

The Prior of Norwich's Manor of
 Hindolbeston :
 its Early Organisation and the Right
 of the Customary Tenants
 to alienate their strips of Land.

COMMUNICATED BY

REV. WILLIAM HUDSON, F.S.A.,

F.P.

In the paper on the "Camera Roll by Bartholomew de Cotton" in our vol. xix., p. 268, I stated that Mr. H. W. Saunders and I had recently been examining a considerable number of Account and Court Rolls of the Manors of the Prior of Norwich in the 13th and early 14th centuries. It was remarked on p. 269 that the early Rolls of monastic and ecclesiastical owners had a special importance as compared with those of private owners of manors, because on account of unbroken continuity of tenure they retain statements of more primitive practice and employ occasionally archaic terms reminiscent of far earlier conditions. Some further

explanation will emphasise the significance of this comparison. In our vol. xiv. I contributed a paper on "Three Manorial Extents of the Thirteenth Century." These three Manors were all in the hands of civilians of high position and illustrated changes which were then strongly developing themselves throughout the country. These changes were summed up (p. 2) under two heads, "firstly, the substitution of money payments both for labour services and for rents in kind; secondly, the breaking up of the regular holdings into most irregular and, in numerous cases, minute sub-divisions." The first was ascribed to the rapidly growing economic changes in the country which caused the lord to want money from his property, and not food or agricultural service. The second was ascribed to much the same development. The actual labour not being so much wanted it was not of so much importance by whom the land was held. It will at once be realised that the chief cause of these changes on civilian manors was altogether absent in the case of a monastic owner. What the Abbot or Prior of a Monastery needed was, first and foremost, the produce of his demesne lands for the maintenance of his monks. In Bartholomew Cotton's Roll the keeper of the Granary accounts for 791 quarters of wheat and 1862 quarters of barley received from the Prior's Manors.¹ To provide these amounts it was necessary to exact the requisite labour, and in doing this absolutely essential work the sub-division of the integral holdings into small tenancies must have caused great inconvenience. Take, for instance, the Manor of Wykes,² where a tenement of 24 acres was held by ten tenants, and another of 10 acres by seven tenants. This being a civilian manor the bailiff had only to collect

¹ *Norfolk Archaeology*, vol. xix., pp. 296-298.

² *Ibm.*, vol. xiv., pp. 49-52.

money rents. How much greater would be the trouble in a monastic manor of arranging and exacting numerous small items of *labour*. The obvious remedy for the lord to employ would, one would suppose, have been to forbid the alienation of land by the tenants. As remarked above, a civilian lord who needed little labour, would perhaps not be much disturbed by the inconvenience to his servants. But to a monastic lord it was a matter of vital necessity to get his labour, and it is fairly apparent that if he did not prohibit the sub-division of his tenants' holdings it was because he could not do so. They were exercising a prescriptive right, and he could not stop them. There remained to him the only remedy, to preserve a record of the original holdings on which the obligations were chargeable and of the changes of ownership of the various items of land of which the whole was composed. For we must always remember that a mediæval agricultural holding was not a compact block, but a collection of strips of acres, half-acres, or even less, scattered about in open common fields. The integral units of obligation (whether of rent or service) were inscribed in the Stewards' Rolls under the name of an early tenant, as "tenement Peet, Bude, Breton,³ &c." and the same name would be retained for generations, even centuries.

The existing records of the Norwich Priory supply us with valuable information on both these points, the size and organisation of the original tenements and the process of sub-division. Among them one must be mentioned in particular. It is not one of those kindly lent to us by the late Dean Beeching, but it must originally have belonged to the Priory. It is now in the British Museum, where it is entitled Stowe MS. 936.

³ *Ibm.*, vol. xiv., p. 17.

It contains surveys of ten manors attached to the Prior's special department. The work was evidently begun when William de Kyrkeby was appointed Prior after the great riot between the citizens and the monks in 1272. The first survey is that of Hindringham, of which the earlier part is missing as are parts of other manors. Some are entirely absent. The last is that of Martham, compiled in 4 Henry de Lakenham, Prior (1292). This is by far the most important of all on account of its unusual form and the exhaustive details of the holdings described. Out of the whole volume of 115 folios it occupies 78. Its peculiarity is that the survey is based on the holdings of 107 "former" tenants. Of each of these holdings it states that it is "now" (1292) held by so many tenants, sometimes as many as 10 or 12. Everyone of the holdings of these sub-tenants, consisting, as usual, of scattered strips, is then described, and in the case of every strip a statement is made of the name of the "field" in which it lies, the tenant whose land it adjoins and the land or road on which it abuts at its narrow end. The amount of detailed information thus given may be realised from the fact that the 107 "former" holdings were in 1292 sub-divided into 935 separate holdings and the scattered strips thus held number 2021. The total area of the land is about 823 acres. These "former" holdings at Martham are, of course, the "tenements" or units, which the steward had here got formally registered (in whole or in fractions) as the units of obligatory service of the customary tenants. Unfortunately he does not tell us when the units had been held in their entirety. This has to be worked out, if possible. The early description of Martham in such detail is of the more importance because we know that it must have been first formed into a manor when Bishop

Herbert de Losinga gave the land to his newly founded Norwich Priory for the maintenance of his monks in 1101. Moreover only a few years before that time we have an account of the status and numbers of the holders of the land in the Domesday Survey. We are thus able, without unreasonable conjecture, to link up the tenants of 1292 with those of Domesday Book. Many other interesting considerations naturally suggest themselves, and have been to some extent worked out by the present writer and some friends in a paper issued by the Royal Historical Society last year.⁴ A great deal, however, remains to be done. The original organisation of the units (12-acre holdings) seems, on the surface, to imply that every set of three or four was more or less contiguous, and yet they appear, even in the "former" time, to have consisted of small pieces, largely scattered asunder. As the original units were, almost undoubtedly, contributory (in sets of, say three or four) to common ploughs of six or eight oxen, the question arises, how was such a system worked? To allocate the "former" holdings is a matter not only of great difficulty in fitting the scattered strips into their proper places, but also because nearly every ancient field-name has been lost for many generations. Still, with the help of local records (generously lent by the owners), maps and other sources of information, much progress is being made, and it is my hope to be able to contribute to the Society's Collections next year the result of our labours. The Hindolveston records about to be presented will do much to illustrate what has been already done and what remains to be more definitely settled.

⁴ Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th Series, vol. i. 28, &c.

TWO HINDOLVESTON RECORDS.

The title at the head of this paper shows that the information to be given relates to the two subjects we have been considering, the organisation of certain original "tenements" and the reasons for their minute sub-division in later times. This information is derived from two distinct records. One is a list of the customary tenants, compiled about 1274. The first portion of this list is among the muniments of the Dean and Chapter. The whole is in the volume, already described, in the British Museum, Stowe MS. 936. This list will be given in tabulated form. The other record is still in the possession of the Dean and Chapter and contains the proceedings of the Hindolveston Manor Court almost continuously from 1309 to 1326 with only one year missing. The conditions of this period were still practically the same as those existing at the close of the 13th century. We may take for granted that the 700 or more surrenders of land there reported as carried out by the customary tenants, to the use of others they themselves chose, were only a continuation of a privilege inherited from their remote forefathers.

I.—THE CUSTOMARY TENANTS OF HINDOLVESTON, *c.* 1274.

Stowe MS. 936, f. 10.

"Homagia⁵ de Hildovestune."

1.—Hamo son of Symon holds 4 acres of land and 2 pieces of meadow for 14½*d.*, aid⁶ 5*d.*, 3 boons in autumn, 3 ploughings, 1 hen and 5 eggs. The same holds at his gate 1 pigtel⁷ for 1 hen.

