little Stretton point certainly point to an equal division of a primary land unit (VCH Leics v:110). The Strettons singularly rated at nine carucates in Domesday as part of the soke of Bowden and it is possible that they were combined with Stoughton and Evington to make up a hundredal unit.

There are, however, more serious complications with the what has been called here the King's Norton complex of vills comprising King' Norton, Galby and Frisby. The logic of topography strongly suggests that King Norton ( c.900 acres), Galby (960 acres) and Frisby (963 acres) are...
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**TABLE 9.11 NORTHERN GROUP OF SMALL HUNDREDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King's Norton Hundred</th>
<th>Stoughton Hundred</th>
<th>Houghton Hundred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King's Norton Complex</td>
<td>24c 3v</td>
<td>Houghton 9c [12c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illston-on-the-Hill</td>
<td>12c</td>
<td>Ingarsby 12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noseley</td>
<td>12c</td>
<td>Scraptoft 12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>48c 3v</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>48c 2v</strong></td>
<td><strong>33c</strong> [36c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>+ Lestone</strong></td>
<td><strong>45c</strong> [48c*]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes a 12c assessment for Houghton-on-the-Hill

the product of a linear division of a primary land unit into almost equal shares. Ecclesiastical ties also point to a tenurial link between these vills: Frisby was a chapel in the ancient parish of Galby; King's Norton was probably formerly attached to Galby church since Owston Abbey is recorded as paying a yearly pension to the rector of Galby when its appropriation of King's Norton church was confirmed in 1340 although the advowson had been confirmed before 1167 (VCH Leics.v: 100,259). The position of the village of King's Norton close to the parish boundary with Galby also seems to confirm a former ecclesiastical and tenurial unity for this group of vills.

There are, however, complications with the assessments for the proposed King's Norton complex (Table 9.12). The Survey's 20c 1v rating for Frisby is certainly too high and the 36c 3v assessment for King's Norton and Frisby cannot be easily accepted. For Frisby a Domesday omission of four carucates seems probable since Frisby was assessed at six carucates in 1279 which accords with the c.1130 rating. Slade suggested that the Basset holding of three carucates could be a scribal error for three virgates resulting in one untraceable assessment of 12 carucates, possibly to be identified with Noseley, held by Hugh de Grandmesnil in 1086 (Slade 1956:34-5). This might well be correct but it is also noticeable that a reduction of twelve carucates would bring the c.1130 assessment total of 24c 3v to within one carucate of the revised Domesday assessment of 23c 3v. It is also noticeable that a reduction of 12 carucates would bring the c.1130 assessment of 24c 3v to within one carucate of the revised Domesday rating of 23c 3v thus pointing to an original 24 carucate unit. The King's Norton complex (24 carucates), Noseley (twelve carucates), and Illston-on-the-Hill (11c 3v in Domesday but twelve carucates in the c.1130 Survey) have been combined here in a putative hundedar entity.
### TABLE 9.12 THE KING’S NORTON, GALBY AND FRISBY FISCAL COMPLEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOMESDAY</th>
<th>c.1130 SURVEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King’s Norton</td>
<td>King soke of Bowden 3c</td>
<td>King’s soke of Bowden 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galby</td>
<td>King soke of Bowden 1c 2v</td>
<td>King’s soke 1c 2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh de Grandmenil</td>
<td>13c 1v</td>
<td>Earl of Leicester 10c 2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Basset 1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17c 3v</td>
<td>16c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisby</td>
<td>Hugh de Granmesnil 2c</td>
<td>Earl of Leicester 6c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Earl of Leicester 11c 1v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Basset 3c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c</td>
<td>20c 1v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19c 3v</td>
<td>36c 3v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible corrections:

- **Frisby:** Domesday omission +4c
- **Frisby:** inclusion of Noseley -12c
- **Frisby:** -23c 3v

The remaining proposed hundredal unit within this Northern Group comprised Houghton, Ingsarby and Scraptoft. The total Domesday rating is 33 carucates but is conceivable that, for purposes of fiscal symmetry, Houghton was assessed at twelve carucates rather than the Domesday nine. One can point many similar changes in assessments between those recorded in Domesday and the c.1130 Survey at, for example, Shangton, East Norton, Lowesby, Cold Newton, Dalby on the Wolds, Humberstone and Belgrave. If twelve carucates is taken to be the original carucated rating for Houghton then one more twelve carucate assessment is needed to make a standard 48 carucate hundred and this might be found in the Domesday Lestone and Leytona of the c.1130 Survey discussed under the Southern Group. Whether or not Lestone was attached to the a putative Houghton hundred its inclusion in the Northern Group would bring the total rating in line with the proposed quota of 144 carucates.

This reconstructed fiscal structure of Gartree would leave Lestone, if correctly identified as Thurlaston, as the only vill detached from the main body of the wapentake. It is perhaps significant, therefore, that the boundary of the royal Forest of Leicester in 1628 included the northern part of Thurlaston (Fox and Russell 1948). In Domesday, this woodland was described.
TABLE 9.13 GARTREE WAPENTAKE SMALL HUNDRED GROUPINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern Group</th>
<th>Central Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LODDINGTON HUNDRED 48c</td>
<td>LANGTON HUNDRED 48c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medbourne Hundred 49c 2v</td>
<td>KIBWORTH HUNDRED 48c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welham Hundred 48c</td>
<td>Great Glen Hundred 46c 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145c 2v</td>
<td>142 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Group</td>
<td>Northern Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bowden Hundred 47c 3v</td>
<td>King's Norton Hundred 48c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddington Hundred 48c</td>
<td>Stoughton Hundred 48c 2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosworth Hundred 48c</td>
<td>Houghton Hundred 33c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143c 3v</td>
<td>129c 2v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lestone (Thurlaston?)</td>
<td>12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141c 2v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: hundreds recorded in the c.1130 Survey are shown in upper case.

as the Hereswode, (meaning "wood of the army"), and "the woodland of the whole sheriffdom", possibly suggesting an origin from the time of the Danish occupation. Gartree wapentake, unlike Guthlaxton and Goscote, is some distance from the shire wood and Thurlaston location on the southern fringes of the Forest would have given the wapentake direct access to this woodland resource. It is even possible to conjecture that the proximity of Thurlaston to the Mercian royal estate at Croft could point to a pre-10th century grant linking a regio based in south-east Leicestershire with 'Leicester Forest'.

Aside from this speculation over the location of Lestone, the important conclusion to be drawn from the proposed hundredal reconstruction is that is that the original fiscal and geographical configuration of Gartree formed a coherent unit planned to a particular duodecimal fiscal scheme. It must be admitted that without documentation it is impossible to prove the existence of any hundredal unit. However, although other combinations of vill are possible this would not alter the conclusion regarding the basic fiscal organisation of the wapentake in its original form.

The results point to a total wapentake assessment of 576 carucate, divided into 12 small hundreds and quartered into 144 carucate groups. Table 9.13 and Figure 16 show the proposed original structure.
Figure 16: Proposed 'Original' Gartree Wapentake and Small Hundred Groupings
There are, of course, a number of difficulties with the assessments which allow differing interpretations of the totals but the proposed hundredal system has the merit of topographical integrity and, it is contended, the most reasonable interpretation of the fiscal record. The Domesday assessments, for example, of Langton hundred (44c 1v), Kibworth hundred (47c 2v) and Loddington hundred (45c 1v) are closely comparable to the reconstituted ones using the Domesday ratings, and it is remarkable how close these figures confirm the 48 carucate unit as the basic hundredal assessment for the wapentake. It is probable that the Survey assessments should be seen as more often than not as the original carucated quotas. Slade's view that "all evidence points to the suggestion that the Survey figures are more carefully assembled than those of Domesday, and are nearer to what may be called the 'original' figures" finds, therefore, some confirmation from this investigation (Slade 1956:97).

In respect of its activities Gartree wapentake was no different to its administrative counterparts elsewhere in England. Moreover, the constituent twelve small hundreds appear to be the Anglo-Danish equivalent of the tithings or administrative subdivisions of the 'English' hundred. These have often been assumed to be groupings of ten men but it is far more probable that the late Anglo-Saxon tithing referred to policing districts which were literally a tenth part of a hundred (Warren 1987:40). The duties of Langton hundred within the administrative superstructure of wapentake and shire can, therefore, be identified as the basic unit for the collection of geld, as the institution which represented the local community in matters which touched their interests and, above all else, a focus for the maintenance of law and order and possibly military obligations (Roffe 1992:33). This policing institution was clearly still a fundamental element in shrieval administration in the early 12th century when the lands of Richard Basset, at the point or just before he assumed the office as sheriff of Leicestershire in c.1130, were collated under an hundredal framework (Green 1986:231-2; Slade 1956:12). As ville integre in a 1274-1307 list published in Nichols the Leicestershire small hundred survived in truncated form well into the 13th century (Nichols 1815:xlvi; Wake 1926).

It might be concluded that the fiscal and institutional structures of Anglo-Danish Leicestershire were far removed from the agrarian reality of an assessment of cultivated land. Nevertheless, as we have argued, the fiscal carucate does generally conform to the facts of economic geography. This can be clearly illustrated by the differences in the size of the hundredal groups shown in Fig.16. Thus the course of the Lipping and then the high Welland-Soar watershed which
respectively form the western boundary of the Easton Group of hundreds in Gartree and the proposed original Knossington hundred in Goscote wapentake, appears to mark a division of the south-east Leicestershire countryside. To the east of this boundary the relatively large geographically size of the hundredal units and high acreage per carucate can be explained by the presence of non-assessed wood-pasture as is suggested by the Domesday record of woodland and the areas later to be inclusion in the royal Forest of Leicestershire and Rutland; to its west lies a countryside dominated by more arable intensive townships with little or no recorded woodland and a corresponding smaller carucate-acreage ratio.

9.4 CARUCATES, HIDES AND THE 'LONG' HUNDRED

The duodecimal character of the assessment of Gartree wapentake is obvious, but as yet no one has been able to pronounce on the system itself. However, it is likely that the proposed fiscal symmetry of the system was connected with the imposition of fines, taxes and possibly military obligations. If so, behind the institutional superstructure we should expect not only a close connection between the monetary and fiscal system, but also one between public dues and obligations and the organisation of the land. This hypothesis suggests that fiscal organisation and land division were inextricably linked and that the roots of this relationship could lie in a pre-10th century context when hidage assessments were first imposed on land units. An even earlier thread of fiscal and administrative continuity with the land tax or tributum of the late Roman Empire has been mooted by some scholars, but this type of long-term continuity is even more difficult to demonstrate (Finberg 1964:8-9).

For the Anglo-Danish period of the 10th and 11th centuries, Stenton noticed long ago how manorial values in the northern Danelaw were predominantly based on the units of £8 or its multiple (Stenton 1910:33-4). His explanation for this turns upon the Danish ora of 16 silver pennies and the long hundred of 120 orae - the 'hundred of silver' and the £8 fines common until the early 12th century (Stenton 1927:158-9; 1971:510). At 240 pennies to the pound, a 'long hundred' of silver orae equals 120x16d.=1920d.=£8. The long hundred of 120 silver orae is probably referred to in the Wantage Code of King AEthelred (c.991-1008), dealing with the peaceful conduct of the courts of the Five Boroughs (EHD I.403; Hart 1992:20-2). The Codes state that the peace given by the ealdorman and the King's reeve at the meeting of the Five
Boroughs is to be atoned for by twelve hundreds, that given by one borough by six hundreds, the wapentake by one hundred, and in the alehouse, if a man is killed, with six marks (£2) but if no one is killed with twelve ores (80 pence or half a mark). Domesday references to the shire customs of Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, Lincolnshire and Yorkshire give similar details concerning the King's peace which were probably based on that of the Wantage Code. These state that breach of the King's peace is to be atoned (fined) by eighteen hundreds, of which twelve are atoned to the king and six to the earl, and that each hundred is to pay £8 (DB I:280v; 336b).

One possible implication of these observations is that the origin of the term *hundredum* used for territorial entities such as Langton hundred, is to be connected with the £8 fines (or 120 ores) imposed for the maintenance of law and order. This much has already been proposed for the twelve carucate hundreds of Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire and for the northern Danelaw in general (Hart 1992:22-3,288; Roffe 1981:33; 1990:18; 1992:33; Round 1896:68-9). A fiscal logic for Gartree wapentake based on an £8 fine imposed on each 48 carucate hundred could then have worked as follows:-

1 carucate renders 40 pence and each virgate 10d
2 carucates renders 80 pence or half a mark
12 carucate renders £2
144 carucate group renders 3x£8 = £24
576 carucates renders 4x£24 or 12x£8 = £96

In this hypothetical fiscal scheme, Gartree wapentake would have rendered £96 or twelve 'hundreds of silver'. That the term hundred was used for reckoning this amount is shown by a late 10th century anonymous writer recording a gift of "twelve hundreds" in 933 but rendered as "£96 of silver" in the early 12th century (Stenton 1927:159n.2).

A further conjecture, although perhaps only coincidental, is a connection between this putative system of levying fines in Leicestershire and a Domesday passage relating to military obligations in Berkshire: "If the king sent an army anywhere, only one soldier went from five hides, and four shillings were given for his subsistence of wages from each hide for two months. The money, indeed, was not sent to the king, but was given to the soldiers" (DB I:56b; Hollister 1962:38). Thus the payment for supporting a warrior-representative would have been 48 pence (4x12d.) from each hide and £1 (20 shillings) from five hides. Hollister considered this
recruitment principle to be universal in the hidated areas of England and, by analogy, pointed to the possibility of a similar six-carucate rule in the northern Danelaw (Hollister 1962:38-53). If we accept that carucation was a twenty per cent revaluation of Mercian hides, the Berkshire military levy is the equivalent to an £8 fine levied on a 48 carucate hundred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£8 fine on a 48 carucate Hundred:</th>
<th>£1 military levy on 5 hides:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 carucate renders 40d.</td>
<td>1 hide renders 48d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 carucates renders £1</td>
<td>5 hides renders £1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 carucates renders £8</td>
<td>40 hides renders £8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 carucates renders £24</td>
<td>120 hides renders £24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is open to question whether a five hide recruitment system also related to other shires or was merely impressed on Berkshire (Abels 1988:108-112). But if the above analysis is correct it would suggest a military significance for the Leicestershire hundredal system. Although this is highly speculative, a possible correspondence between Danelaw fines and a military levy based on the groupings of five hides is worth noting if only to show that the differences between hidated and carucated areas are probably more apparent than real.

The pre-Conquest fiscal and institutional organisation of Leicestershire as a whole as yet to be worked out in detail and hitherto little more than estimations of the total tax liability has been attempted (Holly 1971:327-8). Some duodecimal multiples might be instructive for future research:

- $4 \times 12c = 48c$ hundred; $3 \times 48c = 144c$ assessment group; $4 \times 144c = 576c$ wapentake.
- $18 \times 144c = 2592c$; $54 \times 48c = 2592c$ (2160 hides?) = possible total shire assessment

This shire total is close Cain's calculation of 2604 carucates (Cain 1992:11). However, Stenton's estimate for Guthlaxton (775 carucates) and Goscote (771 carucates) suggests that, as Thorn also observes, both were one third larger than Gartree and Framland (Stenton 1907b:342-3; Thorn 1990b:30n.1). On this reckoning a logical original shire total would be $576c + 576c + 768c + 768c = 2688$ carucates (2240 hides?). More work clearly needs to be done to test if any of these proposed fiscal totals have any validity.

What is suggested here, however, is that the key to understanding Leicestershire's duodecimal cadastre lies with the reconstructed hidages. If carucation was a twenty per cent revaluation of the Mercian hideage, then a 144 carucate grouping would be the equivalent of a 'long hundred' of 120 hides. This hypothesis suggests that wapentake and shire, institutions of local government
for the organisation of judicial and administration business, were planned around a schematic mapping of fiscal units which were, at their inception, groupings of 120 hides. This suggestion is contentious but, nevertheless, provides a basic logic of the Anglo-Danish fiscal system in Leicestershire. Thus, on this reasoning, the original fiscal structure of Gartree and Framland wapentake would have been 480 hides quartered into assessment groupings of 120 hides. Carucation would follow or coincide because the Anglo-Danish monetary system was based on the duodecimal ore and mark. Scandinavian influence is the probable source of octonal and duodecimal reckoning but they could also have re-enforced existing traditions of counting (Sheppard 1974:120; Loy 1962:132).

The practice of counting 120 as 100 is alluded to in the Lincolnshire Domesday when enumerating messuages in Lincoln stating that the "number is reckoned according to the English method, 100 counting for 120" (DB I:336a). The 'long hundred' or Angelicus numerus was seen by Round as a system which particularly "prevailed in the 'Danish' districts" but he dismissed suggestions of reckoning 120 as 144 "by the English number" (Round 1895:66n,133,67). This difficult area needs further study but the following related topics are briefly considered here: (1) the relationship, if any, of the long hundred of 120-hides with the cadestre of other northern Danelaw shires; (2) the possibility that the 120-hide grouping was connected with Mercian administration; and (3) the monetary and social significance of the 'long hundred'.

By comparison with Leicestershire, the low carucation of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire must have represented a considerable reduction on the original Mercian hides. Examination of the township assessments suggests a possible 80 per cent reduction of the Mercian hidage. If this is correct, the common ratings of one, two, three and four carucates represent an original five, ten, fifteen and twenty hides. An 80 per cent assessment reduction is also pointed to by examples such as East Drayton in Nottinghamshire where the irregular Domesday rating of 2c 3b and the fifth part of 1 bovate works out at an original twelve hides. Similarly, the grant of ten mansae of AD966 at Parwich, Derbyshire suggests a similar relationship with the Domesday assessment of two carucates (ECNENM:No.107; S 739). The logic of the restored hidages is perfectly illustrated by the split-township of Nether Broughton (Leicestershire) and Upper Broughton (Nottinghamshire) assessed respectively at twelve carucates and two carucates in Domesday. The original assessment for both Broughtons was evidently ten hides each making the undivided Broughton a typical Mercian estate of twenty hides.
TABLE 9.14 A PROPOSED MERCIAN HIDE AND ANGLO-DANISH CARUCATE RELATIONSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gartree and Framland Wapentake:</th>
<th>Nottingham and Derbyshire:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 20% revaluation of Mercian hides</td>
<td>an 80% devaluation of Mercian hides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12c = 10h</td>
<td>2c = 10h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144c = 120h</td>
<td>24c = 120h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144c x 4 = 576c</td>
<td>24c x 4 = 96c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576c = 480h (wapentake total)</td>
<td>96c = 480h (wapentake total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576c x 6 = 3456c</td>
<td>96c x 6 = 576c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576c = 2880h (shire total)</td>
<td>576c = 2880h (shire total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c = carucates; h = hides

Thom has reasonably suggested that the original total carucation of Nottinghamshire was 576 carucates divided into six wapentakes of 96 carucates (Thom 1990c:38). It is also possible that six wapentakes of 96 carucates was the basis of Derbyshire’s carucation rather than Roffe’s postulated 84 carucate wapentake with seven small hundreds in each (Roffe 1986:109-10; 1990a:15-17; 1990b:18-19; Thorn 1990a:36). It is remarkable how a shire assessment of 576 carucates would equate with the reconstructed assessments of Gartree and Framland wapentake in Leicestershire. A possible explanation lies in the proposed hide-carucate relationship for the respective shires summarised (Table 9.14). A 96 carucate wapentake in Nottinghamshire would make an original 480 hides (5x96) the same as the reconstructed hidage of Gartree and Framland (576 carucates each). The Leicestershire wapentakes would, on this reckoning, have been assessed at 96 carucates if they were part of Nottinghamshire in 1086. It may also be observed that a 96 carucate wapentake in Nottinghamshire would consist of a multiple of four 24 carucates, the equivalent of the 144 carucate groups or possible ‘long hundreds’ of 120 hides in Leicestershire.

A large degree of long-term quantitative stability of the underlying fiscal assessments is implied if carucation was achieved by using a standard formula such as a 20 per cent increase or 80 per cent reduction of the Mercian hidage. The carucated totals must be inextricably linked to the institution of the wapentake which first appears in King Edgar’s fourth code of AD962-3 and again in the AEthelred’s Wantage code where it appears as a fundamental unit of justice in the territory of the Five Boroughs (EHD I.397-405). However, if the wapentake system of
Leicestershire was based assessment groupings of 144 carucates or possibly the 'long hundred' of 120 hides this should not presuppose that the underlying structures were wholly a creation of a new administrative nexus or one that was uniquely confined to the territory of the Five Boroughs.

It might be instructive, therefore, to compare the assessments of the hidated shires of Stafford and Warwick in the Mercian heartland. The Domesday hundredal assessments for Warwickshire, as produced by Thorn, assigns Brinklow 117 hides, Ferncombe 182 hides, Marton 176 hides, Tremlow 129 hides, Stoneleigh 113 hides and Coleshill 183 hides, all compatible with system based on 'long' hundreds (Thorn 1991b:25). It is also of interest to note Thorn’s suggestion that the Domesday total of about 513 hides and 26 carucates for Staffordshire "actually disguises a county of 540 hides and originally containing, in reality, four and a half hundreds: Cuttlestone and Offlow each 'long' hundreds of 120 hides, Totmonslow and Pirehill also perhaps once a long hundred of 120 hides, and Seisdon a long hundred and a half of 180 hides" (Thorn 1991a:27). However, this conclusion must be tempered by the possibility that Staffordshire’s assessment had been drastically reduced (Gelling 1992:194-6). Staffordshire and Warwickshire are late administrative creations with the shire boundary running through the middle of Tamworth, the capital of the Mercian kingdom. The *burh* of Warwick is assigned 2400 hides (corrected from 2404) in the Burghal Hidage, probably dating from AD914-919, but 1200 hides in the County Hidage and about 1310 hides in Domesday (Maitland 1898: 505; Thorn 1991b:23,n.7). It is possible that Staffordshire, Warwickshire and perhaps the western part of Leicestershire were all part of the Burghal Hidage total of 2400 hides which could then represent an artificial grouping of twenty 'long hundreds' (Thorn 1990b:30n.1; 1991a:23; 1991b:23).

There is very little evidence for the organisation of Mercian administration but there seems little reason to doubt that land units had already been organised by the apportionment of regular hidages organised around a *villa regalis*. A 120 hide unit might be alluded to by Bede when he recorded, the gift to the church, in AD656, by the Northumbrian King Oswiu of twelve estates of ten hides each "so that there were 120 hides altogether", the emphasis of a 'long hundred' perhaps embellishing the King with a donation commonly associated with royal holdings (HE:iii,24). Certainly, a 120 hide unit fits well with the fifteen, 30, and 40 hides common in pre-10th century land grants and estates of 60 hides appear just as frequently as 50 hide units, together with large grants of 120 hides for the minsters at Bath and probably Gloucester.
(ECNENM No.45,47; ECWM No.40,50). It is possible that the 30, 60 and 120 shilling fines commonly appearing in Anglo-Saxon legal texts, could be connected with Mercian administrative units based on 120 hide groupings. Moreover, a link between the number of hides in an oath and the corresponding fines might represent a more common relationship between the value of a property and compensations in Anglo-Saxon England (Chadwick 1905:134-5). The Mercian and probably Northumbrian shilling of four pennies fits comfortably into a landholding framework based on 120 hides as opposed to the five penny shilling which seems to have prevailed in Wessex from the 8th century. However, it has been noted by Loyn that with some ingenuity it is possible for Wessex and 'English' Mercia to "reconstitute from a simple grouping of shires larger units of 120 hundreds" thus giving warning that assessment groupings based on the number 120 might have been a more widespread administrative phenomenon of Anglo-Saxon government (Chadwick 1905:209-10; Loyn 1984:137-8).

In conclusion, it seems that the assessment structure of Gartree wapentake is to be connected with the fiscal and monetary system of Anglo-Danish society based around the 48 carucate small hundred. However, the probability that the duodecimal cadestre of Anglo-Danish Leicestershire stands in some fixed proportion to the Mercian hidage opens up the possibility of reconstituting the framework of Mercian 'pre-manorial' territories out of which smaller bookland estates were carved. This proposal has more than a political or administrative significance. If, as we have argued, late Saxon tax assessments were inextricably linked with the tenurial structure and arable potential of late Anglo-Saxon rural society then a reconstruction of the early hidage assessments and their associated territories should also help to shed light on the development of land-management throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.
10.1 INTRODUCTION

The historical problem of how the land was organised and managed is fundamental to any understanding of the pre-Conquest countryside of Langton hundred. There are three interrelated questions which can be posed of the social landscape:

1. The nature of territorial units in the early to middle Saxon period
2. The origins of the manor
3. The origins of the township

The township or vill formed the agrarian basis of late Saxon society around which co-operative farming was organised. A manor can be defined territorially as land held by individuals organised for the exploitation of resources. The Langton hundred evidence has demonstrated that, by the time of the Domesday enquiry, township and manor do not necessarily coincide but it is possible to reconstruct the framework of a multi-vill estate assessed at 36 carucates or 30 hides. However, the problem as to whether the vill or manor was the primary unit remains a critical issue for the evolution of the Anglo-Saxon landscape.

One influential model suggests that the origins of both township and manor lie in a territorial framework which was "social and administrative rather than tenurial" (Blair 1991:12). This system of division and organisation of the land, as summarised by Campbell, comprised the following main elements: (1) a regio of varying but substantial size; (2) a 'central place' or villa regalis; (3) subordinate settlements owing dues and services to the royal vill; (4) areas of common grazing; and (5) a systematic assessment of settlements which was integrated into the round sum hidage of the larger unit or regio (Campbell 1979:95-6). The granting of bookland estates by royal charter represented a fundamental change in the concept of land ownership: the grantee was now able to alienate his land at will and receive renders and services once due to the royal vill. A critical question, then, is the antiquity of small land units of township size - do they pre-date the appearance of church or lay estates as individually assessed sub-divisions of a
primary regio? This problem of the chronology of small land units is inseparable from the development of economically independent co-operative communities which formed the basis of open-field husbandry.

