CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Traces of Primitive Agricultural Organisation as Suggested by a Survey of the Manor of Martham, Norfolk (1101-1292)

Author(s): W. Hudson

Source: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 1 (1918), pp. 28-58

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Royal Historical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3678347>

Accessed: 27-06-2016 04:17 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Historical Society, Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*

TRACES OF PRIMITIVE AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATION AS SUGGESTED BY A SURVEY OF THE MANOR OF MARTHAM, NORFOLK (1101-1292.)

BY THE REV. W. HUDSON, M.A., F.S.A.

Read January 10, 1918.

AMONG the Surveys of the Manors of the Prior of Norwich contained in the volume known as Stow MS. 936 in the British Museum is one which has features of special and, it might even be said, of unique interest. It is the Survey of the Manor of Martham with which the series is concluded. The whole compilation, unfortunately, is in a defective condition. The first folio begins in the middle of a sentence under the heading 'ham,' the last syllable of the word 'Hindringham,' the beginning of which was on the preceding folio now lost. In other places also the record is abruptly broken off. The series was apparently commenced soon after the appointment of William de Kyrkeby to the Priory in 1272, and was continued at various dates, the survey of Martham being made in 4 Henry de Lakenham 1292.

The nine manors previously surveyed are contained in thirty-six folios. The surveys follow the usual plan. First the lord's 'demesne' is described and then follows a list of tenants with their holdings and various services. The Manor of Martham is much more fully treated. Though by no means the most extensive of the Prior's Manors, its survey, commenced on folio 37, is continued

to the end of the volume on folio 115, thus occupying twice the space of all the other nine. The method adopted is this. After a short description of the lord's demesne, we have a sworn statement of 'lands, rents, customs and all services of the Manor of Martham in the fourth year of H. de Lakenham Prior'. Then follows a list of 107 tenants who are stated to have 'formerly held' certain amounts of land subject to certain services. In the case of each holding is added 'of which there are now [1292] so many tenants,' frequently amounting to more than ten. The total number of separate holders of these portions of the 'former' tenements is 935. Each of the sub-holdings is entered with the fullest detail. That is to say, the 107 earlier units having been bundles of strips scattered throughout a number of open fields, the 935 sub-holders have scattered strips which in the aggregate amount to 2021. Under the names of the sub-tenants every one of these strips is described with the name of its field, the tenant whose land it adjoins, and the land or road on which it abuts at its narrow end. In this the survey resembles an Elizabethan survey of later times, only there the tenants are arranged in their 'fields' and 'furlongs,' here they are grouped under their organised 'tenements' as preserved on the Manorial Roll.

It is fairly obvious that the public acknowledgment, if possible, of the existence of these 'Tenemental Units' (as we may call them) was a matter of vital importance to the lord in the demand for the customs and services due from his tenants. For, as this survey shows and as is well known from other sources, the subdivision of tenancies among a great number of owners of small fractions had seriously developed in East Anglia in the thirteenth century, to the lord's great inconvenience. His remedy was partly to make the burden attach to the *land* and not the person, and partly to preserve a knowledge of the 'unit' to which each strip belonged.

From a student's point of view the method employed in this Stow survey suggests more than one opening for investigation. The 107 'former' tenants were not, of course, so many heads of separate families but were, perhaps, included in about two-thirds of that number. And the 935 later 'sub-tenants' of the same holdings practically belonged to much the same families. Their complicated grouping in the various fields, especially at the later date of 1292, presents us with a vivid picture of a community bound together in a network of association which can hardly denote anything but constant inter-marriage of families.

This leads to a further conclusion. All the tenants (with scarcely an exception) are said to hold their lands (as to two-thirds of them) in socage or (as to one-third) in villenage. Yet both the lands and the tenants are so completely intermixed that it is hard to resist the conviction that the tenants were all lineally sprung from the same class and worked together without much regard to their personal status.

Moreover, in this particular case a still more tempting suggestion offers itself. The existence of the 'former' tenements must surely carry us back two or three generations from 1292. This is important because we know the exact date of the first formation of this feudal manor. It was some fourteen years after the Domesday Survey that the then Bishop, on founding the Norwich Priory, gave his land at Martham as an organised manor, with a demesne worked by customary tenants,¹ for the maintenance of the monks (*ad victum monachorum*). And we have evidence (as I think we may take it) that, both before and after the Conquest to that time, the land was occupied by *free* tenants who, under the Bishop's commendation, held it on the conditions of an Anglo-Danish village community. I shall endeavour to give some

¹ This is the sense in which 'manor' and 'manorialise' are used in this paper.

reasons for the assumption that the 107 'former' tenants were the natural successors (some, perhaps, lineal descendants) of the Domesday occupants, and suggest some account of their passage from 'freedom' to a less honourable but possibly more secure condition as customary tenants in a manorial organisation. Finally, it may even be thought that this organisation, in its agricultural features, may have been a continuation (under different conditions) of an agricultural organisation originating so far back as the days of the earlier Angle settlers.

Tenemental Subdivision of Ownership.—In order to illustrate the freedom of the tenants in this practice and the causes which led them to it, I may (before coming to the Martham Survey) draw attention to a very valuable series of Court Rolls of the Prior's manor of Hindolveston in Norfolk¹ running with only one break from 1309 to 1326. There are sixteen full years with the records of fifty-six courts. The surrenders of lands and concurrent admissions form a very considerable item in the usual business. During the whole period no fewer than 740 surrenders are recorded. This makes an average of forty-six for each of the sixteen years or of thirteen for each of the fifty-six courts. The causes, so far as they can be gathered, may be thus summed up. The death of a tenant is the cause of seventy-four. The next heir is specified and admitted. In seventy-three cases a tenant in his life-time transfers pieces of land to a son (or sometimes a brother); in forty-six, similarly to a daughter (or sister); in seventeen to some one not a member of the family. In more than half of these 136 cases of transference the surrendering tenant reserves his tenure for his life. Several of these years (about 1315-1319) were years of exceptionally bad seasons, and in 1319 it is recorded in two cases: 'This surrender was made because

¹ This and many other Rolls were kindly lent to the writer and Mr. H. W. Saunders for examination at the Public Record Office by the Dean and Chapter of Norwich.

the land was sold through great hunger (*pro magna fame*).¹ There is good reason for assigning more than fifty surrenders to this cause. Another not infrequent cause was what we may call marriage settlements, the transaction ending with a 'licence to marry' granted to one or both of the parties. Most of the surrenders, however, have no ostensible cause and were evidently matters of private convenience. In all cases specific mention is made of a person to whose 'use' a new admission is desired. The admission may be delayed on some technical point. But in no case does the lord claim any arbitrary right to dispute the change. And the lands held in villenage are dealt with as freely as those held in socage, the lord's rights being preserved by such forms as 'at the will of the lord,' 'according to custom and services,' and such like.

The *Survey of the Manor of Martham*. This has already been partly described, but some further details may be given:—

1. The Lord's *Demesne* consists of

(a) Arable land, 168 acres, 3 roods, 16 perches, value £17 8s. 4½d.

(b) Several pasture, scythable (*falcabile*) meadow and turbary, 25½ acres, ½ rood, 9½ perches, and 8 p. of 1 ft. breadth.

Total 217½ acres, 1½ roods, 18 perches, and 8 p. of 1 ft. breadth.

(c) The *Messuage* by circuit contains 3 acres, 1½ roods, 8 perches, and is valued yearly at 4s. with its fruit.

2. Then follows the exhaustive list of 'former' tenants with the present subdivisions of tenancy and all the strips of land held by the sub-tenants with their several abutments. This (the main portion of the record) extends from folio 37d to folio 112. It is summed up as follows:—

¹ For the great famine of this period cf. Rogers, *History of Prices*, i. 198; Blomefield, *History of Norfolk*, iii. 76.

