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ABSTRACT

Change and Decay: The Warwickshire Manors of the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield from the Late Thirteenth to the Late Sixteenth Centuries

Penelope Jayne George Upton

This thesis consists of an in-depth study of the medieval Warwickshire manors of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield: Chadshunt and Nether Itchington which succumbed to depopulation and Gaydon, Upper Itchington and Tachbrook which continue to thrive. Chapter 2 sets the scene with an examination of the early history of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield; and the topographical setting and field system of each manor. In Chapters 3 and 4 evidence of weaknesses and incipient problems or otherwise in both the rural economy and social structure in the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries is investigated in order to find early signs of the later problems which beset Chadshunt and Nether Itchington. In Chapter 5 agrarian by-laws are discussed and the transition from a two- to a three-field system at Gaydon, peasant cultivation of crops and ownership of livestock analysed. In Chapter 6 the final century of episcopal lordship is explored, before moving on to Thomas Fisher's tenure as lord from 1547. Fisher has long been viewed as the depopulator of Nether Itchington and demolisher of its parish church. The blame is moved from his shoulders and laid on a decline in ale-brewing, a lack of heirs at Nether Itchington from 1550s, a seigneurial policy whereby tenants were encouraged by very favourable terms to take up holdings in Upper Itchington, and the turbulence caused by the Reformation. Fisher was also not responsible for the decline of Chadshunt, the seeds of whose decline were probably sown by the Newsam family and their enclosing activities. In Chapter 7 non-agrarian by-laws, land transfers, the landless, population turnover and contacts made beyond the manor are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

One very noticeable feature in counties like Warwickshire is the mile after mile of open-field emptiness where bustling communities once lay. This phenomenon was brought sharply to the fore many centuries ago by John Rous, a chantry priest in Warwick, although serious academic study of depopulation and desertion did not really take off until Maurice Beresford and W.G. Hoskins began, independently of each other, their research in post-war Warwickshire and Leicestershire respectively. It became clear in Beresford's early research that virtually no desertions were caused directly by the Black Death and that human decision-making should be emphasized and theories based on the deterioration in soils or worsening climate firmly rejected.\(^1\)


\(^2\) C. Dyer, *The Lost Villages of England, 1954-1998*, in M. Beresford, *The Lost Villages of England* (Stroud, 1998), pp. xvi, xviii. Dyer's very detailed overview of the last fifty years of DMV research renders it unnecessary to do the same here. In the same chapter (p. xiv) he acknowledges that 'the term DMV...has become shorthand for any physical remains of an abandoned settlement, regardless
Beresford's work was in due turn revised by R.H. Hilton, who was 'concerned to shift the explanation for deserted villages away from avaricious individuals towards the overall social and economic troubles in the later middle ages'. Furthermore, as C. Dyer noted, some Marxist historians were not attracted by Beresford's empiricism and use of unwritten evidence, preferring to draw on the works of R.H. Tawney. And 'where Beresford put the emphasis on the lords and outsiders in transforming villages, there is now more concern for internal changes among the peasantry'.

Indeed Tawney observed how by the middle of the sixteenth century a 'consolidation of several holdings or parts of holdings, into fewer and larger tenancies' had become apparent and took the view that the cause of this phenomenon was the edging out of small-scale peasant farmers by greedy lords. Clearly, taken to its extreme, we would expect such action to lead to the wholesale depopulation of settlements. In a robust counterblast to Tawney, E. Kerridge was convinced that desertion was often exaggerated and that many places which appeared at first sight to have been deserted were not so.

Notwithstanding Kerridge's comprehensive dismissal of Tawney's arguments, many historians remain convinced that the later middle ages was a period which 'saw the expropriation of the peasantry by capitalist-minded gentry'. At the vanguard of this debate stands R. Brenner. As M.M. Postan and J. Hatcher noted nearly two decades ago:

'The essentials of Robert Brenner's argument have been put forward many times before by a long and distinguished line of proponents. The counter-argument is also securely placed in historiography.'

Moreover, it has been claimed that 'Brenner's thesis harbours a number of widespread misconceptions'. Nevertheless, the arguments for and against (mostly

---

of its original size and function, or of its date of occupation and desertion'; see also M.W. Beresford, 'A review of historical research (to 1968)', in M.W. Beresford and J.G. Hurst, eds, Deserted Medieval Villages (Woking, 1971), pp. 3-75.


8 M.M. Postan and J. Hatcher, 'Population and class relations in feudal society', in T.H. Aston and
against) Brenner continue. M. Overton, for example, was clear that there was little supporting evidence for Brenner’s view that agrarian capitalism developed in England through the rise of “landlord-large tenant relations”...relations [which] were brought into place through landlords forcing out small farmers and creating tenancies and large farms through coercion and class power.\(^9\)

According to J. Whittle, Brenner asserted ‘that the key processes in the development of agrarian capitalism were the dissolution of serfdom and the expropriation of the rural population from the land.”\(^10\) And Whittle has indeed been able to prove conclusively that, in fact, peasants expropriated each other through the land market. As Dyer remarked:

‘The main contribution of [Whittle’s] book to the debate on the growth of capitalism is its robust refutation of the central plank of Brenner’s thesis, that the key development of the period was the expropriation of the peasantry by an acquisitive aristocracy. The peasants are now firmly identified as the agents of change, and the debate can move on.’\(^11\)

For those continuing to favour what we may call the ‘expropriation of the peasantry by manorial lords’ line of argument, ‘enclosure has been a favourite culprit in the disappearance of the English peasantry’, enclosure being ’the oldest explanation for the destruction of the English peasantry.’\(^12\) In a major contribution to this debate, R.C. Allen identified three types of enclosure.\(^13\) Firstly,

‘the eviction model of enclosure. According to this view, enclosures were effected by manorial lords who evicted their tenants (all peasant farmers), converted the land to pasture, and operated it as a large capitalist enterprise. The village was deserted as the population left.’