⁵ The term "Homage" includes all the occupants of the manorial land.

⁶ "Aid" was a payment made by all the tenants of the Prior's Manors to the Cellarer of the Monastery. In his Rolls it is called "Aid to the Larder," or stock of meat.

⁷ Pictellum, a small piece of ground.

2.—William son of Ralph, John son of Symon and Agnes his mother hold 1 full land, to wit, 18 acres for 8*d.*, aid 20*d.* Also they ought to work from the feast of St. Peter ad vincula⁸ to the feast of St. Michael every work day except Saturday and on Saturday they ought to cart (*cariare*) with the lord's food and on Friday they shall not have food. But on Tuesday and Thursday each one shall have at vespers 3 loaves and on every day except Friday 1 repast at noon (*nonam*). Also they ought to work from the feast of St. Michael to the feast of St. John Baptist every week for 2 days until noon and have 1 loaf at noon. Also they ought to weed (*sarculare*) from the feast of St. John Baptist till St. Peter's Chains every work day with 1 man until the lord's corn is thoroughly weeded and meanwhile they shall have 4 repasts only. Also they ought to cart 1 cart load of the lord's brushwood and another cart load of the lord's at their own cost. Also they ought to prepare 4 perches of hedge round the lord's courtyard and prepare wood at their own cost. Also they ought to carry⁹ (*averare*) with their fellows corn and malt which shall have come from the demesne to Norwich until the whole has been carried and each one of them shall have at Norwich a loaf and ale. Also they shall ditch about the lord's lands, when necessary, with their fellows at their own cost. Also they shall do 6 boons¹⁰ with the plough at the lord's food and 3 boons with their harrow and have 1 Billyng.¹¹ Also they ought to make half a mett¹² of malt and have 3 loaves and they shall thresh the same. Also they shall cart manure with their fellows till it is fully carted and have every day 1 repast at noon and every cart shall have at vespers 6 loaves.

⁸ August 1.

⁹ *Cariare* is to carry in a cart: *averare* (from *averium*, cattle) to carry on a pack-horse.

¹⁰ *Precaria*, works done at the lord's request.

¹¹ "Byllinc, a cake," Bosworth A. S. Dict. Spoken of as "*companagium*," something added to an ordinary meal.

¹² A mett or meet is explained in the Martham Survey to "contain 4 seams of barley or malt." A seam (*summa*) was 1 quarter. Half a mett would be 2 quarters. See Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 4th series, vol. i. 34.

And at the time of sowing beans they shall cart manure until noon and have for a cart 6 loaves. Also they shall give foldage,¹³ to wit, for every ox 1d. and for a cow 1d. and for every beast (averio) of $2\frac{1}{2}$ years $\frac{1}{2}$ d. Also they shall ditch 4 perches round the lord's "culture"¹⁴ at their own cost because they are "fulle londemen,"¹⁵ and "half londemen" ought to ditch 2 perches. And he who holds 1 toft ought to ditch 1 perch. And if it chance that the lord's corn has not been gathered in before the feast of St. Michael they shall work every week for 2 days with food except Friday on which they shall not have food. Also they ought to give 2 hens and 20 eggs.

3.—Thomas, son of Simon, holds a full Lancetage, to wit, 18 acres for 8d., aid 20d. 1 hen and 20 eggs and all other things as the aforesaid William with his fellows. The same holds a certain land, to wit, 2 acres or more for $5\frac{1}{4}$ d.

4.—William, son of Nicholas and Richard his brother hold 9 acres, to wit, half a lancetage for 4d., aid 10d., 2 hens and 10 eggs and work in all things as Thomas, son of Simon, except that he ought to have every day in autumn 1 [loaf] both on Friday and other days."

19.—Margaret, wife of William, holds $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres, 1 quarter of a lancetage, for 4d., aid 5d. 1 hen and 5 eggs. She is to work every day of the week except Friday with food from 1 Aug. to Michaelmas, and from Michaelmas to St. John Baptist 1 day per week till noon and have 1 loaf, and from St. John to 1 Aug. to weed every day and have 4 repasts only and on the day when she has a repast to weed till vespers. To spread manure every day while it is being carted and have food at noon and at vespers $1\frac{1}{2}$ loaves. To give foldage, harrow and ditch as above. To do 3 averages, carrying and

¹³ Right to set up a fold instead of sending their sheep to the lord's fold.

¹⁴ Plot of cultivated land.

¹⁵ These terms and "toft" and "lancetage" are explained later.

driving, thresh and clean $3\frac{1}{2}$ coombs of oats and give $\frac{1}{2}$ d. and have at vespers $1\frac{1}{2}$ loaves.

24.—Alan, son of Odo, holds 9 acres of land for 40d., aid 10d. To do 4 boons with the plough, with the lord's food, in August and every day shall have 3 loaves at vespers. Also he owes 4 averages with food, 1 hen and 10 eggs.

TABULATED LIST OF THE TENANTS OF HINDOLVESTON.

Name of Tenant.	Holding.	Rent.	Aid.	Services.
1. Hamo. s. of Symon .	4a.	14 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.	5d.	
2. Will. s. of Ralph, Joh. s. of Symon & Agnes his mother . . .	18a. (f.l.) ¹⁶	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.	20d.	as described
3. Thos. s. of Symon ¹⁷ .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Will.
4. Will. s. of Nicholas & Ric. bro. . . .	9a. (h.l.)	4d.	10d.	as Thos.
5. Richard, s. of West ¹⁸ .	9a. (h.l.)	4d.	10d.	as Will. s. of N.
6. Will. Knyght . . .	9a. (h.l.)	4d.	10d.	as Will. s. of N.
7. Thos. del Ackre . . .	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ a.	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.	(land formerly of Simon Knight)	
8. Peter Bissop . . .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
9. Will. de Lyng and 3 "socii"	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
10. Pet. Gamel ¹⁹ . . .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
11. Gamel, s. of Alan & Peter	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
12. Will. Sibeloth . . .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
13. Walt. le Tournour ²⁰ .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
14. Alan le Tournour . .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
15. Joh., s. of Richard ²¹ .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
16. Joh., s. of Will. Clerk	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
17. Richard de Bosco ²² .	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
18. Thos., s. of Michael	18a. (f.l.)	8d.	20d.	as Thos.
19. Margaret, w. of Will.	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ a. (q.l.)	3d.	5d.	as described
20. Thos. Kingsheved . .	1 toft (q.l.)	3d.	5d.	as Margaret
21. Ric., s. of Gilbert ²³	1 toft	3d.	5d.	as Margaret

¹⁶ (f.l.) land held for a full lancetage, (h.l.) for half, (q.l.) for a quarter.

¹⁷ Also 2a. for 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. ¹⁸ Another for 4d. ¹⁹ Another for 6d.