	£	s.	d.
Sum of Rent of Martham	9	16	7 $\frac{3}{4}$
„ „ Aid	3	14	7 $\frac{3}{4}$
„ „ Average of (de) Villenage and Socage	1	0	0 $\frac{3}{4}$
„ „ Working (operabilium) days in autumn	356	days	
„ „ Boons (xij ^{xx} jdi)	24	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	„
„ „ Mondays	20		„
„ „ Hoeing Corn (xj ^{xx} ijdi)	222	$\frac{1}{2}$	„
„ for Ditching	0	1	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
„ „ Carting Manure	1	2	3
„ „ Making Malt and Threshing (flagellatiōne) of the whole Vill	1	18	0 $\frac{3}{4}$
„ of Hens (v ^{xx} et ij)	103	hens	
„ „ Lands (¹ DCV ^{xx} et ij)	823	acres	
„ „ Harrowing of (de) Socage	27	days	

3. After this comes the statement: "We have told (dictum est) of arable lands and their services and customs. There follows of Turbaries and their rents. And be it known that all the Turbaries (omnia Turbarum) lie in the Marsh which is called Suthfen and head (accapitant) upon the Bruary which is called Martham Lyng. Therefore a beginning is made at one side, and we follow until we have reached to the other."

These 'Turbaries' (which would supply the tenants with fuel) consist of portions of the size of 1 acre or $\frac{1}{2}$ acre and pay a rent of 1d. per acre. The total amounts to 36 acres held in 33 portions, more than one tenant often sharing a portion. The tenants, as may be expected, are among the holders of the previously mentioned arable lands.

With the Turbary Rents are included 1 meadow rented at 6d. and 5 abutals at 6d. Added to these are 2 abutals at 10d. each.

4. Then 'There follows of the tenement formerly (quondam) of Simon de Len and previously (prius) of villenage'. Four tenants (with varying customs) are mentioned, and their combined holdings contain 20 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres.

¹ The long hundred (D = 600, C = 120) is in frequent use in these Manorial documents.

5. The survey closes with 'Libere Tenentes,' a heading which stands over 2 tenements only. One, of $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres, 'formerly held' by Thomas Syk is now held by 5 persons, 3 of the family of De Syk. The other, of $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres, is held by 2 brothers. Both tenements contribute small rents only. Finally 4 persons hold 1 abuttal each, paying in all $2\frac{1}{4}$ d. The $\frac{1}{2}$ d. rent for each of the first two is said to be 'wrongfully taken by Roger Bavent,'¹ who held a large amount of the adjoining land outside the manor.

The '*Former*' *Tenants*. We will now consider this list which is thus introduced :—

'Of lands rents customs and all services of the Manor of Martham In the 4th year of H. de Lakenham Prior by such [men] sworn viz. : Robert Stannard Roger Auaunt Robert de Sco Alexander de Sco Roger Rede Gerard Stiward Hubert Edmund Humfrey de Syk Robert Blakyng junior Roger Bolle John Elsy William Yware Nicholas Berte Robert Orger Ralph Prudume Roger Walter William Pethun Richard Pethun Robert de faldgate and Robert Erl who say that

Muſt x acr.

'Roger de Hil formerly held 10 acres of land which are called Mulelond and he pays therefor yearly "ad census"² 4s. To Aid 11 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. And he shall do 3 boons in August, price of a day 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. at the lord's food viz. for the first boon 1 repast to wit bread potage ale and 1 dish of flesh and cheese or milk, likewise for the others, for every boon 1 repast, that is to say bread potage 1 dish of fish and cheese or milk. He shall carry (averabit) to Norwich one load (averagium), viz. the seventh part of 1 met, and 1 met as it is called contains 4 seams³ of barley or of malt and he shall have there 1 loaf and 1 gallon (galena) of ale. If he does not carry he shall give 1d. and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. He shall cart (cariabit) for 1 day in August if he has his own cart and if he has not a cart he shall come only (tū? tantum) if he shall have been asked (precat') and he shall have there for carting or for himself with a fork (pro se cum furca) 1 repast viz. bread of wheat potage ale flesh on a

Noa de meet.

¹ He married Elizabeth daughter of Mathew Gunton, a large landowner in this neighbourhood, and must have been connected with the Sussex family of De Bavent, lords of the Manor of Wiston. (See Sussex Archæological Collections, Vols. LIII and LIV.)

² Rent.

³ Summa, horse-load = 1 quarter.

flesh day or fish on a fish day. He shall make malt viz. the seventh part of 1 mett or he shall give 1½d. He shall flail (flagellabit) for half a day without food or he shall give ½d. He shall plough if he have his own plough with as many beasts (averiiis) as he has in his own plough and he shall have for an entire plough 3 loaves as large as can be made, 40 loaves of 6 bushels of barley (iij panes quam magni fieri possunt xl panes de vj bus'ordei) and 9 herrings. But if he has not got his own plough he does not plough. He shall harrow for half a day after noon whether (quamvis) he has his own horse (affrum) or not with 1 horse or he shall give 1d. And he shall give 1 hen and 5 eggs of the price of 1½d.

'Of which there are now 11 tenants viz.

'Robert de Hil senior holds 1 acre and 1 rood 23 perches and 6 feet, of which ½ acre lies in his own toft with a messuage next the land of Geoffrey Brunstan on the west and abuts on the King's way which leads from Martham to Reppes towards the south. Also 3 perches and 6 feet lie in the field of Rollesby next the land of John Bene on the south and abut upon the land of Geoffrey de Sco towards the west. Also 26 perches and 12 feet lie in the field of Rollesby next the land of William Richild on the north and abut upon the land of Robert de Sco towards the east. Also 20 perches lie in the field of Sco next the land of Alexander de Sco on the north and abut upon the land of Nicholas Drie towards the west. Also 10 perches lie in the field of Sco next the land of Robert Sangestrye on the north and abut upon the land of Roger son of Richard towards the west. Also 13 perches and 6 feet lie in the field of Sco next the land of Geoffrey de Sco on the east and abut upon the King's way which leads from Martham to Reppes towards the north. Also 26 perches and 12 feet lie in the field of Sco next the land of John Walle on the east and abut upon the King's way which leads from Martham to Reppes towards the south. Also 10 perches lie in the field of Martham next the land of Humfrey de Syk on the west and abut upon the land of Robert de Syk.'

Then follows a detailed description in similar form of the other 10 present holders of portions of the former tenement of Roger de Hil.

The second 'former' tenement is that of a typical holding in villenage.

Werk.

'Thomas Knight held formerly 12 acres of land of villenage which is called 1 eruing and renders therefor yearly of census 16d. To Aid 14d. He shall do 16 working days in August and for every day he shall have 1 repast viz. bread and fish. He shall hoe 10 days without [the lord's] food, price of a day $\frac{1}{2}$ d. He shall cart to Norwich 6 cartings or shall give 9d and he shall have for every carting one loaf and 1 'lagena' of ale. Also for ditching 1d. He shall make for malt $3\frac{1}{2}$ seams of barley or shall give 6d. Also he shall flail for 12 days or shall give 12d. He shall plough if he has his own plough and for every ploughing he shall have 3 loaves and 9 herrings and if he has not his own plough he shall not plough. He shall harrow at rye oats and fallows (falihes) as his partners (socii) whether (quamvis) he has his own ² [? harrow] or not. For carting manure he shall give 12d.

It is to be known that 12 acres of villenage are called 1 Eruing. And every tenant of 1 Eruing shall do in all things as is aforesaid concerning the tenement of Thomas Knight. And there are held (habentur) in Martham 22 Eruings and 3 acres of villenage. And all these shall harrow all the land of the Hall except the lands required (quesitis) for rye oats and fallows.

