

LAND AND LABOUR IN FOURTEENTH CENTURY TOTTENHAM

DOUGLAS MOSS AND IAN MURRAY

This essay is a preliminary study of the Middlesex manor of Tottenham based on the numerous documents held at Bruce Castle Museum in the London Borough of Haringey, of which Tottenham is now a part. Court rolls, extents, bailiffs' accounts, surveys, rentals and custumals, the earliest dating from 1318, make up a mass of material rarely found in lay-owned manors, though for the fourteenth century there are considerable gaps. For some years the Libraries Department of the former Borough of Tottenham had been engaged in translating this material and several volumes of court rolls covering the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries have been published. Mr. R. Oram, Mr. F. L. Fenton, Mr. W. Marcham and Mr. C. H. Rock were the pioneers in this task which we hope to carry a stage further, for although tentative suggestions as to the social and economic organisation of the manor have already been put forward, notably by Messrs. F. L. Fenton and D. Avery, the subject has never been treated in detail. We limit ourselves initially to the fourteenth century pending the translation and publication of the much more numerous fifteenth century records, which have unaccountably so far been neglected.

The manor of Tottenham in 1086 belonged to Judith, the Conqueror's niece. Judith's daughter married David, future king of Scotland, and until 1254 Tottenham was a possession of the Scottish royal house. In that year direct succession failed and the manor was divided into three parts, owned respectively by Robert de Brus, John de Balliol, and Henry de Hastings, Earl of Pembroke. In 1295 the Balliol manor and in 1306 the Bruce manor, escheated on their lords' rebellion. By the mid fourteenth century the Balliol manor was owned by the Daubeney family, the Bruce manor by the Fawkoners and the two manors were often known by their names. An approximate third of the Bruce manor was leased to the Mocking family in 1332 and subsequently passed to Elmin Legat, who had married Margery, widow of Nicholas de Mocking. So, in the second half of the century there were four Tottenham manors, Balliol/Daubeney, Bruce/Fawkoners, Mockings and Pembroke. These were re-united in 1429 by John Gedeney, London draper, one of the many prosperous London citizens who over the centuries bought land in the district. The activities of another of these, John of Northampton, following his acquisition of Daubeney in 1392, are of particular interest.

I. THE STRUCTURE OF THE MANORS

Dr. Robinson, the nineteenth century antiquarian, in his *History of Tottenham*, quotes from a number of extents, and we begin with that of 1254, made when the single manor was about to be divided. The details are set out in Table I.¹

The total enumerated acreage is thus 1915, the total value, with a few other items, is given as £57.15.6. This area may be compared with the approximately 4600 acres of present day Tottenham and Wood Green. The difference would be made up by two woods, "of uncertain extent" and the non-enumerated lands of the free tenants, who paid £4.10.4 in quit rents. The considerable difference in the value placed on the arable and the meadow reflects the disparity between the rich land by the banks of the River Lea and the poor productivity of the London clay, of which most of the region consisted. Tottenham probably was always more important as a pastoral, rather than arable, community.

TABLE 1

	Area	Value	Value per acre
Demesne arable	527 acres	£9 17 0	4½d
Villein lands	40 x 32 acre virgates 1280 acres	£20 0 0	3¾d
Cottar		3 4½	
Meadow	92 acres	£22 5 0*	5/4½d
Pasture	16 acres	£2 12 0	3/3d

* After deduction of 9 acres for tithe.

A Bruce/Fawkoner extent of 1304, a Pembroke extent of 1313 and a Balliol/Daubeney extent of 1334 show the position some years after the division and, from the summary in Table 2, one observes that several changes had taken place.²

TABLE 2

	Demesne	Meadow	Villein Arable	Value
Bruce 1304	110 acres	22 acres at 2/-	274 acres	£14 3 0
Pembroke 1313	172 acres	30 acres at 2/-	433 acres	£19 6 4½
Daubeney 1334	171 acres	32½ acres at 2/6	433 acres	£17 4 3½
Total ..	453 acres	84½ acres	1140 acres	£50 13 8

The total demesne arable has diminished by about 14%, the villein arable not so much, the total value had fallen by about an eighth. Most surprising of all is the drop in the value placed on the meadow. The overall picture is of a fall in estate value similar to that which was taking place in many parts of the country after the thirteenth century, the medieval "high farming" periods had ended.

Two fourteenth century rentals exist, one dated 1368, the other undated but from internal evidence probably some twenty-five years earlier.³ Regrettably these are both for the Pembroke manor, but in compensation provide a vast amount of information. In the earlier rental 47 tenants in villeinage are listed, in the later one 40 (see table 3). As Pembroke was something over a third of the total Tottenham area this implies some 130 villein tenants in all. We have in the court rolls, lists of tenants for Pembroke 1396-7,⁴ Bruce 1397-8,⁵ and Daubeney 1391-2,⁶ and omitting names repeated in different manors, these total 100 unfree and at least 21 free tenants, a high proportion of villeins for this date. A rental of Mockings manor 1377,⁷ much less detailed, names a further 24 free and 13 unfree tenants, two names appearing in both lists. Of these 35, 20 are found in the other manors. There were, then, after several outbreaks of plague, still something over a hundred unfree tenants, a high population density in an area of not very good land.

Four classes of unfree tenants are enumerated in the rentals, holders of villein land, molland and cotland and those paying money rents. The total size of individual holdings varied from, in the earlier rental, John atte Mersh 41 acres (out of a total 432) to the one acre of John Denys junr. and the several who only held a cottage. One family, that of atte Mersh, held in all 91¾ acres. Ignoring seven cottagers the median holding was only 7½ acres, something not

surprising in view of the concentration of occupiers. In 1368 one tenant, Thomas Hardyngge, was occupying $54\frac{3}{4}$ acres.

TABLE 3

INDIVIDUAL HOLDINGS OF VILLEIN LANDS

	<i>Earlier rental</i>		<i>1368 rental</i>
John atte Mersh	41 acres	Thomas Hardinge	$54\frac{3}{4}$ acres
William Egepole	38 acres	Geoffrey Egepole	35 acres
John atte Wode	37 acres	Alice Edrych	32 acres
William atte Mersh	28 acres	William atte Mersh	32 acres
Geoffrey Edrich	28 acres	Hugh atte Stone	32 acres
Gilbert Absolon	$27\frac{1}{2}$ acres	Geoffrey Maiheu	31 acres
Heirs of Boleheued,	$27\frac{1}{4}$ acres	John Hood	$29\frac{1}{2}$ acres
seven, including John Hood		John atte Mersh	24 acres
Richard atte Helle	24 acres	Heirs of William Colyere	16 acres
Hugh atte Stone	24 acres	Alice Absolon	24 acres
John Hood	16 acres	John Brodelane	} jointly
William Colyere	16 acres	John Denys	$11\frac{3}{4}$ acres
John Denys	$11\frac{3}{4}$ acres	Richard atte Mersh	$11\frac{1}{2}$ acres
William son of John		Geoffrey Godard	$11\frac{1}{2}$ acres
atte Mersh	$10\frac{1}{2}$ acres	William Drake	8 acres
Geoffrey Godard	$9\frac{3}{4}$ acres	John Abraham	8 acres
John Godewyne	8 acres	Thomas Vynche	8 acres
John son of		William the Bakere	8 acres
Abraham	8 acres	Alice Yonge	$7\frac{1}{2}$ acres
Geoffrey son of		Roger Marshal	6 acres
John atte Mersh	$7\frac{3}{4}$ acres	Geoffrey Chapman	6 acres
Alice le Yonge	$7\frac{1}{2}$ acres	Thomas de Westone	} 13 acres
Katerina Fyppes	$7\frac{1}{2}$ acres	Isobel Egepol	} jointly
Thomas Shepherde	7 acres	William atte Mersh	} jointly
John Busse	$6\frac{1}{2}$ acres	Juliana atte Waters	4 acres
Robert Maiheu	$5\frac{3}{4}$ acres	Geoffrey Warin	4 acres
Ralph Hunteman	$5\frac{1}{2}$ acres	John Egepol	3 acres
William Brodelane	5 acres	Stephen Shepherd	3 acres
Geoffrey atte Mersh	$4\frac{1}{2}$ acres	Thomas Flemynge	2 acres
Michael Sherman	4 acres	John Busse	2 acres
Abraham son of John	4 acres	John Phipps	2 acres
John atte Merke	4 acres	John Absolon	$1\frac{3}{4}$ acres
Geoffrey Chapman	3 acres	Isabella atte Church	1 acre
John de Mockynges	$2\frac{1}{2}$ acres	Gilbert Absolon	3 roods
William Balle	2 acres	William de Ware	1 rood
Matilda Marshall	$1\frac{3}{4}$ acres	Robert Skynne	third of 2 acres
Sibilla Hood	$1\frac{3}{4}$ acres	Robert Hadham	} curtilages
John son of John Denys	1 acre	Geoffrey Thurkell	} curtilages
Roger Denys	third of 2 acres	John atte Watere	} curtilages
		Heirs of John Cornmonger	} curtilages
Roger atte Lofte			
John Abraham, blacksmith			
John son of Richard			
atte Stone			
John atte Watere			
William Briscey			
John Cornmonger			