Without pre-Conquest documentation a reconstruction of Anglo-Saxon administrative units in south-east Leicestershire must rely on topographical and retrospective evidence from later periods. However, in an area disrupted by the Viking conquest and subsequent English reconquest the particular assumption of continuity between the regiones and the wapentake cannot be accepted without careful evaluation (Cam 1944:64-106; Phythian-Adams 1986:16-18; Roffe forthcoming). Indeed, Gartree wapentake can only be understood in the context of Anglo-Danish fiscal administration - the suggested 'original' 576 carucates, sub-divided into four 144 carucate assessment groups and twelve small hundredal units is a product of the 10th century when the institution of wapentake and shire were created.

The following reconstruction of early territorial organisation rests upon three main suppositions: (1) carucated assessments were a twenty per cent revaluation of the Mercian hide; (2) tax assessments generally exhibit long-term quantitative stability which were only subject to distorting reassessments in the late Saxon period; and (3) early territories or regiones were defined by the principal watersheds. The valley-watershed relationship holds the main key to understanding early social and political entities. Indeed, the Langton hundred survey has shown the watershed 'wold' in Shangton and Hardwick to be a zone of low-population density with minimum arable land use - a type of countryside most likely to form an early frontier or boundary. The development of Langton hundred can, therefore, be considered in relation to its wider regional context of the drainage system of the upper River Welland catchment area.

10.2 TERRITORIAL ORGANISATION AND NATURAL TERRITORIES

The upper Welland catchment can be defined to the south by the Jurassic escarpment in Northamptonshire of the Welland-Nene watershed; to its west by the watershed around the headwaters of the rivers Welland and Avon and Nene which form the major topographical division of south Leicestershire; and to the north by the Welland-Soar watershed of High Leicestershire. A further Welland-Soar watershed running north eastwards through the centre of
Gartree wapentake divides the Welland tributaries from the River Sense or Glen flowing to the Soar. The southern natural boundary is particularly prominent where names of pastoral or woodland connotations (Longwold in Clipston, Oxendon, Dingley and Ashley) together with numerous small woods, field-names suggestive of arable intakes, medieval deer parks and moated sites are all indicative of marginal lands formerly used as wood-pasture. Foard has also suggested that there was "a significant boundary running along the Nene-Welland watershed" (Foard 1985:195). It is significant then, that the patterns of land tenure enshrined in Domesday and parish organisation reveal a series of interlocking estates spanning the River Welland (Roffe forthcoming). The origin of these linkages must lie before the creation of the institution of shire and wapentake in the 10th century.

The upper Welland catchment is itself bisected by the course of the Lipping, an archaic river-name, with one other example known from the old district of Anglo in Jutland, suggestive of an early boundary feature (Cox 1971:95-6; Ekwall 1962:201). Stream names in -ing are well known to be associated with ancient boundaries in Anglo-Saxon charter-boundaries (Gelling 1978:120). The Lipping was very probably coined in the early Saxon period at which time it could already have acted as a territorial division of the upper Welland drainage system. Even so, the Lipping is unlikely to mark the frontier of archaic territories or polities. The interlocking configuration of the ancient boundaries of Welham, Stonton, Glooston, Cranoe and Thorpe Langton on the high ground of Langton Caudle is a classic case of the division of land formerly intercommoned by the communities either side of the Lipping who had shared the pasture grounds of this prominent land mark. There is no reason to suppose, however, that these social groups formed part of a separate polity or regio in the early Anglo-Saxon period.

Nevertheless, the fact that the Lipping divides the upper Welland drainage system into two discrete halves, one focused on the Langton Brook and the other on the Medbourne Brook, suggests its use as an ancient territorial division and one which might fossilise the territorium boundary of Roman 'small towns' at Medbourne and Great Bowden (Liddle 1995:87,91). South of the River Welland, the Northamptonshire hundreds of Stoche and Stafold mirror this division of the valley unit. It is proposed that the upper Welland catchment can be subdivided into three natural areas which might reflect pre-10th century administrative subdivisions.
i) The Medbourne Brook and Eye Brook Complex

The natural territory of this region incorporates all the Welland catchment east of the Lipping, including the valley of the Eye Brook (i.e. the townships in Loddington hundred although this could have formed a separate unit in its own right), and the Northamptonshire hundred of Stoche (Gover et al. 1933:155). The area around Medbourne, the site of a small Roman town on the Gartree Road, is one of intense early Saxon settlement (Liddle 1994). The place-name means "meadow stream" and the use of OE *burna*, suggests that this was coined in the early to middle Saxon period for the name of the estate around the stream which forms the major Welland tributary east of the Lipping (Gelling 1984:16-20). It has been suggested above that the Anglo-Danish assessment for the area east of the Lipping was 144 carucates. This would make a reconstituted 'long hundred' of 120 hides.

Significantly, Domesday fees on both sides of the Welland seem to have descended from substantial pre-Conquest comital estates spanning the river valley (Roffe 1993 and forthcoming). South of the River Welland, the Domesday hidage of Stoche hundred is almost 40 hides, the same rating given in the Northamptonshire Geld Roll (Hart 1970:38). *Stoche* can be divided into two discrete blocks of twenty hides: an Astley estate complex which mirrors the Welham fee of the Countess Judith and one centred on Stoke Albany and Wilbarston where Robert of Tosney held the main fee as he did in the Medbourne complex. In the late 10th century Rockingham was held by Frane, the king's thegn who donated West Langton to Peterborough Abbey which was also the recipient of Cottingham and Middleton from a donation by Earl Aelfelm (AD933-1006), together with the Great Easton complex north of the Welland from Earl Ralf (AD1041-1057) (ECNENM:No,14,20,38). If the low Domesday assessment for *Stoche* is the result of a 60 per cent reduction, original regular decimal assessments can be restored for most of the townships suggesting an original 100 hide assessment. If correct, the potential pre-10th century assessment for the Welland catchment east of the Lipping was around 220 hides.

ii) The Gumley-Langton Brook Complex

West of the Lipping the Langton Brook is the primary watercourse flowing into the River Welland. Gumley, situated just four kilometres southwest of the Langton Brook Saxton settlement and cemetery complex, was certainly an important meeting place for the Mercian *witenagemot* in the 8th century, with assemblies recorded there in AD749, 772 and 779 (S 92,109,114; Stenton 1905:1-2). The reconstructed carucation for the whole Gumley-Langton
Brook complex, which is here defined to the north by the Burton Brook and the Welland-Sence watershed, amounts to around 230-240 carucates and a possible original total of 200 hides. Tenurial and parochial ties again show that the territories based on Great Bowden, Thedingworth and Lubenham originally included lands south of the Welland in Northamptonshire's Stotfold hundred. If Stotfold was an original 100 hides the combined total with the reconstituted Gumley-Langton Brook complex would make a total of some 300 hides.

iii) The Great Glen-River Sence Complex

Great Glen, through which flows the River Sence as part of the River Soar drainage system, is the place where a charter was issued in AD849 by Alhun, Bishop of the Hwicce (S 1272). The church dedication to St Cuthbert and fragments of Mercian sculpture support the view that this was a high status middle Saxon settlement and it is possible that Great Glen was the site of, or close to, a royal palatial complex which formed the villa regalis of a territory based on the River Sence (Bailey,N 1988:2-4; Hoskins 1957.7). This putative estate probably included the ancient parish of Wistow, the reputed place of the murder of Wigstan, a prince of the Hwicce, in 849 by Beortfrith, son of the Mercian king Beortwulf (Bott 1953). Ecclesiastical, tenurial, fiscal and place-name considerations suggest that Burton Overy, the strettons and the King's Norton could have originally formed part of this estate. The addition of Illston-on-the-Hill and Noseley (possibly part of a small hundred based on King's Norton) gives a total of some 117 carucates or a possible original assessment approximating 97.5 hides.

There is a topographical coherency to this group. On its western side lie a coterminous ring of townships surrounding Leicester, perhaps forming part of the original grant of lands to the see of Leicester in the late 7th or early 8th century, and divided from the Great Glen complex by the 'Old Mere' (OE mere, 'boundary') identified by Hoskins as an archaic boundary (Hoskins 1957a:4; 1957b:18). To the north the upper reaches of the Sence or its watershed divides the Glen group from the remaining townships of Gartree wapentake (Stoughton, Thornby, Busby, Evington, Scraptoft, Ingarsby and Houghton) which were perhaps attached to the wapentake on its creation in the 10th century for fiscal administrative reasons. The linear and equal division of the Strettons, King's Norton, Galby and Frisby are suggestive of their northern boundary following the line of an ancient frontier with communities who looked to the Soar and Wreak valleys. If so, the line of the 'Old Mere' might be traced north-eastwards after leaving Great Stretton to join with the Tilton Lane, the northern boundary of Billesdon parish and Gartree
wapentake. At this point Billesdon Coplow (OE hlaw, 'a tumulus, hill') forms the pre-eminent landmark of High Leicestershire, and it might be significant that a 6th century square-headed brooch was found "within a short distance of Billesdon Coplow", perhaps indicating a pagan burial close to a natural boundary feature dividing two tribal groups within Leicestershire (Clough et al. 1975:44-5; Cox 1971:206; Gelling 1978:134-7,154-7).

It is contended that this reconstruction of natural territories yields patterns which potentially point to a tribal unit or regio forming one of the building blocks of the 7th century Mercian kingdom. Furthermore, it is noticeable how the focus of the suggested divisions of this territory each centres on a major tributary watercourse and in the case of Medbourne (AD1266) and Great Glen (AD1272) were later granted the right to hold a market, perhaps continuing a pre-Conquest tradition as local trading centres (Everitt 1985:101; VCH Leics v:104,233). The Gumley-Langton Brook axis is clearly an exception to this later pattern of development but its position as a 'central place' could have been taken over by the 11th century royal soke centre at Great Bowden which appears to be the result of a late Saxon administrative reorganisation (Roffe forthcoming).

This threefold division might, therefore, reflect an archaic administrative arrangement within the larger territory or regio which has roots in an early Anglo-Saxon or even Roman division of the land. Garthorpe wapentake, as an institution of the 10th century, is clearly the product of both the fission and fusion of earlier territories but where township and wapentake boundaries do follow the principal watershed divides they are most likely to mark an archaic administrative boundary, a conclusion supported by much of the 11th century tenurial and parochial geography of the region. Nothing certain, however, can be said about the early political structures of the study area but elsewhere the main evidence for the regiones comes from records concerning the 7th century and so they are likely to have originated before AD600 (Bassett 1989b:18). The earliest surviving charters in the late 7th century have estates measured in hides and so it also appears that a system of hidage assessments was in place before the beginning of written records. Whatever the origins of the regiones might be in the 5th or early 6th centuries, the rise of royal authority thereafter must have been a significant factor defining their position as administrative subdivisions of kingdoms upon which tribute was levied and collected.
In this context, the suggested reconstructed hidages of the upper Welland territory might have some significance. These are: (1) the Medbourne Brook-Eye Brook complex 115 to 120 hides; (2) the Gumley-Langton Brook group 200 hides; and (3) the Great Glen-River Sence group 97.5 hides. When the presumed original 200 hides of the Northamptonshire hundreds of Stotfold and Stocche are included the combined total is close to 600 hides. Without pressing the point too far, an assessment total close to 600 hides is comparable with the hidages found in the document known as the Tribal Hidage, a probable 7th century tribute list for a Northumbrian or Mercian overlord, allotted to the smaller sized tribal groups located around the lower Welland valley (Brooks 1989:160-2; Courtney 1981; Davies and Vierck 1974; Hart 1971; 1977; Higham 1995:74-111). If so, it could be that the geo-political and fiscal entities of the Tribal Hidage continued into the Mercian kingdom proper, subsumed into the 30,000 hides allotted to the 'original Mercian lands' (Brooks 1989:160).

The outlines of an upper Welland 'polity' can also be tentatively drawn with reference to adjacent putative early to mid-Saxon social administrative districts. To the east, the territory of Rutland has been suggested as a former regio of the Middle Angles, possibly centred on Hambleton (Cain 1987; Cox 1994:xxvii-xxxvii; Phythian-Adams 1977, 1980). To the north, Anglian groups occupying the Soar-Wreake catchment could have formed a coherent territory, the bounds of which were possibly closely coterminous with Goscote wapentake. To the west, it is possible to identify a complex of vills based on the River Soar and lower River Sence around Croft, the place of a Mercian assembly in AD836 (S 190). To the south the Soar-Avon watershed divides the Croft group from a further, probably related, complex of vills based around upper Avon drainage system and its main tributary the River Over or Swift. Lutterworth and Misterton ('the Minster tun') are the likely ecclesiastical and secular foci for this putative pre-10th century territory which 11th century TRE and TRW patterns of landholding suggest stretched across the shire boundary to the watershed of the River Avon and Nene in Northamptonshire.

South of the River Welland, Foard has suggested the presence of three early to mid-Saxon provinces within Northamptonshire, centred on Oundle, Northampton and King's Sutton (Foard 1985:193-200). Only one of these polities has documentary evidence: Bede records that Wilfrid died within the provincia In Undalum ('province of Oundle'), and a monastery at Oundle, once dedicated by Wilfrid to St Andrew, is specifically stated as Wilfrid's death place (HE:v,19;
Eddius.LXIV, LXVII, Gover et al. 1933:213-4). Provincia is Bede's normal term for a Kingdom or sub-Kingdom implying that In Undalum covered a wide area with its royal centre presumably at Oundle (Campbell 1986:113). The boundaries of In Undalum could have stretched to at least as far as Kettering, just fifteen kilometres from Langton Hundred and eight kilometres from the bounds of Stoche hundred. The late 7th century monastery of Brixworth has been suggested by Hart as one of Wilfrid's foundations and part of the original province of Oundle (Hart 1992:143-4). Brixworth is, however, more likely to have formed part of a province centred on Northampton, the site of the only archaeological evidence in the region which might indicate a middle Saxon palace complex (Foard 1985:199-200; Williams et al. 1985). The third proposed polity, centred on King's Sutton, has early associations with the Mercian royal family and its territory seems to have extended well into north Oxfordshire (Blair 1994:51-2,65-6; Foard 1985:198-99).

Foard's mapping of provincial groupings is instructive since they are comparable in size with a territory based on the upper Welland catchment and those of the smaller polities of the Tribal Hidage (Foard 1985:Fig:5). Moreover, this was a closely settled landscape in the early to middle Saxon period suggesting that fixed administrative boundaries could have been an early feature of the countryside. For example, the concentrations of early-middle Saxon sites located along valleys of the River Ise and Harpers Brook just south of the Welland-Nene watershed points to a similar intensity of settlement as that produced in Langton hundred and Medbourne survey's (Bellamy 1994). This narrow Welland-Nene watershed dividing these adjacent valley communities is typical of a region for which there is little evidence for large tracts woodland or pasture ground which might have acted as a kind of 'no mans land' or frontier.

The location of a primary early royal caput within the region of the upper Welland catchment remains an open question but the Gumley-Langton Brook axis needs serious consideration. The area of the Langton Brook stands out as the largest concentration of early to middle Anglo-Saxon settlement yet found in Leicestershire with a density of 'sites' and the presence of two pagan cemeteries hinting that this area was focus within the local settlement hierarchy. The middle Saxon royal residence at Gumley may have been a hunting lodge, the presence of two leah place-names suggesting an early wooded landscape along the Gumley hills. Gumley's commanding hill-top site possibly stood in some sort of functional relationship with the valley below, an example of a 'split-centre' where the villa regalis, at which local dues were
collected, was separate from the royal palace or place of assembly. Kingsthorpe Bridge, the
name of the ancient crossing of the Langton Brook by the modern A6 might provide an
ambiguous link between Gumley and the valley sites recording the name of a settlement using
the OE place-name element *throp* coined by its dependent relationship with the assembly place at
Gumley (Russell 1934:18).

Morris’s discussion of middle Saxon palaces concluded that they were places "where people
were accustomed to participate in seasonal gatherings under the direction of local leaders" and
"are likely to have been natural targets for missionaries, and that a proportion of such places may
have been venues which were already old" (Morris 1991:24). Finds of two 9th century strap ends
and a reported 8th century *sceatta* close to the West Langton cemetery are typical artifacts we
might expect from a middle Saxon meeting place. Moreover, the AD749 charter issued by king
AEthebald describes Gumley as "a celebrated place" (*in loco celebre*), implying that the Mercian
kings were operating from a residence that had already gained a renowned importance before the
mid-8th century (S 92). It might be significant, therefore, that the Langton Brook cemeteries are
the largest concentration of pagan burials yet discovered in south-east Leicestershire which
could have acted as central depositories for an extensive social territory.

In searching for the early Saxon context of the Gumley-Langton Brook axis, there are some
coincidences which might be worthy of attention. Gumley’s place-name, *Godmundeslaech* (749),
*Godmundesleah* (779) or ‘Godmund’s leah’, combines the OE personal name Godmund with *leah*
meaning ‘Godmund’s wood or woodland clearing’ (Cox 1971:222-3; Mills 1991:150). Godmund
is found in just two other place-names: Goodmanham (Yorkshire, East Riding) and
Godmanchester (Huntingdonshire). Despite Wallace-Hadrill’s doubts, Goodmanham can be
identified with *Godmunddingham* (731), meaning ‘enclosure or homestead of Godmund’s family
or followers’, named by Bede as the place of a pagan sanctuary in the 620s (HE:ii,13; Mills
meaning ‘the Roman town associated with a man called Godmund’, suggests that an
Anglo-Saxon chief named Godmund had taken possession of the Roman town of *Durovigutum*

Godmund was probably not an uncommon name in the 5th and 6th centuries but the distribution
and associations of the Godmund place-names suggest they might be connected with the same
man or family group. The main Roman Road network links the three Godmund place-names. At Godmanchester, there is evidence for 5th century Saxon occupation within and outside the town walls and of other early Saxon finds in the locality (Burnham and Wacher 1990:129). Sancton, the adjoining township to Goodmanham, is the largest known pagan cemetery north of the Humber, and presumably the principal pagan shrine of the Anglian kings of Deira (Myres and Southern 1973). The Goodmanham-Sancton axis can, therefore, be reasonably argued to be the probable location of the Deirian royal residence referred to in Bede as "by the Derwent" (HE:ii,9; Higham 1993:66-7,81,118). Furthermore, the Roman 'small town' at Shiptonthorpe is sited within three to five kilometres of Sancton and it is possible that this late Roman centre, which has produced evidence for sub-Roman activity, was related in some way to the first Anglo-Saxon settlements (Frere 1985:281; 1986:386). The context of the Gumley-Langton Brook royal residence and pagan cemetery and settlement complex seems to mirror that at Goodmanham-Sancton. A case can be made for both being important royal and pagan centres of their respective kingdoms. High status middle Saxon activity at Sancton is certainly indicated by metal detector finds of strap-ends and one of the largest quantity of 8th and 9th century coins yet recovered in the Northumbrian Kingdom (Booth and Blowers 1983).

If the Gumley-Langton Brook axis, Goodmanham-Sancton axis, and Godmanchester, were royal and/or pagan centres then they suggest early political and cultural ties between the East Midlands and Deira, a possibility also indicated by the Sancton-Baston stamped linked pots dispersed throughout much the same region (Arnold 1988:76-8; Myres 1986:174-6,193). These associations may be no more than coincidental but they do allow the speculation that Godmund place-names commemorate a mighty family lineage linked to important pagan shrines and settlements and which continued to function as 'central places' in the Mercian and Deirian kingdoms.

These scraps of documentary, archaeological and topographical evidence do not prove that the Gumley-Langton axis was the principal location of a villa regalis or 'central place' in south-east Leicestershire. But the strong possibility remains that the natural territory of the upper River Welland catchment appears to be contiguous with a once unified regio. The fact that this large putative province is close to the Mercian heartland in the Trent valley and to the more local, historically or archaeologically, attested royal or ecclesiastical centres at Croft (AD836), Brixworth, Northampton and Leicester (see Chapter Two), in addition to the sites within
south-east Leicestershire at Great Glen and Gumley, all seem to testify to the areas strong royal connections and place it firmly within the orbit of Mercian administrative structures.

10.3 THE ECCLESIASTICAL CONTEXT OF LANGTON HUNDRED

It is probable that an important church site stood close to the royal vill at Gumley and it is worth considering the possibility that the origins of the Church of Langton might lie with a pre-10th century royal foundation sited in close proximity to a villa regalis. What has been called the "minster hypothesis" has become an influential model of the development of rural ecclesiastical organisation in the Anglo-Saxon period (Blair 1988; Blair and Sharpe 1992). This proposes a pre-Viking organisation of pastoral care administered from monasteria, 'minsters or monasteries,' whose parochiae were often coterminous with a regio or provincia, with the minster sited at, or close to, a royal tun. The assumption is that these minsters were staffed by communities of priests charged with missionary work in their parochiae. The proliferation of local churches in the post-Viking period followed the establishment by comites or king's thegns of churches for their own private use on their bookland estates. Many of these might be called 'secondary minsters' or 'mother churches' whose parochiae included a number ofvills, some of which were later to become dependent chapelries or parishes in their own right. The foundation of local churches by lords building their own manorial Eigenkirche to serve a 'parish' containing only one or two townships continued into the post-Conquest period, so that by 1200 the majority of medieval churches had been established. Once the bounds of a parish were fixed they rarely changed, making parochial organisation one of the most enduring features of the landscape.

That St. Peters Langton was not simply a manorial Eigenkirch is evident from the large size of the parish (about 4000 acres), and the presence of dependent chapelries and townships. A terminus ante quem for the foundation of the chapels at Tur and Thorpe Langton is provided by a royal confirmation in 1162 of the grant of Langton church to Leicester Abbey (Dugdale 1830 vi:467). A priest is recorded at Tur Langton in 1165 and 1166 also shows the presence of a chapel there by the mid-12th century (VCH Leics v:212). The 1220 Matriculus shows a single parochial unit with three chapels served by the mother church: those at Thorpe and Tur Langton and a chapel of Langton (Phillimore 1912 i,264). The chapel of Langton was served three days a
week from the mother church and was presumably sited at East or West Langton although nothing further about its existence is known.

There is nothing structural in the mother church of Langton which dates before a late 13th century rebuilding but some reused fragments are probable survivals of an earlier Norman church: two stones with a lozenge pattern used externally in the east end of the north aisle and a crude relief carving of a naked standing figure set in the wall of the vestry passage (Brandwood 1987:27). The independence of a 11th century church is suggested by the *Ecclesiastical History* of Orderic Vitalis which records the confirmation by royal charter in 1081 of a grant made by Hugh of Grandmesnil to the Abbey of Saint-Evroul of a villein to act as tithe collector (Chibnall 1972:236-7). Parsons' identification of Thorpe Langton as the place referred to in the grant is almost certainly mistaken and probably rests on an incorrect translation of the Domesday (East) Langton holding of Grandmesnil containing a priest (Morgan 1979:13,57; Parsons 1986:39) The Saint-Evroul grant, therefore, seems to confirm that the Domesday reference to a priest on the East Langton manor of Hugh of Grandmesnil implies the existence of a church at Langton in 1086 which is likely to be an important pre-Conquest foundation.

Some clues to the pre-Conquest status of the church of Langton can be gleaned from its exceptionally large glebe and high 13th century Papal Valuations which are notable characteristics of former Saxon minsters or secondary mother-churches (Blair 1991). In 1846, the total area of glebeland was 127 acres and is given as four yardlands in the 1792 enclosure award and 17th century terriers (White 1846:493). Three yardlands were intermixed in the fields of East, West and Thorpe Langton and one yardland in Tur Langton. Glebeland is one of the most stable of small land units and there is no reason why these four yardlands did not represent the early medieval size, a view consistent with the 1279 Hundred Rolls where the rector of the church of Langton is recorded as holding a virgate of glebe in Tur Langton. From the places in the deanery of Gartree selected from the Papal Valuations shown in Table 10.1 only Wistow equalled Langton's very high valuation of £70 in the 1291 Ecclesiastical Tax of Pope Nicholas IV and, for Leicestershire as a whole, only Market Bosworth and Melton Mowbray exceeded this figure (Lunt 1926:530-34). This *Taxatio* seems exceptionally high but earlier *taxatio ecclesiastica* in 1217/1229 and 1254 also reveal a high valuation for Langton which is well above the average for the deanery. This superficial examination of the 13th century valuation records, therefore, at least hints of an important pre-Conquest minister status for Church Langton.
TABLE 10.1 ECCLESIASTICAL VALUATIONS IN THE DEANERY OF GARTREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valuation of c.1217/1219</th>
<th>Valuation of 1254</th>
<th>Valuation of 1291</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. s. d.</td>
<td>m. s. d.</td>
<td>m. s. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>40 0 0</td>
<td>70 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wistow</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>50 0 0</td>
<td>70 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibworth</td>
<td>26 0 0</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td>56 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bowden</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td>56 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medbourne</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>32 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands Bosworth</td>
<td>15 0 0</td>
<td>20 0 0</td>
<td>28 6 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurnby (Stoughton)</td>
<td>15 0 0</td>
<td>18 0 0</td>
<td>27 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallaton</td>
<td>10 0 0</td>
<td>16 0 0</td>
<td>39 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangton</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>8 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Valuation</td>
<td>11 0 0</td>
<td>15 0 0</td>
<td>24 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A consideration of the topographical and tenurial setting of the church helps to illuminate the circumstances of the original foundation. Church Langton never constituted a distinct township with both church the settlement located within the ancient township of East Langton (Throsby 1790 ii:343,345). The mother church of St Peter is situated on the edge of the small village of Church Langton but unlike many late Saxon and Norman manorial churches St Peter's is not sited in close proximity to a manorial house site. Instead, we find rectory and church together standing isolated apart from two farmhouses and a few cottages on a commanding position on the clay plateau of the Langton ridge. Nichols described the hilltop site of Church Langton as "Pleasantly situated on an eminence, it is seen for miles round, and commands a fine prospect on every side" (Nichols 1798:659). In contrast to the relatively favourable physical location of the other Langton villages, the Boulder Clays surrounding Church Langton are devoid of springs and the importance of the wet line around the Langton ridge was noted in Nichols history: "about a quarter mile north of the Church is an excellent well, or spring, called St.Anne's or Saddington's well; which in dry seasons has frequently been highly serviceable to the inhabitants of Church Langton...which is situated on high ground, and is rather scarce of springs" (Nichols 1798:659).
The high and isolated position of the church of Langton is certainly suggestive, therefore, of an early pre-Conquest foundation. This topographical situation is not unique in southeast Leicestershire. St Wilfrid, the mother church of Kibworth, is sited in a central position to its large parish, standing isolated from the four medieval villages it served. A parallel can be found in the Church of Toot Baldon St Lawrence, Oxfordshire, whose isolated hilltop site was probably the pre-Conquest mother church of Greater Baldon (Bond 1985:117; VCH Oxon v:52). At Ruddington, Nottinghamshire, the isolated church of St Peter Flawford has been shown to be a pre-Viking minster centrally placed to serve a large parish (RLHAS 1980). Some pre-Viking minsters are well known to be located in high places - Brixworth is an obvious late 7th century example (Parsons 1977). Similarly, Brown has postulated that the prominent hill site of church of Preston, the 'priest's-tun', overlooking the valley where the royal vill of Fawsley once stood, suggests an early ecclesiastical focus (Brown 1991:13). Moreover, it is worth noting that some 34 per cent of sceattas and many of the finds of strap-ends are found within the vicinity of pre-Danish ecclesiastical sites (Morris 1991:22-3).