Of which 12 acres there are now 12 tenants viz. :—'

Then follow the details of these 12 sub-holdings.¹

The archaic word used for a full villenage tenement deserves notice. It is always written 'eruing'. The letters in the MS. are very carefully formed. Once or twice the form 'erving' is used. It is possible that this pronunciation was adopted. The word can hardly be anything else than the Saxon 'eruing,' ploughing. For the present we may take it as expressing (originally) the obligation of the holder of the land to furnish a certain portion of a plough-team.

The term 'mulelond' used of Roger de Hil's land is of common occurrence in Norfolk. 'Molmen' were

¹ A list of the "former" tenements with some details is given in the Appendix. Present difficulties have prevented its being set out in tabulated form, but it may serve to verify and illustrate the statements in the text. Specimens are also given of some of the tenements as subdivided in 1292. A list of the turbaries is added.

² M.S. Suam? herciam.

customary tenants distinguished from villeins chiefly as not being liable to the regular week work throughout the year. After Roger de Hil the similar tenants down to No. 18 are said to hold land 'in socagio'. From that point to the end they are said to hold land 'called mulelond'. There can be no distinction of tenure intended, for in the margin (in a slightly later hand) all the lands of the tenants are throughout distinguished as either 'muſt' or 'werk,' whereas in the Summary they are all described as 'villenage' and 'socage'.

We cannot assign any definite date to this list. It does not appear to have been taken from any existing record. It must have been the result of family or local tradition going back with more or less certainty to the holder of a definite unit. Once only is a date mentioned. Richard Gemere 50 is said to have received his first holding 'de novo'¹ Tancrede Prioris'. He was Prior 1170-80.

It must be noted that there is scarcely a single holder of villenage land who does not also hold land in socage. The significance of this fact will appear still more clearly in the list of the tenancies in 1292 in the Appendix.

The amount of 22 eruings and 3 acres stated to be reckoned in Martham would (at 12 acres each) be 267 acres. The actual number recorded, in whole or fractions, is 20½ and ⅓. It may be observed, however, that Nos. 27-30 contain 15 acres held in villenage and yet not specified as portions of eruings. Also 54 with 3 acres 3 roods is so treated and in 52 no notice is taken of 20 perches. With these additions the required amount is very nearly reached.

Very noticeable are the details of Nos. 27-30 (Walter son of Hugo, Will. Leve, Thos. Lom, and John de Bruerio) which are even more striking in the actual text. Each of these four tenants is said to have 'formerly

¹ Some word such as 'assarto' seems to be wanted.

held' $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres and 1 rood of villenage, also $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres and 1 rood of mulelond. In the subdivided tenancies the two classes of land are not in any way distinguished. It is difficult not to conclude that these four holdings had at some still earlier time formed a single unit of 30 acres or $2\frac{1}{2}$ shares of 12 acres each. We may observe further that they are immediately followed by three other holdings of 6 acres each (1 villenage, 2 socage) which would make 48 acres or four full 12-acre holdings. From Simon de Len's tenement at the end of the record we have traces of two more previously existing tenements in villenage of the normal size. And the frequent occurrence of holdings of 12 acres, 6 and 3 acres in the list of socage lands raises a suspicion that many or even all of them at the original formation of the manorial system might, no less than the villenage lands, have been organised on the system of 12-acre holdings. As will be seen, this is confirmed by the practice disclosed in the early surveys of other manors (see p. 52).

The 'Former' Holdings as subdivided in 1292.—We may now describe the details of some of these holdings. The full details are too voluminous, though most interesting. Thus, in the case of the three members of the de Hil family in No. 1, 30 perches in the field of Rollesby held by Robert de Hil senior consist of one strip of 3 perches 6 feet and another of 26 perches 12 feet. In the other two holdings the two similar strips are described as 3 perches 6 feet and 1 third of $\frac{1}{2}$ acre. So 1 rood 30 perches of the 1st tenant in the field of Sco is made up of four strips of 20 perches, 10 perches, 13 perches 6 feet, and 26 perches 12 feet.¹ The complications of these intermixed scraps of tenancy suggest many difficulties not only of assigning obligations but of cultivation and reaping the fruit of the particular strip. The ploughing could be done in common, and if, as must have been the case, the separate strips

¹ The perch on the Martham Demesne contained $18\frac{1}{2}$ feet, but on the tenants' land 18 feet.

(even of 3 perches and 6 feet) could, with their specified abutments, be definitely localised, the weeding could have been done by the tenant. But in time of harvest it is difficult to suppose that all these small scraps of land clothed with the same crop could be distinguished from each other. Did they reap in common and divide the crop according to the size of each person's holding?

The intermixture of Socage and Villenage Tenants and lands is very striking. Thomas Knight 2, the typical villenage tenant, also held 4 acres of socage land. In 1292 they were held by the same three tenants who lead the list of eleven holding his villenage land. So with the de Sco (or Belaghe) family in tenement No. 8 and the families of Grundolf and Mercator (or Chapman) in tenement No. 17. And the same may be found in numerous other cases. The most convincing proof of the intermixture of the lands is found in an analysis of the principal 'fields' which the writer has made. As might be expected, the villenage lands are most of all to be found in the two great fields called Estfeld and Westfeld, which would certainly have formed the principal part of the old Village Community fields. In Estfeld out of a total of 207 acres 77 are held in villenage. In Westfeld the proportion is much larger, 92 acres out of 158. In a field called Tomeres which seems to have been connected with Estfeld there are 15 villenage acres out of 63. On the other hand, in Suthfeld, presumably an original field, which, however, had evidently changed its character, there are only 8 villenage acres out of 47. None of the lord's demesne was on common land. He held several pieces, one 'by exchange' and others perhaps by forfeiture or for convenience.

Intermixture of Families.—Illustrations of this fact are constantly occurring throughout the list of the tenants in 1292. It is not possible to say exactly what the relationship was, but intermarriage is the most natural explanation. We may take the first holding formerly of Roger

de Hil. Out of the 10 acres three of the de Hil family hold 4 acres 1 rood in three equal shares, and four members of the de Sco family hold 2 acres 1 rood in four equal shares. Eustace Stannard holds a similar amount of 2 acres 1 rood. Adam Harding holds only 10 perches but they include a messuage, and Robert de Hill's 23 p. 6 ft. (a fraction of a share with the two other de Hils) are in a field called Hardingstoft, while the 2 roods held by Beatrix Alex are in Hardingshill. The three de Hils held three equal portions of the toft which evidently went with the holding, each having also a messuage with a portion of the toft, while Eustace Stannard's large toft¹ with a messuage is described as being 'in the field called Hiltofts' as if he had a strong claim on a share of the more central or residential part of the holding. Still more striking is the case of the two families of Elsy and Longe. They hold conjointly three of the Turbaries, implying, as I think, a conjoint connection with three separate holdings. They are, in fact, to be found associated in six different holdings. There were seven members of the Elsy family and eleven of the Longe family holding lands in their own names. The tenement No. 69 called after John le Longe is a socage tenement of 10 acres. In it John and Simon Longe hold equal shares, each with a toft, and Eustace has a smaller holding with an equal toft. Again this must imply an inherited interest in the original tenement. Yet before them come the names of John, Roger, and Robert Elsy who hold three shares, about equal to those of John and Simon Longe but without tofts. Then comes the name of Alice Elsy (the only female tenant of the family). She holds only 3 roods, about half the size of the shares previously mentioned. But she alone has a 'messuage in her toft'. Must we not assume that Alice was a Longe who had married an Elsy and was occupying in her own right the 'messuage' of the holding? Of the 10 acres 5 were held

¹ For the meaning of the tofts, see p. 47.

by the Elsy tenants and 5 by the Longe family. One rood in excess was held by Richard Orger. There is no Elsy tenement, but No. 67, called after John Wymarc, a villenage holding of 6 acres (entered just before that of John le Longe) is entirely held by John, Roger, and Robert Elsy in three shares of 2 acres each, the two former holding tofts here. This seems to mean that they were a villein family, for the holding was reckoned as half an 'eruing'. Many cases similar to these might be cited if space permitted.