curtilages

The duties of the various types of tenant are enumerated in great detail. Services were light; for a whole 32 acre virgate 37 winter and 31 summer works were all that were exacted. This, of course, is to be expected in such close proximity to London. Four and a half acres only had to be ploughed by a virgate tenant, one and a half of "*cert* corn", one and a half of oats, one and a half of fallow, this constituting $13\frac{1}{2}$ works. The sum of all ploughing to be performed by the villeins was only about 45 acres, implying that much of the 172 acres of Pembroke's demesne was, at the time when the listed obligations were first written down, either already leased or else worked by hired labour. In all, $425\frac{1}{4}$ winter works, valued at $\frac{3}{4}$ d each, 294 summer works, valued at 1d, and 142 "*opera minutae*", in summer, valued at $\frac{1}{2}$ d, were due. In addition, rents were paid, $7/2\frac{3}{4}$ for 32 acres, $4/10\frac{1}{2}$ for 24 acres, being typical. Surprisingly, there is no mention whatsoever of payments in kind, poultry at Christmas or eggs at Easter.

After the 20 villein tenements eight mollands are listed, each of eight acres of arable and, in all but one case, half an acre of meadow. Molmen being less common than villeins we give their obligations. John, son of William Abraham, rendered $35\frac{3}{4}$ d, considerably more per acre than the villeins and the services were correspondingly lighter. "He was liable in summer for eight minute works. He will hoe a whole day for two works and make hay on $\frac{1}{2}$ acre of meadow of *cert* for one work and he will help at stacking of hay in the grange (two works per day); also he will reap, bind and shock one acre of corn of *cert* (two works) and if he does not do the aforesaid works when the lord is not in need he shall pay for each work a $\frac{1}{2}$ d as above, and he will make one wodelode, price 1d." These lighter services, of course, reflect the partial commutation of the molmens' services for money rent. Finally, the nine cottars, owning from one to four acres of arable, sometimes with meadow, paid $4\frac{1}{2}$ d an acre rent and performed either eight or nine minute works.

The holdings of the unfree tenants are described schematically in table 4. In total, the area is roughly equivalent to 13 virgates, about a third of the forty virgates of villein arable in the undivided manor. All the villein land holdings are distinguished by names, mostly family names and it is of interest to note that in the 1368 rental only seven of the twenty are held by families bearing the name of their tenement, while in the earlier one eleven are. From the names of recent holders given in this earlier rental a further four tenements had been held some way, perhaps a generation back, by the family whose name the tenement bore, in all, then, fifteen out of twenty. Might we not infer from this that the whole tenement system of the Pembroke manor, as described in these rentals, only dates back to about the end of the previous century?

In the Domesday Inquest we are told that six villeins held virgates, 24 half virgates, and 12 bordars five acres each. The 20 virgates of 1086 had expanded to 40 in 1254, as a result of assarts from the Middlesex forest, presumably. The 1254 extent does not say how the 40 were divided between the tenants. On examination, the 20 holdings in the Pembroke rentals divide into two of 32 acres, two of 16 acres, five of 24 and five of 8 acres, one of 28 and one of 4 acres, one of 13 and one of 3 acres. There are eight mollands totalling 64 acres and two holdings which do not fit so easily into the pattern, occupying 12 and $11\frac{1}{2}$ acres. In addition there were 25 acres of cotland and about 17 acres belonging to payers of rent. It appears likely that the rental holdings had been formed by the division of what were originally whole and half virgates, a process brought about by the pressure of population on the land available in this overcrowded manor.

TABLE 4
PEMBROKE MANOR — BONDAGE TENEMENTS

Name of Tenement	Area	Sub- divisions	Winter Works	Summer Works	Money Rent
1 Geoffrey atte Merssh	32 acres, 3 acres meadow		37 $\frac{3}{4}$	31	7/2 $\frac{3}{4}$
2 Entire	28 acres, 2 acres meadow		35 $\frac{1}{4}$	20	6/6
3 Absolon	24 acres, 2 acres meadow		40 $\frac{1}{2}$	20	4/10 $\frac{1}{2}$
4 Stonat	8 $\frac{1}{4}$ acres, 1 acre meadow	7 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres 3 roods	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1/6 $\frac{1}{4}$
5 Hood	12 acres, 1 rood meadow			10 $\frac{1}{2}$	3/10 $\frac{1}{2}$ & $\frac{1}{2}$ farth
6 Arnold	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow	5 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres		10 $\frac{1}{2}$	2/4 $\frac{1}{2}$
7 Huberd	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow	7 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres $\frac{1}{2}$ acre		10 $\frac{1}{2}$	2/4 $\frac{1}{2}$
8 Boleheued	13 acres, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres meadow (Margin note: 8 acres worked in winter, 12 acres in summer)	In 7 hands	27	15 $\frac{3}{4}$	2/1
9 Balle	24 acres, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres meadow	3 acres 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres 1 acre 4 acres 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres 1 rood 2 acres 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres	35 $\frac{1}{4}$	15 $\frac{3}{4}$	5/4
10 Edrych	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow			5 $\frac{1}{4}$	2/8
11 Maberly	8 acres, 1 acre meadow	1 rood 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	1/8 $\frac{3}{4}$
12 Abraham	4 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow			5 $\frac{1}{4}$	1/2
13 Egepol	32 acres, 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres meadow	30 $\frac{1}{4}$ acres 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres 1 rood	48 $\frac{3}{4}$	29	6/6 $\frac{3}{4}$
14 In the Lane	24 acres, 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres meadow	9 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres 8 acres 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ acres 3 roods 3 roods	51	21	3/11 $\frac{1}{4}$
15 atte Stone	16 acres, 1 acre meadow		20	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	3/5 $\frac{1}{2}$
16 atte Helle	24 acres, 3 acres meadow		38 $\frac{1}{4}$	26 $\frac{1}{4}$	4/8 $\frac{1}{2}$
17 Colyere	16 acres, 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres meadow		27	15 $\frac{3}{4}$	3/1 $\frac{3}{4}$
18 Denys	11 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres, 1 acre meadow		13 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	2/8 $\frac{1}{2}$ & $\frac{1}{2}$ farth
19 atte Wode	24 acres, 2 acres meadow		25	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	6/1 $\frac{1}{2}$
20 Pymmehowe	3 acres	Empty			
			425 $\frac{1}{4}$	294	72/4 $\frac{3}{4}$

Note that, at $\frac{3}{4}$ d for a winter work and 1d for a summer work, total payments work out at equivalent of just under 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d an acre, some tenement's services being more commuted than others.