---

Thus, according to this model, 'enclosure was the prime mover that destroyed the peasantry'. Allen argues that 'early enclosures often did, indeed, eliminate peasant agriculture and concentrate the ownership of property in the hands of manorial lords' and points out that 'the work of Hoskins and Beresford on deserted villages suggests that fifteenth- and sixteenth-century enclosures led to depopulated villages.' But how many were thus affected is a moot point. Secondly, there were abandonment enclosures. Allen reminds us of the ways in which both Hilton and Dyer successfully countered the traditional view that enclosure between 1450 and 1525 resulted in deserted villages because 'those enclosures were effected by manorial lords evicting their tenants and converting the open fields to grass'. They conclusively demonstrated that

'depopulation preceded enclosure: as a result of the mid-fourteenth-century population decline, settlement in marginal grain-growing areas was abandoned as their inhabitants drifted to more productive farming districts and took up vacant tenements. The abandoned farm land reverted to rough pasture, passed into the hands of the manorial lord, and became ipso facto enclosed.'

Thirdly, according to Allen there were 'enclosures that did not result in depopulation at all'.

Without doubt, not only enclosure but also the closely-linked issue of engrossing provoked animated discussion in sixteenth century England. In many instances when some tenants left the village those remaining could engross holdings when land was cheap or left vacant. In other instances, as M. Spufford observed was the case in Chippenham (Cambs.), by the middle of the sixteenth century the 'old middle rank of the peasantry with subsistence had almost disappeared' as not only was the lord actively buying out copyholders but 'much more tellingly, the tenants of medium-sized holdings...also fell victim to the actions of their more successful engrossing peers.'

---

17 M. Spufford, Contrasting Communities English Villagers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 66, 75-76.
It is now accepted that 'English villages, as well as falling victims to acquisitive landowners, were abandoned because they were adversely affected by long-term changes in land-use, population and social structure that were widespread in the medieval countryside', processes which began in the early fourteenth century. Often settlements were deserted despite the lord's best efforts. And occasionally desertion proved to be simply a phase in a settlement's history, as many once-shrunken villages have grown again in modern times. The modern county of Warwickshire is currently enduring an ever burgeoning programme of house building, to the extent that even new 'rural villages' are springing up, begging the question: 'Why consume what pockets remain of rural Warwickshire while so much of Birmingham lies derelict?' One bold example is 'Warwick Gates' which seems to have grown overnight at Heathcote, thus filling in the gap which once lay between Whitnash and Leamington Spa. And yet there is a paradox. Warwickshire is a county well known for its high number of DMVs but nobody has yet suggested reviving any of them.

In the remainder of this chapter I intend to explain why I have chosen to study the Warwickshire manors of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield - Tachbrook and Gaydon, thriving in the modern landscape, Chadshunt, a shadow of its medieval self and Itchington, once two settlements of which Upper Itchington is now Bishops Itchington and Nether Itchington just an open emptiness. I shall also describe the wide range of sources, give a chapter by chapter synopsis and define the questions to be addressed and hypotheses to be questioned in the thesis.

**Reasons for choice of manors**

The original intention of this thesis was to take Beresford's lists of Warwickshire DMVs and to explore and explain systematically the demise of each settlement,

---

18 Dyer, 'Deserted medieval villages', pp. 27, 30.
19 Dyer, p. 37.
having been inspired by reading Beresford's *Lost Villages of England*. Within a matter of weeks and following consultation with Professor Christopher Dyer (then still at the University of Birmingham) I realized that the task was far too great and the sources far too scattered to be encompassed into one study. I was encouraged, therefore, to scale down geographically my remit and, after much dipping into *VCH Warwickshire* and several visits to local repositories, I saw potential in studying a small group of contiguous manors under common lordship, all of which at some point suffered either shrinkage or total depopulation. Furthermore, I tend to agree with Bond's views that the 'most profitable line of research...[lies in]...detailed surveys of individual parishes and small areas' and 'the way ahead clearly lies in multidisciplinary topographical microstudies'. Of course we are familiar with the objection to local or single case studies, that too much information 'makes for painful reading without making generalizations any easier to form.' And yet surely exceptionally detailed data can and do provide the opportunity to test general ideas. Moreover, the cause of many desertions continues to be an open question, as does the part played by landlords, and this 'can only be resolved by detailed study of particular cases'. Once local details have been understood 'comparisons can be made with studies of