²⁰ 1a. rent 2d. by Thos. del Acre. ²¹ Another for 5d. ²² Another for 19 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

²³ Another for 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

188 THE PRIOR OF NORWICH'S MANOR OF HINDOLVESTON.

Name of Tenant.	Holding.	Rent.	Aid.	Services.
22. Thos., s. of Daniel ²⁴	5a.	4d.	5d.	as Margaret
Thos. del Acre ²⁵	1a.	3d.		
23. Robert the Smith ²⁶	(q.l.)	3d.	5d.	as Margaret
24. Alan, s. of Odo	9a.	40d.	10d.	as described
25. Hugo, s. of Roger	9a.	45½d.	10d.	as Alan
26. Mathew the Smith ²⁷	12a.	40d.	10d.	as Alan
27. Rob. Fraunceys ²⁸	18a.	4s.	20d.	as Alan
28. Simon, s. of Martin & Ranulph, s. of Toche	8a.	4s. 5½d.	10d.	as Alan
29. Ranulph, s. of Bernard	9a.	26¾d.	10d.	as Alan
30. Joh. Miriel, Will. Dive, & Alan Muriel	9a.	40d.	10d.	as Alan
31. Ric., s. of Ebrard, & Will. his bro.	9a.	40d.	10d.	as Alan
32. Ranulph, s. of Will.	9a.	33d.	10d.	as Alan
33. Hugo, s. of Simon, Hugo, s. of Sweyn & Elviva	9a.	27d.	10d.	as Alan
34. Thos., s. of Will.	9a.	28d.	10d.	as Alan
35. Joh., s. of Ranulph	60a.	10s.	(form. of Rob. Andreu)	
36. Ric. Wrot	2a.	4d.	1d.	small services ²⁹
37. Geoffrey Palmer	2a.	4d.	2½d.	small services
38. Matilda, w. of Erl	1a.	3d.	1d.	small services
39. Ric. Stiremund	1 toft	12d.	5d.	small services
40. Agnes, w. of Godwyn	3½a.	7d.	2½d.	small services
41. Alice Tudbol ³⁰	4a.	13d.	½d.	small services
42. Nicholas, s. of Ymene	1 toft, 3a.	18d.	5d.	small services
43. Gamel and Thomas	½ toft	4½d.	2½d.	small services
44. Robert de Birstune	1 pce. land	½d.	—	—
45. Thos. Harald	1 toft	13¾d.	5d.	small services
46. Joh., s. of Ranulph	14a.	25½d.	—	(formerly of
47. Emma Nobolet	1½a.	—	5d.	Nobolet) all of
7. Thos. del Acre	4a.	12d.	—	same tenure,
48. Will. le Carpenter	1 piece	1d.	—	Emma Nobolet
49. Simon Palmere	1a.	4d.	—	to do all services
				because she sits
				in the principal
				messuage.

²⁴ & ²⁵ Formerly of German. ²⁶ Another for 33d., aid 5d. ²⁷ One piece for 1½d.

²⁸ One at his gate for ½d.

²⁹ These tenants have to do a variable number of occasional boons and generally to give a hen and a few eggs.

³⁰ One piece of bruery for 3d.

THE PRIOR OF NORWICH'S MANOR OF HINDOLVESTON. 189

Name of Tenant.	Holding.	Rent.	Aid.	Services.
50. Geoffrey Palmere . . .	2a.	9d.	1d.	small services
51. Will., s. of Walter . . .	2½a.	5d.	½d.	small services
52. Matilda, w. of Ric. the forester . . .	1 piece	2d.	—	as Will. s. of W.
53. Ranulph, s. of John	18a. (f.l.)	5s. 8a. ⁸¹	8d.	services descd. ⁸²
54. Emma Molle, Gun- dilda, Petronella, d. of Ranulph . . .	40a.	7s. 6d.	20d.	services descd. ⁸³
55. Ric., s. of Osmund	8½a.	3s. 1d.	9d.	small services
56. Ric. the Miller . . .	3a.	14d.	5d.	as Ric. s. of O.
57. John Stute . . .	1 pichtel	2d.	—	small services
58. Ric. de Northwode . . .	30a.	7s. of census	—	—
59. Gilbert and Alan . . .	18a.	3s.	20d.	services desc. ⁸⁴
60. Will., s. of Roger . . .	18a.	4s. 7½d.	20d.	as Alans. of Odo ⁸⁵
61. Thomas, s. of William	70a.	12s. 7½d.	—	—
62. Ranulph, s. of Roger & his mother & Leviva	18a.	5s. 2½d.	—	services descd. ⁸⁶
63. Hugo, s. of Margaret & Margaret . . .	9a.	26d.	—	services descd. ⁸⁷
7. Thos. del Acre . . .	land	10½d.	1½d.	services descd. (form. of Wal- ter le Tournour)
„ „ „ . . .	land	9d.	2d.	services descd. (formerly of Godwyn Suter)
„ „ „ . . .	5 pieces	4d.	(in	Northwodeker and at gate of Thos. the Chaplain)
64. Philip, s. of Geoffrey	4a.	16d.	5d.	services
65. Ric. Coupere, Geoffr. & Ric.	1 toft	12d.	5d.	as Philip

⁸¹ 8a. in Stenhwet and two small pieces.

⁸² To do 4 boons in August and 4 with a plough. Also 4 averages, ditch and give 2 hens and 20 eggs.

⁸³ To give 2 capons. To plough till noon if they have had their dinner (disnarium, dejeuner) at terce (9 a.m.), "but if not they shall depart at terce."

⁸⁴ Same as 53.

⁸⁵ To give 35 eggs.

⁸⁶ Same as No. 53, and to give half a comb of malt of oats.

⁸⁷ The remaining tenants to No. 76 do much the same services as No. 53 with slight variations. Several do only 3 boons and 3 ploughings. Nos. 72 and 73 have to do 9 boons.

190 THE PRIOR OF NORWICH'S MANOR OF HINDOLVESTON.

Name of Tenant.	Holding.	Rent.	Aid.	Services.
7. Thos. del Acre	—	land	(form. of Berte)	services
66. „ „ „	3½r.	3d. of census	(form. of Gueppe)	services as land of Berte
67. Reyner, s. of Gunnora	2a.	8d.	2½d.	services
68. Cecilia, w. of Daniel	5½a.	22d.	2½d.	services
69. Joh., s. of Jocelin	8a.	5s. 5d.	14½d.	services
	and 1 toft			
70. Ranulph, s. of Ric.	18a. (f.l.)	4s. 6d.		services as Joh. s. of Joce.
„ „ „	7a.	15½d.		with 1 alderbed and ½ alderbed (form. of Ran. s. of Will.
„ „ „	2a.	6d.		(form. of West.)
„ „ „	14½a.	2s. 6½d.		(which Will., 2nd Prior ³⁸ gave to Will. de Dicleburg; no services because Ric. & Geoffrey Palmere do for a land they hold thereof).
„ „ „	7½a.	21½d.	—	in Northcroft
71. Joh., s. of Will. Toce. & Joh. bro.	5a. 1r.	15½d.	4½d.	services
72. Joh., Will., Geoffr., sons of Robert, & Geoffrey, s. of Peter	18a.	6s. 2d.	20d.	services ³⁹
73. Roger Sparke & Wlviva	18a. (f.l.)	6s. 10d.	20d.	services
74. Ric. & Gregory	4a.	12d.	5d.	services (form. of Will. de Dicleburg)
75. Emma Gos	1 mess.	—	—	services (form. of Will. de Dicleburg)
76. Ric. the Miller	1 piece	2d.	½d.	services
77. Roger, s. of Richard (or small cottage)	1 pce. of a bordell'	—	—	1 hen, 3 boons in August
78. Rob. the Smith	1 pictel	½d.	—	„ „
79. Matilda Gardiner	„	1d.	—	„ „
80. Daniel Geoffrey	„	1½d.	—	„ „
81. Alice the widow	„	2d.	—	„ „
82. Matilda, widow of John	„	1d.	—	„ „

³⁸ William de Turb was Prior from 1121 to 1140. *Blomefield's History of Norfolk*, vol. iii. 600.

³⁹ Except 4th because "non habet residentiam ibi."