PEMBROKE MANOR — MOLLAND TENEMENTS

Name	Area	Sub- divisions	Summer minute works	Money Rent
1 Rolfe	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow		8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$
2 ate Stone	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow		8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$
3 Corleby	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow		8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$
4 Robert	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow	4 acres 4 acres	8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$
5 Edrych	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow		8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$
6 Thorwrewe	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow		8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$
7 Merdes	8 acres, $\frac{1}{2}$ acre meadow	3 acres 4 acres 1 acre	8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$
8 Boleheued	8 acres, 1 rood meadow	Owned jointly by heirs	8	2/11 $\frac{3}{4}$

COTLANDS

Area	Summer Minute works	Money Rent
1 1 acre in early rental, 6 in 1368	8	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d
2 1 acre " " 6 "	8	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d
3 1 acre " " 6 "	8	4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d
4 4 acres, 1 rood meadow	9	1/6
5 4 acres	9	1/6
6 4 acres, 1 rood meadow heirs of Boleheued	9	1/6
7 4 acres	9	1/6
8 2 acres	9	1/6
9 4 acres	9	1/6

Tenements 1, 2 and 3 paid same rents and performed same works in later rental, in spite of increased size of tenement.

TENANT FOR CERT RENT IN MONEY

1 Dwelling with garden and 4 acres of land	1/- rent for dwelling and garden 1/6 for the land
2 Messuage and 7 acres land in three parts	3/- rent for messuage 1/6 for 3 acres 1/6 for 4 acres
3 Croft and 3 acres land	Croft 1/1 rent land 2/1 rent
4 2 acres	1/4 rent
5 Area not stated	2d rent
6 A plot	1d rent
7 Messuage and 1 acre	6 $\frac{1}{2}$ d rent
8 Messuage and 1 curtilage	1/- rent
9 A third of 2 acres	4d rent
10 Messuage and curtilage	1/- rent
11 Messuage and curtilage	1d rent
12 Messuage and curtilage	1d rent
13 Dwelling	1d rent
14 Dwelling	1d rent
15 Dwelling and curtilage	6d rent

We have suggested that the subdivision of original whole and half virgates into the holdings listed in the rentals had been reached shortly before 1300. The process did not end there. Eight of the tenements are sub-divided. In the course of some twenty years, however, the median size of an individual serf's holding (about seven acres) remained the same. There had been some polarisation between large and small occupiers; Thomas Hardyng in 1368 had $54\frac{3}{4}$ acres, John atte Mersh, with the largest holding a generation earlier, had only 41. There were, in both rentals, a number of very small holdings. As already observed, even after the outbreaks of plague Tottenham's population was still high, pressure of population on land considerable, and, indeed, the splitting of tenements was still occurring. From examination of the court rolls it might have been possible to see in detail how changes in ownership pattern had been brought about, but, unfortunately, there are no court rolls for Pembroke in existence prior to 1377. We felt that perhaps something could be inferred from the court records of all three manors, which do exist.

The laws of inheritance prevailing in Tottenham were unusual. A custumal, dated 36th year of Henry VI,⁸ quoted by Robinson, states "if any have two or more sons the youngest son born shall be heir, according to the custom of the manor", and "inheritance of the customary land and tenements ought to be divided amongst the daughters, issue male being deficient." Without speculating on why, in this part of Middlesex, youngest sons inherited, we give examples, from Bruce manor 1395/6, of the second rule's application. In that year, on the death of William Drake, one and a half roods of meadow in Wyldemerssh were claimed by his three daughters, Joan, Alice and Juliana.⁹ In the next year Joan and Katherine, daughters and co-heirs of John Denys,¹⁰ "claim two acres of land". And in Pembroke, 1394/5, we again find William Drake's daughters, this time seeking the seven acres their father had held in that manor.¹¹

Yet whatever the custom of inheritance may have been, in practice it was frequently circumvented. This same William Drake, on his deathbed, "sick in body but sound in mind", as the phrase went, had paid the lord for licence, first to sell a croft and an acre of land to the use of Thomas Fynch and Richard Drake, "for the benefit of the King's way and of his (Drake's) soul". Secondly, a messuage, with garden and hedges was to go to Fynch and Richard Drake so that they might surrender it to the use of Joan, William's wife, for her life, and only on her death was it to pass to the direct heirs.¹² A rather circuitous way of making sure his wife was provided for. Other instances abound, sometimes, apparently, aimed at preventing inheritance by the lawful heir, as when William Deyere, before death, surrendered his two acres to his son Thomas. Only if Thomas died without heir was this land to go to the younger son, William, and then only if William gave Tottenham church the then large sum of 40/-.¹³

Actually there seems to have existed a considerable free market in land, subject only to first obtaining, and paying for, the lord's license. The court rolls abound with sales, leases and mortgages, but once again we must express regret that owing to the gaps in the records it is difficult to follow the fortunes of any individual peasant completely. For instance, we find the before-mentioned William Drake owning eight acres of arable in 1368; in 1377/8 he bought 14 acres of land and two acres of meadow from William atte Mersh;¹⁴ on his deathbed left an acre to Fynch and Richard Drake, yet in 1394/5 he died seised of 19 acres of land.¹⁵ Note that the purchase from William atte Mersh meant that from then on tenement 2 on our list, tenement Entire, became sub-divided. In Daubeney, during nineteen years commencing in 1380/81, Thomas Fynch bought 12 acres of land and a half

TABLE 5 BRUCE OR FAWKONER'S MANOR — ACCOUNTS

It will be seen that some of the accounts do not balance,

Year	Income	Expenses	Deliveries of money to lord	Reeve's excess or deficiency
1374/5	£19 12 9½	£2 4 6	£16 0 0	- £1 7 10½
1375/6	£24 10 3¾	£2 11 9	£22 4 6	+ 5 11
1376/7	£23 8 4	£3 11 11	£19 0 0	- 16 4¾
1377/8	£25 2 11½ & half farthing	£2 13 10	£19 13 4	- £2 15 9½
1379/80	£27 0 14¾ & half farthing (sic.)	£3 19 4	£20 11 0	- £2 10 10½
1380/81	£22 15 6¾ (£25 6 5½ with arrears b/f.)	£2 7 5	£13 11 0	- £9 8 0
1381/2	£16 6 10¾ (£23 14 10¾ with arrears b/f.)	£5 11 9¾	£17 0 0	- £1 3 1
1382/3	£14 11 5 (£15 14 6 with arrears b/f.)	£2 5 10½	£14 19 4	+ £2 3 8
1383/4	£18 18 0½	£2 19 4	£14 12 0	- £1 6 8½
1384/5	£18 13 3 (£19 9 11¼ with arrears b/f.)	£2 11 0	£16 14 0	- 4 11½
1385/6	£23 17 4½	£3 19 1½	£19 0 10	- £1 7 4¾
1386/7	£26 8 10½	£4 11 0	£13 7 11	- £8 9 1½ £7 0 0 owing by Duke of York)
1387/8	£21 13 2¼ (£30 3 3½ with arrears)	£3 12 10½	£19 4 4	- £7 6 1 (£7 by Duke)
1388/9	£18 7 3 (£25 7 3 with arrears)	£4 3 1½	£14 0 18 (sic.)	- £7 2 7¾ (£7 by Duke)
1394/5	£21 7 10 (£28 7 10 with arrears)	£3 7 7	£10 7 2	- £14 13 1 (of which £5 1 0 written off)
1397/8	£7 5 11½	£1 17 7½	15 0	- £4 15 4
1398/9	£7 0 4½ (£11 0 10½ with arrears b/f.)	£1 15 0¼	None	- £9 5 3½
1399/ 1400	£16 8 10 (£24 14 1½ with arrears b/f.)	£2 14 9½	£4 2 10½	- £18 16 5¾
1401/2	£13 14 1¼ (£24 2 6¾ in- cluding arrears b/f.)	£4 5 5	£7 12 7	- £12 4 6¾