22 Beresford, 'The deserted villages of Warwickshire', pp. 86-105; M.W. Beresford, *The Lost Villages of England* (London, 1954), pp. 388-389; Beresford and Hurst, *Deserted Medieval Villages*, pp. 204-206. The fact that *Lost Villages* has once more been reprinted demonstrates clearly the way in which it has been of enormous long-term significance as a general inspiration to its many readers, and as the starting point for so much new work.' see Dyer, 'The Lost Villages of England', p. xxiv. 23 Bond reached the same conclusion after attempting a similar study in the 1970s although Dyer himself has published his own research into deserted villages in the west midlands: Dyer, 'Deserted medieval villages', pp. 27-45.


other localities, and overriding trends can be differentiated from local peculiarities.\textsuperscript{28}

Indeed if we can add to our understanding of changes in landscape and society in one village we can throw light on parallel developments over a much wider area.\textsuperscript{29}

Although medieval Warwickshire is a much studied county, very little has been written on the manors of Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon, held by the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield until 1547, despite having by Warwickshire standards not only an excellent run of court rolls, but also much other surviving documentation from the eleventh century onwards.\textsuperscript{30} Indeed, from both an ecclesiastical and a secular viewpoint, the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield has

\begin{footnotes}


\textsuperscript{30} Tachbrook is broadly the modern Bishops Tachbrook but in this thesis includes the lost settlement of Naspes and excludes Tachbrook Mallory which was a separate vill in the middle ages. Itchington is rather more than the modern Bishops Itchington, as in the middle ages it comprised of Upper and Nether Itchington. Chadshunt and Gaydon are broadly the same today in geographical terms as they were in the middle ages. As noted by Bond, 'Chadshunt...has dwindled to an insignificant hamlet' but remained a significant omission from Beresford's lists: see Bond, 'Deserted medieval villages in Warwickshire', p. 87, see also C. Dyer, 'Chadshunt', MSRG Annual Report 1 (1986), p. 27, for the comment that 'the deserted village site at Chadshunt (SP 349529) [is] a new site in Warwickshire in spite of this being a much-studied county' and C. Dyer, 'Chadshunt', MSRG Annual Report 4 (1989), p. 34, for the observation that Chadshunt 'lies on the dividing line between "deserted" and "shrunken" villages.' The Warwickshire section of Razi and Smith's \textit{Medieval Society} is surprisingly limited, even excluding those manors belonging to the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, for which there is a wealth of material for the fourteenth century, the century on which the Appendix was meant to be focused: see J. Cripps, R.H. Hilton, J. Williamson, 'Appendix A survey of medieval manorial court rolls', in Z. Razi and R.M. Smith, eds, \textit{Medieval Society and the Manor Court} (Oxford, 1996), pp. 630-631. There exists only one known printed acknowledgement of the abundance of evidence for the bishop's Warwickshire manors: C. Dyer and C.J. Bond, \textit{Compton Murdak Deserted Medieval Settlement and its Historical and Archaeological Context} (unpubl. typescript, 1994), section 4.1. Indeed in the Sites and Monuments Record for Tachbrook the lost settlement of Naspes is dismissed as having 'documentary evidence inferior in quantity' which is patently not true: SMR no Wa 734, quoting \textit{MVRG}, 6, p. 3 (1958). For one other study of the bishop's manors see E.B. Fryde, 'The tenants of the bishops of Coventry and Lichfield and of Worcester after the Plague of 1348-9', in R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post, eds, \textit{Medieval Legal Records Edited in Memory of C.A.F. Meekings} (London, 1978), pp. 224-266, where he confines his research to the Hundred Rolls of 1279 and two vacancy accounts of 1321/2 and 1358-60. The bishop also held Stivichall, now a suburb of Coventry, but has been excluded from this thesis: firstly, because its sources, although rich, are quite different from those for the other manors and, secondly, because from the mid-thirteenth century until the end of the sixteenth century as a result of subinfeudation the bishop had very little direct interest in or control over this manor.
\end{footnotes}
remained until very recently singularly under-studied.\footnote{R. Swanson, ‘Episcopal visitation of religious houses in the diocese of Lichfield in the early fourteenth century’, Studia Monastica 29 (1987), p. 94.} One possible reason for this oversight, and for the oversight of other local historians, is the fact that the surviving material for the Bishop’s manors has haphazardly found its way into several repositories and has been catalogued as though each deposit related to one manor alone and not as a fragmentary part of a much larger estate. To this end the reader may well ask why I have not undertaken a study of the bishop’s entire estate, as many others have done, for example, Dyer on Worcester. To have done so would have been logistically and practically even more difficult than attempting a county-wide study of DMVs because the bishop’s estate was not only scattered across five counties but the assorted sources are highly varied in type and survival rate, and dispersed across the country.\footnote{The counties are Warwickshire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Shropshire and Staffordshire. The bishop also held the manor of Towyn in north Wales: see P. Heath, ‘The medieval Church’, in M.W. Greenslade, ed., VCH Staffordshire, 3 (London, 1970), pp. 15-16.}

\textbf{Sources}

To probe the impact of catastrophic events from earlier times, such as the Black Death, the historian has to rely on the witness of the written word, which in itself throws up two formidable obstacles: firstly, ‘the haphazard inheritance of records’; and secondly, as many of those records were compiled with the interests of either the state or, more locally, the lord of the manor in mind, ‘we [have to] see the rest of..."
society through their eyes'. The challenge presented by that haphazard inheritance can certainly be quelled to a great extent by drawing on 'a full range of disciplines, using every type of evidence.' In writing this thesis I have endeavoured to do just that and I shall now describe the wide range of evidence which I have called upon.