THE PRIOR OF NORWICH'S MANOR OF HINDOLVESTON. 191

Name of Tenant.	Holding.	Rent.	Aid.	Services.
83. Agnes Coke . . .	1 pictel	2d.	—	1 hen, 3 boons in August
84. Langelif Kyde . . .	„	2d.	—	„ „
85. Two Cecilias . . .	„	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.	—	„ „
86. Adam the Miller . . .	„	1d.	—	„ „
87. Mannyng . . .	„	1d.	—	„ „
88. Puleyn . . .	„	1d.	—	„ „
89. Ascelina Peytevina . . .	„	—	—	„ „
90. Warin Stiremund . . .	„	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.	—	„ „
91. Joh., s. of Ranulph . . .	„	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.	—	„ „
92. Joh., s. of Seluue . . .	„	1d.	—	„ „
93. Geoffrey le Gros of Northune . . .	2a.	4d.	—	in Fornefeld
94. Peter the Constable of Neuton . . .	—	2s.	(1 mill pool of Langwade & 1 place where the mill is situated)	
95. Walter Wuke gives for a pasture	—	—	—	1 hen and eggs
96. Ranulph, s. of Warr' gives for same	—	—	—	„ „
97. Margaret, d. of Edwyn gives for same	—	—	—	„ „
7. Thos. del Acre shall give	7s.	6d.	for land which Ranulph the priest gave him, except the aforesaid lands which he holds of the Lancetage of the lord Prior which he holds by gift of said Ranulph the priest.	

NOTE.—In autumn, at boons, loaves to be 128 to 1 seam. Drivers of pigs to Norwich to have food in “aula hospicii.” The reeve to have $\frac{1}{2}$ d. from every tenant of the quarter of a Lancetage, as jurors say.

Census of the Mill under the Hall . . .	1 mark.
„ „ „ in the middle of the vill . . .	14s. 0d.
„ „ „ at the head of the vill . . .	1 mark.

Emma and Margaret pay yearly for rent . . .	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.
and for 1 hen . . .	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.
Also for reaping in autumn . . .	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.
„ for land of Adam de Onstlond for aid . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.
„ to aid for Hana Bissop . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.
„ to rent for said Hana . . .	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.
„ for threshing of corn they pay . . .	2d.”

The Lancetages.—In considering the above list of tenants for the purpose of investigating the previous development of manorial conditions we may set aside Nos. 35, 54, 58, and 61, holding between them 200 acres⁴⁰ and practically rendering no service except rent, and also Nos. 77 to 92, holding small pightels and doing scarcely any agricultural service. There remain 77 tenancies whose holders were bound to more or less service. Of these nineteen are specifically included in a systematic organisation, entitled "Lancetage." Their lands are classified under the title of full, half, and quarter lancetages. The first class, who hold a full land, are charged with a long schedule of services, minutely specified. The second class do half the services of the first, and the third half of those of the second. Thirteen other holdings, Nos. 21 and 22 and Nos. 24 to 34, though not called by this name, are in a similarly organised condition. The corresponding tenants on the Priory Manor of Hindringham are also called "Lanceters." The list of them is missing. It is plain, however, that they numbered 34 and each held 14 acres.⁴¹

We may enquire what is meant by the term "Lancetage." It is manifestly derived from the Old English "Landsaeta," or land settler, and forms a link of connection between our tenants and the original Angle settlers on the land. It had, of course, lost much of the original simplicity of its meaning. The Angle, and afterwards the Anglo-Danish, land settlers were, at first entirely, and to the end in practice, masters of the soil on which they were settled. But by the time of our documents "lancetage" implied the lowest form of tenure, involving a large amount of

⁴⁰ The total acreage of the tenancies included in the above list is 865.

⁴¹ At Newton the tenants were called "Lanceti" (*Blomefield's Norfolk*, vol. viii. 227). A full land was 14 acres.

compulsory agricultural service to a lord. The term, in fact, exactly corresponded both in original meaning and in development to the Latin "villanus," which originally meant one who was settled on a country "villa," or farm, as contrasted with the dweller in a city or town. The Roman writers, naturally, found no better term to apply to a Saxon country settlement than their term "villa," and the occupying tenants would be correctly termed "villani." It is true that the Latin farm-tenant was in a much more subordinate position than the English "land-settler." But in the time of Domesday Book, which must have chiefly stereotyped the usage, the word "villanus" not inaptly described the social status of the agricultural tenant in a great part of England. The independent land-settler had become the subordinate worker on the land of a lord. And so it had come to pass that "in lancetagio domini" was equivalent to "in villenagio domini," describing a man at the lord's command for the performance of all sorts of specified services.

The Organisation.—This explanation of the term here employed does not, however, fairly express its real significance. Its persistent existence through some centuries of use testifies to the continuance of some reality which it connoted. This was, as I think, the agricultural organisation of a local settlement for the culture of the land. An original settlement was a group of persons who combined together to till the ground on equal terms, sowing and reaping over open fields with co-operative labour. Some may have had a larger and some a smaller share. Otherwise there was equality and it is thought that the sub-division of a share into scattered strips was done to ensure equality on soil of varying conditions and that the strips were originally re-allotted from time to time.

The manorial system,⁴² when it was introduced, necessitated a modification of this system. As a rule the lord's demesne, or home farm to be worked by the tenants for his benefit, must have been taken from the common land. Whether that were so or not, at least it was necessary to organise the labour of the tenants. This was certainly done by attaching so much labour service to so much land held by the tenant. Obviously, the more equality there was in the tenants' holdings the easier would be the organising of their services. Here we may take an illustration from the parallel case of Martham.⁴³ Without entering into details, I may state that the 18-acre holdings of Hindolveston are there represented by 12-acre holdings under another archaic title. Each is called an "Eruing." It is said that on the manor were reckoned 22 eruinges and 3 acres. Eruing is plainly a corrupt rendering of the Saxon word "eriung," or ploughing, and must mean that each holding so called was responsible for some portion of a common plough-team. Some indications seem to show that the portion was a quarter. If so it would follow that a plough on that land had been, in old times, worked by eight oxen and that each eruing contributed two. Now it suggests itself here, as in the case of lancetage, that the continuance of the word implies that something of the sort may be traced back to its original use. In other words, it is possible that the old land-settlers had their plough-team shares of land organised at a very early period. On the other hand it is also possible that this organisation was due to the manorial system and its requirements,

⁴² A system of estates consisting of a lord's demesne worked by customary tenants who held their lands under him.

⁴³ See Transactions of Royal Historical Society (as above), p. 36. For "Tofts," p. 47.

and that old names were continued to describe something new in detail if not in purpose. In any case it is to be taken for granted that the organisation of the 18-acre holdings at Hindolveston must carry us back to the first establishment of the Manor, the date of which is, unfortunately, not known to us as is that of Martham.

Tofts.—It will be noticed that No. 20, Thos. Kingsheved, is not said to hold any land but one toft. In the MS. it is "1 toft, viz., 1 quarter of a lancetage." He is therefore charged with the same services as Margaret, who holds "4½ acres, the quarter of a lancetage." Similarly, No. 21 is so charged for "1 toft," and 39, 45, and 65 have to pay 5d. (the normal charge for the quarter of an "aid") for 1 toft. This is a valuable piece of information. At Martham it is almost certain that every "former" tenement had a toft. These tofts appear as portions of the sub-divided holdings, very frequently in equal shares as divided between children. The original tofts can mostly be re-constructed and in many cases comprise about three acres of land in their entirety. As the full "eruing" at Martham was twelve acres, this would make a toft equal to a quarter of an eruing. An original toft seems to have been a portion of a "full land" holding, with or without a house, in which the tenant could keep his oxen and other animals and poultry with a herb-garden. At Martham the rest of the holding was often quite apart from the toft. The tofts of different tenants were gathered together in groups about the vill or district. If we imagine a manorial system being imposed on a previously independent community, this provision of a toft for every holding would seem to point to the original holders of "eruings" or "lancetages" being tenants of small means.

requiring such an accommodation and not, to any extent, larger tenants, such as the members of a village community, dividing their lands into sections of equal agricultural responsibility. Such persons would have their own crofts or curtilages.