The close proximity of St Anne's well to the church also hints the presence of an ancient holy well, and perhaps an original converted pagan spring. The juxtaposition of holy wells and minster churches is better known in some other shires and this possibility should not be ignored for Leicestershire (Rattue 1993). If the Church Langton well is an early sacred spring, its dedication to St. Anna, a patroness of wells, who interceded for the childless, might have been to aid fertility (Cox 1994:liii). It has also been suggested that Anne in well-names could have replaced a similar sounding Celtic name such as Anu, a goddess of prosperity, but this seems unlikely since the cult of St Anne only really penetrated England after c.1150 (Cox ibid.; Farmer 1987:19; Morris 1989:89-90; Rivett and Smith 1979:250).

Ecclesiastical provision can be seen as a reflection of lordship at a local level and a multi-vill parish, such as Church Langton, is likely to have served the estate of an important pre-Conquest thegn or lord or could have been a royal foundation from the pre-Viking period. Accepting that the financial and jurisdictional rights of the church of Langton were once linked to territorial lordship, then the upper date for the origin of the ancient parish of Langton must be the 10th or early 11th century before the advance of manorial fission. This would provide one possible reason for its isolated position - central to the scattered settlements it served. A non-resident
bookland lord, such as thegn Frane of Rockingham, could then be envisaged as the founder of the church for the pastoral care of his tenants scattered across the Langton estate.

However, the dedication to St Peter, its topographical position, detachment from a manorial administrative centre and large parish suggest the possibility of an earlier pre-Scandinavian foundation in the 8th or 9th centuries. A Mercian royal foundation cannot, therefore, be ruled out, and the 30 hide assessment of Church Langton parish is typical of recorded pre-10th century minister foundations. If so Church Langton might have been one of the first ecclesiastical sites marking the transition from an early Saxon pagan centre to a Christian focus for the region and one which was closely associated with the caput of a regio based on the upper Welland catchment.

10.4 THE ANTIQUITY OF SMALL LAND UNITS

The fact that secular lordship and parish were often coterminous begs the question of the extent to which medieval township boundaries correspond to Romano-British ones. If townships and manors are the result of the fission of primary hidated territories of the early to middle Saxon period then the later Saxon township may owe little to the sub-Roman or Romano-British period. This view suggests that, while the outer bounds of territories might broadly follow earlier divisions, the internal structures of smaller, economically independent, land units are a middle to late Saxon innovation. At its extreme, this model argues for a major hiatus in the organisation of small land units in the years between c.450 and 900. This envisages early Saxon tribal territories comprising dispersed settlements owing dues to the royal tun but with no intermediate territorial unit below that of the regio before the development of bookland estates and township-sized land units (Arnold and Wardle 1981; Foard 1985:204-5; Klingelhofer 1992:23-4). It is argued here that it possible to detect rather more signs of a possible Roman to Saxon continuity of land division within the study area. However, evidence for the Roman to Saxon transition can never be conclusive but at the very least there are grounds for believing that the origin of the medieval township is by and large 'pre-manorial' with roots in the 7th or 8th century.
One approach available to assess Roman to Saxon continuity is to relate the three-tier Romano-British settlement hierarchy of the type discussed in chapter four with medieval township boundaries. The spatial association of villa and non-villa settlements has been used by Applebaum and adopted by Hingley (Applebaum 1963:2-3; Hingley 1989:106-8). This envisages discrete estate land units represented by a central villa, surrounded by a peripheral pattern of tenants in smaller villa-type settlements with 'native' farmstead sites the homes of tenants or coloni of the villa owners. In Langton hundred, the relationship between Roman villas and medieval township boundaries does suggest the possibility some form of continuity of Romano-British land units into the Anglo-Saxon period (Fig. 17). Direct continuity of this type will always be impossible to prove but is perhaps reinforced by the signs of early Anglo-Saxon occupation around all the villa-type sites produced by the fieldwalking survey in the valelands.

The West Langton villa is clearly the major Romano-British settlement of the Greater Langton land unit. Interestingly, the farmstead sites in Thorpe Langton suggest a dependant relationship within the proposed Roman settlement hierarchy which seem to anticipate the dependant status of the Anglo-Saxon place-name. If the Greater Langton land unit has a pre-English origin its size would allow room for the settlements of tenants or small-scale landholders possibly represented by the richer farmsteads or villa-type sites in East Langton. The absence of late Roman sites around the West Langton villa suggests the possibility that the land was worked from estate buildings housing the coloni or serviles of the villa owner. Certainly the two large concentrations of pottery and building material found away from the main villa building suggests some form of nucleated settlement. The parish boundary, following the course of the Langton Brook, cuts through this settlement complex and is clearly a post-Roman boundary at this point. Even so, the protrusion of Greater Langton across the Langton Brook before its boundary reaches the Market Harborough-Church Langton road forms an unnatural salient which can be rounded off by continuing the boundary along the Leicester-Harborough road (the present A6). This would provide Greater Langton with a coherent southern boundary encompassing the West Langton-Foxton villa complex and the scatter of Roman pottery sherds which thins out before the main road. The adjustment to the bounds of this putative villa estate is most likely to have occurred in the early to middle Saxon period when settlements and pagan cemeteries are found on opposite banks of the Langton Brook.
Figure 17: Relationship of Roman Villas and Anglo-Saxon Sites to Medieval Boundaries.
In Tur Langton (Land Block C) we find one certain villa-type settlement and a second smaller settlement with some evidence for Romanised building. Two other sites have been classed as farmsteads. Shangton (Land Block D) repeats this pattern with one villa-type site and four farmstead or 'native' settlements. This must represent a fairly complete picture of the Romano-British settlement pattern in Langton hundred. It is again worth noting that the medieval dependant status of Thorpe Langton is mirrored in the Roman settlement hierarchy by an absence of a villa-type site. This spatial pattern seems to fit the peripheral holdings model very well, with one relatively large villa-type settlement for each major medieval township. So just as the distribution of medieval manor sites often correlate to the pattern of medieval townships, there is no reason why Romano-British villas were not also functionally related to the organisation of local land units, even though the lands attached to a villa property estate may not have been a compact holding.

This possibility gains some slight support by the emerging pattern of approximately one villa-type settlement per parish or township within the upper Welland valley, although, given difficulties of defining 'site' status, such observations will always be open to a degree of subjective interpretation (Scott 1993:110-16). The suggested relationship between Roman villas and medieval townships does not, therefore, constitute proof that the basic medieval framework of land division in the upper Welland valley had been established by the late Romano-British period. However, the suggestion that some estate structures continued to function during the Roman to Saxon transition is not such an unreasonable proposition given the fact that Anglo-Saxon settlement is now generally accepted to have been well established by c.500, and possibly before the middle decades of the 5th century (Hawkes 1989:86; Hines 1990:26-7). What is noticeable from the published distribution maps of the earliest datable material is that most are to be found between the Thames and the Humber with concentrations in East Anglia and the East Midlands (Hawkes 1986:Fig.28; Hines 1990:Fig.1). The artifact finds from around the West Langton seem to fall into this regional distribution of culturally related material which can be placed in the second half of the 5th century (Chapter Six; Hawkes 1986:Fig.30).

It is also noticeable how this Anglian cultural zone covering East Anglia and the East Midlands centres on the possible location of the late Roman province of Flavia Caesariensis. Although the extent of this province is not recorded, it possibly included the territory of the Corieltauvi and Iceni, with the provincial capital at Lincoln (Jones and Mattingly 1990:143-49; Mann 1961;
The province could also have included *Durobrivae* (Water Newton) on the Nene which itself might have achieved recognition as a *civitas* carved out of the southern Corieltauvi and northern Catuvellauni (Branigan 1987:57; Burnham and Wacher 1990:90-1; Todd 1991:42). To this early Anglian zone can be added the late Roman *civitas* of the Parisi north of the Humber, whose tribal territory formed the heartland of the Anglian kingdom of Deira (Higham 1993:81). In the late 5th and 6th centuries cultural contacts and alliances between the small polities of this Anglian zone are archaeologically attested by the predominance of cremation rites (including the 6th century Sancton-Baston die group), and the widespread distribution of artifact-types such as small-long and cruciform brooches and women's sleeved wrist-clasps, the latter suggesting a Scandinavian influence from the late 5th Century (Arnold 1988:Fig.2,19; Hines 1984).

This speculation does not imply there was ever a late 5th century cohesive Germanic polity based on the whole province of *Flavia Caesariensis*. However, the likelihood that this was the first province of the diocese of Britannia to pass under the sway of Germanic domination does suggest a degree of administrative continuity between the Romano-British *civitas* and early Anglo-Saxon polities. It is noteworthy that Higham has also recently argued for a link between the Mercian and Roman provincial structure, although his reconstruction of *Flavia Caesariensis* is limited to the East Midlands (Higham 1995:150-1, Fig. 8). If the hypothesis that Anglian polities owe something to a continuity with late Roman provincial and cantonal structures is correct, then, at the level of the local estate, it is not unreasonable to propose a continuum of land units during the Roman to Saxon transition.

This discussion of Roman to Saxon continuity also helps towards an assessment of the place of the townships of Langton hundred in early to middle Saxon territorial organisation. However, without charter evidence, there is no way of being certain that any of the township boundaries were in use in the early to middle Saxon or Roman periods. Even so, on grounds of topography the boundaries of the Langton hundred and its main subdivisions suggest an early unit (Fig. 17). Township bounds which follow watercourses, roads or linear routes across the landscape are most likely to be archaic boundary features. A tendency to zig-zag, a feature usually associated with the headlands and furlongs of the open-field system, probably indicates a relatively late subdivision of larger blocks of land. It is significant that the principle boundaries of Langton hundred make use of the River Welland and the Langton Brook, the archaic named Lipping, the
Welland-Soar ridgeway road, and stretches of linear boundaries which ignore natural
topography. All of these are potential early boundary features. Moreover, it is noticeable how
the Roman Gartree Road bisects parishes for large stretches of its course from Leicester to
Medbourne suggesting that the boundaries of early estates could pre-date the laying out of the
road in the early Roman period.

Some further clues for the antiquity and early manorial context of the Langton townships can be
gleaned from their place-names. The possibility that Tur Langton could have formed part of an
estate granted as early as the 8th century is suggested by its name Terlington which contains the
genitive -ing- as a connective partical between a personal name and habitation word - in the
sense of an estate which was once associated with a man called Tyrhtel or *Tyrli (Gelling
1978:177-83; Mills 1991:204). It has been suggested that -ingtun place-name element could
have been in use from the time of the earliest English settlements (Copley 1988:6). They are
more likely, however, to be particularly assigned to the 8th and 9th centuries since identified
historical personages can related to some of this category of place-name (Smith 1956 i:293-4).
Tredington, by the River Stour is one example where a charter of AD757 names thegn Tyrrda as
the previous estate holder who is thereafter commemorated in the place-name (ECWM:92;
Gelling 1978:178; Hooke 1985a:106-08, 1985b:127-131; S 55). Tredington was a minster
foundation of 30 hides containing a number of townships, although the charter gives no
"indication of the date at which these smaller units first become recognisable separate
communities" (Hooke 1985a:108). Similarly, the best interpretation of Tur Langton is that it
commemorates an 8th or 9th century holder of an estate which could possibly already have been
connected with Greater Langton to form a typical 30-hide Mercian estate perhaps, even then,
associated with the foundation of a minster at Church Langton.

For Greater Langton, its name, as defined by Smith, derives from the OE adjective Lang, 'long',
+ tun, "which usually means extending over a great distance" and by Mills as "a fairly common
name, usually 'long farmstead or estate" (Mills 1991:204; Smith 1956 ii:15). If Langton is a
topographical description of a settlement or estate, it contrasts with other types of tun names in
south-east Leicestershire which mean: (1) a subsidiary or outlying settlement (Kings Norton,
Great Easton, East Norton, Newton Harcourt); (2) a render of a specialist agricultural product or
service (Carlton Curlieu, Laughton); and (3) tun names which incorporate a personal name
suggestive of a mid-to late Saxon estate owner (Glooston, Slawston, Blaston, Illston-on-the-Hill and Rolleston).

If most other tun names suggest a late or subsidiary status the chronology and status of OE Lang when combined with tun is not certain. The use of OE Lang is unlikely to have been a purely topographical description of a dominating natural feature such as a long hill as in Langton in County Durham which derives from Lang + dun. Much depends upon how we define tun (Smith 1956 ii:188-98). Do we have here a long enclosure around a settlement or a long estate? Most hopeful is 'the long estate' whose shape could have been determined by natural feature such as a spur or ridge of high ground. A further factor might be that the adoption of Lang was used to describe a settlement morphology influenced by a major routeway, possibly a Roman road traversing the Langton land unit.

To assess the place of Langton place-names in English settlement history, the archaeological and historical associations of the fifteen Langton place-names in England (excluding two Langton Greens) and two in Scotland (formerly part of English Northumbria) are summarised in Appendix 9. Few are in marginal locations suggesting that, as a group, they are frequently in close proximity to Roman 'small-towns' and high status Anglo-Saxon sites, occupying the core arable zones of early estates. Thus, nine (60 per cent) of the English Langtons are located within eight kilometres of a Roman small town or local centre and six of these are within four kilometres of a major Roman centre. Eight Langtons (53 per cent) are juxtaposed to land units containing Anglo-Saxon royal or early ecclesiastical sites and of these Catterick, Partney and Yeavering are specifically mentioned by Bede writing in the early 8th century (HE I ii,16,14,20; iii,11,14). In short, it seems that Langton place-names are frequent indicators of land units located in the core lands of ancient estates suggesting that some were coined in the early to middle Anglo-Saxon period.

If Greater Langton is considered in the context of split-townships in English settlement history we find that, on the whole, they are situated in the major river valleys rather than the marginal lands around the watersheds. In Chapter Seven, it has been shown that the fission of almost all of Leicestershire's fourteen 'paired' settlements had occurred before 1086. Even so, the absence of a Domesday qualifier for most split-settlements suggests that, in their unified state, most are in origin, relatively large primary land units occupying the core zones of ancient estates.
Moreover, of some nineteen 'paired' land units in Leicestershire and Rutland twelve (63 per cent) are located on the shire boundary, including the Bowdens, Applebys and Broughtons which are divided between shires. A further, possibly related, observation is the close association of split-townships with Roman 'small towns', a fact which might have implications for the Roman to Saxon transition (Phythian-Adams 1977:77-8; Sawyer 1978:62-3). For Leicestershire and Rutland, these include the Claybrooks (Venonae), the Castertons (Great Casterton), the Withams (Thistleton), the Broughtons (Vernemetum), the Sheepys (Manuessedum) (Liddle 1995:81-91). The Greater Langton land unit and its juxtaposed relationship to Great Bowden containing a possible town site would fit into this regional pattern, suggesting that the Lipping might have formed a *territorium* boundary with the Roman 'small town' at Medbourne (ibid.:87,91).

It is possible, therefore, that the *territoria* of some Roman 'small towns' were fossilised into large Anglo-Saxon land units which were later split-tenurally and physically. This much has been suggested for the Claybrookes and Castertons by Phythian-Adams (Phythian-Adams 1977:78; 1978:38). In the case of Greater Langton, the intense early Saxon activity around the West Langton-Foxton villa hints at a possible Anglo-Saxon link with residence of an elite late Roman family who could have had administrative responsibilities in the local *pagus*. Certainly, the suggested (but not proven) correlation between the late Roman settlement hierarchy and medieval townships, points to an Anglo-Saxon territorial division of the land broadly following the framework of the late Roman period. The significance of this coincidence of split-settlements 'central places' and administrative boundaries needs further investigation but, at the very least, topographical, place-name and archaeological evidence seem to combine to suggest a high status and early origin for Greater Langton.

This is not to deny that Anglo-Saxon estate structures were forces for change. Some township boundary features are clearly late creations carved out of pre-existing estates. The fission of the Greater Langton land units is a prime example of an Anglo-Saxon land division but even here the shared common rights indicate the archaic integrity of Greater Langton. It is the marginal watershed townships that are more likely to have been mensurated and assessed anew in the middle to late Saxon period. Moreover, settlement nucleation in the Anglo-Saxon period and the fundamental changes in the framework of peasant landholding and agrarian organisation which led to the development of open-field farming suggests there is no direct link between the Saxon
manor and Roman villa. However, this does not necessarily imply a revolution in the organisation of land division in the Anglo-Saxon era. The proprietoral estate was a fluid entity, but there seems also to have been a continuum of the underlying structures of exploitation from the 7th or 8th centuries and possibly with the Romano-British countryside.

What does seem to be critically important here is the long-term relationship between taxation and land management. It has been strongly argued in Chapter Eight and Nine that the constituent land units of Langton hundred and Gartree wapentake as a whole were assessed in round figure units based on duodecimal carucates and this cadastre was principally based on a twenty per cent revaluation of the Mercian hide. If the tax system recorded in Domesday is an essentially an inherited ancient fiscal system then the possibility remains that 11th century cadastral units are the direct descendents of the 7th century territorially-based round-figure assessments imposed from above under royal authority for the purpose of rendering tribute and obligations. Some confirmation that many small land units existed before estate fission is suggested by a AD685-7 grant of 60 hides at Farnham (Surrey) which seems to apportion the assessment to smaller named land units or settlements (Blair 1991:25-6; EHD I:445; Gelling 1979:150-1; S 235; Sawyer 1978:143-4). A similar early example is found in a Sussex charter (AD688-705) which testifies to the grant of 38 hides in five named places, made up of parcels of twelve, ten, eleven, two and three hides (EHD I:485-6; Loyn 1984:38; S 45). As Campbell has remarked, it is not improbable that "assessments were such as to ensure that the total for all settlements dependent on a particular royal vill came to a round number of hides" (Campbell 1982:58).

There are, therefore, two principal ways in which the round figure assessment of land units, such as Greater Langton (24 carucates or twenty hides) and Tur Langton (twelve carucates or ten hides), were created: they were either a secondary development resulting from the fission of primary territories into smaller estates, or were pre-existing land units assessed as constituent parts of a primary territory. It seems likely that the rise or royal authority in the late 6th and 7th century and was also related to the development of royal administration and this might be the context of an original apportionment of hides to regiones such as the proposed polity based on the upper Welland. However, whether or not the Anglo-Saxon cadastre was imposed during this period or even owes something to the land tax or tributum of the later Roman Empire, the theory that the territorial framework of assessed township units followed a secondary fragmentation of primary territories into chartered 'bookland' estates is not proven (Foard 1985:204-5). Similarly,
the view of Klingelhofer that a "community-wide" rural economy based upon the primitive unity of the regio simultaneously dissolved into manors and vills at "some time between the 8th and 10th century" is questionable (Klingelhofer 1992:24,56). It remains possible, therefore, that many small township-sized land units were in place by the late 7th century, each having a semi-economic independence based on the communal sharing of both arable and meadow.

To argue for a long-term stability of assessments suggests that an understanding of the organisation of land management in Anglo-Saxon society rests heavily on an interpretation of the meaning and territorial significance of the word 'hide'. It is possible that a semantic evolution of the enigmatic hide might have also have implications for settlement and agrarian structures. Charles-Edwards has made a convincing case for the archaic social hide to be the standard holding of a free conjugal household with its area of ploughland worked by slaves or dependants (Charles-Edwards 1972). The word *hīd*, a 'hide', belongs to a group of cognate words meaning 'family' or 'marriage' (ibid.:6). A relationship between the archaic hide and the household or family finds support by Bede's translation of 'hide' into *terra unis familiae* - "the land of one family" (HE:i,25, ii,9, iii,24). Thus the hide represents the minimum unit of resource appropriate for upholding the social status of a normal freeman and the term *ceorl* has been suggested by Higham to signify the lowest rank of freeman in early English society (Higham 1992:144-5; 1995:235-50).

By the time the hide first appears in our sources in the late 7th century it certainly bears the stamp of royal authority to form the basis of a territorially based system of taxation which was, as Higham has argued, "the basis not only of relationships between peasant and landholder but also between kings and the free community" (Abels 1988:100-1; Higham 1995:245). What is not clear is how the peasant tenancy, servile or otherwise, were organised in relation to the public and private renders which were apportioned by the hide. However, it is possible that the link between taxation and the tenurial structure of late Saxon townships mirrors an earlier society based on free households which could have been as equally schematised. The standard five or ten hide holding, for instance, seems to represent the minimum estate sufficient for a thegn or nobleman who held their land as royal retainers (Higham 1992:144-5).

It is reasonable to postulate that the original territorialisation of the Mercian hide was formalised around 'pre-manorial' territories such as a putative tribal grouping centred on the upper Welland,
and that the fragmentation of these primary assessed units formed the framework of ecclesiastical or secular multi-vill estates such as the Langton complex. However, although the manor was in place by the 7th century so it seems were the underlying small land units - the precursors of the medieval township. Thus, while estate fragmentation created some secondary townships units (such as East, West and Thorpe Langton), the majority were probably primary, 'pre-manorial', units of resource exploitation. If this is correct, an early systematic division of the land by the allotting of specific hidage assessments suggests that viewed over the longer-term of some 500 years (c.650-1150) these cadstral units were a fundamental factor moulding the development of pre-Conquest agrarian organisation and land management.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

COMMON-FIELD AND VILLAGE ORIGINS

11.1 INTRODUCTION

"I have heard that our lands in England were never divided into such small parcels till the days of King William the Conqueror; who, fearing the people did disaffect him, out of state policy commanded the lands to be so divided, that the people, being busied about division of their lands, might have no leisure to disturb his government: if this be so, it is no just offence to restore our lands to their pristine order" (Nichols 1810:99).

Joseph Lee, the Leicestershire rector of Cottesbach, wrote this explanation of the open-field system in his 1654 defence of enclosure. The cynic might say that we still have just as little understanding of the reasons for this agrarian system than those working the open-fields in the 17th century. The genesis of open common-fields and the village stems from a time before documentation, and, at the heart of the problem, remains an explanation of the broad division of lowland England characterised by champion and woodland countrysides. Most scholars now seem to favour a complex interplay between environment, community, demographic levels, state and lordship which belies any simple model of change (Dyer 1990). In part, this is a reaction to earlier suggestions that 'racial' or 'ethnic' factors, such as the degree of 'Germanisation' following the Anglo-Saxon settlement, are a solution to these contrasting pays (Gray 1915:411; Homans 1941:25-8, 1969). However, Williamson's repeated assertion that the "woodland and champion dichotomy began a long time before the time of Domesday" seems to lead us back to consider the social context of peasant landholding in the early to middle Anglo-Saxon kingdoms (Williamson 1988:12, 1993,117; Williamson and Bellamy 1987:25).

By focussing on the social and tenurial context of settlements and field systems, a clearer explanation of the woodland and champion dichotomy might be forthcoming without having to evoke the confusing multiplicity of regional and temporal causes through which "scholars have sought to distinguish one part on the country from another" (Dodgshon 1980:155). In short,
there must be a relatively straightforward reason why so much of medieval England adopted a co-operative and communal approach to farming their cultivated fields. It is, therefore, the 'basic design features' of these field systems - tenemental shares in a subdivided archaic core area of common arable with apportioned tenemental rights to meadow and pasture - which demand an explanation.

Starting with the long-term structures shaping the settlements and fields of Langton Hundred - the nature of the land and the balance between arable and non-arable resources - one thing is clear from the archaeological survey: the countryside of the 2nd century AD was as fully exploited as that of the 12th century. Both the extent of cultivation and population seems to have peaked before the end of the Roman period and again after the Norman Conquest. Even so, there is a measure of early Saxon continuity of intensive exploitation in the valeland townships of Greater Langton and Tur Langton: the arable may have contracted to some extent but there is no reason to suppose this was a dramatic reduction. It is only the hinterland wold townships of Shangton and Hardwick that the area of cultivation was noticeably reduced in the later Roman and early Anglo-Saxon period, and a pastoral emphasis was still evident in the 11th century. Nevertheless, there is little evidence to suggest that demographic trends were, by themselves, in any way the critical influencing factor affecting the adoption of common-fields or the village.

Consideration of the inter-township rights to common arable of Greater Langton suggests that their common fields developed before tenurial fission, an event of the late 10th century at the latest. It is unlikely that common arable or sub-divided holdings were created as a single act of planning and it is reasonable to argue that township-wide common arable could be associated with a pre-nucleation phase, a fact obscured by the development of the village in Midland townships. How long before the 10th century Greater Langton functioned as a community, in the sense of the rights of husbandmen to common shareland, depends on how we view the social and economic organisation of the early and mid-Saxon regio and the origins of the tenemental framework of small land units. If most township sized units such as Greater Langton, Tur Langton and Shangton were already in place in the 7th and 8th centuries, each with their own hideage rating assessing obligation for public renders, then it is quite possible that rights to common arable could also have been in place by this time.
However, a gradualist view argues for population growth, piecemeal colonization, partible inheritance, and pressure on rough grazing grounds as possible reasons for common arable. Thus, a development starting from compact several holdings, broken down by partible inheritance and added to by progressive clearance, is a common long-term model of change (Thirsk 1964; Dahlman 1980:143). One of the most persuasive ecologically-based arguments is the "fission of the multiple estate" model of Fox (Fox 1981:98-101). This proposes that a severance of putative 'river and wold' type linkages precipitated a pastoral production crisis in now independent land units; cut off from their traditional rough grazing grounds, husbandmen adopted a closer integration of fallow and cropping organised at a township-wide level resulting in a division of the arable into two or three sectors to facilitate the fallow grazing of the common flock. Fox also gives credence to "the notion that communities arrived independently at the same solutions as they approached towards the adoption of the Midland system", a development he places in the 10th century (ibid.:101-2). In terms of practical husbandry, cultivated fields need fertilizing, not only from farmyard manure but also from communal fallow grazing, a practice which Fox sees as much to do with the need for pasturage than fertility (Fox 1984:129-30).