(Compiled from Bruce Castle Museum Records Mem. 33-62)

but these are the figures in the documents

Faggots sold		Hay sold		Pasture sold	
3000	£6 15 0	16 acres	£5 8 0	6 acres	£1 0 0
3000	£6 15 0	16 acres	£7 10 0	6 acres	£2 0 0
3000	£6 15 0	16 acres	£10 0 0		
3000	£7 10 0	16 acres	£8 6 8	6 acres	£2 6 8
3000	£7 10 0	5 acres and old hay	£2 2 0 £5 9 4	6 acres	£2 3 4
3000	£7 10 0	16 acres	£5 0 0	6 acres	£2 3 4
3000	£6 15 0		£2 12 8		
2260	£4 12 9¼		£2 6 8		
		20 acres	£5 3 4	2½ acres	14 4
1200 at 5/6					
1025 at 5/-	£5 17 3	30 acres	£9 16 4		
4100	£11 5 6	20¼ acres (of which Duke of York owes £7 0 0)	£7 8 0		
2875	£7 3 9	32 acres 3 roods	£8 0 0		
3000	£7 10 0	20 acres	£4 1 6		
2400	£7 13 4	10 acres	£6 13 4		
	None		None		
	None	Destroyed or taken away by Henry of Lancaster's army			
2000	£5 0 0		None	13 acres	£4 2 10½
2000	£5 0 0		£1 4 9		

TABLE 6
DAUBENEY/BALLIOL MANOR ACCOUNTS

It will be seen that some of the accounts do not balance,

Year	Income	Expenses	Deliveries of money to lord	Deficit
1389/90	£15 5 2	£3 15 1½	£7 0 0	- £4 10 0½
1390/91	£17 7 7½	Not listed	£8 13 4	Not listed
John of Northampton becomes Lord				
1391/2	£13 6 9½	£1 16 0½	£5 0 0	- £6 13 7
1392/3	£14 12 5½ (£15 7 0½ with arrears b/f.)	£2 11 10	£7 5 8	- £5 9 6½
1393/4	£12 6 4½ (£16 15 10¾ with arrears b/f.)	19 0½	£12 7 0	- £3 9 10½
1394/5	£13 13 8½	19 0	£5 13 10½	- £7 0 10½
1395/6	£12 13 11½	£5 6 1½ (of which £3 1 3½ for Greneford's confiscated land)	£4 0 0	- £3 7 10
1396/7	£14 8 4	£3 6 6½	£9 13 11	- £1 12 11¼
1397/8	£14 13 5¾	£3 10 0½	£7 5 11	- £3 9 11¾
1398/9	£21 10 5¼ (including £5 fine levied on Greneford which was never paid)	£11 13 3½ (including two fines, of £5 and £2, not paid)	£8 2 1	- £1 2 7¼ (sic.)

(Compiled from Bruce Castle Museum Records Mem. 27-40)

but these are the figures in the documents

<i>Faggots sold</i>	<i>Hay sold</i>	<i>Oats sold</i>
500 £1 5 0	£1 0 0	
No sale. 2000 made, 1000 of which carted to Fletstret to Prior of St. Bartholomew	£5 0 0	
	None	
525 £1 6 3	None	

5 quarters 3 bushels 12/6½

Hay of 25 acres not carried

1500 faggots made for stock	A cart of hay carried to Shordyche for stock
1000 faggots and 400 400 "Bressayll"* made for stock	Hay for stock only
300 "Bressayll"* 3/6 1500 faggots for stock	ditto

*Brushwood, Brushes?

acre of meadow in several transactions, besides leasing $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres, a croft and half an acre of meadow. He also bought four and a half acres in Pembroke in the same period.¹⁶ We would very much like to know the transactions which resulted in Geoffrey Maiheu, with his 31 acres in the 1368 rental, dying in 1397/8 with only six acres remaining,¹⁷ but in the years for which court rolls exist not a single sale by him is mentioned. However, in Pembroke alone, for the years of which records remain, 1377-1383/4 and 1391-1399, a total of $106\frac{3}{4}$ acres of land and nine acres of meadow were sold and $9\frac{1}{4}$ acres of land and $15\frac{1}{4}$ acres of meadow were leased for varying periods, in addition to a number of tofts, crofts and gardens of unspecified area. By these various devices, in a village of high population density, the process by which the number of small occupiers increased was facilitated, as was also that by which the virgate holdings became broken down.

An example must be given of another type of change, one which was to accelerate in the next century, namely, the purchase of land, villein and free, by London citizens. From Pembroke court rolls for 1380/81 and 1392/3¹⁸ we learn that the 24 acres of John atte Mersh in the 1368 rental, tenement atte Helle, passed to his son Thomas. On Thomas' death it had been sold to Alice, daughter of Gilbert atte Mersh and her husband, Richard Henham, though Alice's sisters disputed this fact, apparently unsuccessfully. Finally, Alice and Richard sold it to Thomas Purnell, "gurdeler", and themselves disappear from the records. Purnell thus joined the small group of Londoners investing in land in Tottenham, already including Sir Nicholas Twyford, goldsmith and alderman, Adam Bamme, goldsmith, Thomas Duk, at one time Sir William Walworth, and some eight others besides.¹⁹

II. MANORIAL FINANCES

Tables 5 and 6, based on the bailiff's accounts, illustrate the economic fluctuations of the Bruce-Fawkoner manor (1374-1402) and the Balliol-Daubeney manor (1389-1399). Once again, there are some gaps in the record, and no accounts at all exist for the Pembroke manor for this period. Actually, although it is customary to refer to this type of document as a bailiff's account, no mention of a bailiff occurs anywhere in the documents except in Bruce manor, 1398/9 and 1399/1400. Otherwise, the only manorial officials mentioned are the lord's steward, presiding over the court, the reeve, who put together the details on which the accounts were based, the woodward and the constable. One of the clerks, who inscribed the details given him by the reeve, has left his name, Peter Gold, to posterity at the foot of a membrane. Surprisingly, it is from these accounts, together with the court rolls, that we obtain a momentary glimpse of what manner of men were these who, long ago, worked on their several acres, bought and sold them, perhaps succeeded in accumulating a large holding, and who, as will appear, were by no means downtrodden, subservient animals.

The accounts abound with figures erased, disallowed by the lord's steward, and corrections inserted generally increasing the sums due and decreasing those paid out. One constantly repeated erasure is of the payment of 2/- for hire of a man to guard the hay at night time. A careful watch was kept on the reeve's figures, though. It will be seen that fluctuations occur in the quantities of faggots and hay sold and in the prices obtained. A permanent increase in the price for faggots, from 45/- to 50/- per thousand, took place in Bruce manor from 1377/8. The cost of making them, 10/- per thousand, remained the same. The quantity sold rose to a peak of 4100 in 1386/7 and in the preceding year the sale of hay reached its maximum.