Was the whole of the Tenants' Lands thus Organised?—There is another observation which may be made on this list. While the systematic arrangement of holdings and services ceases at No. 34 and the remaining holdings are variable in both aspects, yet some of the same features recur from time to time with noticeable differences. Thus No. 53, Ranulph, son of John, holds 18 acres which are described as a "full land," yet his rent, aid, and services are all different from those of the normal holders of a full lanceutage. The same is true of No. 59. No. 60, also with 18 acres, has to do the same as No. 24, the typical 9-acre holder. So Nos. 70, 72, and 73, all with similar holdings, stand by themselves as regard services. Even within the range of the regular holdings there are peculiarities. Nos. 4 to 6 are specified as "half lands" and charged correctly as regards rent and aid, but they have to follow the services of a holder of a full land. Perhaps this means, to do services in proportion. But the long list of 9-acre holders, from Nos. 24 to 34, though they all have to follow No. 24 as their type, are not said to hold half lands and their rents are ten times larger than those of their earlier compeers. All these are evidently not reckoned as under the same obligations as the holders of lanceutages. How are we to explain this feature? There is little doubt that they had all alike formerly been included in the same classes, but some had, for various reasons, escaped from the lowest tenure and risen a

step higher. In Martham where the tenants are entered under two classes, in villenage and in socage, just the same features are found. Many of the socmen have the same holdings as the holders of eruings with less burdensome obligations. In many cases in all the early surveys of Monastic Manors in Norfolk (of which there is a large number) it is noted that such and such a land had formerly been "subject to work." There is then a probability that at the origin of a manor the newly constituted customary tenants were (at least as regards the able workers) organised throughout on a system of equal holdings and proportionate services. This is one of the points which remains to be investigated and also whether the foundation of such a system had not been laid in far distant times.

Date of Sub-division.—There is still another question which seems especially difficult to answer. It will be seen by a comparison of the Hindolveston and Martham lists. As already observed, the Martham survey shows that, even in 1292, the 107 "former" units were already sub-divided into 900 or more small tenancies. Yet here in Hindolveston, only eighteen years earlier, we find no definite evidence of any such sub-division, unless the word "socii," more than once used, implies something of the sort. What are we to conclude? In the Manor of Wykes, already quoted and in other cases, there are similar instances of early sub-division. There is no reason to suppose anything special at Martham. Yet we must either imagine that at Hindolveston the lancetages, though entered on the list as integral units, were really made up of scattered items, or else that at Martham and elsewhere some very peculiar dis-integrating influences were at work in the latter part of the 13th century. To the present writer the former

seems the more likely conclusion, and perhaps the evidence of the alienations taking place at Hindolveston in the early 14th century will strengthen the suspicion that some similar process must have been taking place before the compilation of this Stowe MS. Survey.

Hindolveston in Domesday Book.—In order to compare our list of Customary Tenants with the occupants of the land when the Domesday Survey was made the account in that record is here given from the *Victoria County History of Norfolk*, vol. ii. p. 116.

“D. B., fol. 192, Hundred Ensfort.—The Bishop holds Hidolfestuna in demesne⁴⁴ for a manor and for 200 acres. Then,⁴⁵ as now, 12 villeins and 22 bordars and 3 serfs and 2 ploughs on the demesne and 5 ploughs belonging to the men; then woodland for 600 swine, now 300, 12 acres of meadow, 1 mill. Then, as now, 2 rounceys⁴⁶ and 20 beasts and 40 swine, 40 goats, 2 hives of bees. Here belongs (jacet) 1 outlying estate (berewyk) which is called Norton [Wood Norton] of 200 acres. Then, as now, 9 villeins and 6 bordars, then 2 serfs, now 1; then, as now, 1 plough on the demesne and 2 ploughs belonging to the men, 8 acres of meadow, woodland for 30 swine. And 1 church in the Manor with 26 acres and it is worth 20 pence. And a third part of a church⁴⁷ is in the outlying estate with 2½ acres and it is worth 4 pence. And 8 sokemen⁴⁸ with 51 acres which Hugh holds of the Bishop; 3 bordars, then as now, 2 ploughs and 4 acres of meadow, woodland for 10 swine.

⁴⁴ “In dominio pro manerio et pro 200 acris.” The Bishop held the land (not as patron, but) under his own control. It was already organised as a manor. His assessment to the King's geld or tax was for 200 acres.

⁴⁵ Then = in the time of King Edward (1066); now = at the time of the Domesday Survey (1086).

⁴⁶ Runcini, rough horses.

⁴⁷ The land out of the tithes of which the church was endowed belonged to three lords.

⁴⁸ Socmanni, men under the “soc” or jurisdiction of a lord. When the land became manorialised they were an upper class of tenants with less burdensome customs than the villeins.

And in Gechestueit [Guestwick] 1 sokeman with 24 acres of land and 2 oxen. Then half a plough, now 1.

And in Gegeteta [Guist] 2 sokemen with 2 acres, which the same Hugh holds. Then the whole was worth 10 pounds, now 13 pounds 8 shillings. And Hidolvestuna is 1 league in length and 1 in breadth,⁴⁹ and pays 8 pence and a half-penny for geld.⁵⁰

It is worth while to set by the side of this the Domesday description of the principal occupants of Martham at the same time:

"In Martham were 36 freemen of Aylmer by commendation only (holding) 5 ploughlands and 10 acres. Bishop William has them now: and 50 acres of meadow. Then, as now, 16 ploughs. It was then worth 6 pounds, now 8 pounds and 10 shillings. There is 1 church (holding), 50 acres and worth 50 pence. (Domesday Book, fol. 200; *Victoria County History of Norfolk*, vol. ii. p. 123."

It thus appears that while in Martham (not only in this large holding, but also in a few other smaller ones) the Bishop's land was held entirely by freemen, in Hindolveston there was not one freeman. In Martham the Bishop had only "commendation" (patronage) over the tenants, at Hindolveston he held them "in dominio," or under complete subjection as lord of a "manor." The Martham record is most valuable as helping us to appreciate what took place within a few years when the Bishop turned his land there into a manor for the benefit of his monks. This process had taken place some time before at Hindolveston. Just as we must suppose that the 36 freemen of Martham became the customary tenants of the manor as villeins and

⁴⁹ A rough measurement of land in Domesday Book. Its exact meaning is still in some doubt.

⁵⁰ The Dane geld, a tribute first exacted to meet the Danish invasion, now continued as a Royal tax.

socman, so conversely we may assume that the villeins and bordars of Hindolveston had been (or were descendants of) freemen, formerly tilling the ground for themselves.

The Hindolveston account is hardly full enough to assist us much in tracing back the history of our tenants of 1274. No doubt they were the successors of the villeins of Domesday. But we cannot tell what sort of holdings the latter had. If, as probable, we are to take Wood Norton as part of the manor there were 21 villeins with 7 ploughs. (The bordars or cottagers are not reckoned as occupants of the land.) The relation of acreage to a plough is here unfortunately very confused. In Hindolveston itself the Bishop has two ploughs to his demesne land of 200 acres; in Wood Norton one plough to the same acreage. In Guist one sokeman has for 24 acres two oxen and provides half a plough which would seem to imply a plough-team there of four oxen for 48 acres of land. This is about the average of land found in East Norfolk in Domesday Book as worked by a plough-team, but a team of four oxen is unusually small. The Bishop has only three ploughs to 400 acres of demesne, but then he relied also on the ploughs of his men. On the other hand Hugh, who held 51 acres of land under the Bishop at Guestwick with eight sokemen under him, had two ploughs, or one for 25 acres. On these points we must wait for further knowledge.