On a review of the evidence already adduced we seem to be justified in saying that although the customary lands of the Martham manor (which practically included all the manorial lands) were, not only in 1292 but at the earlier time of the 'former' tenants, occupied by a tenantry of twofold status, socage and villenage, yet that both the lands and the families were so intermingled that the same persons were constantly responsible for the two classes of obligations attaching to the two grades of service. And here I would draw attention to the service as specifically assigned to the two typical holdings, that of Roger de Hil for the socage lands and that of Thomas Knight for the villenage lands. The latter are by no means burdensome and the former are not altogether light. The irksome week-works so often required are absent. The regular ploughing and doubtless other works must have been done by household 'famuli,' among whom at this time the Bailiffs' Account Rolls mention 'four ploughmen' and 'harrowmen,' i.e. for two demesne ploughs.

It may, perhaps, be thought that the conditions of this manor were unusually favourable to the tenantry and unusually homogeneous as regards their status. Such I believe to have been the case, and I wish to suggest that an explanation may be found in the circumstances of the Domesday occupants of the same land which we will now consider.

Domesday Occupants of the Martham land.—The land which formed Martham Manor was not organised as a Manor at the time of the Domesday Survey. It is necessary to bear in mind something of the nature of the change which was then taking place in the country. For some generations past the old Village Communities as independent groups under their Hundreds as well as other more scattered occupiers of land had been everywhere falling under the control of local lords. At first they merely 'commended themselves' to a more powerful neighbour for protection in lawless times. By degrees this relation developed into more or less complete subjection. The system known as a mediæval manor, with a lord's 'demesne' worked by tenants rendering agricultural service in various degrees, was already far advanced before the Norman Conquest, especially in the south and middle of England. In the Danish districts of East Anglia, however, the old system still lingered in a weakened form. Everywhere through Norfolk and Suffolk were independent freemen (thought to be frequently Danish soldiers who had settled on the land and mingled with the Anglian inhabitants), and occasionally we find groups of freemen. All these, whether isolated or in groups, cultivated their own lands. They were under commendation to some lord, and in return rendered some military, jurisdictional, or other personal service, but not agricultural.

The Martham land with which we are concerned cannot be precisely identified in all its parts. But fortunately its principal constituent element is known, and it contains so large a proportion of the whole and is in itself of such exceptional interest that any uncertainty as to the remainder is of comparatively little importance. Martham in Domesday Book comes under the heading 'Lands of William the Bishop' and (particularly) forms part of the lands which he held 'of his fee,' that is, in his private control and not attached to his bishopric. Of some of these

he was already manorial lord. Of others (including Martham) he was Patron by commendation, which probably made him their 'mesne' lord between them and the King.

There are several small tenancies which might have become part of the Martham Manor. But the one I have mentioned will suffice for our present purpose. The entry runs as follows :—

'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 (D.B., folio 200 ; V.C.H. *Norf. ii.* 123).

Bishop Ailmar had been Bishop of Elmham at the Conquest. In 1075 the Bishopric was removed to Thetford, and in 1086 at the Domesday Survey was held by Bishop William de Bellofago.

This group of thirty-six freeman at Martham is certainly of great interest. Not very many of these groups are met with, and this is one of the largest in Norfolk. The men do not work for any lord, nor have they any subordinate workers mentioned as under them. With the help of such internal organisation as may have been in practice in such cases they were conjointly working the whole five ploughlands. We surely cannot be mistaken in regarding them as the still existing Anglo-Danish Village Community of Martham. The holding is a large one. The "five ploughlands" are understood to mean the amount of land at which they were assessed for the Danegeld. It is, however, generally believed that a ploughland was at least 120 acres,¹ so that they held some 610 acres to which we may perhaps add the 50 acres of the Church land. Now the arable land of the manorial tenants in 1292 was about 840 acres. We

¹ But see the case of Lawshall, Suffolk, p. 54.

therefore have here a very large portion of the subsequent manor.

In 1096 the then Bishop, Herbert de Losinga, moved the See to Norwich and at once established there a Monastery for sixty Benedictine monks. He set aside certain of his lands for the maintenance of the monks, and amongst others his land at Martham, including the land described in the above entry. This he states in his Foundation Charter of September 1101.¹ This plainly involved the conversion of the land into the conditions of a manor. As held by the thirty-six freemen there had been no lord's demesne. Henceforth the Prior was to be the lord and was to receive for the support of his monastery the produce of a demesne cultivated by manorial tenants. Of a similar process of conversion we are told in the case of Caistor by Yarmouth in the adjoining Hundred of East Fleg. There eighty freemen held four ploughlands with twenty-two ploughs. We read, 'Of all this Earl Ralph made a manor: now there is 1 plough in demesne, 21 of the men'.² This can only mean that Earl Ralph appropriated a small portion of the land with one plough-team to his own use and organised the tenants into customary workers with the other twenty-one plough-teams.

Bishop Herbert does not seem to have cut off the 168 acres of the Martham 'demesne' arable lands from those of the thirty-six freemen. He must have added some other land. There was one holding which he might have used. Of the adjoining manor of Hemsby, which after belonging to Algar, Earl of Mercia, had now come into the hands of the Bishop, we read, 'To this manor belongs 1 outlying estate (berewite) [in Martham] consisting of 2 ploughlands. Then as now 2 ploughs on demesne and 1 belonging to the men.'³

¹ Dugdale, *Monasticon*, iv. 16; Blomefield, *Hist. Norf.* xi. 163.

² D.B. fol. 134; V.C.H., *Norf.* ii. 61.

³ D.B. fol. 195; V.C.H., *Norf.* ii. 118.

The 'men' here were seven villeins, and there were three bordars and one serf. Hemsby had been manorialised by Algar before the Bishop received it. The manor of Hemsby was also given by Bishop Herbert with Martham to his Priory, so this holding may well have formed the demesne of the new manor of Martham. It is true that two ploughlands amount to more than the 168 acres mentioned in the Stow Survey. But the contemporary Account Rolls of Martham speak of more than 200 acres being sown in a year apart from fallow. Some other lands may have been added to make up the amount of about 840 acres, or whatever the manorial tenants in 1101 had in their own hands. It is sufficient to note that all the small pieces which might have been thus utilised are described in D.B. as being held T.R.E. by 'freemen'.

Organisation of the Manor.—For this purpose the Bishop would have to organise a manorial tenantry bound to work his demesne for the benefit of his monks. Towards this object he may have had some 'villani, as just mentioned.' He no doubt dealt with the existing tenants as Earl Algar had done at Hemsby or Earl Ralph at Caistor. With regard to the exact number of thirty-six freemen we need not be too precise. They are represented in D.B. as though they passed undisturbed through the great national convulsion of the Norman Conquest. Yet some, probably most of them, must have been liable to military service. And some families must surely have been broken up. Still, if the Bishop as Patron of the vill were answerable to the King for his geld, the Commissioners would not need to enquire into this detail. It was not a case of change of lordship. The Bishop would have to deal with a body of tenants described as freemen and hitherto owing no agricultural work to a lord.¹ It would be foolish to say that they and their

¹ In these cases there is no mention in D.B. of any 'feorm' or food-rent.

families were turned adrift and fresh tenants introduced. Yet within little more than a century we find the tenants entirely classified as sokemen and villeins. We must suppose the village community of freemen consented, willingly or not, to be converted into a manorial set of workers. The change perhaps was not so very great at the time. Already there were many cases recorded in D.B. where freemen were working as bound subordinates (sub eis) to other freemen. In great stress a man or family could only part with their land for food and submit to enforced service even though still 'free' in social status. Under Norman rule and Norman lawyers they rapidly descended to legal bondage. But in 1101 a 'villanus' was still something of a villager, and extra work for a lord even though enforced was only his accustomed work, and in the case of Martham was not over-burdensome.