It is clear that in a normal year there was a considerable surplus for the lord in both manor's somewhat larger in Bruce, the smaller of the two. Typical of the income side are the following items from the earliest Bruce account, 48th year of Edward III.²⁰

Rents of assize	£3 10 6 $\frac{3}{4}$
Farm of 60 acres demesne	£1 0 0
Farm of pasture	6d
Fishing	4 0
Income from courts	9 4
Sale of 3000 faggots	£6 15 0
Sale of hay	£5 8 0
Sale of pasture	£1 0 0
Winter works (160 $\frac{3}{4}$)	10 0 $\frac{1}{2}$
Summer works (97 $\frac{3}{4}$)	8 2
Works sold on account	7 2 & half farthing
Total	£19 12 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ & half farthing

Over half the possible labour services were being performed. Most of the demesne arable, in both manors, was farmed by tenants at the low rent of four pence an acre, the amount named in the demands of the rebellious peasants in 1381. In the earliest of all the extant court rolls, a Daubeney court of October 1318 there are two references to tenants leasing portions of demesne, seven acres by William le Yunger, four acres by Gilbert atte Fryth.²¹ The only items sold throughout all the accounts, are faggots, hay and pasture, in varying amounts—except for one year during John of Northampton's ownership of Daubeney's, of which more presently. Although in a region likely to produce a saleable surplus of meat and dairy products, there is no mention of such sales in either manor. Many tenants had quite a few animals; references occur to trespass or over-burdening the common, by single individuals, with 14 bullocks, 12 cows, 6 oxen, 10, 20 36 and 40 sheep. Perhaps the lords had leased their stock of animals with the demesne, but with a rent of only 4d an acre this hardly seems likely. There are no items giving payments to servants looking after the demesne animals: there do not seem to have been any.

It appears that in all but a few years the deliveries of money by the reeve to the lord were deficient. Generally the reeve either paid the difference on the spot, or it was carried forward and gradually worked off, with the lord occasionally remitting a small portion. What was done about the excess payment of £2 3 8 in 1382/3 is not recorded, one of the unanswered questions from the period. There seems to have been a most unexpected explanation, if we are correct, of the very large deficiency, £9 8 0, or over 40 per cent of the sum due in Bruce manor in 1380/81.

On the membrane detailing this year's account²² there appears a list of payments made which has been erased, as presumably not acceptable and which shows a smaller deficiency of £5 8 0. This includes two, if not three, very unusual entries, as follows: "To a certain priest, on Good Friday, 40/-. To a certain servant of the lord coming upon a messenger 20/-. Delivered to a certain priest coming with a certain sign (*per certum signum*) at seed time 20:-". Nowhere else in any of these accounts is money recorded as having been paid to anyone except the lord or the lady, or to some named servant or official, as Richard Waltham, the lord's attorney, John Beverley, Thomas the lord's servant, Peter Hereford, the steward. Who, then, were these mysterious anonymous priests and messenger, one bearing a sign, in the spring prior to the peasants' uprising? May there not be at least a possibility that we have here instances of payment by sympathetic peasants to some of those

priests who, chroniclers said, went about fomenting rebellion? If so, this prosaic account membrane casts a glimmer of light on the methods used in organising the revolt. We wonder whether anything similar has been noted in records of other manors.

It may be objected that if payments had been made to emissaries of an organised revolt the fact would not have been committed to writing. Yet ostensibly the revolt was not directed against the king, but only his evil advisers and the peasants may not have believed that the payments were wrong. Further, doubtless expecting the rising to be successful, they would have felt that eventually all would be forgiven. Of course, as soon as the clerk realised the implications of the entries, he erased and disallowed them.

Although we do not know if any Tottenham residents joined in the march to London, there is ample evidence that an insubordinate spirit was present there at the time. Tottenham does not seem to have had a particularly repressive regime; if anything the reverse was the case. Labour services were light, rents low, and the custom regarding heriot was most favourable to the tenants. It was only payable if the dead man had owned cattle²³ and time after time we read that the land was "not heriotable", or, "no heriot is due".

Nevertheless, in Richard's second year, in Daubeney, four villeins would not carry the lord's wood to London and the whole homage was in mercy for refusing to perform this task and for not reaping the lord's corn. Richard Abraham did not mow half an acre of meadow and an acre of oats for the lord. Richard Attegor did not plough an acre of the season's fallow.²⁴ In the third year of the reign, in Bruce's, Richard Malger, a member of a family noted throughout the century for its independence, and two of whom were at that time in flight from the manor, had his corn and chattels seized, because he was "in rebellion against serving the lord" and "is a rebel and fugitive".²⁵ And in the climacteric year, 1380/81, on a Pembroke court roll there is an enigmatic reference to "things taken away from the mill".²⁶ Some peasants ran away from the manor and, in spite of repeated injunctions, were never brought back. We shall probably never be certain as to the explanation of the handing over of such large sums to anonymous priests but it is surely legitimate to speculate. After all, we remember that in 1351 Tottenham had been the seat of a riot against the justices attempting to enforce the Statute of Labourers²⁷ and the tradition of rebelliousness may still have been alive. It remains to add that in the following year a pound of the large deficit was allowed by the lord and six pounds paid by the reeve. Possibly, if our theory of the deficit's origin is correct, the result of a collective effort by the peasantry.

To pass on, after 1380/81 there was a decline in the income and profits of the Bruce/Fawkoner manor for a few years, till in 1385/6 the position was restored. There were no signs of unrest in the court now. A setback, however, happened in 1386/7, when seven pounds' worth of hay was sold to the Duke of York²⁸ and, from the accounts of this and subsequent years, payment was never received. It is tantalising to find accounts for the two years 1396/8 missing, as in the next year a catastrophic collapse of the finances is seen to have occurred. Nothing was sold; no hay, no faggots. The demesne leased had risen to 108 acres and the number of works commuted had risen by 40 per cent.²⁹ And then in 1399, Henry of Lancaster's army, on its way to London, destroyed or took away all the hay³⁰ from the grange, presumably, considering the time of year, preparatory to its sale. It is surprising that there was a partial recovery in the manor's fortunes in the next two years, in view of the impact these depredations must have made.

The Daubeney accounts bring to light the fact that no similar depredations by Henry IV's forces are recorded there. This manor's lord was James of Northampton, son of the

John of Northampton who had been an adherent of John of Gaunt's party during the conflicts of Richard II's reign. Most probably it is this which accounts for the differing action in the two manors. One sighs at the absence of Pembroke accounts, which might have been conclusive on this point. Pembroke was at the time in the hands of Roger Walden, Richard's Treasurer and Archbishop of Canterbury, soon to be replaced in the latter office by the Lancastrian Thomas Arundel. If only we knew whether Henry IV's soldiers spoiled the Pembroke manor too—but, alas, we must be grateful that so much material relating to this little village has survived.

Turning our attention now to the accounts of the Balliol/Daubeney manor we see immediately that, while larger than Bruce, it was, to begin with, poorer and less efficiently run. For comparison, the sources of income for our earliest year, 1389/90, are given.³¹

Rents of assize	£7 9 2 and 1 lb of pepper
Farm of 162 acres of demesne	£2 14 0
Income from courts	14 6
Sale of hay	£1 0 0
Sale of 500 faggots	£1 5 0
Sale of 432 winter works	} £2 2 6
Sale of 169 summer works	
17 wodelodes	
Total	£15 5 2 and 1 lb of pepper

When John of Northampton, a member of the draper's company and former mayor of London, became lord in 1392, it would appear he was determined to improve matters.