II.—THE ROLLS OF THE MANORIAL COURT (1309 to 1326).

Alienation of land in the Manorial Court.—It has been stated on p. 184 that the Dean and Chapter have a record of the proceedings of the Manorial Court,

running from 1309 to 1326. Such a court is known by the name of Court Baron, or "Curia Baronis," *i.e.*, the Court of the Lord. This was true in so far that the lord's steward presided and the lord took all the fees, fines, and profits. But it is pertinent to observe that the court consisted of the tenants themselves and by them all matters were decided. The business of the court included all questions connected with the tenants' lands, and in particular every change of ownership or tenancy had to be reported to it and entered on the roll of its proceedings. This practice, though in some cases a burden, was really a very great protection, giving every tenant an absolute security of title to his land. Students of manorial history are in some doubt as to how far a tenant was at liberty to alienate his land even within the bounds of his own manor. The legal theory among the Norman lawyers was that the whole was the lord's. As we have seen he had the undoubted right to call for labour and other services from the occupants. It has been assumed, therefore, that he had the right to put a veto on any change that might risk his due services. The very ample evidence to be given from this Hindolveston document certainly seems to show the tenants exercising the unrestricted right of dealing with their lands as they pleased, without any attempt on the part of the lord to interfere with their liberty. The services chargeable were, of course, understood to pass with the land.

The practice in such matters was as follows:—The tenant who wanted to part with any portion of his land came to the court and surrendered it into the lord's hands, naming the person to whom he desired to convey it. The person so named applied for admission which was granted. Certain fines were paid and the

202 THE PRIOR OF NORWICH'S MANOR OF HINDOLVESTON.

transaction was entered on the court roll and thenceforward became a legal record of title. The best way to enable a reader to realise the extent to which this process was being carried on at this period on the Manor of Hindolveston is to present to him a tabulated schedule of the courts and the number of surrenders at each court. In the number of transactions are included changes of tenancy at a death, which needed no surrender. The death was reported by the jurors, who also stated who was the next heir or heirs. The heir, who was present, applied for admission and it was granted on fulfilment of certain conditions.

LIST OF COURTS WITH NUMBER OF SURRENDERS AND ADMISSIONS.

1309.	22 Sept.	..	7		1314.	3 Jan.	..	11
	27 Nov.	..	12			17 May	..	6
			—	19		11 July	..	11
1310.	24 Mar.	..	21			19 Oct.	..	15
	26 June	..	19					— 43
	15 Sept.	..	16		1315.	21 Feb.	..	13
			—	56		10 July	..	21
1311.	22 Jan.	..	7			10 Oct.	..	20
	21 May	..	21					— 54
	9 July	..	5		1316.	17 Mar.	..	51
	14 Sept.	..	10			12 July	..	54
			—	43		28 Sept.	..	22
1312.	7 Jan.	..	5					— 127
	7 Apr.	..	23		1317.	17 Jan.	..	23
	30 June	..	9			18 Apr.	..	31
	15 Sept.	..	7			4 July	..	22
	7 Dec.	..	5			8 Oct.	..	11
			—	49				— 87
1313.	31 Jan.	..	5		1318.	13 Feb.	..	25
	25 May	..	8			23 May	..	13
	10 Oct.	..	10			9 Oct.	..	11
			—	23				— 49

THE PRIOR OF NORWICH'S MANOR OF HINDOLVESTON. 203

1319.	22 Jan.	..	6		1324.	14 Feb.	..	10
	7 June	..	16			3 May	..	5
	8 Oct.	..	11			9 Aug.	..	2
			—	33		30 Oct.	..	11
1320.	13 Feb.	..	7					— 28
	30 May	..	5		1325.	19 Feb.	..	4
	25 July	..	7			12 July	..	3
			—	19		10 Oct.	..	8
1321.	26 Sept.	..	5					— 15
1322.	26 Jan.	..	16		1326.	11 Mar.	..	7
	28 June	..	12			15 July	..	13
	1 Oct.	..	4					— 20
			—	32				—
1323.	21 Jan.	..	13					753
	1 July	..	28					—
	20 Oct.	..	10					—
			—	51				

There is a gap between July, 1320, and Jan., 1322, except one court in Sept., 1321. The first and last years are also short. We may reckon that we have a complete record of sixteen years with 748 re-admissions, nearly all after surrender. This gives exactly forty-eight changes of tenancy in each year. It is evident that in 1316 and 1317 some abnormal influence must have been at work, probably bad seasons, as will be shown.

Our chief interest in these changes is to discover, where possible, what were the causes which led to them as illustrating the social life of the tenants. To this end I have made a rough analysis of rather more than half the surrenders.

A.—Death of the tenant and admission of the next heir	74
B.—Transference by tenant during lifetime to						
(a) Sons or brothers	73
(b) Daughters or sisters	46
(c) Others not members of the family	17
					—	136

204 THE PRIOR OF NORWICH'S MANOR OF HINDOLVESTON.

C.—Stress of bad seasons (say)	100
D.—Private convenience, including marriage ar- rangement	443
	<hr/>
	753
	<hr/>

A.—The first of these classes of transference of property was usually quite simple. The eldest son was heir and took his father's place. Sometimes, however, questions arose and they were carefully settled by the Court. Here is one such case:

“An inquest says that Richard Armigard who is dead held in the lord's villenage 4 acres of land with a messuage upon it and that the said Richard had 3 daughters, Alice, Cecilia, Amabilia, who are his heirs, but because the said Cecilia married a stranger she is not yet received to her share (purpartem) without the mandate of the lord Prior. But if the lord Prior is willing to do her favour she shall pay her share of heriot. And they give for heriot of the said land 5s. Pledges John Vincent and Geoffrey Harald. Also the said Cecilia and Amabilia offered for heriot $\frac{1}{2}$ acre of land after the death of Escelina their mother. Because of her marriage to a stranger Cecilia shall give for that heriot 6d. Also the said Alice offers for heriot 3 acres of land after the death of Matilda her mother and gives 3s. 6d. Same pledges.⁵¹”—15 Sept., 1310.

On 10th October, 1313, we find it reported that—

“Gilbert Armegerd died seised of 1 acre of land of villenage and Alice, Cecil and Mabil', daughters of Richard, brother of Gilbert, are his heirs, who came and made fine. Pledge William Tubbel.”

⁵¹ This statement, as it stands, is rather obscure. The deceased tenant had been twice married and both wives are spoken of as if alive at the same time.

Here is a more complicated question of inheritance :

"Inquest says that John Mondgome, who is dead, held in villenage 1 cottage and died without an heir. Therefore the right to this cottage reverted⁵² to a certain Wulvina, sister of Roger Mondegome, father of the said John, and from the said Wulvina the right descends to a certain Roger as son and heir and from Roger to a certain Simon atte Brigge as son and heir who offers himself and gives, &c. Pledge William Tubbel. Fine 12d. Also the Inquest says that a certain Leviva Osmond held in villenage 40 ft. by 40, after whose death John Mondgome entered as son and heir who afterwards died without an heir. Therefore the right of the said tenement reverted to a certain Alan as uncle, and brother of Leviva, mother of the said John. And from Leviva the right descended to a certain Richard as son and heir and from Richard to a certain John as son and heir, who now claims, &c. And from the whole of this tenement it is ordered to make for Alice late the wife of John a dower. Fine 4d. (9 July, 1311.)"