One problem, however, is that little evidence has been found to support the notion that intercommoning in Eastern Leicestershire was sufficient to warrant a postponement of common arable. Thus, the loss of any access husbandmen might have had to the wider resources of the primitive 'estate' is unlikely to have been a precipitating factor leading to a remodelling of field layout. Indeed, there is ample evidence to show that common arable is not inextricably linked to the balance between arable and non-arable resources: communal fallow grazing on the core of ancient arable is just as evident in 'woodland' countrysides, a fact which Blair considered in the context of late Saxon Surrey to be "hard to reconcile with Fox's model" (1991:90). Blair further concluded that it is "hardly likely that common fields were themselves created at a stroke. Tenemental symmetry must result from the re-apportionment of holdings which were already subdivided, and the origins of which lie beyond the reach of records" (ibid.:77). If correct, we should look beyond a simple ecological constraint of pasture shortage as a cause of agriculture co-operation between groups of neighbours to focus more on the landholding framework of Anglo-Saxon society.
11.2 ASSESSED LAND AND THE PRE-CONQUEST MANOR

The late Saxon hide referred to the render of obligations or taxation exacted from the holders of land. It has been argued that the fiscal carucate determined the number of yardlands in a township and that the Leicestershire carucate was very probably quantitatively related to the Mercian hide. The origin of the tenemental framework of a township must, therefore, rest ultimately on the appearance and meaning of the hide as a territorial unit of taxation which almost certainly "moulded the development of land-management throughout the Christian Anglo-Saxon period" (Blair 1994:79). Although Stenton's view of an egalitarian early Anglo-Saxon society populated by free peasant households cannot be accepted, his description of the territorial function of the hide is still vital: "responsibility for payment of the king's feorm, service in the fyrd [army], and for all other public burdens was distributed over the country in terms of these peasant tenements" (Stenton 1971:279). In this context, it could have been the creation of small peasant tenements, each assessed for their obligations for public renders, which was a critical factor shaping patterns of settlement and agrarian organisation.

There are three pre-Conquest documents which might help to cast light on the organisation of peasant holdings and the related issue of the pre-Conquest manor. These are (1) a custumal of c.AD900 for Hurstbourne (Hampshire) listing the dues owed by ceorls on each hide; (2) a custumal of AD956 for Tidenham (Gloucestershire) recording the dues and labour services of tenants; and (3) the Rectitudines Singularum Personarum, a late Anglo-Saxon treatise on the rights and obligations of various classes of tenants (EHD II:875-880; Faith 1994; Finberg 1972b:452-3,511-14; Lennard 1959:364-68). Coupled to these we have the late 7th century laws of King Ine of Wessex, the earliest English record which has a bearing on agrarian conditions (Attenborough 1922:36-61). From these sources, it is possible to make a generalised distinction between two categories of land within an estate: the inland, which had the fiscal meaning of tax exempt, and the outland, occupied by tenancies who had an obligation to "defend or acquit all the taxes imposed by the state" (Aston 1958:69; Vinogradoff 1908:187).

One element of the inland population can be distinguished by the small size of their holdings and an obligation to serve the table of the seignorial home-farm. These servile workers represent the slave-owning aspect of Anglo-Saxon society - the 'hutting' of slaves by providing them with a smallholding in return for service labour. Amongst the smallholding Domesday peasantry
which might be particularly associated with the inland are those described as Bordars (Faith 1992:22-4; 1994:47). However, their smallholdings of a few acres held from a lord for servile services, were probably unrelated to the hidated portion of an estate and the peasant tenements therein.

The question which concerns us here, is how the peasant tenancies were created, and their obligations in the context of the division between the inland and outland of an estate. The inland of the Tidenham survey is populated by geburas who, like the geburas, of the Rectitudines, held a yardland of land in return for rent and labour services. Law 67 of King Ine refers to tenants, generally associated with geburas, holding yardlands for a fixed rent (gafot) and labour service in return for a homestead (botl) (Aston 1958:71-2). The fact that bound tenancies, measured in yardlands, were in place in the late 7th century has been seen as evidence for the roots "of medieval English villeinage" (Charles-Edwards 1979:103). However, Faith, although accepting that "there was in Anglo-Saxon England a very dependent peasantry owing labour rent", has expressed doubts that they were at work on a demesne in the classical sense, suggesting that groups of geburas farmed holdings which were "physically part of the inland" (Faith 1994:46-7). These inland tenancies, Faith argues, formed the "embryo of a settlement, with their yardlands grouped together in an associated field system" (ibid.47). Significantly, Faith points to the 38 villani and 38 plough-teams of the Domesday survey for Tidenham to be the counterpart of the Anglo-Saxon gebur, their holdings roughly corresponding to the nine hides of inland recorded in the Tidenham survey (ibid.). These arguments could, therefore, provide a link with the customary tenements of the 13th century manor and the yardland holdings of the Anglo-Saxon geburas.

The relationship between hidage and tenements provides a possible mechanism by which the service holdings of the geburas were created, at least numerically. Likewise, there is every reason to suppose that the peasant farms of the outland were apportioned tax liability according to the hidage rating of the component part of an estate of which they formed a part. The term gesett land seems to mean taxable land in the sense that the occupying tenancies were responsible for paying public obligations, and this is certainly the case in the Tidenham survey where gesett land is recorded in contradistinction to inland, a division preserved in Domesday where it presumably continued "to be the basis on which geld was levied" (Faith 1994:45). The laws of Ine also makes the distinction between a gafolgelda and a gebur, while later chapters
speak of gesett land implying that the division between the inland and outland of an estate was in place by the late 7th century (Ine:6.3,64-6). However, as Faith has observed, by the time of the Tidenham survey gafol, in the sense of a tax payment, had become indistinguishable from rent, probably as a consequence of the transfer of rights and dues from land previously paid to the king to individuals (Faith 1994:45). If so, gesett land could also be rented out for 'rent' gafol (i.e. gafolland or gafol gesett), while still maintaining an obligation for the geld liability of an estate.

The outland tenants or gafolgeldas, however, were comparatively free and independent farmers, owing lords various rents, financial or otherwise, but of a less servile kind (Faith 1992; 1994). Although gafol can mean rent, in origin it was a tribute or tax paid to the king, so, as Loyn as noted, "it is possible to interpret a gafolgelda as one responsible for the payment of public exactions, notably the geld" (Loyn 1962:186). Faith has argued that it is likely that to gesett land in an estate was "to allot its tax liability among its component parts by name as had been done at Farnham, perhaps even among individual farms" (Faith 1994:45). Since the apportionment of tax to holdings on the gesett land was rated by the hide, there is also reason to suppose that these dues were allotted to peasant farmers whose holdings were measured in yardlands - quarter shares of the primary hidated assessment. It is possible, therefore, that even in the 7th century, gesett land was tenanted land rated in hides, but rather than a demesne orientation, gesett land was occupied by a freer class of peasantry who held their land on condition of paying public renders of tribute or tax to the king (Vinogradoff 1911:240).

A bipartite pre-Conquest manor divided into an inland and an outland can be demonstrated where a lord's inland remained outside the geld-paying arable land in the post-Conquest period. Thus, at Chippenham (Cambridgeshire) most of the demesne arable (480 acres) also lay in a consolidated block outside the open-field system which contained approximately 1225 acres (Spufford 1965:28-29). Geld-paying land of around 1200 acres is just what we would expect from the assessment of ten hides in 1086 and 1130 giving 40 virgate holdings of 30 acres (Hart 1974:27,29). This holding structure is confirmed from 13th century evidence at which time most of the tenanted land was held as half-yardland or fifteen acre holdings. That the hide was expected to contain 120 acres in Chippenham in the late 10th century is shown when a party of men, expecting to find 360 acres after measuring three hides, find only 226 acres, or two hides less fourteen acres (Finberg 1972:481).
It is also possible that the inland sector of a manor and its 'hutted' labour force was located some distance away from the lord's curia. In the Domesday social composition of Greater Langton, bordars account for 28.6 per cent of the total recorded population and thus stand out as one of the largest concentrations in the shire (shire average 21.3 per cent). Moreover, Thorpe Langton's eleven bordars account for very nearly 38 per cent of its Domesday population. Harvey has suggested that a high proportion of bordars (over 40 per cent) is sometimes a "symptom of population expansion and of intensive cultivation", but the favourable situation of Thorpe makes it unlikely that these smallholders are associated with colonizing manorial waste or previously uncultivated land (Harvey 1979:108-9). If we interpret the bordars of Thorpe as an original servile labour force occupying the inland close to a curia at East Langton, then it is probable that this bordland was not liable for geld. A laying out of new yardland tenements after these bordars were given standard holdings in the post-Conquest period would then account for the high yardland-carucate ratio in Greater Langton. It is possible that the lord of Langton encouraged the development of two distinct manors with endowments of part of his inland and its 'servile' workforce resulting in Thorpe's fiscal and physical independence before Domesday.

Thorpe Langton's simplex name Torp (1086), Thorp (c.1130), is usually rendered "dependant settlement". On grounds of their distribution, it is possible that the majority of Danelaw names in Thorp could derive from OE thúlp rather than ODan thuep (Cameron 1977:144; Fellows Jenson 1978:86-91; Lund 1976). The recurring subordinate position of thorp settlements, many never gaining fiscal independence, suggests the possibility that they might originally have been settlements of dependant inland peasants farming a lords arable. If so, some of this category of place-name could be considered as a reflection of the social landscape of the pre-Conquest manor.

However, the significant conclusion of this brief discussion of the pre-Conquest manor (which has relied heavily on the recent work of Faith), has been to suggest how important the obligation to pay public and private renders and taxes was in the creation peasant tenements. That this is the case is shown most obviously by the carucate-yardland relationship observed in Leicestershire. This fact, however, conceals the processes by which this was achieved. The two elements of the pre-Conquest estate are, for example difficult to trace from later evidence, unless customary and
freehold land mirror the old distinction between the *inland* and *outland* or *gesett land* of an estate.

There is one aspect, however, of this discussion of tenements and tax assessments which might cast light on the origin of the village and its associated field system. Aston, commenting on the yardland tenements of the pre-Conquest *geburas*, suggested that they were sufficiently regular in size "to make it impossible to see them as mere fragments of once larger holdings, and to argue strongly for some ordered creation and control of tenements by a superior" (1958:71). Faith has argued, in relation to the Tidenham estate, that "it seems likely that the peasant dwellings and holdings which had comprised the Anglo-Saxon *inland* developed after the Conquest into nucleated settlements with their own field systems (1994:48). The *outland* peasants must also have been part of these same processes of reorganisation which led to the development of planned villages and the classic manor of customary and free smallholdings. However, behind these planned elements of the early medieval countryside, it is still difficult to glimpse earlier rural structures. Even so, from the earliest charters of the late 7th century, it seems not unlikely that the constituent parts of an estate had been apportioned a hidage rating which was allotted to the individual farms occupying the *inland* and *outland*. It is not known, however, how this assessed land was organised within pre-11th century land units or how long the arable was regarded as common shareland.

11.3 ASSESSED LAND AND TOWNSHIP STRUCTURE

"In very old schemes of taxation and the like pasture land is neglected: not because it is unimportant, but because it is indispensably necessary. It may be taken for granted...Thus if, for fiscal and governmental purposes, there is to be a typical tenement of x arable acres, nothing need be said of any other kind of ground" (Maitland 1897:388-9). This observation is taken from a perceptive section of Maitland's famous essay on the hide (ibid.:386-92); his apology for raising "this dreary old question" is justifiably defended by seeing the hide as 'pre-judicial' to all the great questions of early English history" (ibid.:357).

It is open to question how far we can push back into the Anglo-Saxon period Maitland's observation on taxable land, but it does have significant implications concerning the relationship
between the tenemental structure of a township and taxable land. Dodgshon, in his discussion of the origins of British field systems, makes the crucial distinction between two boundaries within historic townships: an inner one around an archaic core of assessed arable and customary tenements and an outer one of non-assessed land consisting of common waste or rough grazing (Dodgshon 1980:84-5). In this context, the assessed tenemental framework of a township can be considered in relation to the balance between arable and non-arable resources. Thus, if and when arable intakes were made outside of the core area of cultivated land, they could be incorporated into a township's assessed tenemental framework by creating new tenemental units or by increasing the size of the existing ones. Alternatively, where there were large tracts of unassessed woodland and rough grazing land, expanding cultivation could result in a shift from assessing arable intakes in the old tenemental units to other measures such as 'acres', a trend which can be demonstrated for the post-Conquest period.

In the Langton hundred and most other Leicestershire townships, the assessed area of regular virgates incorporated almost all of the land around nucleated settlements. The fact that a tax-yardland relationship can be still be observed several hundred years after the Domesday survey, testifies to the conclusion that some townships had reached or were close to the limits of their cultivated capacity by the 10th or 11th centuries. This is certainly true of the valeland townships where there seems to have been little room for expansion outside of the tenemental framework of assessed land.

By contrast, in woodland countrysides, where the balance of resources is tilted in favour of non-assessed land, assarting was probably a contributing factor in the demise of the geld as an effective land tax. This expansion of the arable is likely to be a fundamental reason why a tax-tenement relationship cannot clearly be observed in woodland countrysides; by the time documents record peasant holdings the old tenemental framework had already been, or was in process of, breaking down. Even so, an archaic tenemental structure can sometimes be glimpsed. At Havering in Essex, for example, there were in 1251, many new arable intakes assessed in 'acres' but also 40 archaic virgate holdings which can probably be linked to Havering's ten hide Domesday assessment (McIntosh 1986:92).

It is, therefore, significant that some studies of woodland countrysides have revealed an archaic virgated structure associated with a core arable area of irregular open-fields with sub-divided
holdings (Roberts 1968:103-4; Taylor 1970:89-100). Thus Blair, in his discussion of landholding in Surrey, observed that the "virgated structure of many, perhaps most open-field parishes had a core of uniform subdivided holdings...they stand out as something separate and distinct from the irregular holdings, both virgated and non-virgated. By c.1300 they were no more than the vanishing relics of an older pattern" (Blair 1991:74-5). In his study of the Forest of Arden, Skipp recognised a number of small open-field systems "associated with a nucleated or semi-nucleated settlement" which had evolved "exclusively in pieces of country which were among the earliest to be cleared and cultivated" (Skipp 1981:174). Similarly, for Hanbury in Worcestershire, Dyer has described two areas of old cultivation within which were "concentrated various elements in the landscape which are likely to be early in origin: the core of the bishop's demesne, most of the holdings of customary tenants [mostly half-yardlanders], and the open field arable. There is every likelihood that part of these developed lands had in fact been farmed since the Roman period" (Dyer 1991:22-3). These studies of woodland country all point to an arable core with virgated tenements (i.e. assessed for the geld) farming diminutive open-fields under common control. Moreover, these open common fields are usually associated with nucleated settlements, although the Hanbury survey teaches us that the link between open-fields and the village was not universal (Dyer 1991:36). With some dangers of over simplification and generalisation, each of these studies suggest that at an early stage of development, regions later characterised as 'champion' and 'woodland' countrysides shared some common basic elements.

Dodgshon has also concluded that the paths along which field systems developed conceal "basic design features that were far more uniform across the country than previous discussions have admitted. There was but one type of British field system, articulated into different regional variants rather than different regional types" (Dodgshon 1980:155). These are defined here as comprising two main elements: firstly, an arable core consisting of subdivided open-fields usually subject to communal fallowing; and secondly the lord's demesne lands. The roots of some of these relationships are probably buried deep in the past. The balance between arable and non-arable lands, for instance, might be traced to the countrysides of the early Anglo-Saxon or late Roman periods. The implication is that the archaic core of assessed arable land was, in many instances, cultivated throughout the Anglo-Saxon period and certainly long before Domesday. Moreover, it is these same lands which were assessed in hides (or later in carucates), which, rather than being a purely seigneurial assessment, were inextricably linked to a land unit's obligation for public renders and taxation.
Regional studies of British field systems have largely ignored tax assessments as a factor influencing tenemental structure and the division of the arable (Baker and Butlin 1973). Thus, in her 1973 survey of East Midland field systems, Thirsk answered the question "what of the first virgates?" by suggesting that the standard holding of the 12th century was a recent creation arising from three possible changes: by arbitrary redistribution by the lord; by partible inheritance; or by co-operative assarting (Thirsk 1973:272-73). The theory that the first standard virgates were a creation of some "archaic orderly system of allocation" was dismissed because "in the light of our knowledge of the land market it is impossible to believe that such order could have survived from several centuries before" (ibid.:273). However, for centuries before the final enclosure of the open-fields there was a great deal of stability of agrarian units for the purposes of the apportionment of tax. Thus, in 1743, Greater Langton's holdings were of varying sizes but this did not effect the systematic counting of agrarian units in yardlands whose ultimate origin lies with the Anglo-Saxon tax system (Appendix 2). The choice of c.1150 as a terminus post quem for the development of the village and open-field husbandry is, therefore, an appropriate one, not just because it is the beginning of the historic period for the study of rural society, but also because it marks the approximate demise of a national system of land taxation whose origins lie in the early to middle Saxon period.

The demonstration of a link between peasant holdings and tax assessments in Leicestershire is important for two reasons: first, it shows a possible mechanism by which standard holdings were created, and secondly, it places the division of the arable within the context of a national fiscal system. However, although tenemental structure must have been reorganised after carucation, there seems little reason to suppose that the tax-tenement relationship was an innovation of the Saxo-Norman period, or that, in Harvey's words, the standard holding was the result of "a process of territorializing the holdings of manorial tenants" in the 12th century (Harvey 1984:12). It is contended here that, rather than being a late Saxon revolution in the concept of the peasant holdings, the roots of the schematized organisation of peasant farms lie with the territorially-based scheme of taxing the land in the early to middle Saxon period.
The question, then, of how the land was farmed and originally shared out is still a central issue of Anglo-Saxon agrarian history. Vinogradoff envisaged the archaic township as a "community of shareholders" in which tenurial units were "commensurate to the shares which they represent in the village [township] group" so that they could be "shifted bodily from one place to another provided their proportionate value was maintained" (Vinogradoff 1911:179). Dodgshon, using charter evidence, has also proposed a transition from a shareholding system to one which defined a tenement in terms of what it actually comprised on the ground (Dodgshon 1975; 1980:3-5,34-41,50,53). Harvey has argued for much the same in his discussion of the origin of standard holdings: "In 1100 the tenant's holding could be viewed simply as a standard share in the vill's resources; by 1200 it was far more likely to be viewed as precisely defined in its area and other rights" (Harvey 1984:12). However, as Fox has observed, the use of charters as evidence for a 12th century change in the nature of landholding is open to question: "what we are witnessing here is simply a development of the diplomatic" (Fox 1992:48). If we narrowly define "a community of shareholders" as a shared right to communal grazing of the arable and non-assessed lands without evoking a thesis of primitive equality and periodic allocation, the actual event of sub-dividing the land or any subsequent reorganisation of field layout is easier to imagine; remodelling could take place without cutting through 'property' rights because the arable was common to all tenements.

Turning again to the laws of Ine, we find that when ceorls have "common meadow or other land divided in shares (gedalland) to fence, and some have fenced their portion and some have not, and [if cattle] eat up their common crops or grass, those who are responsible for the gap are to go and pay to the others, who have fenced their part, compensation for the damage" (Ine 42). This other gedalland or deal-land must refer to arable land which had been divided and dwelt out in shares and required fencing to protect crops from beasts grazing on the common pasture (Finberg 1972:416-7; Fox: 1981:87; Kerridge 1992:17-18; Thirsk 1964:37). The fact that the common meadows stand first in Ine 42 suggests they "were jealously kept in the hands of the community" and that rights in meadowland were held in proportion to rights in common arable (Hooke 1981:58; Vinogradoff 1911:173). A 12th century copyist rendered the gedalland of Ine 42 griffolland, with alias gedalland added above the line, is possibly no more than a scribal error but nevertheless might hold some truth if land rented out for gefol (be it inland or gesett land) was also regarded as common shareland in the 7th century (Attenborough 1922:35,48).
The origin of a schematised system of dividing the land between peasant tenancies probably lies with the standard hide units of the *terra unis familiae* - the social hide or holding capable of supporting a family of free status (Charles-Edwards 1972). In particular, a transformation of the hide into yardland tenancies farming the *inland* and *outland* of individual estates could have been a powerful force drawing groups of peasant farmers together in nucleated or semi-nucleated settlements to facilitate the management of the common flock and arable. If township-sized land units were hidated by at least the late 7th century, the implication is that their communities already had a semi-independent economic existence and whilst some of the wider pasture and woodland resources of a *regio* might be shared or intercommoned, the arable fields connected with individual farmsteads could have formed the original basis of the hidage assessment. This is, in any case, an intrinsic characteristic of early land assessments throughout Britain (Dodgshon 1980:83-9). Thus, when the land is cultivated by numerous small tenancies, communal regulation of folding small folks attached to each holding is likely to follow, particularly in areas lacking the subsistence opportunities of fen and wood-pasture regions. If the assessed lands of of the subdivided hide were grouped together into a simple open-field system it is possible that it was regarded as common sharetand from the start, a right perhaps bequeathed by its origin as the sharetand of the kindred (Ine 42,67). This hypothesis at least has the merit of explaining how the land became divided into standard tenancies without cutting through property rights.

Certainly, the appearance of the village is such a dramatic change in settlement morphology when compared with the early Saxon, Roman and prehistoric past that a deliberate and widespread replanning of settlements and fields from above seems the most plausible explanation of rural reorganisation. Moreover, the possibility that moves towards nucleation began in the 7th century suggests that the rise of royal authority and its related administration is the likely force behind these changes. New conditions of landholding could have been imposed on the peasantry as part of the link between the territorialisation of authority and the relationship between status and landholding (Charles-Edwards 1972). Land and the surplus that it generated were fundamental to the maintainance of status and power in Anglo-Saxon society. It may be supposed that the inheritance of the 7th century kingdoms were many smaller polities each recognised as units of assessments for purposes of tribute taking, but one might expect that one element of a transformation of the structures of control and administration was a shift away from
a tribute system based on kin ties to one based on the imposition of a formal system of taxation (Arnold 1988:198-201; Scull 1992:16-18).

The rise of royal administration could have been connected with a more sophisticated accounting and recording methods following the introduction of Christianity and royal charters giving churches and individuals rights over land and its cultivators or 'tribute-payers'. However, although in the 7th century a formalised system of taxation was already in place, in the context of essentially non-monetary renders of food rents or labour and military service, smallholdings may not have been of equal size or closely defined on the ground although round-figure hidage assessments suggest some uniformity even at this early date. The creation of yardland tenements might well have resulted in sub-divided fields but of an irregular kind - in an essentially cashless society, the regular disposition holdings for the equitable apportionment of tax would have been unnecessary. Even so, throughout the period between c.650 and 950, it is possible to envisage the agrarian structure of Langton hundred organised around the territorial context of township units with a tenemental framework determined by the apportionment of royal taxation assessing public dues.

Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the 10th and 11th centuries marked a critical period for the organisation of rural society. It is probably significant that this period coincides with the wider growth of the cash economy and development of a national monetary system (Stafford 1989:212-14). Moreover, the cash 'geld' represents an important change in the way public dues were paid, eventually replacing the traditional renders with monetary payments. The administration and apportionment of the 'geld' and other monetary rents could have been a potent force in defining peasant smallholdings on the ground. Thus, when a 'geld' was charged at so much per hide or carucate, it would have been apportioned downwards through the shire, wapentake, small hundred, township and finally to the yardland acres of individual farms. It is even possible that the late Saxon administrative nexus which created the institution of shire and wapentake in the Northern Danelaw also entailed a reorganisation of smallholdings so that that services to the burh and fiscal exactions could be justly and efficiently apportioned amongst individual yardlanders. Brown has, for instance, suggested that the event of the English reconquest of Northamptonshire in AD917 was subsequently responsible for the translation of the hidage assessment into a field system at Daventry resulting in "a totally planned landscape" (Brown 1991:77). In other words, a township's tax assessment was used as the basis for land.
division, each tenement's share of the allotted tax liability translated into the same proportionate share of sub-divided arable.

Certainly, the Langton hundred cannot be understood without reference to its place within the institutional and fiscal context of an Anglo-Danish administrative system which could have exerted an affect on land management. It is possible, for example, that the administrative structure of the East Midlands was organised as a defensive march protecting West Saxon England from the North. Thus, the notion that the planning of villages and field systems first appeared in the areas of former Danish occupation following their incorporation into the administrative nexus of a centralising English state could have some validity (Hodges 1989:151-89).

Nevertheless, the debate over who was responsible for replanning the organisation of settlements and fields has tended to polarise in recent years into those who favour the manorial lord as the initiating authority (Campbell,B. 1981), and others who emphasise the role of the collective action of local communities (Dodgshon 1980:75-8; Dyer 1985:32; Fox 1992:50-2; Harvey 1989:43; Reynolds 1984:101-54). Supporters of the seigneurial theory of replanning might, for example, argue that the tenurial fission of multi-vill estates, such as Greater Langton, could have been instrumental in village planning and field organisation as manorial lords sought to manage agricultural resources more efficiently to meet the increasing fiscal exaction of the state and to enhance their income and social control of the peasantry. Certainly a regular tenurial field layout (governed by the geld) was probably, in many instances, accompanied with a replanning of tenemental plots to create regular village plans. The transformation of the peasantry of the inland and outland into the tenant smallholders of the classic manor, must also have been a critical factor in the development of the planned village and regular open-field layout. This aspect of rural reorganisation is most noticeable in the regularity of croft and toft sites along the village streets of Tur Langton and Shangton which could conceivably have a 'late' 11th or 12th century origin.