This John of Northampton is well known as the flamboyant and demagogic character who, supported by members of the lesser crafts, had led a struggle against the London oligarchy, headed by William Walworth and Nicholas Brembre. As mentioned, he was of John of Gaunt's party, had suffered imprisonment in Tintagel, and had, in 1392, not long been released owing to a turn of fortune in the conflicts of the rival groups. In Tottenham his actions were rather surprising for such a champion of the poorer classes.

In the account for 1392/3 no winter works were sold, and for a brief moment we wondered whether John had magnanimously remitted the amount due. Of course, this idea was absurd. It seems he had decided, in the final decade of the fourteenth century, to restore labour services and cultivate part of his demesne directly. Just when, in the country as a whole, the reverse was happening. From reference to the court rolls, quoted above, to mowing oats and to ploughing fallow in Richard's second year, cultivation of the demesne by labour services existed to some extent then, but there are no more such references after that year. (Did the Peasants' Revolt lead to the change?) Now, on ten acres of demesne retained in the lord's hands, three quarters six bushels of oats, purchased from one Richard Norton, were sown, fencing, ploughing, harrowing, reaping, binding and threshing were performed. In all 24 quarters, 3 bushels of oats were obtained, of which four were reserved for seed, 15 were carried to the lord's grange at Shoreditch and the rest was sold for 12/6½d. The seed had would have cost about 8/9, possibly less; the works performed, if they had been sold, would have brought in £1 13 4. As the total value of the oats harvested was thus about £2 16 10 a good profit had been made.³² If we relate these figures to Sir William Beveridge's details of Winchester manors of around this period,³³ some comparisons emerge. Three bushels were sown on an acre in Tottenham, about four in the Winchester manors. The yield per quarter of seed was thus over 6.5 at Tottenham, compared with 2.87 for

1350-99, or 3.59 for 1400-1449, in Beveridge's figures, a phenomenal difference, only to be explained by the fact that these Tottenham acres had been under grass for many years. The yield per acre was 2.4 quarters, again much more than the 1.7 Beveridge found for 1400-1449. Four quarters were reserved for next year's seed and John must have been congratulating himself on the experiment's success. But the cultivation of oats and the imposition of labour services came to an abrupt end.

We will never know precisely why, but an examination of the 1394/5 accounts may perhaps explain the matter.³⁴ It will be seen that there was an enormous deficiency in deliveries that year, £5 13 10½ paid, £7 0 10½ deficient. There appears no reference on this or subsequent accounts to this money being obtained from the reeve or his successors. One can legitimately conclude that stubborn resistance by the peasants, "bloody-mindedness" might be a better term, exemplified by a deliberate withholding of money, somehow prevailed over the new lord's attempt to introduce the greater efficiency of the business man.

John had a small success in the production of the hay crop. The cost of making and mowing the meadow in 1389/90 was 2/- an acre³⁵ and by 1395/6 this had been reduced to 1/10.³⁶ For comparison, the value of the works required to perform these operations on the larger part of the meadow worked by labour services, at three works per acre, was 3d. Maybe it was this great difference between hired and compulsory labour costs which induced Northampton to make his attempt to extend labour services to arable cultivation.

The evidence seems to point too, to John Northampton, and subsequently his son James, trying to grasp the lands of John Greneford, or at least to harassing Greneford for some ulterior purpose. Greneford was the largest holder of villein land in the manor, perhaps in the village, with at least 50 acres of arable, 3 acres of meadow, 5 acres of wood and, in addition, 35 acres of demesne which he rented.³⁷ As a preliminary, possibly connected with what was to follow, as soon as Northampton became lord, there occurred the unexplained action of a Roger Milys, or Miles, a man not resident in the manor, against Greneford "in plea of land".³⁸ This dragged on over four courts before, in the court after All Saints' Day in 1392, Milys demanded the 50 acres, etc., from Greneford with a writ of *forma donacionis in descendere*.^{39*} Two courts later, in Pentecost week 1393, Milys "by license of the lord, releases to John Greneford . . . all the right and claim which he has" for the land in question for which 10/4 was given for enrolment.⁴⁰ Then, at the court held after St. Andrew, 1393, we read that Greneford, "to the prejudice of the lord and his fee, has demised to John Maiheu . . . a messuage and 30 acres of land in villeinage by indenture for one and a half years, and therefore it is ordered to seize the aforesaid tenement". Further Greneford had "demised without license to William Salmon two tenements called Markes" and these were also to be seized.⁴¹ Greneford had respite at this court, then at the next he brought from London the indenture by which he had demised the lands in question. But it was nevertheless ordered that Maiheu and Salmon "shall not occupy the said lands and tenements" and "other indenture was required".⁴² Greneford paid twice for respites, the second time in Pentecost week, 1396, and we hear no more of the matter and Greneford was occupying his lands again.

At Michaelmas court, 1397, Greneford was amerced 12d for not repairing his houses.⁴³ At the Pentecost court, 1398, the enormous fine of 100/- was imposed for this offence.⁴⁴ The fine was not paid and at James Northampton's first court, Monday after St. Luke

*It seems strange to invoke this Writ if the land in dispute was unfree. Was Greneford, who undoubtedly held villein land, a freeman, holding freehold land also?

1398, an order was made for the seizure of all the lands and tenements in bondage belonging to Greneford.⁴⁵ Just as the fine was not paid so there is no mention in the accounts, as there was in 1395-6, to the loss of revenue due to the sequestration of Greneford's land. (Why not in 1394-5 also?) Indeed, in the account for 1399-1400 a specific mention is made of rent paid by Greneford. It would seem that in some way, by stubbornness and procrastination, this tenant triumphed over his lord. But whatever the outcome, this affair, and John Northampton's other actions as lord, would appear to throw interesting fresh light on the character of the man.

As will be seen, the loss of income from Greneford's estate, which sum, by rather strange medieval book-keeping methods, was added to the expenses, considerably increased the manor's outgoings in 1395-6.⁴⁶ Deliveries to the lord were small, the deficit again large, if not as large as in the previous year. Not till 1396-7, by which time full commutation had been restored, was there a return to a satisfactory financial position, and there was nothing corresponding to the contemporary collapse in Bruce.

III. THE AGRICULTURAL METHODS OF THE MANOR

The system of cultivation employed in eastern Middlesex in the Middle Ages has always been obscure. H. L. Gray described it as a "hybrid system difficult to follow in its origins . . . Scarcely any part of England is so dependent upon conjecture for the writing of its early field history."⁴⁷ He believed it resembled the fields of Hertfordshire, where the open fields were irregular in character, numerous and "so far as can be seen, not grouped by furlongs into two or three large areas."⁴⁸ Of those who have examined the Tottenham material, C. H. Rock wondered whether common fields ever existed in Tottenham,⁴⁹ while mentioning that Edmonton was not enclosed till 1800. Walthamstow, too, was not enclosed till 1850, whereas, at the time of the Earl of Dorset's survey, 1619, Tottenham was almost entirely enclosed. Others were puzzled by the fact that, while there was obviously strip cultivation, such a large number of fields were named, fifty or more in the fourteenth century, excluding crofts and "pytels".

We believe that the field system which existed in the manor of Tottenham corresponded in many respects with Gray's view, though in the absence of any terrier or surveys for the fourteenth century any attempt to solve the problem must be tentative. To establish the existence of a three-field system or what might rather be called a three-course rotation, with fallow every third year, Gray believed the following facts must be proved to exist. First, three large fields containing inter-mixed strips, then, a fallow course every three years, finally, a more or less equal distribution of each tenant's strips throughout all the fields. In the absence of the last a three-field system would, he believed, be unworkable, because each tenant would periodically have most of his land fallow, and so have no source of food or income. It is also necessary to show that there was common grazing on the stubble after harvest.