Unearthing the whereabouts of the court rolls and account rolls of Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon was particularly difficult, scattered as they are in several record offices. Furthermore, in some repositories many of the relevant documents were uncatalogued, and the dating of others was erratic and sometimes incorrect, for example, virtually all the late thirteenth-century and early fourteenth-century account rolls deposited at LJRO (Table 1.1). These were originally catalogued in the early 1880s when they were still in the archives of Lichfield Cathedral by the Rev. Dr J.C. Cox, who in his time made an enormous and lasting contribution to local history. Unfortunately, he seems to have been unaware of how to interpret the regnal style with which virtually all manorial documents open. One example should suffice to explain his errors. The account roll catalogued by Cox as

34 Dyer, 'Rural settlements', p. 130. Dyer, himself, has sometimes been compelled to 'argue, via some dangerous and sometimes speculative counting'; C. Dyer, 'How urbanized was medieval England?', in J-M Duvosquel and E. Thoen, eds, Peasants and Townsmen in Medieval Europe Studia in Honorem Adriaan Verhulst (Ghent, 1995), p. 169; and to be content with skeletal results because of the patchy preservation of documents: C. Dyer, Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society The Estates of the Bishopric of Worcester, 680-1540 (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 3, 5. Indeed very few historians of medieval rural society have been as blessed as either Razi in his study of Halesowen (Worcs.) or the countless students of the manors of the bishopric of Winchester: Z. Razi, Life, Marriage and Death in a Medieval Parish Economy, Society and Demography in Halesowen 1270-1400 (Cambridge, 1980).
35 The court rolls and account rolls are dispersed between Birmingham Reference Library, the Bodleian Library (Oxford), the British Library (London), Cheshire Record Office (Chester), Lichfield Joint Record Office, the Public Record Office (London), Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Records Office (Stratford-upon-Avon), Staffordshire Record Office (Stafford), and William Salt Library (Stafford), all of which have been visited as medieval manorial documents do not lend themselves easily to being photocopied; see the Bibliography for full references. Had I relied solely on the data in the Manorial Documents Register I would only have discovered a fraction of this material.
36 J.C. Cox, ed., Catalogue of the Muniments and Manuscript Books Pertaining to the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield Cathedral, Collections for a History of Staffordshire William Salt Archaeological Society 6 part 2 (Stafford, 1886), pp. 34-36. R.L. Poole is rather harsh in his judgment that Cox's work suffered 'from an imperfect acquaintance with ecclesiastical, historical and legal terms', particularly as Poole (after Cox) also misdated his sole example of an account roll from the collection (N12) because of his own imperfect acquaintance with regnal styles: R.L. Poole, 'The muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield', in Historical Manuscripts Commission Appendix to the 14th Report part 8 (London, 1895), pp. 205-206, 230.
Table 1.1 Suggested dating of LJRO account rolls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>manor</th>
<th>Cox's reference</th>
<th>Cox's date</th>
<th>LJRO reference</th>
<th>suggested revised date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkswich N1</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>D 30/11/81 (1279)</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkswich N2</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>D 30/11/82 (1281)</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkswich N3</td>
<td>t. Ed I</td>
<td>D 30/11/83 (t. Ed I)</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock N5</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>D 30/11/85 (1282)</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt N6</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>D 30/11/102 (1307)</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington N7</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>D 30/11/99 (1276)</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington N8</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>D 30/11/100 (1277)</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington N9</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>D 30/11/101 (1307)</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannock N10</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>D 30/11/84 (1275)</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield N12</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>D 30/11/79 (1275)</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichfield N13</td>
<td>undated</td>
<td>D 30/11/80 (1279)</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longdon N14 [*N15]</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>D 30/11/86 (1284)</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugeley N15 [*N16]</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>D 30/11/87 (1277)</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugeley N16 [*N17]</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>D 30/11/88 (1280)</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarvin N19 [*N20]</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>D 30/11/91 (1275)</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarvin etc. N27</td>
<td>1299-1305</td>
<td>D 30/11/93 (1299-1305)</td>
<td>1299-1305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N7 is for Itchington. It runs from Michaelmas of the third year of Edward to Michaelmas of the fourth year, the regnal style being *regnis regis Edwardi*. Cox, understandably, assumed that this referred to Edward I but miscalculated that as Edward ascended the throne in 1272 that Michaelmas of the third year of Edward began in 1274, overlooking the fact that Edward’s reign began on 20 November. The more familiar I became with this account roll the more puzzled I became. For example, none of the manorial officials or tenants mentioned in *N7* appeared in the Hundred Rolls only five years later. The light dawned in dramatic fashion on reading a paper written by Dr David Postles. The account roll *N7* was in fact from the early years of Edward II’s reign (1309-10), whose correct regnal style is *regnis regis Edwardi filii regis Edwardi* but occasionally appears as *regnis regis Edwardi*. The