However, a late Saxon or early medieval phase of rural replanning should not necessarily be seen as the reason for township-wide common arable or settlement nucleation. It has been argued that any remodelling designed to give each yardland an equal share of the total resources of a township would, almost certainly, be achieved by reorganising earlier subdivided fields
whose arable was already farmed as common shareland. It is probable that the processes behind rural organisation can neither be assigned to a single period or that these coincided between regions. The duodecimal holding framework of Leicestershire townships cannot be older than the carucation of land units some time after the late 9th century Scandinavian conquest or later than the demise of the 'geld' as a national land tax in the 12th century. But perhaps a more significant observation is that the landholding framework of the peasant tenements farming the inland and gesett land of an estate (together with their associated core of common arable), probably lies with the allotment of the pre-10th century hide under royal authority.

It has been argued that the grouping together of cultivators around core areas of assessed arable within defined territories could have formed the focus of nucleated settlements and an open-field system from as early as the late 7th century. In champion townships like the Langtons the assessed arable comprised most of the cultivated land but in woodland countrysides the evidence for open subdivided fields can only just be glimpsed in the 13th century: this archaic feature was already breaking down as cultivation expanded and several holdings multiplied. Nevertheless, the interplay between tax assessment, arable land and tenemental structure might also provide a framework for understanding dispersed settlement. Isolated farmsteads and their several fields might be as much a symptom of the breakdown of the 'geld' as a reflection of environmental and social factors. It might be significant, therefore, that archaeological survey in woodland countrysides has hitherto largely failed to find conclusive evidence for pre-12th century occupation of dispersed farmstead sites (Hooke 1994:89-90; Taylor 1992:8-9). If the national system of land taxation broke down at the same time as rising population and pressure to expand the area of cultivation, it is possible that regional differences in the balance between arable and non-arable resources then became a critical factor influencing paths along which contrasting countrysides developed.

Any generalised explanation of rural settlement in an essentially prehistoric period, is bound to over simplify the dynamic nature of the rural economy. Nevertheless, the problem has to be faced of how we can connect the dispersed Romano-British and early Anglo-Saxon settlements of Langton hundred with the villages and open-fields of the 13th century. When one considers the 'basic design features' of early field systems - tenemental shares in subdivided archaic area of assessed arable with apportioned tenemental rights to meadow and pasture - there must be a less complicated explanation for this shift in settlement than the present trend for a multiplicity of
regional economic, social and environmental factors, often with a variety of dates (Dyer 1990b). Equally, it seems unlikely that communities reached similar decisions independently of each other and the repetitive regular duodecimal pattern of yardland tenancies from township to township in Leicestershire points to a fairly uniform tenurial structure with a common planned origin. Thus the fact that arable lands were assessed in hides (or later in carucates) suggests that, rather than having a purely seigneurial origin, small agrarian units were inextricably linked to their obligation for taxation which was ultimately apportioned under royal authority.

For Langton Hundred the conclusions regarding rural organisation before c.1150 can be summarised as follows:

1. A regular tenemental framework governed by the geld.
2. Township-wide common arable which pre-dates the 10th century.
3. Village settlements were certainly established by the late Saxon period with a possible move toward nucleation in the 7th or 8th centuries.
4. Township sized land units were already in place by the late 7th century, each allotted a hidage rating assessment of the arable under royal authority.
5. The Mercian hide was revalued by twenty per cent on the carucation of land units in the 10th century.
6. The character of the countryside in terms of the balance between arable and non-arable resources was broadly established by the 7th or 8th century.

At present, it is not possible to pronounce with absolute confidence on all of these arguments. Nevertheless, it does seem likely that the genesis of the village and their associated field systems should be viewed as part of a process rather than a single event. The 10th or 11th centuries were probably the critical period for village planning (if not nucleation) in the study area as peasant holdings were gathered together in a more regular way than in the preceding centuries. However, we should not presuppose that organised communities were the result of new settlement and field structures organised from above in the late Anglo-Saxon period. In short, the roots of the communitas villa of the 13th century, with its various by-laws governing agrarian life, must be ultimately traced to a pre-10th century context of yardlanders assessed for their public obligations. This view stems from the proposition that behind an organised planning of settlement and field layout, lies an older landholding framework which had evolved from the allotment of tax assessments (or hides) on townships and the farms therein. This calls into
question the view that the establishment of the village and open, common field systems were linked to a late Saxon fission of large 'multiple estate' groupings. Instead, an alternative explanation is that the broad foundations of a township community of husbandmen and common sharelands are to be sought much earlier the Anglo-Saxon period.
CHAPTER TWELVE

CONCLUSION

The central concern of this research has been to investigate the relationship between environmental structure and human behaviour in a small area of the upper Welland valley in south-east Leicestershire. The fine details of the development of the countryside will always remain obscure but nevertheless an integrated approach which combines archaeology with historical sources has begun to yield significant advances in our interpretation of the past landscapes south-east Leicestershire. Thus attention given to Leicestershire by the Leicester School of Local Historians has demonstrated how our understanding of regional societies can be enhanced by viewing the relationship between human settlement and the constraints set by the land: the topographical distinction between the river vale and its hinterland provides a continuing and relevant framework for researching the pattern and progress of settlement.

Historical data provide contextual and temporal information, which casts light on aspects of social and economic life and the character of the countryside for which the archaeological record may have little to say. Archaeological survey, on the other hand, has allowed a longer-term perspective settlement and land use which is beginning to give greater time depth to the historians contextual framework of ‘vale and wold’.

The debate over long-term ‘continuity’ or ‘discontinuity’ in the countryside can be expressed in terms of three key aspects of society and environment: (1) the continuous exploitation of the land; (2) the location of settlements across landscape zones; and (3) administrative or functional continuity of land units. The board trends in settlement and land use from the end of the first millennium BC can now be summarised from a stronger data base from which to draw conclusions. What appears to be clear from the archaeological record is that, viewed over the long term, the countryside of the early to middle Roman period was as fully exploited for cultivation as that of the 12th century. Thus Later Iron-Age finds are found throughout the survey area and this intensive exploitation of the land continues into the early Romano-British period. However, it is probable that by the 4th century there were fewer occupation sites in the hinterland (or at the very least lower levels of prosperity), with a possible intensification of settlement in the river vale and a more pastoral economy in the hinterland.
Significantly, the distribution of early Anglo-Saxon sites suggests that the general pattern of settlement followed that of the Romano-British period albeit in an attenuated form. The Roman to Saxon transition did not result in a catastrophic dislocation in settlement and land use. A dispersed settlement pattern continued into the early Anglo-Saxon period and the proximity of Anglo-Saxon sherds to many of the Roman-British settlements suggests some continuity of occupation or, at the very least, that the land continued to be farmed in the 5th to 7th centuries from the same general settlement areas as in the Romano-British period. There may have been a less intensive exploitation of the countryside marginal to the river vale when compared to the Roman period but this should be viewed as part of a process of changing resource exploitation which had its origins in the late 3rd and 4th centuries.

Certainly the sparsity of early Anglo-Saxon finds from the hinterland cannot be taken as evidence for extensive woodland regeneration around the watersheds. Thus the regional rarity of names specifically referring to woods suggests that woodland regeneration was minimal and the wald names of Shangton and Hardwick documented in the 13th and 14th centuries reinforces the interpretation of Fox that this type of countrysides was distinguished by its wood-pastures environment as opposed to being densely wooded (Fox 1989). The pastoral connotation of Hardwick's place-name seems a particular characteristic of this type of country.

Although this long-term perspective of settlement and land use confirms the importance of the valley-watershed division, the interplay between arable and pasture remains enigmatic. Even so, by the 13th century, archaeological and documentary data shows a return to widespread cultivation across this vale and wold countryside. However, although the limits to cultivation are likely to have been seem to have been reached at a relatively early date in the valeland townships (probably well before the Domesday Survey), the frequency of arable intake field-names in Shangton and Hardwick and the relatively low plough-team and population densities recorded in Domesday point to a post-Conquest expansion of cultivation and the presence of a more pastoral economy even in the 11th century. The arable fields of the hinterland townships were, however, pressing hard on their boundaries in the late 12th century, although this conclusion must be tempered by the possibility that some with parts of the northern plateau remained an area of permanent pasture. Population growth, with its requisite demands on the land, must also have been the critical impetus for this arable expansion in the hinterland and, once this pressure ceased in the mid-14th century, the wold townships were the first to succumb to depopulation.
and conversion to sheep pastures - a return to, as Fox suggests, a distinctive "pastoral heritage" (Fox 1989:85).

The generalised picture of a 2nd century AD area of cultivation at least as extensive as that of the 13th century suggests that the peaks of intensive arable land use coincide with population pressure on the land for the production of an agricultural surplus. It might then be inferred that, in the intervening late Roman and late Saxon periods, when population levels were lower, the spatially-marginal and sparsely settled watersheds were predominantly utilised for their woodland and pasture resources, with the valelands remaining the core zone of arable production. In this model, the ebb and flow of settlement and cultivation would be responsive to changing economic and social factors such as landlord pressure to exact an agricultural surplus.

Such trends, however, do not easily explain the development of the characteristic features of the early medieval countryside in south-east Leicestershire. These are village settlements as opposed to dispersed farmsteads or hamlets and open-field husbandry regulated by communal co-operation. One observation regarding rural organisation is worth making: if extensive cultivation peaked before the end of the Roman period and again after the Norman conquest it is difficult to argue that environmental change or population growth are by themselves the primary catalyst for the evolution of the village and open-fields. What does seem certain is that village, common open-fields and township are inextricably linked and that their origin lies before the reach of documentation in the pre-Conquest period.

The hiatus in settlement location in the Anglo-Saxon period leading to the creation of the village is so fundamental that it implies that there is no direct link between the Roman villa and medieval manor. Nevertheless, it might be significant that early Anglo-Saxon sherds have been found close to the villa or villa-type sites, with very little evidence produced for activity around the sites of Romano-British farmsteads. The fact that occupation continued around higher status late Romano-British sites suggests that, (although it can never be proved), local estate structures survived to be taken over by new proprietors or remained under the control of indigenous population. Since the area of intensive land use contracted in the late and early post-Roman centuries, it is in this core arable zone of the Welland valley that convincing evidence for continuity can be found. The relationship between villa sites and medieval townships opens up the possibility of a continuity of small land-unit boundaries with parts of the medieval pattern.
being either fossilised or perhaps revived from the Roman period. This would suggest, however, a much greater degree of continuity in terms of land measurements for which the evidence is as yet inconclusive (Fernie 1991:4; Kidson 1990).

The extent to which there is a continuity between Roman land division and the medieval township must remain highly speculative. To explain the sharp break in the pattern of settlement we should look to the Anglo-Saxon social and institutional context of change in the countryside. The role of archaeology is limited since, in the absence of any recognisable middle Saxon pottery and the rarity of late Saxon finds, no precise chronology of nucleation can be given. However, to judge from the archaeology alone, nucleation occurred in the mid-to late Saxon period and it is probable that the basic medieval pattern of nucleated villages had been established throughout the survey area by the 10th century. Even so, there is still nothing in the archaeological record to contradict a much earlier move towards nucleation in the late 7th or 8th century.

Whatever the preferred chronology for nucleation, the processes of rural reorganisation cannot be considered without reference to the social or communal dimension of the continuity debate for which it is difficult to recognise tangible evidence. It is the contention of this study that Anglo-Saxon rural society was a schematised one, mirroring the orderly nature of Anglo-Saxon government and that this fact goes some way towards casting light on the tenurial structure of small land units and the related problems of settlement and field morphology. However, we are at once faced with a problem of defining how far groups of peasant households functioned as a community before the 12th century. Over the longer-term much depends on how we view the social and economic organisation of the early and mid-Saxon regio: were they 'community-wide' systems of land use or already sub-divided into semi-independent small land units by the late 7th century? There are three arguments resulting from this research which might a bearing on this problem. First, that the inter-township rights to common arable in Greater Langton are unlikely to have evolved after township fission in the 10th century. Secondly, the demonstration of a link between taxation, peasant holdings and township size suggests that the fiscal carucate or 'geld' was related to a late Saxon agrarian reality. Thirdly, the Leicestershire carucate was a twenty per cent revaluation of the Mercian hide to bring it into line with a duodecimal monetary system.
The territorialised and schematised nature of pre-Conquest society and land division is clearly illustrated by the place of Langton hundred within the institutional and fiscal context of Anglo-Danish administration. It has been possible to recover from the fiscal complexity of Domesday and the c.1130 Survey an earlier, simpler, more logical system, based on a uniform wapentake assessment of 576 carucates quartered into 144 carucate groupings. Within this scheme, the 48 carucate Langton hundred seems to have been one of twelve territorial tithings making up the wapentake assessment quota.

However, although as an institution Langton hundred was a late Anglo-Saxon creation, all be it based on an existing estate complex, the constituent townships have their roots in a pre-10th century context. If the Leicestershire carucate was a twenty per cent revaluation of an original Mercian assessment in hides, six, twelve, eighteen and 24 carucates would represent an original five, ten, fifteen and twenty hides making it likely that the broad foundations of the late Saxon schematised division of the land had evolved from territorial units existing in the 7th or 8th centuries. Moreover, the probability that Greater Langton was already functioning as a community of farmers in the 10th century suggests that sharing the use of local resources within small land units had already had a long existence. If this is correct, many, and possibly the majority, of townships are unlikely to be a late Anglo-Saxon feature of the countryside. With the fragmentation of large estate entities, new townships were undoubtedly created in the Saxon period, a process by which some core valeland land units like Greater Langton developed as split-townships. Nevertheless, the model proposed here is that most small units of exploitation (the township) were already in place well before the 10th century each being allotted a tax rating as a constituent part of larger, multi-township, estate groupings.

If the apportionment of a regular cadestre on township units was not a late Saxon innovation and if these fiscal units exhibit a long-term numerical stability then a longer-term relationship between taxation and land management can be proposed. Thus accepting that the carucate was a fiscal scheme closely related to ploughlands or cultivated acres, recognition that the carucate was essentially an inherited ancient fiscal system suggests that the general character of the countryside in terms of the balance between arable and non-arable resources was already established by the 7th or 8th. This points to a division of south-east Leicestershire into an arable intensive and a wood-pasture zone broadly demarcated by the Lipping and the Welland-Soar watershed.
It seems, therefore, that an appreciation of the interplay between the public obligations of peasant tenements and the organisation of rural life is critical for an understanding of land management throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. While the territorialised and schematised nature of pre-Conquest society is reflected in the apportionment of tax, it was also the mechanism used for dividing the land amongst peasant cultivators responsible for the payment of obligations to lord and state. Thus, the late Saxon geld was important in shaping the framework of open-field layout and regular village plans and this reorganisation must have occurred after the carucation of land units sometime between the late 9th and the 11th centuries. The change to a duodecimal tax system, therefore, led to a related duodecimal holding framework. A large degree of planning lies behind the settlement and field structures documented in the 12th and 13th centuries and the relationship between the number of yardland smallholdings and taxation must be a consequence of a period of rural planning which had fixed the number of real tenements in line with the duodecimally based late Saxon carucate. National schemes of taxation, therefore, influenced manorial development and the great changes in rural organisation in the 10th and 11th centuries.

However, the territorialising of communal co-operation into township size units of exploitation should not be seen as simply a response to new land management and land use requirements in the late Saxon period. While the force and efficiency of the late Saxon geld provided the framework for rural planning based on the principle of fiscal diffusion downwards to the peasant cultivator, it is possible that the hide had already shaped the tenurial structure of rural society from at least the 7th century. Moreover, the fact that yardland tenancies are recorded in the late 7th century dooms of King Ine has two important implications. The first is that the archaic or social hide, representing the land sufficient for the support of a family of free status, was anachronistic well before the late Saxon period. The hide had evolved, at an early stage, into subdivided peasant tenements farming the \textit{inland and gesett land} of an estate. The second is that the creation of small tenancies within a landholding framework of small townships could have drawn cultivators together for the regulation of the common fold for the purposes of ensuring both the fertilizing of the arable and adequate grazing for small tenancies. That this seems to be a logical hypothesis for the region of the Langton hundred comes from the retrospective evidence that, by the 10th century, the land had already been divided into township units which were taxed and were economically independent.
It is possible, therefore, that the territorilisation of political authority through a framework of allotting public obligations to township sized units and the peasant farms therein, marks out the middle to late Saxon period as distinct from the preceding centuries. If nucleation can be traced to the late 7th or 8th centuries an act of deliberate replanning of rural settlements and their fields can most convincingly be explained by the rise of Mercian royal authority and its related administration. If so, identifying the initiating authority of rural reorganisation as communal action versus the power of coercive lords is surely too simplistic. Widespread and early nucleation is far more likely to be linked to a transformation of the structures of control by a shift away from a tribute system based on ties of kin to one based on a more formal imposition of taxation.

The wider territorial pre-10th century context of Langton hundred has been sought in a system of social territorial organisation based upon main drainage system of the upper Welland catchment. The boundaries of this proposed early to middle Saxon 'polity' were reorganised at the creation of the institution of shire and wapentake in the 10th century but it is nevertheless argued that the bounds of Gartree wapentake follow, albeit in attenuated form, the territory of an earlier regio. The Langton hundred itself formed a compact 'multiple estate' stretching down from wold to Welland which had, by the 11th century, divided into its constituent elements. The antiquity of Langton hundred as a tenurial rather than fiscal unit is unknown but the suggestion that the Gumley-Langton Brook axis is the location of the principal villa regalis or 'central place' of an upper Welland territory points to Greater Langton, at least, forming a core land unit within ancient estate structures.

The position of this proposed 'polity' close to the heartland of the Mercian kingdom and its relationship with the known itinerary of the Mercian kings, places it firmly within Mercian administrative structures. Moreover, it is possible that the reconstituted assessment quota approximating 600 hides reflects an early tribe of Anglian peoples similar to those recorded in the Tribal Hidage. However, whether or not an early Anglo-Saxon regio based on the upper Welland catchment can be linked to an even earlier Roman pagus based on the territoria of Roman small towns at Medbourne and perhaps Great Bowden, it seems that questions concerning the Roman to Saxon transition must give more consideration to the origins of the hide as a territorial land tax. Was the hide, as is generally assumed, a new Anglo-Saxon cadestre,
cadestre, or could it in some way connect with the *tributum* or land tax of the later Roman empire (Finberg 1964:8-9; Higham 1992:146-7)? On present evidence this is perhaps unlikely, although there was probably a greater continuum of the basic framework of 'taxable' small land units. On a wider geo-political scale, a hint of administrative continuity might be detected by the relationship between the earliest Anglo-Saxon settlements which formed the core Anglian cultural zone and the late Roman province of *Flavia Caesariensis*.

Although this survey has been narrowly focused on a small area of the Welland valley and its immediate hinterland, it has a wider relevance for many similar valley-watershed countrysides in the East Midlands. The potential of field survey in this region to recover sufficient surface data in order to address some of the diachronic questions of settlement and land use in south-east Leicestershire has been clearly demonstrated. The principal strength of the Langton hundred as a study area is that it provides a cross-section of adjacent but contrasting landscape zones of the river vale and its hinterland. Future fieldwalking programmes should concentrate on countrysides around the watersheds in High Leicestershire, an area identified by the Leverhulme project on medieval settlements and landscapes as a priority for detailed investigation (Lewis and Mitchell-Fox 1993). One useful comparative case study with Langton hundred would be the Loddington hundred based on the Eye Brook. However, it is suggested by this researcher that it is essential to consider future landscape histories within the territorial and fiscal context of Anglo-Saxon administration. In particular, there is a pressing need to reconstruct the original carucation and framework of fiscal units for the whole of Leicestershire. This is necessary not only for understanding the institutions of Anglo-Danish society, but also its relevance for the development of land management throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.
APPENDIX I. GAZETTEER OF FINDS.

This gazetteer offers an abbreviated summary of finds relevant to the period of this research. Lithic finds have been excluded but late and post-medieval finds have been included in the finds summary. All finds are surface scatters produced by the fieldwalking survey unless otherwise stated. The catalogue is divided into two parts: (1) a summary of finds organised by field number; and (2) a catalogue of 'sites' where a concentration of finds has been deemed to represent potential areas of habitation, industrial or funerary activity as opposed to sherd scatters produced by agrarian manuring processes.

The abbreviations used throughout the catalogue are:-

E/LBA = Early to Late Bronze Age  c.2000 to 800 BC
EIA = Early Iron Age     c.800 to 300 BC
IA = Iron Age          c.300 to 1st century AD
RB = Romano-British   c.AD 50 to 400
SX = Saxon            c.450 to 850
Med = Saxo-Norman to Medieval  c.900 to 1350
LM/PM = Late and Post-Medieval c.1400 to present day

Other abbreviations used are: Conc = Concentration; Pot = Pottery; T/S = Traverse and Stint fieldwalking; Grid = Intensive Field Survey.
APPENDIX 1A. FINDS SUMMARY.

These have been arranged by the Land Blocks as defined in Chapter Three. Each entry includes the following information:

1) Field Number. These correspond to the field numbers allotted by civil parish. The numbers are those given to fields at the time of their survey with the exception of some minor changes.

2) Date of Survey.

3) Grid Reference. All references are to grid square SP and are to the approximate centre of the field.

4) Height. Shown in metres above O.D. The height range for each field has been estimated from the Ordnance Survey maps and are to be used as a general guide only.

5) Finds Summary. Sparse, Moderate and Dense, refer to the general spread of pottery in each field. Where appropriate these have been related to the date of finds. In most cases, the sherd numbers indicate the general frequency of finds. Sparse and moderate indicate probable manuring scatters. Dense concentrations are deemed to indicate possible settlement, funerary or industrial areas. THL RB1, WTL SX4 etc., refer to ‘sites’ in the site catalogue.

THORPE LANGTON (Land Block A).

THL 1; 17/10/88; 733915; 73m.
1 SX; 9 Med; 17 PM. Sparse Scatter.

THL 2; 19/10/88; 735913; 72m.
7 Med; 4 PM. Sparse Scatter.

THL 3; 21/10/88; 735925; 105m.
3 RB; 8 Med; 27 PM. Moderate Scatter.

THL 4; 04/02/89; 73559205; 75-90m.
4 Med; 7 PM. Sparse Scatter.

THL 5; 04/06/89; 745924; 75m.
8 1A; 113 RB; 1 SX; 6 Med; Dense Concentration of RB pot: THL RB1.

THL 6; 23/09/89; 745915; 80-15m.
2 RB; 1 RB Imbx; 3 Med; 15 PM.

THL 7; 24/09/89; 748910; 70m.
1 Med; 5 PM. Sparse Scatter.

THL 8; 29/10/89; 737920; 75-90m.
1 RB; 22 Med; 63 PM. Moderate Scatter.
THL 9; 04/11/89; 756920; 70-80m.
14 lA; 22 RB; 12 SX; 10 Med; 63 PM. Moderate Cone of RB pot: THL RB4, dense cone of SX pot: THL SX3.

THL 10; 22/10/90; 755917; 70-80m.
10 RB; 13 SX; 6 Med; 8 PM. Dense cone of SX pot: THL SX4.

THL 11; 23/10/90; 748915; 72-80m.
2 RB; 10 Med; 15 PM. Moderate scatter.

THL 12; 31/10/90; 750914; 70m.
1 lA; 6 RB; 6 Med; 19 PM. Moderate Scatter.

THL 13; 24/11/90; 754915; 70-76m.
7 RB; 6 SX; 2 Med; 19 PM. Dense cone of SX pot: THL SX5.

THL 14; 01/12/90; 948918; 70-85m.
14 RB; 37 Med; 68 PM. Moderate scatter of MED and PM pot.

THL 15; 24/12/91; 751922; 72-81m.
11 lA; 42 RB; 29 Med; 44 PM. Dense concentration of RB pot: THL RB2.

THL 16; 27/12/91; 747922; 75-85m.
5 RB; 9 Med; 8 PM. Moderate scatter.

THL 17; 28/12/91; 748923; 75m.

EAST LANGTON (Land Block A).

ETL 1; 17/10/87; 724936; 125-130m.
10 RB; 90 Med; 58 PM. Moderate scatter. Dense cone of Med pot close to church.

ETL 2; 28/10/87; 728932; 120m.
12 Med; 14 PM.

ETL 3; 25/09/88; 719941; 125-132m.
1 lA; 24 RB; 14 Med. 7+PM. Dense cone of RB pot: ETL RB3.

ETL 4; 11/12/88; 726942; 90-100m.
1 lA; 7 RB; 29 Med; 74 PM. Moderate scatter of Med and PM pot.

ETL 5; 18/12/88; 725739; 100-125m.
2 lA; 1 RB; 12 Med; 45 PM. Moderate scatter of Med and PM pot.

ETL 6; 06/01/89; 734925; 80-110m.
2 lA; 7 RB; 17 Med; 30 PM.

ETL 7; 09/04/89; 731942; 80-90m.
12 lA; 161 RB; 181 SX; 66 Med; 78 PM; Dense cone of RB pot: ETL RB1; Dense cone of SX pot: ETL SX1.
ETL 8; 16/04/89; 730930; 115m.
1 IA; 6 RB; 19; Med 33. Moderate scatter

ETL 9; 19/10/89; 733929; 100-115m.
1 IA; 4 RB; 19 Med; 34 PM. Moderate scatter.

ETL 10; 29/04/89; 730932; 111m.
1 IA; 9 RB; 16 Med; 32 PM. Moderate scatter.

ETL 11; 30/04/89; 730927; 105-115m.
1 IA; 3 RB; 6 Med; 54 PM. Sparse scatter of Med pot.

ETL 12; May/89; 734933; 80-110m.
39 IA; 294 RB; 61 Med; 99 PM. Dense cone of IA and RB pot and tile: ETL RB2.

ETL 13; 11/05/89; 7365935; 80m.
1 RB; 2 Med. Sparse scatter.

ETL 14; 30/12/90; 727930; 115-120m.
1 IA; 3 RB; 8 Med; 24 PM.