Of the presence of intermixed strips in the fourteenth century there can be no doubt at all. Instances abound. In one of the earliest court rolls, of Daubeney's 1318, Nicholas Terry surrendered two acres of arable "whereof three rods in Homfeld, three in Wodecroft, half an acre in Longfeld".⁵⁰ In the same manor, in 1324, John in the Hale surrendered two acres, one in Hacchesfeld, one in Clayhanggre.⁵¹ In 1380 William Abraham surrendered "three acres of arable lying in two pieces in the fields called le Greyfeld and Suerdescroft".⁵² There are cases of sales designed to produce consolidation of strips, as when, in 1377, Richard

Taylor “surrendered a piece of land lying in Longcroft between the land of Richard Brok on either side to the use of the said Richard Brok”.⁵³ At the very end of the century, in 1398, John Absolon “surrendered an acre and three roods of land in Hodesfeld between the land of Thomas Duk on one part and the land of John Turner on the other”.⁵⁴ In 1381 William Godard complained that the same Thomas Duk had cut his grain to his (Godard’s) damage,⁵⁵ which implies that Duk had overstepped the “metes”, or bounds, between their respective strips. There are a number of instructions in the documents enjoining marking out these metes carefully.

We have suggested that by about 1300 the sub-division of original whole and half virgates had reached the stage appearing in the Pembroke rentals. From these rentals we see that the villein’s obligations included ploughing “at the three seasons”, “of the winter sowing of *cert* and at sowing of oats and at fallow”.⁵⁶ The crops sown appear to have been barley, oats, peas and beans. There are many vague references to corn, but only one to wheat. (From the phrasing of the rentals it would seem that growing of oats was introduced at a later date, probably coinciding with the greater use of horses. But it is surprising that in the late fourteenth century, when in many places cultivation of oats was declining, this cereal appears to have been a principal Tottenham crop. As there are frequent references to makers of “horse bread”, production of food for horses was evidently an important Tottenham occupation.) In Daubeney, in 1378, Richard Attegor was amerced for not ploughing an acre of the lord’s fallow, as we have mentioned above. All this implies that at the end of the thirteenth century and later in Pembroke, and in Daubeney in the year 1378, the traditional three-course rotation was practised on the demesne. But in Bruce, as early as 1374, and in Daubeney by at any rate 1389 most of the demesne was leased to the tenants. The memorandum attached to the record of John Northampton’s first court lists the 24 tenants who rented, at 4d an acre, all but 17¼ acres of the demesne, in amounts varying from 35 acres to a half acre.⁵⁷ It would seem certain that this land would be farmed in severalty, and thus create a desire to farm in severalty among some of the other tenants, too. There are a number of specific references to enclosed land. In 1381 Alice Reves surrendered six acres of enclosed land called Parkfeld.⁵⁸ In 1387 William Aleyn surrendered three roods of enclosed land called Mabbescroft.⁵⁹ In 1389 John Wayte surrendered a croft of enclosed land called Snowpyghthal.⁶⁰ In 1391 Thomas Cuffele surrendered four and a half acres of land with hedges⁶¹ and next year Hugh atte Stone a croft containing 8 acres, with hedges⁶² (probably one of his eight-acre mollands). Yet, in all the court rolls existing for the fourteenth century these are the sole references to enclosed land and one might reasonably infer that in other cases, except for leased demesne, land mentioned was unenclosed, while in all the above the fact of its being enclosed was stated because it was exceptional. Further, most of these statements refer to crofts or pitells, which one would expect to be enclosed.

Several references appear to land being common. In 1377, in Pembroke, John Cavendish, then lord of Daubeney, was accused of enclosing “a certain croft of seven acres of land which is common every third year (surely of significance) therefore it is ordered that all tenements which he enclosed shall be open”.⁶³ In 1398 John Twyford (heir of the London goldsmith Sir Nicholas Twyford) had “enclosed a croft called Themanlond, which should be common from the Feast of All Saints to the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin (Nov. 1 to Feb. 2) and claims it in severalty, therefore he is in mercy”.⁶⁴ In 1399 Lord John Innocent enclosed the field called Caroldysfeldes “which is common”.⁶⁵ Later in the year James Northampton had “enclosed a certain pasture called le More”, which also “was

common every third year".⁶⁶ (It is to be noted how such attempts, by the gentry, appear and increase towards the century's end.) At this point we pause to say, surely, lands "common every third year" can have no meaning but common pasture on the grass of the fallow field every third year.

Very little is known as to how strips were distributed among the different fields. John of Northampton, in the memorandum already mentioned, lists the fields over which his demesne was spread, which, if it gives any guidance, were as follows:⁶⁷

Longfurlong	6½ acres		6½ acres
Danehulle	18½ acres	}	
Dane	8¼ acres		26¾ acres
Stones	5½ acres	}	
Stonyfeld	27 acres		32½ acres
Estfeld	14 acres		14 acres
Westhalefeld	37½ acres	(12½ in one piece)	37½ acres
Woderedyng	25½ acres		25½ acres

If perhaps Stones and Stonyfeld were adjoining, and also Danehulle and Dane, we have six groups, with Longfurlong and perhaps Estfeld as the odd ones out. But in any case we do not know how these fields were spread over the area of the manor. If the demesne was a compact area, and there are no references to tenants, other than those leasing demesne, holding any land in these fields,* there appears to have been a sufficiently equal division between its fields to have satisfied Gray's criterion for a workable three-field system.

As far as the tenants were concerned, the small size, in Richard II's reign, of many of the holdings makes it difficult to see how some of them could have had strips spread evenly over the manor. When tenants died we are almost always only given the acreage they left and not how this was distributed. However, John Denys died owning only two acres, all in the west end of Aylwynesfeld.⁶⁸ The frequent sales of land, of course, easily resulted in this situation, and as to whether it was typical we cannot pronounce.

We have been unable to find any direct reference to feeding on the stubble after harvest. In the adjoining village of Edmonton, which had a similar field pattern, David Avery has quoted from the 1699 by-laws as follows: "No person or persons shall at any time hereafter break open the hedges, gates, rails, locks or chains of any of our common fields or common marshes after they are enclosed until they ought to be laid open for common."⁶⁹ But of course this refers to a period three centuries later than the one we are discussing, and no by-laws for Tottenham in its unenclosed state exist.

So far some case could be made out for much open field cultivation, perhaps on a rotation system of a little wheat, peas, beans and oats, then barley, then fallow, in the latter part of the century, associated with a certain amount of working in severalty. The field system was in a transitional stage. But there remains the difficulty of the large number of obviously small fields. "Altogether more than fifty fields are named on the fourteenth-century rolls: by named, I mean that the word field is part of the name", as the late F. L. Fenton said in a lecture to the Edmonton Hundred Historical Society in 1961.⁷⁰

One possible explanation we would suggest is that this multiplicity of fields is more apparent than real. The 1459 terrier shows that at that date there were only about 24 primary fields, of some 80 acres, the other "fields" being sub-divisions of these. East Middlesex was, in the early Middle Ages, a heavily wooded area. The villein and bordar holdings of Domesday, if the virgate then, as later, consisted of 32 acres, totalled 636 acres.⁷¹ By 1254

*The demesne meadow was mixed with that of the tenants.

the unfree tenants held 1,280 acres and obviously much assarting had taken place in the interval to account for the difference. Might not a similar process have happened in Tottenham to that which T. A. M. Bishop describes, in "Assarting and the Growth of the Open Fields",⁷² as occurring in Yorkshire? Individual families, or groups of families, cleared parts of the forest and in many cases these assarts were gradually added to the open fields while retaining their original names. In effect, these "fields" were, in many cases, the furlongs of the larger fields. Clayhanger, Lytelhanger and Woderedyng are obviously wood assarts. Aylwinesfeld, Pagysfeld, Davydsfeld, Ricardyslace are examples of fields bearing personal names, though we must admit all but the first of these seem to have been in the hands of one peasant. We see crofts entirely enclosed, and crofts which are in a transitional state to enclosure, common every third year; crofts in strips belonging to different tenants.