If then, when the Bishop set to work to organise his manor and got together lands amounting to the 840 acres (or thereabouts) which we find in the Stow Survey in the hands of the tenants, and if, as we have seen reason to suppose, he organised (if he did not find already existing) a system of cultivation on the basis of 12 acre tenements, that would require some seventy sectional tenements. We may cite three pieces of evidence all of which seem to bring us to about this result.

(a) First, we know that the villenage tenements were reckoned at $22\frac{1}{4}$ eruings of 12 acres each. That this apportionment was in actual operation we learn from the summary of the lord's profits. 'Hoeing corn $222\frac{1}{2}$ days.' The typical villein tenant is bound to hoe ten days which produces the exact number. So 1d. from each villein 'for ditching' is correctly entered as $22\frac{1}{2}$ d. Then another item in the summary says, 'Harrowing of socage twenty-seven days'. We find that the socage tenant has to harrow for half a day. This would amount to fifty-four socage harrowings. This statement is im-

portant, for only nineteen other tenants in 1292 are specified as bound to do 'as Roger de Hil'. If each did half a day that would only produce ten days instead of twenty-seven. It must refer to fifty-four units not recognisable in the survey of 1292. If they were original units we have socage tenements 54, villenage, 22½, total 76½.

(b) Next we have the list of Turbaries. As it is given in 1292 it has manifestly been much altered. But it has the appearance of an original set of equal shares of half an acre each, most of which had become grouped among joint tenants but not losing their original form. They amount to 73 half acres and 1 rood.

(c) Then we have the 'Tofts'. In the subdivided tenements of 1292 under one or other of the subtenants (generally the first) we are told that of his land so much (some small amount) 'lies in his own toft' (in tofto suo). It usually abuts on some road. Sometimes it is described as his 'toft with a messuage'. In many cases, as in that of Roger de Hil (No. 1), it is evident that two or more tofts mentioned are portions of one larger toft divided amongst co-heirs. These tofts were not, as frequently, separate small holdings, but plots of private ground with or without a dwelling-house, which a tenant of a holding required for a shelter for his oxen, poultry, garden produce, or other conveniences. They appear to have been settled in groups for they often adjoin each other and abut on the same road. At this distance of time it has not been possible to locate the exact spots indicated. But it seems certain that they were more or less scattered about and in many cases did not lie in the village. Several minor 'fields' are called from tofts, as Blakemans-tofts, Hardingstofts, and others. We may reasonably assume that in any original organisation each tenement would have its own toft. By 1292 they were much mixed. Tenants held lands in many tenements, and it is plain that when they are said to have land 'in their toft' it

was often not in connection with their family holding. We can, therefore, only estimate the original number in the best way possible. In the whole list of 107 'former' tenements no less than 191 tofts are mentioned. But as already observed a large number of these were fractions of earlier tofts. On the other hand, thirty-two of the 107 tenements have no tofts at all. This leaves seventy-five with tofts. These tofts are so often held by a minor tenant among larger sharers in a tenement that it is impossible to say to what original tenement his land may have belonged. But, for whatever it is worth, the coincidence of this figure with the totals already given may well be noted as some corroboration of the suggestion that this figure approximately represents the original number of tenants' holdings.

The 12-acre Eruings, were they new in 1101?—Assuming, as I think we must, that the organisation described in the Stow Survey must date back to the formation of the Manor in 1101, we are led to enquire further, Did the Bishop find any such organisation in practice in the village community? Our information shows us thirty-six men with sixteen plough-teams cultivating rather more than 600 acres of land. Now if we take the working occupiers of land in this part of Norfolk (in King Edward the Confessor's time), freemen, sokemen, and villeins (excluding bordars and serfs as holding scarcely any land), we find on the average one plough-team to nearly 50 acres of land and four tenants to one plough. At Martham there was a plough-team to rather less than 40 acres and scarcely more than two men to provide each plough-team of (normally) eight oxen. Is it not more than probable that while the thirty-six freemen answered for the vill to the King (no doubt through the Bishop), the cultivation of the land was shared with them by several minor tenants? May we not suppose that the 'eruing' was already in use? According to the formula just stated, if we allow four men to provide a plough-team we should require

some sixty-four shareholders for the sixteen ploughs, and if the shares were equally divided the sectional tenements would be about 10 acres each. This very nearly corresponds to the villenage eruing of 12 acres in our Stow Survey, and suggests that it originally expressed a share of land which provided one-quarter of a plough-team or two oxen.

By way of confirmation of this suggestion, I would put forward two pieces of evidence.

First, the *terminology* of the Martham Survey is distinctly suggestive of an earlier set of conditions than those existing at the close of the thirteenth century. The two classes of customary tenants are simply described as holding in Socage or in Villenage. This is a peculiar feature of this survey. In the other surveys in this volume they are not much classified and are only called 'Custumarii'. There are, however, two similar and contemporary series of surveys of Norfolk Monastic Manors well known to students. There is the *Cartulary of Ramsey Abbey*, published in the Rolls Series, and there is the valuable Cottonian MS. in the British Museum (*Claudius C. XI*) dealing with the Manors of the Bishop of Ely. Throughout the numerous surveys in these two collections Socage Tenure or even Sokemen are hardly ever mentioned. The commonest term for full working tenants is 'Operarii'. The somewhat less burdened class of tenants are 'Custumarii et Censuarii'. There are many varieties of a minor character, but this may hold good as a general statement. The Martham use seems to point back to Domesday. There the independent tenants are 'Liberi homines' or 'Socmanni'. If, as I have suggested, the thirty-six Freemen of Martham became, with others, the customary tenants of the newly formed manor, they could no longer be described as 'liberi homines' nor were they 'libere tenentes'. Those of them who became tenants 'in villenage' may have been among the 'villani' or villagers who were mainly

responsible before for the tillage of the land. The others, who accepted lighter burdens were, no doubt, already the Bishop's 'sokemen' as being under his jurisdiction by 'commendation'. This would account for the description at an early time, but not later.

The second consideration relates to the organisation of the labour on which the lord depended for his manorial profit. This organisation, as we know, was based on the proportion of the common land which the tenant held, and there was in all cases a fixed unit on which the rest of the portions were based. Now we may fairly ask, was this system newly created for the working of a newly invented feudal manor, or was there something of the sort in previous existence even in a village community? Must it not have been a necessary accompaniment to the system of co-cultivation by a co-operative community? We read of hides in Domesday Book, but they are plainly to be taken as fiscal units, of carucates or ploughlands, which also are fiscal units, though it is admitted they must approximate to a certain measure of land. It is not till we come to a 'virgate,' the fourth part of a ploughland, that the human element comes in. A 'virgater' is held to describe the ordinary tenant. A virgate is the basis of what organisation there may have been. From this starting-point we may examine some useful evidence to be gathered from the various Monastic Surveys just mentioned. They reveal, as would be expected at the close of the thirteenth century, a complete manorial organisation of customary services. But there are not a few indications of earlier conditions. Amid a considerable variety of detail one fact stands out with a fair amount of constancy. The unit on which the system of services is based is the 'virgate,' mostly attributed to the customers or higher class of responsible tenants. This may be taken as a survival of Domesday terminology. This unit contains all kinds of variations in

size.¹ Side by side with this unit, or sometimes as a synonym² of it, is another, a Full Land.³ This is mostly used of lands in villenage, and probably means lands which have to bear the full burden of labour. We may fairly set down this term to the manorial system. As a full land describes the same sort of unit as a virgate it equally varies in size. Our present aim is to see how far we can trace it back. To begin with, our 12-acre 'eruing' at Martham is a full land of that manor. As already observed its name is of itself an indication of archaic origin. Its meaning is 'ploughing,' a somewhat indefinite description of some agricultural responsibility. It occurs also on the Abbot of Ramsey's manor of Wimbotsham⁴ in Norfolk. In the time of King Stephen 'Roger cum Barba' held 30½ acres 'viz. 3 aruinges'; for which he did certain services. The men of the vill say that in the time of King Henry [I] these '3 aruings were divided between three men,' each of whom did all the services Roger was doing. This makes the Wimbotsham eruing 10 acres and the services correspond with those of tenants who hold 10-acre tofts on that manor. Thus we find that the organisation of which the holding thus described was an integral part was not new within a generation or two of the Conquest. On the same manor⁵ and others of the same Abbot were tenants holding 'in landsetagio' whose services were very similar to the last named. This word, describing a holding corresponding to the Martham eruing, is found in the manors of the Prior of Norwich at Hindringham⁶ (14 acres) and Hindolveston⁷ (18 acres). This term also

¹ Shipdham, 16 acres (*Claudius C. XI*, fol. 244); Bridgham, 48 acres (fol. 250).