WEST LANGTON (Land Block B).

WTL 1; 714922; Jan./88; 715921; 79-9m.
19 IA; 713 RB; 173 SX; 90 EM; 53 PM; Dense cones of IA pot, RB pot and tile, and SX pot: WTL-FOX RB1; WTL SX1 and WTL SX2. Site of the West Langton/Foxton Villa and Anglo-Saxon cemetery.

WTL 2; 26/10/87; 718926; 90-105m.
1 RB; 5 Med. 10 PM.

WTL 3; 19/10/87; 711933; 95-110m.
2 RB; 3 Med; 7 PM.

WTL 4; 01/11/87; 717940; 115-130m.
6 RB; 7 Med; 23 PM.

WTL 5; Dec./87; 710939; 120-25m.
2 IA; 6 RB; 8 Med; 14 PM.

WTL 6; 29/12/87; 710936; 115-120m.
3 RB; 1 Med; 2 PM.

WTL 7; 03/01/88; 712936; 110-120m.
8 RB; 16 Med; 15 PM.

WTL 8; 24/01/88; 717921; 79-84m.
38 RB; 4 SX; 4 Med; 4 PM. Conc of RB pot: WTL RB1. Conc of SX: WTL SX2.

WTL 9; 19-29/04/88; 708935; 110m.
9 EIA; 21 RB; 87SX; 25 Med; 15 PM. Dense conc of EIA (WTL EIA1) and SX pot: TUR SX4. Township boundary ploughed out; SX total includes TUR 9.
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WTL 10; 30-31/03/88; 713939; 121-125m.
7 RB; 1 SX; 13 Med; 17 PM.

WTL 11; 31/03/88; 709934; 90-110m.
3 RB; 7 Med; 20 PM.

WTL 12; April/88; 709926; 85m.
9 Med; 11 PM.

WTL 13; 05/11/88; 706933; 90-105m.
7 RB; 38 SX; 15 Med; 15 PM. Dense conc of SX pot: WTL SX4, total included in Land Block C.

WTL 14; 12/11/88; 720925; 90-110m.
3 RB; 3 SX; 5 Med; 39 PM.

WTL 15; 13-14/11/88; 720935; 120-25m.
14 RB; 5 Med; 35 PM. Conc. of RB pot: WTL RB2.

WTL 16; 26/11/88; 716934; 110-125m.
1 RB; 7 Med; 14 PM.

WTL 17; 26/12/88; 708928; 80m.
2 RB; 3 Med; 1 PM.

WTL 18; 14/01/89; 708931; 85-90m.
1 PM.

WTL 19; 29/01/89; 718923; 80-90m.
6 RB; 5 Med; 16 PM.

WTL 20; 11/02/89; 705930; 85m.
7 Med; 2 Med.

WTL 21; 14/04/89; 720922; 80-90m.
7 IA; 22 RB; 61 SX; 28 Med. Dense conc of SX pot: WTL SX7.

WTL 22; 13/05/89; 713933; 95-110m.
1 RB; 2 Med; 6 PM.

WTL 23; 14/05/89; 712920; 79m.
1 IA; 8 RB; 23 SX; 12 Med; 5 PM. Dense conc. of SX pot: WTL SX8.

WTL 24; 19-20/08/89; 709937; 114-125m.
Finds summary in TUR 24: township boundary ploughed out.

WTL 25; 23/10/89; 701933; 89m.
1 RB; 4 Med; 12 PM.

WTL 26; 26/11/89; 705932; 89m.
No finds.

WTL 27; 26/11/89; 709923; 80m.
3 RB; 12 Med; 4 PM.
FOXTON (Land Block B).

FOX 1; 15-16/05/89; 710920; 80m.
15 RB; 51 SX; 26 Med; 6 PM. Dense conc. of SX pot: FOX SX1.

FOX 2a; 27-28/12/88; 713916; 80-92m.
53 IA; 60 RB; 56 SX; 12 Med; 26 PM. Dense conc. of IA and RB pot: FOX RB2; Dense conc of SX pot:
FOX SX2.

FOX 2b; 09/09/89; 713914; 85m.
1 RB; 11 Med; 11 PM.

FOX 3; 26/09/89; 710918; 80-85m.
4 RB; 2 Med; 6 PM.

FOX 4; 27/09/89; 715913; 80m.
1 RB; 1 Med; 8 PM.

FOX 5; 30/12/89; 716917; 78-85m.
27 IA; 375 RB; 130 SX; 22 Med; ** PM. Dense conc of RB pot and tile: WTL-FOX RB1; Dense conc of SX pot FOX SX3; Iron Slag RB or SX?

FOX 6; 02/01/90; 717916; 79m.
1 RB; 3 Med; 3 PM.

FOX 7; 03/03/90; 718918; 77m.
2 RB; 5 PM.

FOX 8; Sept/85; 715920; 83m.
Fieldwork incomplete.

FOX 9; Nov/85; 712920; 81-5m.
1 RB; 19 Med.

FOX 10; Jan/85; 714909; 80m.
3 RB.

FOX 11; '86; 711912; 82-90m.
2 RB; 47 Med; 83 PM.

FOX 12; 05/01/90; 708916; 85-103m.
3 IA; 18 RB; 28 Med; 85 PM. Conc of RB pot: FOX RB3.

FOX 13; 06/01/90; 710915; 82-95m.
8 RB; 8 Med; 26 PM.

FOX 14; 07/01/90; 714917; 90m.
No finds.

FOX 15; 13/01/90; 715915; 85-102m.
2 IA; 19 RB; 8 Med; 14 PM. Conc of RB pot: FOX RB3.
FOX 16; 20/01/90; 715910; 100-110m.
9 RB; 1 SX; 23 Med; 20 PM. FOX SX4.

TUR LANGTON (Land Block C).

TUR 1; Sept.86; 698939; 89-115m.
9 RB; 10 Med; **PM.

TUR 2; Nov.86; 702943; 100-10m.
184 RB; 3 SX; 33 Med; 19 PM. Dense conc. of RB pot and tile: TUR RB1; TUR SX1.

TUR 3; Nov.86; 703945; 100-05m.
3 RB; 4 Med; 11 PM.

TUR 4; 22/12/86; 725944; 90-110m.
8 RB; 33 Med; 16 PM.

TUR 5; April.87; 710942; 105-20m.
1 RB; 10 PM.

TUR 6; April.87; 701935; 89-98m.
15 IA; 304 RB; 5 EX; 31 Med; 16 PM. Dense conc of RB pot and tile: TUR RB2; TUR SX2.

TUR 7; Sept.87; 718943; 105-131m.
1 IA; 5 RB; 37 Med; 78 PM.

TUR 8; April.88; 698943; 105-120m.
24 IA; 99 RB; 27 SX; 23 Med; 131 PM. Dense conc of IA Pot; conc of RB pot: TUR RB1; dense conc of SX pot (TUR SX3.

TUR 9; April.88; 705935; 90-110m.
2 EIA; 20 RB; 87SX; 30 Med; 32PM. Dense conc of SX pot with an annular loom weight: TUR SX4.
SX total includes WTL 9; township boundary ploughed-out.

TUR 10; May.88; 705938; 95-115m.
1 EBA; 4 RB; 4 SX; 31 Med; 48 PM.

TUR 11; 29/08/88; 708941; 100-120m.
3 IA; 2 RB; 12 PM.

TUR 12; 21/10/88; 701490; 100-115m.
9 IA; 263 RB; 5 SX; 24 Med; 40 PM. Dense conc of RB pot and tile: TUR RB1; TUR SX1.

TUR 13; 29/10/88; 701938; 95-105m.
3 RB; 3 Med; 17 PM.

TUR 14; 27/11/88; 734944; 83m.
1 RB; 9 PM.

TUR 15; 27/05/89; 708954; 120-140m.
4 RB; 22 Med; 30 PM.
TUR 16; 17/10/89; 709951; 110-125m.
5 Med; 16 PM.
TUR 17; 27/10/89; 696944; 115-122m.
9 IA; 2 RB; 2 Med; 28 PM. Conc of IA pot.
TUR 18; 25/11/89; 706954; 110-145m.
3 RB; 21 EM; 61 PM.
TUR 19; 03/12/89; 704948; 100-110m.
4 RB; 21 Med; 61 PM.
TUR 20; 03/12/89; 702948; 100-106m.
6 RB; 17 Med; 78 PM.
TUR 21; 07/05/90; 711954; 125-140m.
1 EIA; 6 RB; 18 Med; 45 PM.
TUR 22; 27/10/90; 710948; 105-115m.
3 RB; 24 Med; 10 PM.
TUR 23; 03/11/90; 706950; 104-120m.
5 RB; 34 EM; 38 PM.
TUR 24; 19-20/08/89; 709939; 110-125m.
5 RB; 12 Med. 39 PM.
TUR 25; 06/01/91; 713954; 130-139m.
3 Med; 10 PM.
TUR 26; 30/11/91; 704944; 95-105m.
5 RB; 1 SX; 2 Med; 15 PM.
TUR 27; 20/04/92; 733947; 83-95m.
3 IA; 1 RB; 6 Med; 14 PM.
TUR 28; 20/04/92; 731949; 95-110m.
4 RB; 5 EM; 12 PM.
TUR 29; 22/04/92; 729953; 90-105m.
6 IA; 83 RB; 1 "dupondius"; 1 Med; 5 PM. Dense conc of RB pot: TUR RB3.
TUR 30; 24/04/92; 726955; 110-115m.
2 RB; 4 Med; 10 PM.
TUR 31; 24/04/92; 724954; 105-115m.
4 RB; 5 Med; 8 PM.
TUR 32; 25/04/92; 720951; 100-115m.
1 RB; 4 Med; 8 PM.
TUR 33; 25/04/92; 721954; 100-15m.
2 EIA; 83 RB; 1 SX7; 5 Em; 24 PM. Dense conc of RB pot: TUR RB4.
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TUR 34; 03/05/92; 730946; 90-117m.
3 RB; 4 SX; 9 Med; 25 PM. Conc of SX pot: TUR SX7.

TUR 35; 04/05/92; 729949; 105-115m.
2 RB; 2 SX; 3 Med; 10 PM. TUR SX7.

TUR 36; 08/05/92; 723946; 100-105m.
5 RB; 13 Med; 19 PM.

SHANGTON AND HARDWICK (Land Block D).

SHT 1; 30/08/89; 717958; 106-130m.
1 RB; 11 Med.

SHT 2; 01/10/89; 709963; 120-135m.
2 RB; 51 Med; 28 PM.

SHT 3; 08/10/89; 708959; 120-145m.
1 RB; 17 Med; 11 PM.

SHT 4; 16/10/89; 710958; 120-140m.
3 RB; 11 Med.

SHT 5; 18/10/89; 711972; 135-155m.
6 RB; 12 Med.

SHT 6; 21/10/89; 714972; 130-145m.
5 Med.

SHT 7; 28/10/89; 714966; 124-132m.
9 RB; 35 Med.

SHT 8; 05/11/89; 714966; 125-140m.
122 RB; 70 Med; conc of RB pot: SHT RB2. Dense scatter of Med pot.

SHT 9; 11/11/89; 718961; 106-127m.
2 RB; 15 Med.

SHT 10; 12/11/89; 722963; 110-127m.
1 RB; 8 Med;

SHT 11; 12/11/89; 726962; 95-102m.
15 IA; 109 RB; 11 Med; Conc of IA and RB pot, Some tile: SHT RB3.

SHT 12; 16/11/89; 713974; 135-155m.
1 RB; 5 Med;

SHT 13; 16/11/89; 720954; 105-125m.
1 RB; 12 Med.

SHT 14; 17/11/89; 721958; 100-124m.
4 RB; 17 Med;
SHT 15; 17/11/89; 724959; 105-116m.
10 RB; 34 Med;

SHT 16; 18/11/89; 721961; 110-125m.
8 RB; 33 Med;

SHT 17; 18/11/89; 727958; 95-115m.
9 RB; 7 Med;

SHT 18; 10/12/12; 713958; 115-140m.
12 RB; 16 Med;

SHT 19; 17/01/90; 716966; 115-129m.
1 RB; 11 Med.

SHT 20; 28/01/90; 726965; 93-115m.
1 EIA?; 37 IA; 211 RB; 1 SX?; 27 Med. Conc of IA and RB pot: SHT RB4.

SHT 21; 14/04/90; 709966; 140-146m.
22 RB; 68 Med;

SHT/HDW 22; 01/11/90; 721971; 130-145m.
1 EIA?; 76 RB; 1 SX; 19 Med; Conc of RB pot: HDW RB1.

SHT/HDW 23; 02/11/90; 729969; 100-114m.
3 IA; 3 Med; 2 PM.

SHT/HDW 24; 02/11/90; 730968; 96-100m.
2 PM.

SHT/HDW 25; 02/11/90; 730970; 100-110m.
5 RB; 2 PM.

SHT/HDW 26; 02/11/90; 728972; 105-120m.
6 RB; 12 Med.

SHT/HDW 27; 10/11/90; 721976; 125-145m.
1 RB; 7 Med; 6 PM.

SHT 28, 11/11/90; 713976; 115-130m.
3 RB; 43 Med.

SHT 29; 18/11/90; 710969; 135-153m.
149 RB; 17 Med; 12 PM. Conc of RB pot and tile: SHT RB1.

SHT 30; 25/11/90; 717965; 120-130m.
8 RB; 36 Med;

SHT 31; 25/11/90; 712966; 130-145m.
6 RB; 20 Med.

SHT 32; 02/12/90; 713968; 130140m.
60 RB; 21 Med; 18 PM. Conc of RB pot: SHT RB1.
APPENDIX 1B. SITE CATALOGUE

This catalogue contains a brief summary of the finds produced from 'sites' deemed to represent potential areas of habitation or industrial or funerary activity. Each entry is arranged by the respective Land Block and includes the site code, civil parish, field number(s), the OS grid reference (field and not exact site location), proposed status, and a summary of finds.

EARLY-LATE BRONZE AGE
TUR EBA1 Tur Langton; Field TUR 10; 705938.
1 sherd T/S. Early Bronze Age um?

PRE-ROMAN IRON-AGE
The material has been divided into two possible chronological categories: (1) Early Iron-Age; and (2) Middle-Iron-Age to late LPRIA.

EARLY IRON-AGE
ETL EIA1 East Langton, Field ETL 7; 731942.
1 ETL? Grid.

TUR-WTL EIA1 Tur Langton, West Langton; Field TUR 9 and WTL9; 705935, 708935.
Ploughed-out township Boundary.
5 EIA? T/S and Grid.

TUR EIA2 Tur Langton; Field TUR 21; 711954.
1 EIA? T/S.

TUR EIA3 Tur Langton; Field TUR 33; 721954.
2 EIA? T/S.

SHT EIA1 Shangton; Field SHT 20; 726965.
1 EIA? T/S.

HDW EIA1 Hardwick; Field SHT/HDW 22; 721971.
1 EIA? T/S.

MIDDLE IRON AGE TO LPRIA
Sites which have produced evidence for LPRIA to ERB continuity include their Romano-British site code: (+ indicates sherds dated to the ERB period could be LPRIA)

LAND BLOCK A
THL IA1 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 5; 745924. Lipping-Welham Road.
8+ IA, RB site: THL RB1.
THL IA2 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 9; 756920. Welland Terrace.
14+ IA.

THL IA3 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 15; 751922. Lipping-Welham Road.
20 sherds of coarse wares with possible origins in the LPRIA; associated with RB site THL RB3.

THL IA4 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 17; 748923. Lipping-Welham Road.
RB site THL RB2; 20+ IA.

ETL IA1 East Langton; Field ETL 3; 719941. Ridge Road.
ERB site ETL RB3: possible LPRIA origins.

ETL IA2 East Langton; Field ETL 7; 731942. Lipping-Stonton Road.
RB site ETL RB1: 20+ coarse ware with possible origins in the LPRIA.

ETL IA4 East Langton; Field ETL 12; 734933. Lipping Valley.
RB site ETL RB2: 19+ IA (Includes 1 EMSW).

ETL IA5 East Langton; Field ETL 12; 734933 (736932). Lipping Valley.
9 IA (includes 3 EMSW).

ETL IA6 East Langton; Field ETL 14; 727930. Ridge Road.
1 EMSW.

LAND BLOCK B

WTL IA1 West Langton; Field WTL 1; 714922. Langton Brook.
32 IA. RB site WTL1 with possible LPRIA origins.

WTL IA2 West Langton; Field WTL 21; 720922. Langton Brook.
6+ IA and 1 possible Triangular loomweight frag. Associated with possible RB site WTL RB3.

FOX IA1 Foxton; Field FOX 2a; 713916.
52 IA (includes 1 EMSW); 1 Triangular loomweight. Associated with ERB site FOX RB2.

FOX IA2 Foxton; Field FOX 5; 716917.
27+ IA. Associated with RB site FOX RB1 (WTL-FOX villa complex).

FOX IA3 Foxton; Fields FOX 12 and 15; 708916 and 715915.
5+ IA (includes 1 EMSW). Associated with ERB site FOX RB3.

LAND BLOCK C

TUR IA1 Tur Langton; Fields TUR 2, 8, and 12; 702943, 698944, 701940.
34 IA. Possible associated with RB site TUR RB1.

TUR IA2 Tur Langton; Field TUR 6; 701933.
15 IA (includes 5 EMSW and 2 with finger impressed decoration). Associated with RB site TUR RB2.

TUR IA3 Tur Langton; Field TUR 17; 696944.
9 IA (includes 2 EMSW).

TUR IA4 Tur Langton; Field TUR 29; 729954.
10+ LPRIA. Associated with RB site TUR RB3.
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TUR IA5 Tur Langton; Field TUR 32; 713968.  
15+ LPRIA. Associated with RB site TUR RB4.

LAND BLOCK D
SHT IA1 Shangton; Field SHT 8; 717969.  
10+ LPRIA. Associated with RB site SHT RB2.

SHT IA2 Shangton; Field SHT 11; 726926.  
22+ IA. Associated with RB site SHT RB3.

SHT IA3 Shangton; Field SHT 20; 726965.  
37+ IA (includes 6 EMSW). Associated with RB site SHT RB4.

SHT IA4 Shangton; Field SHT 29; 710969.  
10+ LPRIA; Associated with RB site SHT RB1.

HDW IA1 Hardwick; Field SHT/HDW 22; 721971.  
12+ IA. Associated with RB site HDW RB1 with possible LPRIA origins.

HDW IA2 Hardwick; Field SHT/HDW 23; 729969.  
3 IA (includes 1 EMSW).

ROMANO-BRITISH SITES
LAND BLOCK A
THL RB1 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 5; 745924. Lipping-Welham Road, Farmstead.

THL RB2 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 17; 751922. Lipping-Welham Road, Farmstead.

THL RB3 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 15; 748923. Lipping-Welham Road, Farmstead.

THL RB4 Thorpe Langton, Field THL 9; 756920. River Welland Terrace. Status unknown, possible manuring scatter.

ETL RB1 East Langton; Field ETL 7; 731942. Lipping-Stonton Road, 'Villa-Type' Settlement.

ETL RB2 East Langton; Field ETL 12. 734933. Lipping Valley, Farmstead.

ETL RB3 East Langton; Field ETL 3; 719941. Ridge Road. Farmstead.

LAND BLOCK B
WTL-FOX RB1 West Langton and Foxton; Fields WTL 1 and 8, FOX 5; 714922, 717921, 716917. Langton Brook, West Langton and Foxton Villa

WTL RB2 West Langton; Field WTL 15; 720935. Ridge Road, possible Farmstead.

WTL RB3 West Langton; Field WTL 21; 720922. Langton Brook, possible Farmstead.

FOX RB2 Foxton; Foxton; Field FOX 2a; 713916. Langton Brook, Farmstead.

FOX RB3 Foxton; Fields FOX 12 and 15; 708916, 715915. Farmstead.
LAND BLOCK C
TUR RB1 Tur Langton; Fields TUR 2, 8 and 12; 702943, 698843, 701490. Kibworth Road, Villa-Type Settlement.

TUR RB2 Tur Langton; Field TUR 6; 701933. West Langton Road, Farmstead.

TUR RB3 Tur Langton; Field TUR 29; 729953. Lipping Valley, Farmstead.

TUR RB4 Tur Langton; Field TUR 33; 721954. Lipping Tributary, Farmstead.

LAND BLOCK D
SHT RB1 Shangton; Fields SHT 29 and 32; 710969, 713968. Langton Ridge/Gartree Road, Villa.

SHT RB2 Shangton; Field SHT 8; 714966. Ridge Road/Gartree Road, Farmstead.

SHT RB3 Shangton; Field SHT 11; 726962. Lipping Valley/Gartree Road, Farmstead.

SHT RB4 Shangton; Field SHT 20; 726965. Lipping Valley/Gartree Road, Farmstead.

HDW RB1 Hardwick; Field SHT/HDW 22; 721971. Shangton Grange/Gartree Road, Farmstead.

EARLY-MIDDLE ANGLO-SAXON SITES
LAND BLOCK A
THL SX1 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 1; 733915. Langton Brook. 1 T/S.

THL SX2 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 5; 745924. Lipping Valley. 1 T/S.

THL SX3 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 9; 756920. Welland Terrace. 3 T/S; 9 Grid.

THL SX4 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 10; 755917. Welland Terrace. 11 T/S; 1 Rim T/S; 1 Stamped T/S

THL SX5 Thorpe Langton; Field THL 13; 755917. Welland Terrace. 6 T/S

ETL SX1 East Langton; Field ETL 7; 731942. Lipping Valley. 6 T/S; 164 Grid; 10 Rims Grid; 1 Decorated Grid; 1 Stamped Grid.

LAND BLOCK B
WTL SX1 West Langton; Field WHL 1; 715921; Langton Brook. Cemetery. 10 T/S; 152 Grid; 13 Rims Grid. 3 Stamped Grid. 2 pot handles Grid. Brooches

WTL SX2 West Langton; Field WHL 1 and 8; 715921, 717921. Langton Brook. 7 T/S.

WTL SX3 West Langton; Field WTL 10; 717939. Langton Ridge. 1 T/S

WTL SX4 West Langton; Field WTL 13; 706933. West Langton Road. 6 T/S; 30 Grid; 2 Rims Grid. Total included in Land Block C.
WTL SX5 West Langton; Field WTL 14; 720925. Langton Brook.
4 T/S.

WTL SX6 West Langton; Field WTL 16; 716934. Langton Ridge.
1 T/S.

WTL SX7 West Langton; Field WTL 21; 720922. Langton Brook.
6 T/S; 55 Grid; 1 Rim Grid; 1 Stamped Grid.

WTL SX8 West Langton; Field WTL 23; 712920. Langton Brook.
5 T/S; 16 Grid; 2 Rims.

FOX SX1 Foxton; Field Fox 1. 710920; Langton Brook.
12 T/S; 35 Grid; 1 Rim T/S; 1 Rim Grid; 2 Decorated (including boss) Grid.

FOX SX2 Foxton; Field FOX 2a; 713916. Langton Brook. Cemetery
1 T/S; 52 Grid; 2 Rims Grid; 1 Decorated T/S. Brooches

FOX SX3 Foxton; Field FOX 5; 716917. Langton Brook.
10 T/S; 111 Grid; 7 Rims Grid; 1 Base Grid; 1 Decorated (figure impressed).

FOX SX4 Foxton; Field FOX 16; 715910.
1 T/S

LAND BLOCK C
TUR SX1 Tur Langton; Fields TUR 2 and 12; 702943, 701490.
6 T/S; 2 Grid.

TUR SX2 Tur Langton; Field TUR 6; 701935.
7 Grid.

TUR SX3 Tur Langton; Field 8; 698943.
3 T/S; 20 Grid; 1 Base.

TUR SX4 Tur Langton; Field 9; West Langton Field 9. 705935 and 708935.
19 T/S; 62 Grid; 2 Rims T/S; 3 Rims Grid. 1 Base. 1 decorated; 1 annular loom Weight.

TUR SX5 Tur Langton; Field 10; 705938.
4 T/S.

TUR SX6 Tur Langton; Field TUR 26; 704944.
1 T/S.

TUR SX7 Tur Langton; Field TUR 34 and 35; 730946 and 729949.
6 T/S.

LAND BLOCK D
SHT SX1 Shangton; Field SHT 29; 710969.
3 Sherds found in 1970s but now lost (Peter Liddle pers. comm.)

HDW SX1 Hardwick; Field SHT/HDW 22; 721971.
1 Grid.
EARLY MEDIEVAL
The following concentrations were noted (by Field Number):

LAND BLOCK A
ETL 1.
70+ sherds adjacent to the wall of the church yard at Church Langton.

LAND BLOCK D
SHT 28.
40+ Saxo-Norman and early medieval sherds probably indicating an area of village shrinkage.

SHT 21.
68 sherds, possibly representing manuring.