One obscure statement in the court rolls, which may have a bearing on the matter, remains to be mentioned. At a Pembroke court, in Whitsun week, 1397,⁷³ several tenants were amerced for cutting the grass "in the meadow and in the lord's and tenants' field" (*in campo domini et tenentium*). If this is a reference to fields under grass, would it be legitimate to take it as meaning that there was a fallow field as part of the demesne and another, single, fallow field, part of the common land of the tenants? One might also, finally, ask whether, with many peasants owning quite a number of animals, would the 92 acres of meadow, 30 acres of pasture, plus rough grazing in the woods, have been sufficient for the animals without a fallow area and common grazing on the stubble?

Another, and perhaps simpler, explanation of the agricultural methods in use during the fourteenth century presents itself. Professor Postan points out that in the later Middle Ages "variations in field system . . . were far more numerous than the conventional distribution of two or three field systems would indicate", even to having "different sequences of crops on different parts of the village arable", but "some form of obligatory rotation would be found".⁷⁴ Professor Genicot's table of crop rotation at the Ramsey Abbey estate of Holywell is an example of this.⁷⁵ As W. G. Hoskins has said, the furlong became the cropping unit. What we find in fourteenth-century Tottenham, as recorded in our several extracts from the records, is quite compatible with a common cultivation carried out on a number of fields, rather resembling furlongs, by more than a single rotation, at least some including a three-yearly fallow course. The fields would have been arranged in groups so as to make the rotation practised workable. It was the obligatory rotation that was the essential feature and the "fields" could be arranged to comply with it. Finally, side by side with this common agriculture there was a growing amount of farming in severalty. These conclusions are as far as we feel we can go, at the present stage of our researches, and we offer them as a tentative hypothesis. The documents for the fourteenth century, though numerous, are not complete enough to give a more satisfactory answer to the problem of how Tottenham's fields were cultivated, but we hope we have made some approach to a solution.

Much more work remains to be done on these Tottenham records. Even when dealing with those written prior to 1400 copious information about prices, rents of land, villein personal property, money lending, and other matters depicting the life of the villagers, has not been mentioned. As we proceed in this work we hope to trace the decline of villeinage, the transition to the completely enclosed village of 1612, and, possibly, the problem of how the division of the manor in 1254 was effected. This, too, might add to our knowledge of how land cultivation was performed in villages divided between a number of manors. Meanwhile, we trust these brief pages may be of some interest and value to students of economic history.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It only remains to acknowledge the help and encouragement given by Mr. B. Benjamin, head of the History Department at Tulse Hill Comprehensive School, and senior history Lecturer at the Working Men's College, and Mrs. Norma Benjamin. Also for work in typing of the manuscript by Mrs. Hilda Massie. Due credit must finally be awarded to all those who in the past have translated and classified a large proportion of the documents we have used; that is, to Mr. Oram, Mr. Fenton, Mr. Rock and Mr. Marcham, as a result of whose efforts this further study was made possible.

NOTES

Abbreviations used: Tottenham Manorial Rolls – T.M.R.
Bruce Castle Museum Collection – Bruce

- ¹ Robinson, *History of Tottenham* (1840), I, pp. 163–4.
- ² Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 165, 166, 167.
- ³ Bruce Castle Museum Collection MR 9, MR 9a.
- ⁴ *Tottenham Manorial Rolls*, II (Borough of Tottenham, Libraries and Museum, 1961), p. 284.
- ⁵ T.M.R., II, p. 88.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- ⁷ Bruce, *op. cit.*, MR 15.
- ⁸ Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 186–196.
- ⁹ T.M.R., II, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 81.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 261.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 265, 261.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 313.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 169.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 261.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 106, 120, 125, 132, 139, 157, 234, 262.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 316.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 205–6, 231.
- ¹⁹ Sylvia Thrupp, *Merchant Class of Medieval London* (Anne Arbor University, 1962), p. 370.
Dalendar of Patent Rolls, 1399–1401, pp. 172–3.
Calendar of Close Rolls, 1381–5, p. 58.
Calendar of Wills Enrolled in Court of Hustings, II, pp. 283–4.
- ²⁰ Bruce, m. 61.
- ²¹ *Tottenham Manorial Rolls*, I (Borough of Tottenham, Libraries and Museum, 1956), p. 1.
- ²² Bruce, *op. cit.*, MR 10, m. 56.
- ²³ T.M.R., II, *op. cit.*, p. 138.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 99.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 185.
- ²⁷ *Calendar Patent Rolls 1350–54*, p. 158.
- ²⁸ Bruce, *op. cit.*, MR 10, m. 49.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, MR 10, m. 37.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, MR 10, m. 36.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, MR 10, m. 27.
- ³² *Ibid.*, MR 10, mm. 42, 43.
- ³³ Lord Beveridge, "The Yield and Price of Corn in the Middle Ages", in *Essays in Economic History*, I, p. 18.
- ³⁴ Bruce, *op. cit.*, MR 10, m. 42.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, MR 10, m. 27.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, MR 10, m. 41.
- ³⁷ T.M.R., II, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 131.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 135.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 143.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 156.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 160.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 162.
- ⁴⁶ Bruce, *op. cit.*, MR 10, m. 41.
- ⁴⁷ H. L. Gray, *English Field Systems* (1959), p. 402.
- ⁴⁸ Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 381.
- ⁴⁹ T.M.R., I, *op. cit.*, p. XI.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- ⁵² T.M.R., II, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

- ⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 306.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 191.
- ⁵⁶ Bruce, *op. cit.*, MR 9.
- ⁵⁷ T.M.R., II, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 49.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 219.
- ⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 227.
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 179.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 307.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 323.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 326.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 81.
- ⁶⁹ D. Avery, *The Irregular Common Fields of Edmonton* (1964). Edmonton Hundred Historical Society, Occasional Papers, N.S. 9, p. 25.
- ⁷⁰ F. L. Fenton, *Some Recent Work on the Tottenham Manor Rolls*. (Edmonton Hundred Historical Society, Occasional Papers, N.S. 1, 1961), p. 9.
- ⁷¹ T. G. Pinder, Domesday Survey, in J. S. Cockburn, H. P. F. King and K. G. T. McDonnell (eds.), *Victoria County History of Middlesex 1960*, I, p. 129.
- ⁷² T. A. M. Bishop, "Assarting and the Growth of the Open Fields", in *Essays in Economic History* (1954), I, 26-40 *passim*.
- ⁷³ T.M.R., II, *op. cit.*, p. 297.
- ⁷⁴ M. Postan, "Medieval Agrarian Society in its Prime" in M. Postan, ed., *Cambridge Economic History of Europe, I; The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1966), p. 573.
- ⁷⁵ L. Genicot, "Crisis: From the Middle Ages to Modern Times", in M. Postan, ed., *Cambridge Economic History of Europe, I, op. cit.*, p. 718.