---

37 The date refers to the Michaelmas in which the account was drawn up in accordance with Titow’s argument so that, for example, 1307 covers Michaelmas 1306 to Michaelmas 1307. Not all historians have adhered to this practice: see J.Z. Titow, *English Rural Society 1200-1350*, (London, 1969), pp. 27-29.
38 D. Postles, ‘The perception of profit before the leasing of demesnes’, *AgHR* 34 (1986), p. 25 gives the correct dates for the LJRO account rolls with one exception: *N9* should be dated 1306-7.
39 Ex. inf. David Postles who explained to me that Jane Hampartumian neé Isaac, late archivist at
account rolls in question should therefore be dated as in Table 1.1. Even though the account rolls are not prolific in quantity and, more importantly, are mostly non-consecutive, the information which they provide is still of not inconsiderable use. They give important data (albeit a snapshot) on tenant numbers, servile works, field systems, rotation and types of crops, numbers and types of livestock, and overall manorial revenue.  

The discontinuities in the sources for this study and the methods employed to overcome them need to be explained. The information from the account rolls just mentioned will be used firmly in the context of other documents such as the Hundred Rolls of 1279 and a very detailed survey of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield’s entire estate drawn up in 1298, and - looking forwards - with some early- and mid-

---

Lichfield Joint Record Office, realized in the mid-1970s that Cox’s dating was incorrect: see J. Isaac, ‘Two medieval accounts for the town of Lichfield’, South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society 18 (1976/77), pp. 59-67. Unfortunately, her untimely death meant that her extensive recataloguing of Cox’s work remained unfinished and out of sight. Happily, that lengthy task has now been taken on by Martin Sanders, the present archivist at Lichfield.

fourteenth century extents. From the latter period an excellent run of court rolls survives, from 1349 to 1367, after which the evidence is very patchy until the mid-fifteenth century, and increasingly prolific from then until 1582. There are also nearly two dozen account rolls dating from 1448 to 1542. Although the information in them is for the most part fossilized, as several sections were copied verbatim year after year, nevertheless, judging from the experience of other historians, some information can be obtained from them.

The manorial evidence will be bolstered by a wide variety of original sources (many

---

41 T. John, ed., The Warwickshire Hundred Rolls of 1279-80 Stoneleigh and Kineton Hundreds (Oxford, 1992); SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268. For a general critique of the Hundred Rolls see particularly E.A. Kosminsky, 'The Hundred Rolls of 1279-80 as a source for English agrarian history', ECHR 3 (1931), pp. 16-44 and M. Postan, 'The manor in the Hundred Rolls', ECHR 2nd ser. 3 (1950), pp. 119-125. The 1298 extent has been acknowledged to be a document of great interest, deserving of great consideration, but surprisingly little used by historians: see Hughes, 'The episcopate of Walter Langton', p. 295. In fact Fryde, unaware of its survival, lamented its loss: see Fryde, 'The tenants of the bishops of Coventry and Lichfield', p. 226 n. 24. Indeed he also thought that two other extents were lost and completely ignored the excellent series of court rolls for Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon. Apart from that, his paper is riddled with inconsistencies and errors. For example, he claims that plague did not make lords more charitable while simultaneously noting that far-reaching concessions were made to the bishop's tenants in Staffordshire in the aftermath of the Black Death. He claims that in two particular extents there is no evidence of tenants but nevertheless is still able to say how many tenants there were on each manor and how much land they held. Whenever a Warwickshire manor is referred to VCH Staffordshire consistently appears as the footnote reference. Roger Northborough's episcopacy in one place is dated as 1322-1358 and in another as 1322-1348. He also fails to understand that when the demesne arable in an account roll is said to be, say, 150 acres, that only half the demesne is being described (in a two field system) because the other half is fallow. Thus his total figure, for example, of 170 acres of demesne at Tachbrook should actually be read as 340 acres. In other respects his arithmetic is also either eccentric or plainly incorrect: see Fryde, pp. 226, 228, 232, 233, 256. He missed the opportunity to correct any of these errors in a condensed reproduction which appears in Fryde, Peasants and Landlords, pp. 62-63. The index to that book refers to Roger Northborough as bishop of Worcester (recte Coventry and Lichfield), and readers interested in Itchington are referred to p. 637, in a book of 371 pages. One survey which is definitely lost is the one drawn up in 1285, probably in response to the Quo Warranto proceedings. This survey was incorporated into a cartulary-type document which became known as the Liber Niger, still extant in the late sixteenth century: see SBTRO, DR 10/2430, 2516 and part of which appears as a transcript in the Fisher Cartulary at SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15. In the seventeenth century Elias Ashmole, the Lichfield-born antiquary, had access to the Liber Niger which somehow had fallen into the possession of one John Hill, the book being described as quondam Epa Coven et Lichf. Clearly the book, which contained episcopal surveys and accounts spanning more than two centuries, had been 'removed' from the Cathedral Archives and is no longer extant. Ashmole's extracts from the book are now in the Bodleian Library, Ashm MSS 864. At least two other Black Books are still in existence: (i) LJRO, D 30/2/1/3, being a volume of Chapter Acts dated 1490-1523 and (ii) T. Hearne, ed., Liber Niger Scaccarii (London, 1774), consisting mainly of mid twelfth-century charters: see R.W. Eyton, ed., The Liber Niger Scaccarii or the Black Book of the Exchequer (AD 1166) Collections for a History of Staffordshire William Salt Archaeological Society 1 (Stafford, 1880).