SHT 8.
70 sherds in the same area of a Roman farmstead site (SHT RB2). Unexplained; habitation?
APPENDIX 2 RIGHTS OF COMMON 1743

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENANTS</th>
<th>YARDLANDS</th>
<th>SHEEP</th>
<th>COWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Edward Pickering's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demesne in the open-fields:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Middleton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Neale</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Smith</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Arable' yardlands dispersed in the open-fields:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Yardlands:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of common in the open-fields:</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sir Edward Pickering's rights of common in the open-fields for his closes in West Langton estimated at 368 acres: 24?* 720 96

Landholders entitlement to rights of common in Sir Edward Pickering's Closes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>TENANT</th>
<th>TOWNSHIP</th>
<th>YARDLANDS</th>
<th>SHEEP</th>
<th>COWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Peach</td>
<td>Mathew Waterfield</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Farrer</td>
<td>Thomas Buszard</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Vowe</td>
<td>Thomas Smith</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Clarke</td>
<td>Isaac Wilby</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Paddy/T.Kendal</td>
<td>Francis Drake</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Kendal</td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sarjeant</td>
<td>Nicholas Sharman</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Warr</td>
<td>William Hensman</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ward</td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Middleton</td>
<td>Joseph Bentley</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Middleton</td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Browne</td>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>cottager</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Drake</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorpe/East</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6 &amp; 2 Legs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issac Wilby</td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wilby</td>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4 &amp; 2 Legs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smalley</td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 Legs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Watson</td>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2 Legs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Buszard</td>
<td>T.Drake/J.Smalley</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>TENANT</th>
<th>TOWNSHIP</th>
<th>YARDLANDS</th>
<th>SHEEP</th>
<th>COWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Clarke</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Pain</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Iliff</td>
<td>William Clarke</td>
<td>East Cottage &amp; 0.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Clark</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Faulkner, minor H. Neale, guardian</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Buszard</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnson</td>
<td>Thomas Buszard</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Iliff</td>
<td>William Grant</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Day</td>
<td>Henry Pain</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gibson</td>
<td>John Ward</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Woodcock</td>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>East Cottage &amp; 0.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wade</td>
<td>John Ward</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Dunmore</td>
<td>Isaac Wilby</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Green</td>
<td>Joseph Bentley</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Pain</td>
<td>Thomas Drake</td>
<td>East/Thorpe Cottage &amp; 3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna Clarke</td>
<td>Henry Neale</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorcas Morris</td>
<td>Matthew Waterfield</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Bentley/A. Warner W. Clarke/T. Gamble</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Blisse</td>
<td>J. Ward/T. Smith</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ward</td>
<td>T. Ward/E. Platt</td>
<td>East/West Cottage &amp; 0.875</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5 &amp; 2 Legs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Bowes/H. Edmunds Breedon Johnson</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Roberts</td>
<td>T. Smith/T. Kendall</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Buszard</td>
<td>Thomas Gamble</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Smeeton</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. William Newton</td>
<td>John Buszard</td>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL OUTSIDE THE DEMESNE = 76.875 Yardlands
MESNE LYING IN OPEN-FIELDS = 10 Yardlands
TOTAL INCLUDING DEMESNE = 86.875 Yardlands
DEMESNE LYING IN CLOSES = 24* Yardlands

ESTIMATED GREATER LANGTON TOTAL = 110.875 Yardlands

* Demesne yardlands have been estimated on the basis of 30 sheep and 4 cows = one yardland. The total yardlands stated in Parliamentary Enclosure Act (1791) is 109.25 yardlands.
APPENDIX 3 WEST LANGTON DOCUMENTS

The extracts are taken from a manuscript in the Rawlinson collection held at the Bodleian library, Oxford, which contains copies of 17th century documents and is lettered on the back "Strelly's MS. of things in Leicestershire, flagrante bello civili...." (MS Rawl. D 116). A partial transcript and list of the contents of this manuscript are published in Nichols (1800:536-38; 1811:1046-47).

APPENDIX 3A ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT TO ENCLOSE FIELDS IN WEST LANGTON (1650)

Articles of agreement made on the 19th day of June 1650 between Arthur Staveley, esq., lord of the manors of West Langton and East Langton in the county of Leicester of the one part and the freeholders and landholders in West and East Langton aforesaid and in Thorpe Langton in the said county whose names are hereunto subscribed of the other part as follows

IMPRIS where as many suitors? and other great inconveniences both in rotting of sheepe wasting of good ground and other great losses both in corn and grass by reason that the lands arable, meadow and grass ground belonging unto ourselves with the farmes and houses in the said three towns do lye intermixed one with another which inconveniences and losses do continue and for preventing whereof certain articles of agreement where heretofore made for dividing of the said fields, and laying to each town a reasonable proportion of ground according to the land and ground belonging unto ourselves? with each farm in each of the said towns respectively as by the said articles bearing the date the 19th day of January in the eigth year of the reign of Charles the late King of England (1633) appeareth. It is now agreed by and between the said parties to these that the the agreement set down and agreed upon in and by the said Articles shall in all things therein contained according to the true intent and meaning thereof take effort and proceed in with all convienient speed to all intents and purposes and in the said divisions respect shall had unto quantity quality and conviency.

Item: it is agreed by and between all the said parties to these that for the laying of the fields to each of the said towns one or more surveyor or surveyors shall with all convienient speed set on work to administer and layforth what ground shall belong or be used with the farms and houses in each of the said towns severally, and to that purpose everyone of the parties shall show to hath surveyed or surveyors what ground he hath in the fields now belonging to the said towns with? each? surveyor or surveyors shall? by the said parties to the or the greater number of them. And that after the same divisions made each town shall common by themselves and not one with another.

Item: it is agreed by and between all the said parties to these that it shall and may be lawfull for all or any of them at any time or times hereafter to inclose and hold in several any land or ground which he hath or shall recieve in exchange abatinge common in the rest of the field according to rate of a yardland
common for every twenty acres that shall be inclosed and so according to that rate for every greater or lesser quantity that shall be inclosed. And upon such abatement of common shall hold the same freed and discharged from all common for any other uses at all.

APPENDIX 3B VALUATION OF FOUR YARDBLANDS: 27th MARCH 1650

March 27th 1650. A brief collection of four yardlands; land arable, meadow, and pasture, with the appurtenances of the inheritance of Nicholas Strelly extracted from his boundary book.

Imprimas: one masuage, 50 acres of arable land, 28 acres of pasture and mowing ground; seven closes containing 10 acres and 12 acres of meadow. A particular valuation hereof as follows:

My homesestead, valued at: £120 0 0
The seven closes, valued at: £300 0 0
The fifteen acres adjoining to be inclosed, valued at: £300 0 0
Twelve acres of meadow at £12: £240 0 0
There are 63 acres still remaining, valued at £30. per annum, which amounts to £600, or take it thus, valued at £10. per acre, and it amounts to: £630 0 0

Amounts according to this valuation: £1590 0 0

Memorandum, that the greatest part of the arable land, meadow, and pasture, with appurtenances, do lie in very good sort, by wrongs and great pieces throughout; and as concerning quality, the prime soil in Leicestershire. NICH. STRELLEY.
APPENDIX 3C VALUATION OF SEVEN CLOSES AND FORTYONE LANDS (1651)

April 1st 1651. Field Measure
My Homestall valued at a £120 and containing an acre
The Orchard leyes containing six roodes
The New Close containing four acres and a rood
Stockwell Close containing six roods
The Bunch Close containing an acre
The Nether Close containing two acres and a half
Bitchel? Close containing two acres and a half
Meadow Close containing one acre; be they more or less.

Here is seven closes, according to computation of field measure they are fourteen acres and a rood. At thirty shillings an acre it comes to twenty one pounds a year.
The seven closes, by statute measure are ten acres and a rood, being valued this way, at fourty shillings an acre which comes to twenty pounds and ten shillings a year

Fortyone lands lying together on the south-east side my closes containing eleven acres valued at twenty shillings an acre: by the year it comes to eleven pounds a year.
There is by statute measure nine acres and three roods

? that seven closes and fortyone lands adjoining contain by field measure twenty five acres and a rood.
By stute measure they contain twenty acres. It is besides my Homestead
APPENDIX 3D VALUATION OF LAND TO BE INCLOSED, SEVEN CLOSES AND THIRTYTWO LANDS (1652)

Wheat Field One headland and the fellow and hades upon Little Hill containing one acre 1652
One half acre land with the hades on the same furlong

Fallow Two half acre leys shutting upon Purgate being one distance from the other
Five leyes shutting East and West, near unto Lords Close, containing three acres
In the whole five acres valued at £15. an acre: £82 10 0

Wheat The dole of Meadow in the Westmoor, containing three acres
Two old rood leys near unto Lords Close, shutting East and West
Four half rood leys in Crosons Close next the Barons Close
Two rood leys together on the same furlong

Peas Two rood leys together in Round-Hill Close

Fallow Two rood leys beyond the Spiney, Hopkins, lately West
Item one half rood land on the West side Rundles
In the whole six acres and half a rood at £15. an acre: £90 0 0

So that there is in Mr. Staveley's closing of my ground 11 eleven acres and a half, to be valued at £15. an acre it comes unto £165, besides the half rood in Rundles: £165 0 0

Item my homestead valued at: £100 0 0
Item seven closes valued at twelve acres, the price: £260 0 0
Item thirtytwo lands with the Barons Gate containing seven acres and one rood valued at eleven pounds an acre: £79 5 0

Memorandum my homestead, seven closes, thirtytwo lands with the gate contain twenty acres, as before priced it comes unto in the whole: £439 5 0
So that this comes to in all £604 5 0
Here is thirtyone acres and a half come to £604 5 0
APPENDIX 3E TERRIER OF ONE AND HALF YARDLANDS (15th MARCH 1653)

A particular of a yardland and a half for a ? of ? to and for the said Elizabeth in the ? of her ? made upon marriage which is ? or intended by the said Nicholas Strelly to ? money for his occasions. And for a compensation to be made to the said Elizabeth for ? in the ?. And for a certain provision for her, and for provision of portions for her children.

A particular of a yardland and a half

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>r.</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imprimis. Stockwell Close containing one acre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item the Nether Pond Close containing two acres and a half</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Bitchill close containing two acres and a half</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Meadow close containing one acre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item the Bunch close containing one acre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item one close called the Orchard layes one acre and a half</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item one half acre ley on the south side there</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Barons New Close containing four acres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item all the pece of land and grass ground ?? Arnolds Slade?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lying in the south east side all the aforesaid closing containing eight acres</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item one parcell of greenesword? near ? ? half an acre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item four half acre layes together in Tocroft?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item eleven lands together in Broademoore containing three acres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item four half acre lands together in Edward Sick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item three layes together in Edward Sick containing two acres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item one roode ley in Edward Sick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item four half acre lands together upon Gripts?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item one half acre land upon the same furlong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item four old roode layes upon Spring leyes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item two roode leyes in the Nether Moore beneath East Langton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item one half Acre ley these? being one ley distance therefrom?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item the pece of meadow in Brodemoore containing four acres</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field Measure = 40 - 3 - 0
APPENDIX 4 GLEBE TERRIER: EAST, WEST AND THORPE
LANGTON (1638-1700)

A Terrier of all the houses, Glebelands, leas, meadows and pastures belonging or in way appertaining to
the Church of Langton with the hamlets thereof as Thorpe Langton, East Langton and West Langton as
members of the same taken by Samuel Hill Doctor of Divinity and Rector of Church Langton above
named the 28th day of May 1638

IMPRIMIS. The mansion house with two barns, three stables, an oathouse?, a malthouse with gardens
above, a kilnhouse, a brewhouse, a backyard or stackyard?, a foreyard, a close and garden adjoining
thereunto by estimation three acres of ground or thereabouts.

Itm 3 yardlands in manner and form following:

WEST FIELD:
Itm in the West Field five roods butting in Purgate
Itm three roods of grass in Edwards Sick
Itm nine half (old) roods of grass lying together butting upon Foxton Lodge
Itm five half acres butting Stonning Hades

[NETHER FIELD IN 1690, 1694 and 1700]:
Itm one acre butting into Rundels
Itm one acre more in the same furlong butting into Rundels
Itm one half rood butting into Rundels
Itm one rood butting upon Sumpters Headland [Shortlayes 1700]
Itm one half acre [old rood] butting upon Sumpters headland [Stepings 1700]
Itm one [old 1700] rood butting in Moregate
Itm one acre [half acre 1700] butting in Moregate
Itm one acre upon Thrall Hill butting upon Littlemoor
Itm one acre [four roods 1690] upon Thrall Hill butting upon Brincks
Itm one acre of grass in Prickshome [Pricksholm 1690]
Itm three half roods of grass butting upon the Hog Pasture
Itm [one acre of grass in Brincks butting upon the Hog Pasture]
Itm one [rood old rood lay] in Brincks
Itm five rood layes in Little More butting into Musell Hole
Itm two old rood lands upon Mathew Green
Itm another lay in Brincks
Itm one acre and a half upon Mussill Hill
Itm three [two old 1690, 1700] roods upon the same furlong
Itm two roods [old] upon Mussill Hill butting upon Sumpters headland of grass
Itm one rood [acre 1700] butting into Meare Hades
Itm one rood butting into Mussell Hole
Itm one [old 1700] rood butting into the Moore
Itm two old roods upon Lanckhill [Langhill]
Itm four half [four roods 1694,1700] upon Clayhill butting towards Greenhams Bridge

THORP LANGTON [THORPE FIELD 1690, 1694, 1700]:
Itm two old roods butting upon Redomes? Gate [Reedham 1690, Redholmes 1700]
Itm the parsons? hadland [one acre 1700] in Thorpe Langton Field butting on Fulwell Meires
Itm three roods and a half [three old roods 1700] at Dexters Comer
Itm two old roods butting upon Mr Streets Cows? Pen
Itm one rood butting upon Paddock Well Stile?

NORTH FIELD [THE WHORLE FIELD 1690, 1694, 1700]:
Itm in the North Field two old roods butting to Great Oxheads
Itm two acres together butting the Tong on Kerrin [Carring] Gate into Whirlesick the grass headlea S.
Itm one old rood butting over Kerrin Gate into Whirlesick
Itm one grass Hadlea butting on Kerrin Gate and into [little 1690] Oxheads
Itm two roods butting in the grass Hadlea
Itm one old? rood upon Whorie butting in Whorlesick
Itm one old rood butting into Stonhill [Stonehill]
Itm two old roods butting into Whorlsicke
Itm three half roods of grass upon Saltingham Leas ... west
[Itm two old roods of grass upon Saltingham Layes Edmund Clark west 1700]

[THE NORTH FIELD 1700]:
Itm two roods of grass in Woodgate Mr. Strelly [Squire Pickering 1694] east
Itm two roods of grass butting on Stonton Brook
Itm two rood leas butting into Tur Langton Meire [Meer]
Itm four leas butting towards St Ann's Well
Itm four leas upon the North Hills
Itm one acre butting on Stonton Brooke by? Woodgates Mr Strelly west
Itm three half acres butting in Woodgate the headland and other two half acres lying at Stonton Brook
Itm one rood butting in Woodgate on the same furlong
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Itm one rood butting into St Ann's Well
Itm six roods upon the Church Gate furlong [butting to the Church Gate 1700]

**MILNE FIELD [MILL FIELD]:**
- Itm one rood on [name illeg.] hadland at Milne Moore
- Itm two old roods butting in Crossgate
- Itm one old rood butting in Crossgate
- Itm three roods butting in Millgate
- Itm two roods butting in Millgate
- Itm one acre butting in the Churchway
  [Itm one acre butting the Mill Mount 1700]

**READOW FIELD [READOW REDDOW FIELD, THE OVER FIELD 1700]:**
- Itm ......one acre butting in Debdale
- Itm one old rood butting upon Dark acre
- Itm two roods butting in Fargate
- Itm one old rood butting in Mill Hole
- Itm one acre butting on Mr Strell's Long Hadland
  [Itm one headland and the [ileg.] butting upon Fargates Edmund Clarke E. 1638 only]
- Itm three half acres and one rood upon Redow
- Itm three half acres more upon the same furlong
- Itm three acres of one piece upon Redow butting into Fargate the Church Leas on the E. side
- Itm five roods butting into Fargates
  Itm four roods between the hadland on the southside of Fargates one of the hadlands is the parsons......
- Itm one half acre butting on the Church Leas
- Itm 13 leas butting in the Church
- Itm 14 leas on the next furlong butting upon Fargates by the Church Close side
- Itm three leas butting upon parsons house [townside 1700] Mr. Strelly S.
- Itm three leas butting over Fargate Way to the Townsend
  [Itm one acre of land butting to Fargates 1700]
  [Itm one acre butting upon the glebe hadland 1700]

**MEADOW: ALL THE MEADOW AS IT LYETH IN THIS PLACE**
- IMPRIMIS one little dole in Little Moore butting to Matthew Green
- Itm one half acre in Over Greenham
- Itm one acre upon Charmes Leas butting to Bouden Brook
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Itm a piece called the Church Florth at the nether end of Charmes Leas butting upon Bowden Brook

Itm one dole in Wildmoore butting on Charmes Leas the which dole belongs one year to the parson and the next to Edmond Clarke

Itm one piece called the Church Florth [Flore] in Cibstacle butting on Mr Halfords headley in Wildmore

Itm one piece of ground called the Cockloh butting on the same headley of Mr Halfords in Tylstall ......

[butting on Wildmoor hadley 1690, 1700]

Itm one old rood in Southell butting on Bouden Brook

Itm one half rood in Southell butting on Bouden Brook

Itm one rood on Redome [Redom 1690, Reedham 1694, 1700] butting on Presborow Hill [Presborough Hill 1700]

Itm one half acre in Redome [Reedham] butting on Redome Gates [Gap 1700]

Itm one half acre lying at Heffe Bridge

Itm three roods in Mickle Meadow butting on Heifers Gutter

Itm one acre more in Mickle meadow

Itm one rood in the same furlong [Mickle meadow 1700] butting against Heifers Gutter

Itm one ten rood dole in Mickle Meadow butting on Wolland

Itm one acre on the same furlong butting on Wolland

Itm two roods on Millgate butting on Caudell Planck [Cawdell Plank 1690, 1694]

Pastures for horses, cows and sheep for three yardlands according to the custom of their common pasture.
APPENDIX 5 TUR LANGTON GLEBE 1638

[A terrier of the Glebe yardland lying and being within the fields of Tur Langton 1694]

THE FIELD TOWARDS SHANGTON [NORTH FIELD 1694]:

Itm one rood upon Sowbarrow Henry Coleman west
Itm one rood shooting into Brakesick John Taylby south
Itm one rood shooting upon Deadmans Gate Henry Coleman junior west
Itm one half acre in the upper end of Tongs Mr. Halford north
Itm another old rood in Tongs Henry Coleman east
Itm one rood in the Nether End of Tongs Mr. Halford south.
Itm one old rood in Shangton Sicks William Amesby south
Itm one old rood in the Upper End of Shangton Slade John Taylby west
Itm two half acres in the Nether End of the Dales Thomas Burges east
Itm two half acres in the Upper End of the Dales Henry Cloeman senior south
Itm three roods shooting into Fargate Thomas Burges north
Itm one rood upon Cockle Hill Anthony Houkins west
Itm two old roods adjoining to Sugar Leas Anthony Houkins west
Itm one rood upon Brier Hill Thomas Smith west
Itm one rood shooting into Carlesick John Taylby east
Itm one old rood shooting into Busteds Thomas Smith west

THE GRASS OF THE SAME FIELD:

Itm one rood lea on Mallow Hill Leanard Coleman south
Itm one little half rood lea butting upon the doles under Mallow Leonard Coleman north
Itm one rood lea in Carlesick Anthony Houkins east
Itm two little doles under Mallow adjoining to the vanlies?? parting
Itm one tyth dole lying under Mallow when Wheate field belonging to the Glebe when peas field belonging to the Hall Land

IN THE FIELD TOWARDS KIBWORTH [WEST FIELD 1694]:

Itm two roods at Wood End Thomas Burges east
Itm one rood more at Wood End Henry Coleman east
Itm half a rood at No Mans Bush Thomas Smith west
Itm one old rood upon Brant Hill Thomas Burges south
Itm one rood shooting into Beck Thomas Smith north
Itm one old rood shooting upon Lords Close Thomas Smith east
Itm one half acre shooting upon Lords Close John Taylby west
Itm one half acre upon Laverlong John Taylby west

**Itm 1694:**

Itm one half acre upon Blackmiles Henry Coleman senior west
Itm two old roods shooting upon Broadwong Thomas Burges north
Itm one half rood upon the top of Quissell Leanard Coleman east
Itm one old rood in Wildmore John Taylby senior west
Itm one rood in Quissell Gate Anthony Houkins east
Itm one rood more in Quissell Gate Henry Coleman senior west
Itm one half acre near Shoovel Broads Henry Coleman senior south
Itm one rood in Breach [Breakhen 1694] Thomas Smith west
Itm one rood under Little Hill and shutting to Stockwell Hill Henry Coleman north

**THE GRASS IN THE SAME FIELD:**

Itm one close adjoining the Churchyard four leas butting upon the Churchyard
Itm one rood lea lying at the Nether End of the four
Itm one haadlea and the fallow at New Close Side Leonard Coleman south
Itm one old rood shooting to the Moore Thomas Smith east
Itm one rood in the Breach [Breakhen 1694] Henry Coleman senior west
Itm one old rood at the Upper More Side Mr.Halford south
Itm two old roods on Stockwell Hill Anthony Houkins south
Itm one tith dole lying in Osbourne meadow Thomas Wats south
Itm one dole beneath Little Hill Foard parting with the rawdies
Itm one dole 17 foot at one end and 14 foot at the other end called the Parsonage Dole Henry Coleman senior north

**THE FIELD TOWARDS STONTON [EAST FIELD 1694]:**

Itm one old rood upon Stonhill Thomas Burges north
Itm one old rood shooting into Millhole William Coleman south as he ...
Itm one roode at Mires John Tailby south
Itm one rood in Broadmarsh John Houkins east
Itm an half rood in Carls Trough Henry Coleman senior north
Itm an half acre at Twogate Leas Mr.Halford west
Itm one half acre upon Craxil [Croxil 1694] John Tailby junior east
Itm one old rood in Langton Meare Thomas Wats east
Itm one half acre in Langton Meare Henry Coleman senir west
Itm one half acre in Flaxgate Mr.Halford north
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Itm a great old rood at Wisclies [Wisards 1694] Yards End Mr.Halford north
Itm one rood in Blake Thomas Burges north half way through
Itm one half acre lying upon Mallow shooting to Shankton Wood Anthony Houkins west
Itm 3 half acres shooting into Beck (Dub de uno) Robert Simmens east

THE GRASS IN THE SAME FIELD:
Itm one rood lea shooting upon Mallow Close by Stonton Brooke Anthony Houkins north
Itm one half acre lea in Blake shooting to Stonton Brooke Henry Coleman north
Itm one little dole beneath Mallow Close parting with the rawdies? Thoamas Burges west
Itm one half acre at Willow Wong Anthony Haukins south
Itm two rood leas at Flaxgate End Thomas Tomson south
Itm one little rood lea shooting into Watermill Hooke John Tailby north
Itm one dole in Beck parting with the rawdies? Henry Coleman senior west
Itm one great tith dole lying in Beck when wheate field belonging to the parsonage when peas field to the Hall Land
Itm one rood lea beneath Mellow Foard Anthony Haukins east
Itm 4 leas six roods lying upon Saltres Piece John Taylby south
Itm one half rood lying in Hogate Mr.Halford on both sides
Itm one rood in Millhole Henry Coleman junior north

GRASS IN THE MOORE:
Itm one dole rood in the Hither Moore Henry Coleman senir east
Itm one old rood dole on the side of Moore Hill Henry Coleman senior south
Itm one old rood dole beyond the Moore Hill Henry Coleman senior north
Itm one ther dole at Crabtree Dole Henry Coleman senior north
Itm one old rood dole in the Upper Moore Henry Coleman senior west: Anthony Houkins hath part of all these five: . the third part
Itm one great tith dole in the Hither Moore Henry Coleman junior north
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APPENDIX 6 FIELD-NAMES

GREATER LANGTON OPEN-FIELD-NAMES
1700. West, Nether, Thorpe, Whorle, North, Mill, Over.
The Wheat Field 1652, 1743; The Bean Field 1743; The Fallow Field 1743

WEST LANGTON FIELD NAMES:
Barons Close 1652; Barons New Close 1653. In or near the Wheat Field in 1652. Same as Lord's Close below? Lord and Baron's close are listed separately in the 1652 terrier.
Barons Gate 1652.
Bitchel Close 1651, Bitchill Close 1653, Bitchell Close 1872.
Bunch Close 1651, Bunch 1912.
Cow Wrong 1791, Cow Close 1912.
Crosour Close 1652. In the Wheat Field
Depedale 1276, Debdale 1638, 1872. "land in a deep valley" (OE deop)
Eighteen Acres 1791, 1912; Eighteen Acres Close 1872.
Flax Close 1791; Top Flax Close 1872.
Lamb Coat 1791, 1872. Lamb Coat Meadow 1912.
Little Bells Close Meadow 1743, Little Bells Close 1791, 1872.
Great Bells Close 1791, 1872.
Little Hill 1652; Hill Close 1912. In the Wheat Field in 1652.
Lord's Close (nine acres part of) 1743, Lord's Close 1652, (part of) 1791, 1872, 1912. Same as Baron's Close above? If so in or near the Wheat Field in 1652.
Nether Close 1791.
Nether Ground 1791, 1872, 1912.
New-Laid-Down Close 1791, 1872.
Round-Hill Close 1652, 1791, 1872, 1912. In the Wheat Field
Rundles 1652 "on the West side Rundles" in or next to the Wheat Field. Rundle is a variant of ME roundel, "a circle".
Salt Pitts 1791, 1872, 1912.
Spinney Hill, Nether and Upper Part 1791. "Beyond the Spinney 1652" in the Wheat Field?
Spinney Leys 1791, 1872.
Spring Leys 1653, Spring Leys Close 1872.
The Two Close Meadow 1743.
West Moor 1652 (meadow). In the Wheat Field in 1652.

EAST LANGTON FIELD NAMES:
Purgate 1652. Hither End of. Further End of 1791. In 1652 two half acre lays in the Wheat Field of West Langton? were "shutting upon Purgate."