² Shipdham (fol. 244), Derham (fol. 227), etc.

³ Feltwell, 20 acres (fol. 255); Tyington, 80 acres (fol. 183).

⁴ *Ramsey Cartulary*, iii, 285. For this reference I am indebted to Mr. W. J. Corbett, of King's College, Cambridge.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 287; Ringstead, p. 268.

⁶ Stow MS. 936, fol. 7d.

⁷ *Ibid.* fol. 14; Norwich fragment pen: D. and C. of Norwich.

is plainly the Saxon word 'landsaeta,' meaning 'land settler,' and seems to imply the holding of a share of the common land. Amongst many illustrative instances of early manorial organisation, I will confine myself to one manor which is organised with special regularity and also runs on parallel lines with that of Martham. This is the manor of the Bishop of Ely at West Walton¹ in the Norfolk fen district. The tenants begin with a list of Knights and Freeholders with whom we are not concerned. Then come 'Customers and Censuarii'. The first holding held by two tenants conjointly consists of '2 full lands' of 24 acres each. They have to render various services, such as ploughing three days if they have six oxen, two if four, one if two, one-half if one, in winter or in Lent. Then follow eleven others of which four hold one full land each and two brothers hold three full lands. Then come 'workers' (operarii) holding full lands of 24 acres. They owe (*inter alia*) 6 works a week—of these there are fourteen all holding full lands equally. Then we have 'workers holding lands called Toftlands' of 12 acres, of whom there are four holding equally. They do three works weekly. Lastly two 'workers holding lands called Hyllondes' of 6 acres each do 1½ works a week. We may note the fact that the 'full land' organisation embraces customers as well as workers, just as I have suggested that the eruing system at Martham may originally have embraced the socage tenants as well as those in villenage. What adds to the interest of this survey is that this manor was a capital lordship with other subordinate manors attached. The chief of these was the adjoining manor of Walpole² which again introduces us to an archaic word denoting, as I think, something which completes the organisation of Walton. Among the 'Knights and Free Tenants' we find Jacobus de Franceis and Thomas de Northwaude.

¹ Fol. 199, *Claudius C.* XI.

² Fol. 193.

Together they hold half a 'tenmanland, viz. 60 acres'. After the Freeholders come two 'Custumarii et Censuarii' who each hold '1 tenmanland, viz. 120 acres'. The first of these holdings is in the hands of a group; Alan and Mathew, John and Ralph, Peter and Geoffrey de Catestowe and their parceners. The other is held by Peter and Walter sons of William son of Cristiana and their parceners. This term has been explained as perhaps describing a combination of ten tofts, or single holdings, of 12 acres, forming a carucate of 120, and that with eleven others making a Danish hundred of twelve carucates (Vinogradoff, *English Society in the Eleventh Century*, pp. 103 and 281). However this may be, the two Customers hold their 120 acres on the same agricultural services with their ploughs and their oxen as those at Walton. And a division of holdings into ten times 12 acres suits Walton better than Walpole. At Walpole another class of Customers have holdings of 30 acres and 15 acres; the workers hold 'full lands' of 30 acres and the toft lands are of 10 acres. There is no 12-acre holding to fit in with the 'Tenmanland' of 120 as there is at Walton. In any case, if there was a Danish division of a carucate of 120 acres into ten shares of 12 acres we may fairly carry our 12-acre Martham 'eruings' back to Danish times.

There is, of course, some difficulty in discovering what would be the obligation of such a shareholder. We must remember that we are not now speaking (or only partly) of obligation to a lord, but of shareholders in a community. In working their own common lands, whether before or under the manorial systems, each holder of land had to make his contribution towards the common ploughs or the common labour. The most usual method was by supplying oxen. If, as we have seen, a plough in early days in this part of Norfolk worked about 48 acres and the team was one of eight oxen, the holder of an eruing of 12 acres would find two

oxen or a quarter of the team. We have some confirmation of this in the *Ramsey Cartulary* i. 144, where we have a quarter of hydated land containing 12 acres. And in i. 358, 'William Lupus holds 1 quarter and does what pertains to a fourth part of a virgate'. On the Abbot's Manor of Lawshall, Suffolk, forty-four 'Customers' held 'quarteria' of $12\frac{1}{2}$ acres each, the virgate there being 50 acres,¹ and 3 virgates made 1 hide. A similar reckoning would make the Martham "ploughland" 144 acres and the amount held by the 36 freemen 720 acres.

If then it be accepted that we may reasonably trace the Martham manorial workers back through their 'former' predecessors to the first manorialisation of the land in 1101, and so to the pre-existing village community of King Edward's days, we may perhaps do more still. The Martham tenants were living under an organisation based on a unit with a Saxon name, an eriung. I have called the '36 freemen' Anglo-Danish, and if, as seems most probable, they were working in Danish times with this agricultural unit, they must have taken it from the Angle settlers whom they found, and with whom they may have coalesced. It is at least noticable that of the four places where we have found 'eruing' and 'land saetas' three are English 'hams' and the fourth a 'ton'. Martham, Hindringham, Wimbotsham, Hindolveston were pre-Danish settlements, and the Stow Survey 'eruings' at Martham may record the survival of a practice in use four centuries before the compilers drew up their interesting record.

¹ 'Bailiffs Roll of Lawshall' in 1393, by H. W. Saunders (Suffolk Arch. XIV, 117, 8).

APPENDIX.

I. LIST OF TENEMENTS IN THE MANOR OF MARTHAM, NORFOLK, AT SOME DATE PRIOR TO THE FOURTH YEAR OF HENRY DE LAKENHAM, PRIOR OF HOLY TRINITY, NORWICH.

The figures in italics show number of tenants in 1292. S. signifies land held in socage : V. land in villenage : er. portions of an eruing.