documents in fact so covered in grime and dust that they clearly have not been examined for decades if not centuries). Warwickshire historians are fortunate in having a wealth of family collections at their disposal, a number of which have provided crucial information for this thesis, particularly the Archer and Gregory-Hood collections at SBTRO and the Landor collection at the WCRO. Because of the complex ecclesiastical and legal situation which obtained in Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon (being peculiar jurisdictions) barely a score of pre-1600 probate wills survives from those places hence it has been necessary to bolster this aspect of research by looking at the wills of testators from neighbouring parishes. Parish registers have proved particularly useful for comparing with court roll evidence to analyse, for example, evidence of the landless. The archives of the Dean and Chapter at Lichfield (still in the process of being catalogued) have been thoroughly delved into, particularly the Act Books and visitation records. Finally, following a chance remark made by Richard Hoyle (when giving a paper in the Department of English Local History), who wondered why manorial historians tended to ignore national records, I set out to explore the many classes of original and unpublished records at the PRO, and was rewarded by a yield of priceless information in documents surviving from Chancery Proceedings, the Court of Requests, and the Star Chamber.

Although nothing can make up for the incomplete survival of documents and the resultant discontinuities in the evidence, nevertheless it is essential in the study of the process of desertion to use whatever evidence has chanced to survive in order to take a long view, from a period of prosperity through the course of decline, depopulation and up to ultimate desertion. The long chronological perspective of the thesis is important because in many to-be-deserted villages decline in cultivation is visible as early as the 1320s with the first important stage of desertion becoming apparent in the late fourteenth century, to which lords reacted by lowering rents and entry fines and attempting to keep buildings in good repair and evicting tenants only as a last resort. Given that ‘to find out what went on in the sixteenth-century

---

countryside we shall do better, perhaps, to turn back to the thirteenth century for enlightenment', I have embarked on a study which uncompromisingly straddles the late medieval/early modern divide but am in good company in this respect. No study on the medieval landscape, deserted or otherwise, can stand up without either fieldwork or the use of maps, both extensively studied as part of my research.

Synopsis of chapters

The aims of each chapter are as follows. Chapter 2 sets the scene for the thesis in historical and topographical terms. Firstly, the early history of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield in relation to Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon is outlined; secondly, each manor is analysed in the context of the pays of Warwickshire; thirdly, the field system of each is explored and explained. The topographical context is crucial because Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon (the first two suffering a great deal of shrinkage before the modern period) will be placed firmly on the wolds of eastern Warwickshire, where it is possible to discern something of a shoreline of abandoned villages on the wold edge of Warwickshire. Chapter 3 moves on to a detailed analysis of their respective demesnes in their late-thirteenth-century heyday in the context of crops and their seeding rates, yields, prices and uses, and types and numbers of livestock. The aims of the chapter are to discover ways in which the landscape was exploited and to test the views of Postan according to which there was an inertia in medieval agricultural productivity against the more upbeat views of Campbell of agricultural progress and innovation. Chapter 4 examines the human settlements that were in serious decline by 1400.


46 See, for example, M.M. Postan, 'Medieval agrarian society in its prime, pt 7: England', in M.M. Postan, ed., The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, 1, The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages
impact on the landscape in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Firstly, the relationship between the lord of the manor (exemplified by Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1296-1321) and his tenants is examined; and secondly, the tenants themselves are analysed in the context of landholding and tenurial obligations, with the particular aim of highlighting and explaining differences between manors. The chapter ends with a section devoted to those tenants employed directly by the lord, the *famuli*. The overarching aim of both Chapters 3 and 4 is to seek out evidence of weaknesses and incipient problems or otherwise in both the rural economy and social structure which may help explain why Chadshunt and Nether Itchington faded from the landscape whereas Gaydon, Upper Itchington and Tachbrook continue today to thrive and expand.

Chapter 5 explores the landscape and its uses in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, seeking out indications of change and continuity. Peasant cultivation of crops and ownership of livestock are analysed. Chapter 6 explores the last hundred years of episcopal lordship from 1448 to 1547, and the life and lordship of Thomas Fisher from 1547 to his death in 1578. Is there any evidence of lords' lowering rents and entry fines and keeping buildings in good repair in an attempt to maintain tenant levels? More particularly what were the causes of the demise of Nether Itchington and Chadshunt during the lordship of Thomas Fisher? Was he so greedy that he edged out small-scale peasant farmers? Can he be held up as a blatant example of a capitalist-minded member of the gentry who were apparently very keen on the expropriation of the rural population from the land? Chapter 7 examines the

community of the vill and non-agrarian by-laws, the land market, the landless, migration and population turnover, and life beyond the manor in the sixteenth century. Can any indications be found of empty holdings or of ruinous buildings? Is there any evidence of, in Tawney’s words, a consolidation of several holdings or parts of holdings, into fewer and larger tenancies? Were peasants expropriating each other through the land market? Are there any signs of tenants of medium-sized holdings failing victim to the actions of their more successful engrossing peers? In Chapter Eight all the evidence is drawn together in an attempt to establish why Nether Itchington disappeared, Chadshunt shrank dramatically and yet Tachbrook, Gaydon and Upper Itchington survived, when all were under common lordship for nearly half a millennium and lay almost as one contiguous segment in the landscape.
CHAPTER TWO