SHANGTON FIELD-NAMES:
Aluwordiowong, Aylewordewong (1320). "In the East Field" (1320) LRO 34 D 56/I/55,65.
Alwordilsike, AilsBardessicch. (ON sik)? LRO 34 D 56/I/55,13.
Baireland (1285?). LRO 34 D 56/I/12.
Barlicroft. "The croft in which Barley was grown" (OE baerlic). LRO 34 D 56/I/27.
Bactonishakis. LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Blakemildihil. LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Blakeland? "black or bleak land" (OE bloec, ON bleikr). LRO 34 D 56/I/17(2).
Brakis (late 13th c.), Brakes furlong (1601).
Beck or East field (1601). "Intake into the open-fields" (OE brecc). LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Breche (4), Breches. In the field toward Lipping? (East Field?) (LRO 34 D 56/I/48). "Intake into the open-fields" (OE brecc). LRO 34 D 56/I/20,34,55,48,75.
Brimbelbrinke, Brimbilbring, Brinbilbrinc. LRO 34 D 56/I/27,34,55.
Farmanhilil, Farmanishyl, Faremanneshil, Faremannishil (1295), Foremannishil (1295), Farmanishil. LRO 34 D 56/I/18,34,41,27,52 (2),55.
Le Ferdgate. LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Flitondis, Flatlandes (1295). Flitlands, "land in dispute," (OE (ge)flit, dispute). Fields often found on boundaries of townships. LRO 34 D 56/I/18,52.
Folewellehil. LRO 34 D 56/I/28.
at Folewellemoer, Folewellemor (meadow). LRO 34 D 56/I/28,45.
Garbedelondes, Garbidelond, Carbodelondis. LRO 34 D 56/I/28,30,57.
Grenesclade (meadow), Greneslade (meadow). LRO 34 D 56/I/41,45.
Harudale, Stongate in Harndale. LRO 34 D 56/I/55,75.
Heinouhull. LRO 34 D 56/I/13.
Heynohill (1317). LRO 34 D 56/I/59.
the carr on E. of Heynowil. LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Heynewelle (1317), Henwell (1601,1606). Third Field (1601), North Field (1606). LRO 34 D 56/I/59, LRO MF261.
against Heynolike. LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Hengebek. LRO 34 D 56/I/28.
Long lond. LRO 34 D 56/I/7 (2).
under the Kirkgate, Kirkgate (1601,1606. LRO 34 D 56/I/12, LRO MF261.
the way from Mathelon. LRO 34 D 56/I/30.
under Mahelehougate, under Menelagath, under Melhougate, above Melogate, below Melongate. LRO
34 D 56/I/68,13,57(2),55,41.
Mednellinds, Medewelondis, Medelond (1328). LRO 34 D 56/I/41,44,105.
the mere next to the church in the town field (1294). LRO 34 D 56/I/15.
Oxpol. LRO 34 D 56/I/34.
Peleylmor. LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Peyschill, Peschill, Peashill (1601,1606). Third Field (1601), North Field (1606). "The hill on which
peas were grown" (OE pise + OE hyll). LRO 34 D 56/I/3,27.
Sorte furlonges, Fortforlonges (meadow). 'sarre' = assart? LRO 34 D 56/I/41.
Schortfurlongis, Schortefiirlongis (meadow), Scorfuralongis (headland and meadow). "The short furlong"
OE sceort). LRO 34 D 56/I/44,45,55 (2).
between Siritchesike and the boundary with Tirlangton. (ON sik). LRO 34 D 56/I/41.
Smalesike (meadow), Smalesik (meadow). "small streamside meadow". LRO 34 D 56/I/41,45.
in the town field from Smetemeduis (1294). LRO 34 D 56/I/15.
"below the 'stang'," "above the stang," = fishpond? LRO 34 D 56/I/3,4.
above Le Stangate, above Le Stangate, above Le Stangate, under Stangate (1295), under Stangate ("in the
Field toward Lipping"), in Stongate in Hamdale. Stoney road = Gartree Road. LRO 34 D 56/I,
18,20(2),55,46,48,75(2).
against Fontes de Stapillowil LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Stapillowill against Heynolike LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
Scapilhonhil (1320) North Field, Staplehill Third Field (1601), North Field (1606).
LRO 34 D 56/I/65. This could derive from OE Stapol, "a post or pillar of wood or stone." If so this may
have been a boundary marker on a hill or a meeting-place. The Gartree Bush or wapentake meeting-place
lay in the Shangton's North Field. A possible woodland connotation - 'the place where wooden posts
were obtained' (Smith 1956 II:146).
Stillpolholm (meadow), Stillepolholm (meadow), Stillepol (meadow). LRO 34 D 56/I/41,45,55.
under Le Sty (in Stillpolholm (meadow)). Le Sty. LRO 34 D 56/I/41,45.
Solvelemore (meadow). LRO 34 D 56/I/41.
Tochar, Tocharsike. (ON sik) LRO 34 D 56/I/55.
between Tuogates (above town), below thogates. LRO 34 D 56/I/34, 41 (2).
between the 2 ways below the church land, "in the same cultura" LRO 34 D 56/I/55 (2).
Vestmedne (meadow). LRO 34 D 56/I/41.
Wadsike. "the streamside meadow where or near woad was grown" (OE wad + ON sik).
LRO 34 D 56/I.55.
Le Was. Possibly "a wet place, a swamp, a marsh" (OE waesse). LRO 34 D 56/I/62.
Westcroftes. "The west enclosure" (OE croft). Specified in the grant as "4 selions in Shangton Field in Westcroftes extending from my court by the lake". LRO 34 D 56/I/104.
Wethehil, Wetheil. LRO 34 D 56/I/7,55.
Longwold. LRO 34 D 56/I/13.
Plan Wold. LRO 34 D 56/I/49.
under Le Woylgate. LRO 34 D 56/I/49.
Weld Furlong. (ME weld). ME weld suggests a dialectal form which in southern counties derives from weald. This is rare as far north as Leicestershire. LRO 34 D 56/I/17.
Wodeway. "the road leading to a wood" (OE wudu + OE weg). Alternatively this could be "the woad way" (OE wad). This is the only recorded use of OE weg in the study area where ON gata is the term normally used for a road or path. LRO 34 D 56/I/17.
Spinney outside Sangton on E side LRO 34 D 56/I/36.
one Todalrode above Brimbelbrinke LRO 34 D 56/I/27.

HARDWICK FIELD-NAMES:
Miklecroft (5), Muclecroft. "By (at) entrance to town", in the Field towards Shangton. "The big croft" (OE micel, ON mikill). The spelling with medial -k- may be a North Midland variant or due to the influence of the Scandinavian mikill (Smith 1956 II 40-1). (LRO 34 D 56/I/47; NRO IL 151,152,154,155,166).
Lundhyl, Lundhil. In the North Field. "A small wood on a hill" (ON lundr + OE hyll). (LRO 34 D 56/I/47; NRO IL 151,154).
Holm in le dedemor (1329). This is derived from ON holmr, meaning "the piece of (higher dry) ground by the stream in the area called dedemor" (Smith 1956 I:258-9). (NRO IL 172).
le Clint (1329). (NRO IL 154,172).
Langeland (1305). NRO IL 162.
Pyshil (1329), Langepeyshyl (1305). "The hill on which peas were grown" (OE pise + OE hyll). (NRO IL 172,162).
Sartecroftes (1305). 'Sarte', a shortened form of OFr. assart, "an intake from waste or woodland" plus OE croft, "a small enclosed field" often attached to a house (NRO IL 162).
Stangate furlong (1329). NRO IL 172.
Cunpittes? (1329). (NRO IL 150,151,152,154,162,172).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Statute Acres</th>
<th>Fiscal Carucates</th>
<th>Yardlands Acres in Open-Flds</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilworth Parish</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>LRO; Nichols 1798:637.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigston Magna</td>
<td>2944</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nichols 1957:22, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Langton</td>
<td>2990</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109.25</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Enclosure Act LRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton E. &amp; W.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Enclosure Act LRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Langton</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Enclosure Act LRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Langton</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Enclosure Act LRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Langton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1791</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enclosure Act LRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bowden</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols 1798:473; 1810:209; Stocks 1926:320.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oadby</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:322; Slade 1956:59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutterworth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>c.1400</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:257.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Glen</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>17c 2b</td>
<td>32.5 (N.End) 30.5 (S.End) 63</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Nichols 1798:572; VCH:41.105. Tote 1778:153.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilworth, N.</td>
<td>7c 6b</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols 1810:198.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilworth, S.</td>
<td>6.5 (13.5?)</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>4.2?</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:204.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimeote</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:209.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddlington</td>
<td>13.5*</td>
<td>c.54</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hughes 1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosby &amp;</td>
<td>c.2341</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:139.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Thorpe</td>
<td>c.500</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton (Wolds)</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Nichols 1800:498.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sproston</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2229</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:328; Slade 1956:55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmorton</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>2059</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:193.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whetstone</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td></td>
<td>LRG; Nichols 1810:165.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrussington</td>
<td>c.12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Nichols 1800:198; Slade 1956:43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Stanton</td>
<td>6 (9*)</td>
<td>46.25</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Nichols 1811:964.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharnford</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Nichols 1811:917.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilworth, H.</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Nichols 1798:662.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleckney</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nichols 1798:876; Slade 1956:33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughton</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>c.986</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>VCH Leics v:216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Statute Acres</td>
<td>Fiscal Acres</td>
<td>Carucates</td>
<td>Acres in Open-Flds</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruntingthorpe</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amooby</td>
<td>13667</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countesthorpe</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:57; Knight &amp; Schulka 1991:44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearsby</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilby</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cokeley</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>e.1599</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noseley</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraptoft</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>Parker 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Harcourt</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8747</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margaret's or the East Field of Leicester</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Billson 1925:10-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromkinthorpe # or the West Field of Leicester</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Park 1925:6-9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstead</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narborough</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1752</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols 1810:815.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leire</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27. 5 in Leire, 4 in Kimcote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shackenstone</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake</td>
<td>e.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>800?</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Nichols 1800:381; Slade 1956:43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Stretton</td>
<td>7047</td>
<td>4.5?</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>5.5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Nichols 1810:209.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepy Parva</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>Nichols 1811:937.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurlaston</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>4?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assessed in hides

# The entries for Bruntingthorpe and 'Bromkinstonthorpe' have been confused in Domesday translations. The Grandmenil holding at Brunestanestorp refers to 'Bromkinthorpe' a lost vill outside the west gate of Leicester, and not Bruntingthorpe. Domesday states the holding was six carucates of land and that "to this manor belong four sokemen in Smeeton Westerby" and "this land with all its customary dues belongs to Leicester" (DB 232d).
OXGANG UNITS:
All known notices to oxgangs are found in Framland wapentake in North-East Leicestershire.
Bottesford, Normanton and Easthorpe: 203.75 oxgangs in 1770 (Nichols 1795:89-90).
Redmile: 76.5 oxgangs in 1791 (Nichols 1795:300).
Muston: 'the north side...50 oxgangs of arable' in 1629 (Nichols 1795:289).
Long Clawson: 169 oxgangs in 1779 (Nichols 1795:133).

DECIMAL UNITS:
Higham-on-the-Hill: 40 yardlands (Burton 1622:130-1; Nichols 1811:639-41).
## APPENDIX 8 TAXATION, YARDLANDS, STATUTE ACRES AND DOMESDAY WOODLAND IN GARTREE WAPENTAKE (excluding detached areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWNSHIP</th>
<th>STATUTE ACRES</th>
<th>TAX (carucates)</th>
<th>YARDLAND SIZE</th>
<th>ACRES PER CARUCATE</th>
<th>EAST OF THE LIPPING</th>
<th>DOMESDAY Leagues or Furlongs</th>
<th>WOODLAND Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keythorpe</td>
<td>c.799</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>c.266</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranoe</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glooston</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockerston &amp; Holyoaks</td>
<td>c.1043</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>c.345</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>c.1097</td>
<td>3 (1279)</td>
<td>c.366</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horninghold</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanton</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawston</td>
<td>c.1201</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>c.400</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Slawston</td>
<td>c.11501</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>4273</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>c.300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>c.210</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presgrave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringhamst &amp; Drayton</td>
<td>c.1334</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>c.222</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Eastern Parish Total:</td>
<td>3612</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medbourne</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallaton</td>
<td>2969</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>8 (6:1130)</td>
<td>152 (203)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangton &amp; Hardwick</td>
<td>c.968</td>
<td>6?</td>
<td>c.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galby</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>6 (1279)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisby</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>6 (1279)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wistow</td>
<td>c.916</td>
<td>7.5 (1279)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellham</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>9 (8.5:1130)</td>
<td>127 (134)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolleston</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>10 (8.1279)</td>
<td>109 (137)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton,H.</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34 (1771)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>c.34 (1765)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strettons</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxton</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWNSHIP</td>
<td>STATUTE ACRES</td>
<td>TAX carucates</td>
<td>YARDLAND SIZE</td>
<td>ACRES PER CARUCATE</td>
<td>EAST OF THE LIPPING</td>
<td>DOMESDAY WOODLAND</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughton</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>2 (127)</td>
<td>48.75 (1663)</td>
<td>967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleckney</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47.5 (1769)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noseley</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48 (1504)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingarsby</td>
<td>c.1200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibworth, B.</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53 (1315)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibworth, H.</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48 (1635)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smeaton</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibworth Par.</td>
<td>4178</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>148 (1779)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43.75 (1791)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton Par.</td>
<td>4409</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illston</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48 (1599)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumley</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>13 (127)</td>
<td>106 (1157)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowsley</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>12 (1279)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraptotf</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44 (1669)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evington</td>
<td>c.1950</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billesdon</td>
<td>c.2545</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>c.212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theddingworth</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>16c 1v?</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddington</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>c.54 (1770)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Glen</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>16 (1758-9)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubenham</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>17? (207)</td>
<td>154 (130)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bowden</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>12.5 (187)</td>
<td>88 (1791)</td>
<td>250 (173)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Langton</td>
<td>2996</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>109.25 (1791)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband Bosworth</td>
<td>3560</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96 (1764)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoughton</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100 (128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex*</td>
<td>(22:1279)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Norton</td>
<td>c.2823</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>c.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The King's Norton Complex (King's Norton, Galby and Frisby) and the Stoughton Complex (Stoughton, Thumby and Bushby; These township were possibly originally assessed together.
APPENDIX 9 LANGTON PLACE-NAMES

Longnewton - (Border, Scotland)

Lanton (Border, Scotland). Seven kilometres from Cappuck Roman fort on Dere Street. Three kilometres from Jedburgh

Lanton (Northumberland) - Langeton 1242. One kilometres from Yeavering the site of a royal palace and the place where Paulinas baptised Bernicians in the river Glenn in c.627 (HE:ii 14).

Longtown (Cumbria) - Longeton 1267. Three kilometres from Netherby (Castra Exploratorvm), an outpost fort north of Hadrian's Wall on the River Esk and twelve kilometres north of Carlisle.

Langton (Westmorland - Cumbria) - LANGETON 1314, 1336 (Glasscock 1975:329) Deserted Village (NY 710200). By the Roman road to Penrith and approximately nine kilometres from the Roman forts at Kirkby Thore (Braunovicium) and Brough (Vertiriets).

Longeton (Lancashire) - Langetuna 1155. 7.5 kilometres from Walton-le-Dale a Roman military supply base and settlement on the Wilderspool to Lancaster road and five km from Penwortham "enclosed homestead at a hill called Penn" Celt *penn 'hill' + OE worth + ham. Next to Hutton 'farmstead on or near a ridge or hill-spur (Mills 1991). Walton and Penwortham were major crossing points of the river Riddle. Kenyon commenting on the close proximity of OE ham name and the Roman site at Walton suggested that "any continuity is with lordships exploiting the same natural resource territories and in the use of communication nodes as strategic central places" (Kenyon 1991:61-2,89-90,115-6).

Longeton (Staffordshire) - Longeton 1212. Nine kilometres from Chesterton (SJ 832489) - fort on a military route to running to the north east. The Roman Road traverses the township and the settlement grew along its course. The township was part of Stoke parish.

Great and Little Langton (Yorkshire, North Riding) - Langeton 1086. (SE 295965). Great Langton is seven kilometres from Catterick (Cataractonium) a small walled Roman garrison town with extensive civil suburbs (Burnham and Wacher 1990:111-17). Evidence for occupation into the 5th century. Catterick was a royal vill (Sawyer 1983:292). It served as the base for the mission of Paulinus in c.627-33 (HE:ii 14, 20; iii 14).

Langton (Yorkshire, East Riding) - Lanton 1086, Langeton 1168. SE 798671. Four kilometres from the Roman fort and civil settlement at Malton (Derventio) and the centre of a villa estate. The coin list and small finds suggest that the villa was flourishing in the early 5th century (Ramm 1978:71-5,80-87,131-2). Early Saxon cemetery. Two Roman roads traverse the parish and join at a fork near Thorntope house.

Langton by Horncastle (Lincolnshire) - Langetone and Torp 1086. Two kilometres from the small walled Roman town of Horncastle (Bunham and Wacher 1990:240-45). Langton forms part of a configuration of parishes which surround Horncastle. Anglo-Saxon burials have been found in and around the town and small-long brooches and 6th century cruciform brooches have been found in the adjoining parish of Thimbleby (Leahy 1993:40-1). Horncastle was a major royal estate centre in the late
pre-Conquest period and is a possible early high status foci for the Anglo-Saxon state of Lindsey (Stocker 1993:117).

**Langton by Partney** (Lincolnshire) - *Langetune* 1086. 2.5 kilometres from the small Roman settlement at Dalby on the Roman road between Lincoln and Burgh-le-Marsh (Whitwell 1970:74-5). A Pagan Anglo-Saxon barrow burial has been found in the adjoining parish of Partney which was site of a 7th century monastery (HE:ii 16; iii 11; Leahy 1993:41; Stocker 1993:110-12).

**Langton by Wragby** (Lincolnshire) - *Langetone* 1086. 1.5 kilometres from Wragby the centre of a large late Saxon soke and site of a minster church. Wragby probably gave its name to the hundred of Wraggo and may have been a pre-Viking royal centre. Eight kilometres from Bardney a late 7th century monastery site (HE:iii 2, 12). The Roman road from Lincoln and Burgh-le-Marsh traverses the parish and changes direction towards Dalby. No pagan finds have been made in this area nor is there yet any evidence for a minor Roman settlement although there is every reason to expect to find one - the four other known Roman roads radiating out of Lincoln have a minor settlements at a similar distance to Langton from the *colonia* and these may have been sited on the boundary of its *territorium*.

**East and West Langton** (Leicestershire). Four kilometres from the Ridgeway, Great Bowden possible 'small Roman town' and five kilometres from the 'small town' at Medbourne. Five kilometres from Gumley an 8th century Mercian royal centre - 749 "a celebrated place".

**Launton** (Oxfordshire) - *Langtune* c.1050, *Lantone* 1086. Four kilometres from Alcester (Alavna) a walled Roman town on the Akeman Street (Burnham and Wacher 1990:92-7). On shire boundary with Buckinghamshire. (Gelling 1953 i:228)

**Langton Herring** (Dorset) - *Langetone* 1086. Next to Portesham meaning 'enclosure near a market town' (Mills 1991).

**Langton Matravers** (Dorset) - *Langeton* 1165 (RCHM 1970:602).

**Langton, Long Blanford** (Dorset), **Langton Green** (Suffolk), **Langton Green** (Kent).
GLOSSARY

Advowson: the right of appointing a priest to an ecclesiastical benefice.

Assart: woodland or pasture cleared for arable land.

Bookland: land held by a title-deed or charter called a 'book' in the vernacular.

Bordar: a Domesday smallhoder possibly related to the Anglo-Saxon gebur.

Burh: a fortified place, often a defended town.

Cadestre: a system of territorially based taxation or tribute levied by per capita or household.

Caput: head manor.

Carucate: a duodecimal unit of tax assessment mainly used in Danish areas. The word is a Latinised form of Anglo-Danish plugesland, meaning 'ploughland', and nominally based upon an area of land with appurtenances ploughable by eight oxen.

Ceorl: an Anglo-Saxon 'free' peasant.

Civitas: a Roman administrative centre.

Copyhold: land held by the title of a deed enrolled on the maorial court roll.

Colour-Coated Ware: pottery produced by dipping a vessel after firing into a solution of clay and water which by means of added minerals results in a slip darker than the paste of the vessel. Nene Valley colour-coat was produced in the lower Nene valley at various sites west of Peterborough and widely distributed in Roman Britain in the 3rd and 4th centuries.

Danegeld: a term used to describe the levying of geld after its use to buy off the Danish threat.

Danelaw: the area of England once under Danish control in the 9th and 10th centuries and subject to their own system of law.

Demesne: the part of a manor held directly by a lord rather than by his tenants and exploited on a lord's behalf.

EMSW: 'East Midland Scored Ware' - a mid-to late Iron Age pottery type, also known as Ancaster-Breedon ware, of the East Midlands area. The surface treatment from which it derives its name can vary from deep scoring to light twig brushing; the lines can regular or irregular. Rims can decorated with finger or finger-nail impressions.

Fabric: the term used to describe the clay and inclusions of a pottery vessel.

Feldon: a term used to describe open-field countryside.

Fee, Fief: land held from a lord by feudal tenure.

Feorm: a food-rent demanded by the king.
Five Boroughs: the administrative and military headquarters of a territory originally settled by Danish armies in the late 9th century. The five *burhs* at Leicester, Derby, Nottingham and Stamford formed a confederation in the 10th century and were last noticed by an entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for AD1013.

Furlong: a group of selions or strips lying together and cultivated as a sub-unit of an open-field.

Gafol: a tax or rent paid by tenants.

Gafolgelede: an occupier of land liable to pay rent and public exactions, notably the geld.

Gehur: a dependent occupier of land held by labour services and rent payable to a lord. Their holdings may have been physically part of the inland.

Geld: a tax levied according to carucatage or hidage.

Gesett land: land tenanted and rated in hides.

Glebe: land attached to a church and held by an incumbent during his tenure.

Gritt-Tempered: a term used to describe a pottery fabric consisting of a mineral suite of quartz, quartzite, sandstone, igneous rock fragments etc. These gritty fabrics are characteristic of the early to middle Anglo-Saxon pottery found in the East Midlands.

Hide: a unit for the assessment of tax and tribute, originally "the land of one family" and based probably based upon the productivity of arable land. The carucate was the alternative term used in the Danelaw.

Hundred: a territorial subdivision of the shire with its own court (moot) for judicial, fiscal and military functions: notionally a hundred hides. As an administrative district the term is synonymous with the Danelaw wapentake.

Inland: part of an estate exempt from paying tax.

Long Hundred: a system of counting 100 as 120.

Lyvenden-Stanion Ware: an early medieval pottery type named after production sites at the Northamptonshire villages of Stanion and Lyvenden in Rockingham Forest.

Manor: a jurisdictional and territorial unit of lordship.

Messuage: a house and its surrounding land.

Minster Church: a church, originally staffed by a team of priests, serving a large *parochia* often containing a number of ancillary churches.

Moot: an assembly of the people which formed a legislative court.

Multiple Estate: a unit of territory of unified ownership consisting of a head manor (*caput*) and a number of contiguous or discontiguous settlements. Multiple estates fragmented when lands
were redistributed as a result of royal patronage, grants to ecclesiastical foundations and inheritance.

**Open-Field:** an area of open arable land divided into furlongs and strips for the purposes of managing crops and fallow. In the Midland system furlongs were grouped into two or three fields of roughly equal size among which holdings were equally apportioned.

**Outland:** part of an estate upon which tenants are liable to pay public taxes such as the geld.

**Ora:** a coin of Danish origin, equal to sixteen or twenty pence.

**Parish:** an area of ecclesiastical administration dependent on and served by a particular church to which the people of the area paid tithes and other ecclesiastical dues.

**Parochia:** territory of a minster church.

**Potters Marston Ware:** an early medieval pottery type produced at Potters Marston, Leicestershire, from c.1100 to c.1300.

**Reeve:** administrative officer (OE *gerefa*) in charge of the management of an estate and of the district dependent upon an estate. A Shire-Reeve or sheriff was the king's deputy.

**Regia:** a district focused on an early to middle Anglo-Saxon royal estate.

**soc and soc:** a jurisdiction claimed by lords as part of their tenure. It included the right to hold a court and to receive manorial profits and services.

**Samian Ware:** glossy red Roman fine ware of the 1st to mid-3rd century, mainly produced in Gaul.

**Selion:** smallest unit of cultivation, forming an open strip or rood which were grouped together into furlongs.

**Scutage:** tax paid in lieu of military service.

**Small Hundred:** an administrative subdivision of the shire between vill and wapentake known only in the Danelaw shires of Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Nottingham and Derbyshire. The existence of the small hundreds of Leicestershire are known only from the *Leicestershire Survey* of c.1130 and differ in their structure from those in other Danelaw shires where the 12 caucate hundred formed the basic hundredal entity. There were twelve small hundreds or territorial tithings in Gartree wapentake.

**Soke:** a Danelaw term for jurisdiction over estates and manors.

**Stamford Ware:** a Saxo-Norman pottery type produced at Stamford from the late 9th century to c.1250.

**Tallage:** tax levied by a lord from his tenants.

**Tenant-in-chief:** a person holding land directly from the king.
Tenement: a holding of land.

Terra Regis: land of the king.

Territorium: Roman administrative territory.

Thegn: a member of the Anglo-Saxon elite who fought or carried out administrative duties for the king.

Tithe: a render of one-tenth of the annual produce due to the mother church.

Township: a secular territorial unit containing one or more settlements. The basic unit of settlement and community for purposes of tax assessment and the enforcement of public order. An area frequently containing a settlement nucleus with a common agricultural unity based on a particular field system.

TRE: (Tempore Regis Edward) a Domesday reference to an estate holder in 1066.

TRW: (Tempore Regis William) a Domesday reference to an estate holder in 1086.

Vill: the usual latin translation of township.

Villa Intégré: a grouping of vills in the medieval period for purposes of peacekeeping and tax assessment. These origins are obscure and in Leicestershire villa intégré of the 13th century do not exactly correspond to the grouping of vills in the Anglo-Danish small hundreds.

Villa Regalis: a royal vill.

Villein: a term used to describe a tenant owing rent and services to a manorial lord.

Virgate: the fourth part of a hide or carucate called a yardland in English.

Wapentake: administrative district within the Danelaw and synonymous with the hundred. From Old Norse vapnatak, 'flourish of weapons', the word may represent the practise of raising weapons to signify assent at an assembly held at the moot-site of the wapentake. Meetings usually took place at well-known features such as burial mounds, cross-roads, boundary stones and trees. The moot-site of Gartree wapentake was held at the 'Gartree Bush' beside the Roman Gartree Road in Shangton. The word Gartree is from Old Scandinavian geirtre, meaning, 'a tree with a blemish or gash on its bark', and it is this distinguishing feature which may have marked a pre-Conquest meeting-place of long standing.

Witenagemot: an assembly of councillors (witan) who met with the king to exercise government.

Yardland: the English form of the word virgate. A unit of tenure supporting a peasant farm which in Leicestershire commonly comprised around 24 acres.
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