1. (11) Hil, Roger de, 10 a. S. 2. (11) Knight, Thomas, 12 a. (V. 1 er.); (3) 3 a. S. = 15 a. 3. (2) Pyne, Richard, 4 a. S. 4. (1) Hisbald, Humfrey, 2 a. S. 5. (12) Stiward, Ywar, 6 a. S. 6. (16) Rede, John le, 12 a. S. 7. (5) Brun, Will., 3 a. S. 8. (10) Sco (Belaghe), Humfrey, 15 a. S.; (4) 1 a. S. purchased; (8) 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er. = 19 a. 9. (10) Blakeman, Yware, 6 a. S. 10. (13) Wluricus, 13 a. S. 11. (16) Ses, Yware de, 10 a. S. 12. (20) Ses, Unbeyn de, 12 a. 2 r. S. 13. (12) Syk, Thos. de, 22 a. 2 r. S. 14. (8) Vosse, Peter, 1 a. S. 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er. = 4 a. 15. (11) Goshey, Will., 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. 16. (4) Keneman, Agnes, 1 a. 2 r. S. 17. (7) Geoffrey, Yware, son of, 12 a. V. 1 er.; (11) 3 a. 2 r. S.; (11) 1 a. S. = 16 a. 2 r. 18. (4) Mome, Roger, 3 a. S. 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er. = 6 a. 19. (1) Buckenham, Rog. de, 1 a. S. 20. (6) Anneys, Will., 18 a. V. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (9) 6 a. S. = 24 a. 21. (2) Arnald, Richard, 2 a. 2 r. S. 22. (2) Stannard, Matilda, 6 a. S. 23. (4) Godyve, John, 4 a. S. 24. (22) Gilberd, Peter, 2 a. S. 12 a. V. 1 er. = 14 a. 25. (4) Pethun, Will, 1 a. S. 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. = 7 a. 26. (16) Fayrman, Bernard, 3 a. S. 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. = 9 a. 27. (7) Hugo, Walter, son of, 3 a. 3 r. S. 3 a. 3 r. V. = 7 a. 2 r. 28. (17) Leve, Will., 3 a. 3 r. S. 3 a. 3 r. V. = 7 a. 2 r. 29. (5) Lom, Thos., 3 a. 3 r. S. 3 a. 3 r. V. = 7 a. 2 r. 30. (9) Bruerio, Joh. de, 3 a. 3 r. S. 3 a. 3 r. V. = 7 a. 2 r. 31. (3) Byl, Stephen, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. 32. (1) Coleman, Matilda, 6 a. S. 33. (5) Yvo, Will., son of, 6 a. S.; 2 a. S. = 8 a. 34. (9) Blaking, Rob. and Elter Rog., 2 a. 2 r. S. 9 a. V. $\frac{3}{4}$ er. = 11 a. 2 r. 35. (3) Harald, Nicholas, 6 a. 2 r. S. 36. (19) Sunnof, Joh., 9 a. S. 37. (4) Chaplain, Will., 2 a. 2 r. S. 38. (7) Gervase, Nich., son of, 3 a. S. 39. (5) Prat, Rob., 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (2) 1 a. S. = 7 a. 40. (9) Hereman, Will., 6 a. S. 41. (10) Erl, Geoffrey, 16 a. S. 42. (5) Cope, Will., 3 a. S. 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. = 9 a. 43. (7) Tusard, Richard, 3 a. S. 44. (10) Spac, Hugo, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (5) 3 a. S. = 9 a. 45. (9) Frome, Gunnilda, 3 a. S. 46. (4) Lestan, Robert, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er.; (2) 1 a. 2 r. S. = 7 a. 2 r. 47. (11) Lestan, [blank], 11 a. 2 r. S. 48. (16) Archer, Will. le, 5 a. 1 r. S.; 1 a. 2 r. S. = 6 a. 3 r. 49. (6) Spac, Roger, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (10) 4 a. S. = 10 a. 50. (8) Gemere, Richard, 8 a. S.; (11) 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (6) 5 a. 2 r. S.; (6) 5 a. 2 r. S.; (6) 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er.; (3) 1 a. S. = 29 a. 51. (6) Orger, Richard, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (9) 9 a. S. = 15 a. 52. (2) Bernard, John, 3 a. 20 p. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er.; (2) 4 a. S. = 7 a. 20 p. 53. (12) Gode, Roger, 12 a. V. 1 er.; (1) 2 r. S. = 12 a. 2 r. 54. (8) Starlyng, Rob. (de terra Swan), 3 a. 3 r. V.; (5) (Same

Swan), 2 a. S. = 5 a. 3 r. 55. (22) Goodrich, Nicholas, 12 a. V. 1 er. 56. (1) Goodrich, Will., 1 a. S. 57. (1) Kylderous, Margaret, 1 a. S. 58. (4) Kylderous, Roger, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. 59. (6) Tusard, Richard, 1 a. S.; (2) 1 a. S.; (2) 2 r. = 2 a. 2 r. 60. (7) Curtman, Rob., 3 a. S. 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er. = 6 a. 61. (2) Orger, Richard, 1 a. S. 62. (8) Atte Pit, Alice, 4 a. S. 63. (2) Bo, Wluina, 2 r. S. 64. (13) Greyve, Ralph le, 11 a. S.; 1 a. S. = 12 a. 65. (8) Robert, John, son of, 14 a. S. 66. (1) Auant, Rog., son of Yware, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (5) 2 a. S. = 8 a. 67. (3) Wymerc, John, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (1) 1 a. S. = 7 a. 68. (4) Pecke, Emma, 1 a. 2 r. S. 69. (9) Longe, Joh. le, 10 a. S. 70. (14) Kinc, John, 11 a. S. 71. (9) Bedel, Richard, 7 a. S. 72. (8) Clerk, Rob. le, 12 a. V. 1 er.; (7) 12 a. S. = 24 a. 73. (6) Mey, Wymarch, 1 a. 2 r. S.; 1 a. 2 r. S. = 3 a. 74. (5) Carpenter, John, 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er.; (1) 1 a. S.; (2) 1 a. 2 r. S. = 5 a. 2 r. 75. (4) Godwyne, Will., son of, 7 a. S. 76. (11) Yware, Rog., son of Stephen, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (3) 7 a. S. = 13 a. 77. (1) Wluan, Adam, 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er.; (11) 10 a. 2 r. S. = 16 a. 2 r. 78. (6) Alexander, Will., 8 a. S. 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{4}$ er. = 11 a. 79. (5) Godknappe, John, 5 a. S. 80. (13) Blaking, Osbert, 12 a. S. 81. (13) Sort, Matilda, 8 a. S. 82. (2) Harding, Humfrey, 1 a. 2 r. S. 83. (12) Matilda, Barth., son of, 3 a. S. 3 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. = 6 a. 84. (5) Ratte, Juliana, 3 a. S. 85. (4) Godwyne and Goda, 3 a. S. 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. = 9 a. 86. (1) Bolle, Roger (Swan), 1 a. 2 r. S. 87. (10) Heyward, Godwyne le, 2 a. S. 6 a. V. $\frac{1}{2}$ er. = 8 a.¹ 88. (17) Hendegord, Rog. and Will. de, 10 a. S. 89. (15) Suthgate, Rog. de, 10 a. S. 90. (1) Marue, Richard, 1 a. S. 91. (2) Hare, Edric, 1 a. S. 92. (3) Smith, Godwyne the, 6 a. S. 93. (4) Steward, Roger the, 10 a. S. 94. (9) Seward, Joh. and Osbert, 5 a. S. 95. (4) Hubert, Robert, 7 a. S. 96. (3) Hemesby, Amable de, 3 r. S. 97. (9) Hubert, Humfrey, 12 a. V. 1 er.; (3) 2 a. S. = 14 a. 98. (14) Dekene, Joh. le, 16 a. S. 99. (8) Haringby, Will. de, 8 a. S. (for homage and service).² 100. (1) Prior of Norwich, 1 a. S. (exchange).³ 101. (1) Blakeman, Roger, 3 r. S. 102. (4) Chaplain, Godfrey, the, 4 a. S. 103. (15) Tucke, Wymarcha, 6 a. S. 104. (7) Cruchestoft, 4 a. S. Steward, Roger the, 1 abuttal. Martham, Warin de, 1 abuttal. Goneton, Math. de, 1 meadow (now Prior). Prior of Norwich will give 10s. called Hornsylver to the census of Martham. 105. (5) Dulle, Matilda, 1 a. 2 r. V. $\frac{1}{8}$ er. 106. (5) Stocklondgore, 2 a. S. 107. (1) Hil, Joh. de, and Keneman, Joh., 1 a. 2 r. S.

2. "FORMER" TENEMENTS OF THE ABOVE MANOR AS SUB-DIVIDED IN 1292.