SETTING THE SCENE

Introduction

The primary aim of this chapter is to set the scene for the thesis, firstly, by outlining the early history of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, in order to place the bishop's Warwickshire manors into an historical context. This will be followed by an overview of the pays of Warwickshire. It is not the intention here to replay the well-worn record of each of these pays, for 'only a fool goes rooting about in the stubble when the harvest is laid up.' For that same reason, the historic division between the Arden and the Feldon will be discussed only briefly, before moving on to a detailed exploration of the Wolds of Warwickshire. Each manor in turn will then be analysed in its topographic setting: Tachbrook in the Feldon, and Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon in the Wolds. Finally, the field system of each manor will be analysed. This exploration - incorporating the evidence of field systems, furlong names and the landscape itself - is an essential prelude because, although this study spans some four centuries, one crucially important factor is the landscape, described by Maitland as 'that most wonderful of all palimpsests'. And furthermore, in the words of Harley who himself made an invaluable contribution to the understanding of the early medieval geography of Warwickshire, 'The evolution of any aspect of society or economy cannot be divorced from the physical qualities of the landscape in which it is

---


2.1 The early history of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield

While the political and administrative boundaries of Warwickshire were formalized by the turn of the eleventh century, ecclesiastically the county continued to remain divided between the dioceses of Coventry and Lichfield and Worcester until 1836, an arrangement whose origins can be traced back to the seventh century and a similar territorial division between the Mercian and Hwiccian peoples. Although in 1075 the see was transferred from Lichfield to Chester, and subsequently to Coventry by 1102, Lichfield remained throughout the middle ages the centre of episcopal administration in the diocese. From 1228 the bishop was styled as 'of Coventry and Lichfield', although successive bishops continued unofficially to be styled as 'of Chester' until the episcopate of Rowland Lee (1534-1543).

In the early middle ages both the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield and of Worcester were influential landowners in the Midlands, generally holding large manors rather than small scattered pieces of land. By the time of the Domesday

---


4 That is not to say that there is nothing new to write about particular settlements in the Feldon as will be demonstrated in the section on Tachbrook. Sixteenth-century evidence for the landscape will occasionally be referred to but dealt with more fully in Chapter 5.


survey the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield had acquired twelve manors in Staffordshire, six in Shropshire, three in Warwickshire and two in Derbyshire, together with burgess tenements in Chester, Shrewsbury and Warwick but these lands were more dispersed and less valuable than those of his counterpart at Worcester. By the mid-thirteenth century, Bishop Roger Meuland (1258-1295), within months of being consecrated consolidated his position in the Midlands when Henry III granted him free warren in all his demesne lands in Staffordshire and Warwickshire and several market and fair charters, including one for a weekly market (Wednesday) and annual fair in Itchington on the eve, day and morrow of Saints Peter and Paul (29 June).

The date of the annual fair raises a perplexing question: why was the feast of Saints Peter and Paul chosen? Elsewhere within the bishop’s estate fair dates coincided with patronal celebrations. Rugeley’s fair, for instance, was to be held on the eve, day and morrow of St Augustine, understandable, for its parish church is indeed dedicated to this saint. Similarly, the fairs at Prees and at Brewood were to be held around the feast of St Chad and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary respectively, again reflecting the dedication of their parish churches. No such explanation fits the situation in Itchington, the parish church in Nether Itchington at that time being dedicated to All Saints and the chapelry in Upper Itchington to St Michael. Secondly, the charter granting the fair included a specific clause instructing that the fair should

---

8 Rowlands, pp. 12-13. The three manors in Warwickshire were Bishops Tachbrook, Caldecote and Farnborough. He had all but lost the latter two by the twelfth century and acquired Stivichall from the Earl of Chester and Bishops Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon from the Priory of Coventry. The acquisition of Stivichall is well documented, but not so the other Warwickshire acquisitions. It is known that when Bishop Robert de Limesey moved his seat from Chester to Coventry he made himself titular abbot of Coventry Priory, seizing the Prior’s half of Coventry. Perhaps he also seized Itchington and Chadshunt at the same time. For Stivichall see SBTRO, DR 10/575, 576; P.R. Coss, ed., The Early Records of Coventry, (London, 1986), pp. 12-13; P.R. Coss, Lordship, Knighthood and Locality A Study in English Society c. 1180-c. 1280 (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 28, 53-54, 65, 160; H.E. Savage, ed., The Great Register of Lichfield Cathedral known as Magnum Registrum Album, Collections for a History of Staffordshire William Salt Archaeological Society (Stafford, 1924), pp. 30-31.