Another case turned on a dispute about legitimacy :

"Henry le Lepere, who is dead, held 1 cottage and 3 acres of land which he held by inheritance of Alice his wife by the law of England.⁵³ And because the aforesaid Henry and Alice had 2 sons, viz., William and Ranulph and from Ranulph issued one Matilda who says that she is heir and that the aforesaid William ought not to be admitted for that he is a bastard, by reason of which word was sent to the Dean⁵⁴ of the Manors to certify to the Court

⁵² Resortiebatur.

⁵³ Where the land belonged to the wife the law allowed the husband, on the death of his wife, to retain it during his lifetime. Sometimes called "by Courtesy of England."

⁵⁴ From soon after the Conquest till the Reformation a Rural (or Bishop's) Dean held an ecclesiastical court, called the "Court of Christianity" in which were tried all causes arising out of marriages or testaments. Many Bishops and Monastic bodies instead of allowing such causes in their own manors or parishes to go before the local court of the Deanery, appointed a special official to try them. The Dean here mentioned would be the official appointed by the Prior of Norwich to deal with such matters arising among the tenants of the Priory Manors.

whether the said William was a bastard or not. And the said Dean sent word to us distinctly and openly by his letters patent that the aforesaid William is legitimate and born in matrimony, which letters remain in the hands of the said William. Therefore seisin is delivered to him to hold in villenage at the will of the lord the said cottage and 3 acres of land, saving the dower of 1 acre of land for Matilda, wife of the aforesaid Henry, to the term of her life. And he gives for having seisin 2s. 6d. [21 Feb., 1315]."

B.—The transference of property by a tenant during his or her lifetime would naturally suggest that, growing too old to perform the obligatory work, he had the land and its burdens transferred to younger hands. No doubt this cause accounts for a certain number of the cases, as for instance:

"John Vincent surrenders into the hands of the lord $\frac{1}{2}$ acre of land in Fornfeld to the use of John his son. Saving to John for life and saving therefrom a dower for Margaret, w. of John. Then to said John, son of John."

We should take this to imply that John, feeling his end approaching, gave the land to his son reserving it to himself while he lived and charging John with the duty of providing out of it a dower for his mother, if she outlived her husband. It was very frequent, in such cases, to draw up a collateral agreement by which the younger tenants bound themselves to make proper provision for their parents' shelter, food, and clothing. No such agreement occurs in this particular set of rolls, but in a rather later set of this same court is enrolled a record of the requirements of a lady who was evidently accustomed to a high style of living.

"Margaret, widow of Giles Hony, alone present in court, in the presence of the Master of the Cellar and the Steward

surrenders into the hands of the lord 1 messuage containing 1 acre and $6\frac{1}{2}$ acres of land in divers places in the field of Hyndolveston to the use of John atte Bek senior and his heirs, to whom was granted seisin thereof to hold at the will of the lord by service, &c., on the following conditions, to pay Margaret 9 marks of silver (£6); at certain times Margaret was to have a woollen cloth for 4 tunics in 4 years next ensuing, of such cloth as John and his wife use and to Margaret's satisfaction, 1 summer and 3 winter tunics. The summer tunic to cost 5s. and to be provided at once. The 3 winter tunics in 3 ensuing winters, each to cost 3s. 4d. She was to be supplied with food and drink, like John and his wife. To have every year 4 bushels of fruit, pears, apples, or such like, unless nothing grew. To have dried for her 3 quarters of barley-malt. Also the easement of the whole end of the hall towards the west with solar,⁵⁵ pantry, buttery and other easement. When she dies, she was to be buried in an honourable way ("as she would wish to have honour [decus] thereby"). Finally, if these provisions were not properly carried out, she might call a jury of 12 trusty and legal men and if they proved in the presence of the Master of the Cellar and the Steward that default had been committed, she might re-enter the whole tenement and hold it to herself as before. (23 Nov., 1377.)"

It will be noticed that this high-class establishment was treated as part of a villein tenement, to which admission was given "by service at the will of the lord." No doubt the land had formerly come under this category and was one of the old villenage tenements. But this date was after the Black Death and the conditions of tenure had been altered.

The tenant's advancing age would not, however, explain more than a comparatively small portion of the 136 transfers of land made during lifetime and especially

⁵⁵ An upper chamber over the pantry, &c., for the private use of the master and mistress of the house.

those with a reservation that the transferor was to hold the tenement so long as he lived. Nearly half the whole number have this stipulation. There was evidently some other object in view than provision for old age. It has been thought that this was a method of ensuring the succession to the particular person desired. But we find a man surrendering a holding with this condition to his "son and heir." Yet we know that the announcement of a tenant's death was always accompanied by a statement of the name of the next of kin or rightful heir and, so long as the right was unquestioned, he was at once admitted. The most probable explanation of this practice seems to be that it was an endeavour to save expense when the change should come. The "fine" claimed by the lord on a surrender of the strips of half an acre or even a few roods and perches was at the rate of over 2s. for each acre surrendered. This was a large sum when the yearly money payment in rent and aid did not exceed, on the average, 3d. per acre, except on the holdings where the services had been wholly or partly commuted, in which cases it scarcely ever exceeded 6d. per acre. It would in any case be to the advantage of the successor that the fine should have been already satisfied, and in the case of an heir would free him, on the father's death, from the obligation of paying a heriot or fee payable on inheritance.

D.—As regards the greater number of the changes made in the occupation of land, which can only be ascribed to private convenience we have no evidence on which to assign causes, except in one matter. Several are plainly connected with arrangements for marriage. Thus at the court on 21st May, 1311:

"Emma, daughter of Peter Matheu, surrendered $\frac{1}{2}$ acre at Estfeld to Henry Manning for life with remainder to Emma

and her heirs. Thomas and Beatrix, children of Peter Matheu, released and quit-claimed to Emma their sister and her heirs all right in $\frac{1}{2}$ acre in Estwode. For this quit-claim Emma surrendered to the lord $\frac{1}{8}$ rood of land at Tullyerd to the use of Thomas and Beatrix and their heirs. Seisin was delivered. Emma surrendered $\frac{1}{2}$ acre in Estwode to use of Henry Manning with remainder to herself. Fine 18d. From Emma, daughter of Peter Matheu, for her marriage 6d. Pledge Henry Manning."

At another court on 25th May, 1313:

"Imania Sybelot surrendered 8 perches of land to William, son of Peter Randolf. Also $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres and $\frac{1}{5}$ messuage to [?] and Matilda, daughter of Imania. In default of heirs to Matilda, reversion to Imaynia. Also she makes fine⁵⁶ for the marriage of Matilda her daughter. William, son of Peter Randolf and Warin Cussyng and Juliana his wife (examined) surrendered part of a messuage to John Cussing and Matilda daughter of Imania Sybelot. If no issue, reversion to donors."

John Cussing was evidently the other party to the marriage.

C.—*Parting with Land for Food*.—Perhaps the most interesting feature of these rolls is that they cover what has been described as the most disastrous period of scarcity in the history of the country. Thorold Rogers⁵⁷ says, under the year 1315: "It is the first year of the great famine. Prices rose after February. Then the real state of affairs became manifest. . . . Altogether the crop of this year must have been nearly a total failure and we shall find that at no time in English history has a dearth of such magnitude occurred. . . . The circumstances of the two years [1315 and 1316]

⁵⁶ Makes an agreement by payment of a "fine."