1. Hil, Roger de, Mulelond—formerly 10 acres, now 11 Tenants. Hil, Rob. de Sen., 1 a. 1 r. 23 p. 6 ft. Hil, Joh. de, 1 a. 1 r. 23 p. 6 ft. Hil, Rob. de, 1 a. 1 r. 33 p. 6 ft. Harding, Adam, 10 p. Stannard, Eustace, 2 a. 1 r. Atte-welle, Joh., 3 r. Alexander, Beatrix, 2 r. Sco, Geoffr. de, 2 r. 10 p. Sco, Robert de, 2 r. 10 p. Sco, Simon, son of Will. de, 2 r. 10 p. Sco, Jas., son of Will. de, 2 r. 10 p.

2. Knight, Thos., Villenage, formerly 12 acres, now 12 Tenants. Knight, Mathew, 3 a. 2 r. Knight, John, 1 a. 3 r. Knight, Andrew, 1 a. 3 r. Anneys,

¹ Here are entered one tenant of a meadow paying 4d. of census and four tenants of cottages paying of census 1 goose, 1d., $\frac{1}{2}$ d., 1 hen.

² No customs are entered.

³ Customs, boons, etc., entered.

Will., 1 a. Knight, Beatrix, 1 a. Aleyn, Rob., 1 r. Wuc, Rob., 2 r. Balle, Hugo, 2 r. Mercator, Rob., son of Rob., 1 a. Folpe, Will., 1 r. 20 p. Godrich, Will., 1 r. 20 p. Also same Knight, Thos., Socage, 4 acres, now 3 Tenants. Knit, Mathew, 2 a. Knit, John, 1 a. Knit, Andrew, 1 a.

8. Sco, Humfrey de, Socage, 15 acres, now 10 Tenants. Belaghe, Alex. de, 3 a. 1 r. 30 p. Belaghe, Jas. de, 3 a. 1 r. 30 p. Sco, Rob. de, 3 a. 20 p. Cock, Rob., 1 r. Sco, Geoffr. de, 2 r. 37 p. 9 ft. Sco, Rob., son of Will. de, 2 r. 37 p. 9 ft. Sco, Simon de, 2 r. 37 p. 9 ft. Sco, Jas., son of Will. de, 2 r. 37 p. 9 ft. Alexander, Beatrix, 2 r. Godknappe, Thomas, 1 a. 1 r. Same Belaghe, Humfrey de (Mulelond acquired), 1 acre, now 3 Tenants. Sco, Alex. de, 1 r. 36 p. Sco, Jas. de, 38 p. Sco, Geoffr. de, 38 p. Syk, Will., 8 p. Same Humfrey, Villenage, 3 acres now 8 Tenants. Belaghe, Alex. de, 3 r. Belaghe, Jas. de, 3 r. Sco, Rob. de, 1 r. 20 p. Koc, Rob., 30 p. Dane, Will., 30 p. Sco, Geoffr., son of Will. de, 30 p. Sco, Simon de, 30 p. Sco, Jas., son of Will. de, 30 p.

17. Geoffrey, Yware, son of, Villenage, 12 acres. Mulelond, $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres + 1, now 18 Tenants. Grundolf, Rob., 3 a. Grundolf, Beatr., 1 a. Grundolf, Gunild, 1 a. Grundolf, Marg., 1 a. Mercator, Rog., 2 a. Mercator, Ric., 2 a. Mercator, Hub., 2 a. Socage: Grundolf, Rob., 1 a. 2 r. 30 p. Godrich, Thos., 2 r. Harding, Adam, 1 r. Grundolf, Gundild, 37 p. Grundolf, Beatr., 37 p. Grundolf, Marg., 37 p. Chapman, Rich., 2 r. 6 p. Hardyng, Will., 1 r. Chapman, Hubert, 1 r. Carpenter, Rob., 30 p. Chapman, Roger, 23 p.

27. Hugo, Walter, son of, Villenage, $3\frac{1}{2}$ a. 1 r. Mulelond, $3\frac{1}{2}$ a. 1 r., now 7 Tenants. Walter, Roger, 5 a. 3 r. 20 p. Knit, John, 1 r. Geg, Robert, 2 r. Bil, Richard, 1 r. Harold, Cecilia, 1 r. Martham, Rob. de, 1 r. 20 p. Suthgate, Joh. de, 1 r. 28. Leve, Will., Villenage, $3\frac{1}{2}$ a. 1 r. Mulelond, $3\frac{1}{2}$ a. 1 r., now 17 Tenants. Leve, Will., 1 r. 20 p. Yware, Will., 1 r. 8 p. Walter, Roger, 3 r. 20 p. Stannard, Rob., 3 r. Bonom, Will., 1 a. Syk, Rob. de, 1 r. 5 p. Sutere, Will., 2 r. Wry, Joh., 2 r. Humfrey, Math., 2 r. Okle, Hen. de, 1 r. Godwyne, Roger, 1 r. Bil, Richard, 2 r. Knit, John, 1 r. Martham, Rob. de, 1 r. 2 p. Stannard, Eustace, 1 r. Chapman, Rich., 1 r. 29. Lom, Thos., Villenage, $3\frac{1}{2}$ a. 3 1 r. Mulelond, $3\frac{1}{2}$ 1 r., now 5 Tenants. Lom, Thos. 3 a. 2 r. Auant, Joh. 2 a. 1 r. Holbue, Thos., 1 r. Cok, Simon, 1 r. Brunston, Geoffr., 1 a. 1 r. 30. Bruerio, Joh. de, Villenage, $3\frac{1}{2}$ a. 1 r. Mulelond, $3\frac{1}{2}$ a. 1 r., now 9 Tenants. Cheplain, Laur., 2 a. 3 r. 4 p. Heye, Joh. de, 2 a. 24 p. Sutere, Alice, 1 r. Longe, Alice la, 2 r. 13 p. 6 ft. Longe, Marg. la, 1 r. 13 p. 6 ft. Longe, Isab. la, 1 r. 13 p. 6 ft. Elsy, Laurence, 1 r. 12 p. Pethun, Will., 30 p. Okle, Hen. de, 1 r. 20 p.

3. TENANTS OF TURBARIES IN SUTHFEN.

Elsy, heirs of, and of Longe, Nich., 1 a. Arnald, Hubt., and Trotting, Ad., 1 a. 2 r. Berte, Nich., and Herbert, Will., 2 r. Godrich, Will., Tusard, Will., Produm, Rog., Keymund, Joh., 3 a. Bolle, Rog., Lom, Thos., 1 a. Galle, Richard, 2 r. Roger, Rob., son of, 2 r. Scorth, Nich., 2 r. Gode, Roger, heirs of, 1 a. Produm, Ralph, 1 a. 2 r. Gemere, Joh. with his fellows, 1 a. Stug, Thos. and his fellows, 2 r. Dekene, Rob., 1 a. Hervy, Alexander, 1 a. Orger, Rob. and Ric., 1 a. Bernard, Nicholas and Roger, 1 a. Elsy and Longe, Nich., heirs of, 1 a. Gele, Adam, heirs of, 2 r. Maybel, Osbert, 2 r. Walter,

Rog., Leveve, Will., 2 r. John and Thos. [sic.], 1 a. Galle, Richard and Nich., 2 r. Fleg, Joh. de and bros., 1 a. Long, Elsy, heirs of, and Suthgate, Rog. de, 1 a. Auant, Roger, 1 a. Kine, Alice, heirs of, 1 a. 2 r. Hendegord, Elsy de, and Tvylyng, Joh., heirs of, 1 a. 2 r. Unbeyn, heirs of, 1 a. Byl, Stephen, heirs of, 1 a. Alexander, Geoffr. and bros., 3 r. Curtman, heirs of, 2 r. Orger, Rob., Kint, Joh., heirs of, 3 a. Gemere, Joh. and his fellows, 4 a. Total, 36 a. 3 r. = 73 half acres 1 r. Rent $\frac{1}{2}$ d. for $\frac{1}{2}$ acre.