⁵⁷ Rogers' *History of Prices*, vol. i. p. 197.

indicate an absolute dearth. The price of wheat in 1315 represents a quintuple and that of 1316 a quadruple of the general average [c. 5s. per quarter]." Our rolls confirm this statement. The analysis of the surrenders in the courts shows double the usual average in the years 1316 and 1317. In the spring of 1315 a Parliamentary Order was issued fixing a maximum price for beef, mutton, pigs, and poultry. Fodder from the harvest of 1314 must have failed in Norfolk. The Parliamentary Order was sent to the Sheriff of Norfolk and is entered in the Norwich Book of Customs, fol. 59.⁵⁸ It is dated 14 March, 8 Ed. II. (1314 $\frac{4}{5}$). The harvest of 1315 was a failure, and in March, 1316, and again in July more than 100 surrenders of land were made. In three succeeding courts (Sept., 1316, and Jan. and April, 1317) 76 more, making 176 in thirteen months with five courts; by far the highest average in these rolls. We cannot, of course, say that all these surrenders were due to the scarcity of food, but several indications point to this cause, and two in 1318 are definitely assigned to famine.

The first actual indication of the effects of the famine is in the court on 12th July, 1316, where we read:

"Thomas Frenkysh, John Huny, and John Matheu acknowledge that they are bound, each and all, to Simon de Dallyng in 6 pounds of silver for corn bought from him to be paid at the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin next after date of completion."

Simon, as we know, was Steward and this entry may be compared with two similar entries on 13th February, 1318:

"Thomas Frenkysh acknowledges himself bound to Simon de Dallyng in 100s. for 4 quarters and 1 bushel of wheat

⁵⁸ Blomefield's *History of Norfolk*, vol. iii. pp. 76, 77.

bought of him and received. To be paid to Simon in his house at Wodedalling on the Feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin next ensuing by pledges John Huny, Thomas de Acre, Richard Human, Peter Danyel. And each pledge has made himself a principal debtor."

"William, son of Hugh Malesusch, acknowledges himself bound to John, son of Simon de Dallingg, in 100s. to be paid to John at Wodedallingg at Easter next ensuing, by pledges John Huny, Thomas de Acre, Hugo Malesusch, and Thomas Frenkysh, of whom each, &c."

From what has been said about prices at this time Simon had not been very exorbitant in his charges. The tenants here named were probably among the better provided with means, since three of them could make themselves responsible for so much money as 200s. The smaller tenants and less able to meet the strain had nothing to barter for food except their land. Immediately before the last entries occur the two already mentioned:

"Joan, daughter of Richard Willis, surrendered 1 acre and 1 rood of land in Northcroftes to the use of William Tubble and Katerine his wife. Emma, mother of the said Joan, surrendered her dower from the said land to the use of the said William and Katerine. Fine 20d. Note that the aforesaid surrender is granted because the land was sold for great hunger (pro magna fame)."

"Joan, daughter of John West, surrendered 18 perches of land in Westfeld to the use of Peter Mounper. Surrender made for great hunger."

The first of these entries reveals a fact which presumably was true of all the other surrenders for private convenience in some form or other. The court does not, as a rule, record any consideration, whether in money or kind, given in return for the land surrendered, unless it was a case of exchange of land. That was a private matter not affecting the tenure.

Another suggestive indication of the scarcity is the occurrence of certain persons to whose use land was surrendered. Evidently there were one or two persons in a position to supply their neighbours with food in return for land. One of these was Adam Carpenter, called also "le Carpenter," or "Carpentarius." The name certainly described his occupation, for when John Thomassone, an infant under age, was with his land given into his charge for six years, Adam was told to "instruct him in the office of a carpenter if he would."⁵⁹ This man's name occurs no less than 42 times and if, as is most likely, he is the same as Adam le Wright, 49 times in these rolls as concerned in exchanges of land. What is most remarkable is that in these 49 exchanges he receives land in 47 and parts with it only in two. Particularly, at the height of the famine, in July, 1315, he receives land from five neighbours and in March, 1316, from six neighbours. The list of surrenders in July, 1315, begins with four surrenders to his use:

"John atte heythe surrendered 3 roods at Steyntweyt to the use of Adam Carpenter and his heirs. Seisin delivered."

"Laurence Mannyng surrendered $\frac{1}{2}$ acre of land in 2 pieces, of which 1 piece lies in [?] and the other in Rydecroft to the use of Adam Carpenter and his heirs. Seisin, &c."

"Peter Harald and his wife Margaret, examined, surrendered $\frac{1}{2}$ acre of land to the use of Adam Carpenter and his heirs. Seisin, &c."

"John Reynald surrendered $3\frac{1}{2}$ roods in his cruft [*sic*] to the use of the said Adam and his heirs. Seisin, &c."

These four surrenders are grouped together and a fine of 4s. is demanded "because the greater part is poor." The marginal comment seems to imply that Adam paid the fine.

⁵⁹ Court, 10 Oct., 1315.

Two other persons, Robert and William Tubbel, appear in a similar light to Adam Carpenter, though on a more limited scale. The former is a party in sixteen transactions, in fifteen of which he receives the land. He also appears in an unfavourable character in a transaction to be mentioned below in connection with the family of Atteheythe. William Tubbel, perhaps his brother, is a party in eighteen transactions and receives the land in seventeen.

The family of Atteheythe, so far as this record records their doings, had what can only be called a tragic history during this period. From the first we find John, the father, parting with his land but chiefly to his children. In 1315 and 1316, however, he parts with $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres (on three occasions) to Adam Carpenter, and 3 roods (in four pieces) to Robert Tubbel, to whom he also conveys 12 perches of land in a close in January, 1317. We hear no more of him till 1319 when we find the following presentment made to the court:

"An Inquest says that William son of John atte Heyth, Ralph, Andrew, Simon, and Alan, his brothers, who are dead, held 1 acre of land and Margery their sister is heir. And because the land is claimed by Robert Tubbel through sale by John Atteheythe their father, therefore the rolls are searched for 5 years past. And because it is found by the Rolls of the Court that the aforesaid John the father gave the aforesaid land to his said sons before he sold it to the said Robert Tubbel, therefore the said land is delivered to Margery. And she gives for heriot 6d. because she is poor."

It is rather unexpected after this to read in the roll for 30th October, 1324:

"Margery, daughter of John Atteheythe, surrendered 1 acre of land and 1 place 8 perches by 6 perches in Steintweit in 4 pieces to the use of Peter, son of Robert Tubbel."

We are left to conjecture whether this means that Margery, after all the sympathy of the court, had to go under, or that the grant was made to Peter, as many such were made, with a view to an approaching marriage. The grant appealed to by Robert Tubbel must have been one recorded on 12th July, 1316:

“John Atte heythe surrendered 3 roods of land in Steyntweyt in 4 pieces to the use of Robert Tubbel and Katerine his wife and the heirs of Robert. Land poor. Fine 12d.”

The previous grant to the sons may have been on 15th September, 1310, when

“John atte Heythe surrendered $\frac{1}{2}$ acre of land at Bischopeslond to the use of Andrew and Ralph his sons. John to hold for life. Fine 9d.”

Only that date takes us a great deal further back than the five years for which the order was given to search the rolls. As, however, public sympathy was evidently with Margery, she would have no difficulty in ascertaining when the transaction had taken place.

I venture to hope that the information here given will be held to confirm the suggestion that the “tenements” whose names and constituent elements were so carefully preserved, where possible, in the Manorial Surveys and Extents, were (at least in Norfolk) derived from a systematic organisation dating from the time when the land and its occupants were originally subjected to the conditions of a feudal manor. And, further, that the sub-division of the original units, so far as it was due to the action of the tenants amongst themselves, was a process which the lord could not prohibit in spite of its inconvenience.

On the constitution of these original units and some other matters of interest I must postpone any judgment till, with my co-workers, I have more fully penetrated the still remaining secrets of the Martham Survey.