9 It has been noted that the 1250s were a decade with an exceptionally high number of market grants, strongly suggesting that Henry III was using such grants as ‘instruments of patronage’: see J. Masschaele, ‘The multiplicity of medieval markets reconsidered’, Journal of Historical Geography 20 (1994), pp. 266-267.
not be held on the chosen date if it was on or near the date of another in the vicinity.\textsuperscript{10} This has echoes of Bracton's mid-thirteenth-century treatise, in which he made it clear that 'a market in a certain place [should not be]...a nuisance to another neighbouring market...[lest it be]...hurtful and tortious' and very likely the same understanding applied to fairs. Furthermore, Bracton defined 'neighbouring' as being 'within six miles and a half and the third part of a half', 'miles' being a loose translation of *leucas*. Yet in the neighbouring royal vill of Kineton, some 3½ miles from Itchington and where the parish church is dedicated to St Peter, a charter had already been granted in 1228 for a fair to be held on the eve and day of Saints Peter and Paul.\textsuperscript{11} Despite the *nisi sit ad nocumentum* clause in the grant to the bishop, and despite Masschaele's claim that sheriffs were assiduous in ensuring the observation of that clause, there is no evidence that the bishop faced any legal challenge to his blatant disregard.\textsuperscript{12} The bishop or his officials may have seen an opportunity to challenge Kineton's commercial dominance in the locality, fully aware that, in Bracton's words, the fair would be 'a hurtful and tortious nuisance, because it is so near'.\textsuperscript{13} Certainly both the market and fair at Itchington

> 'would have had to carve a hinterland out of the territories of existing market[s]...There would have been much alarm among the established centres at the appearance of rivals.'\textsuperscript{14}

Perhaps

> 'too much attention has been paid [to Bracton's theory]...and actual distances between markets [and, by association, fairs] varied widely...it was left to market


\textsuperscript{12} J. Masschaele, 'Market rights in thirteenth-century England', *EHR* 107 (1992), pp. 82-84.

\textsuperscript{13} Twiss, *Henrici de Bracton*, p. 585.

forces (literally) to keep the numbers down'.

Bracton was quite possibly 'not enunciating a hard and fast rule, merely a rule of thumb'. In the case of the fair at Itchington maybe the

'locus of trade [was] not [of] foremost concern...convenience for a household or possibly for the lord's tenants may have been of greater import.'

Market forces certainly had their impact in the later middle ages in Warwickshire. Several markets founded in the mid-thirteenth century in the vicinity of Kineton were no longer in existence by 1600 viz Wellesbourne, Burton Dassett and Itchington itself very likely because they were 'marginal creations catering to a small and strictly localized populace' rather than 'fundamental hubs of regional trade'.

The bishop's rights were affirmed in the Hundred Rolls of 1279 under the entry for Itchington:

Nota: Idem episcopus appropriavit sibi warrenam ibidem sine waranto et habet visum franciplegii furcas assisam panis et cervisie et omnia que ad huiusmodi libertatem pertinentia quo waranto nescitur. Et habet mercatum ibidem per them Mercuris et feriam per iii dies duratentem quo waranto nescitur.

But very soon, during the Quo Warranto enquiry, he was called upon to establish his title to these and several other privileges. During the Warwickshire proceedings of 1285 the jury allowed his episcopal claims to view of frankpledge, gallows, infangenthef, and assize of bread and ale within Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon, and free warren in Tachbrook. Bishop Roger's successor, Walter Langton (1296-1321), was likewise prompt in consolidating his episcopal influence when in 1299 Edward I granted to him, by means of a charter, the franchise of return

15 D. M. Palliser and A. C. Pinnock, 'The markets of medieval Staffordshire', North Staffordshire Journal of Field Studies 11 (1971), p. 54. The authors go on to emphasize that when markets failed geographic conditions and demographic trends alone cannot explain why - human determination and accident are also important factors to be considered.


20 Heath, 'The medieval Church', p. 18.

of all royal writs and *inter alia* the chattels of felons and fugitives and the fines and amercements of all men and tenants, thus establishing the whole of the bishop’s estate into a private shire. This arrangement was to persist well into the sixteenth century, even after the granting of the Warwickshire manors to Thomas Fisher. The ‘return of writs’ was

‘an essential privilege of the greater liberties in medieval England, because it entitled liberty-holders to exclude the sheriff and hence to execute royal writs through their own bailiffs...the right to exclude the sheriff was the essence of the privilege.’

Indeed so great a privilege that from 1306 Edward I decreed that returns of writs were only to be made to members of his own family. And not only was the sheriff excluded from the bishop’s Warwickshire manor, so too was the archdeacon, as the parish churches of Itchington and Tachbrook were subject to peculiar jurisdiction - a system which in medieval England ‘produced considerable challenges to administrative coherence and efficiency’ and as such ‘defy succinct summary’.

### 2.2 The pays of Warwickshire

A. Everitt was careful to emphasize that ‘boundaries of regions...probably change from century to century; an historical region is a flexible entity’, for example, when woodland is cleared in a region in one century, by the next century it is no longer topographically recognizable as a woodland region. More specifically, W.G. Hoskins defined a farming region as a

‘...territory, large or small, in which conditions of soil, topography, climate, and perhaps natural resources combine to produce distinctive characteristics of farming practice and rural economy in the widest sense, to mark it off clearly from its neighbouring

---

It is clear that more work is still needed to define the boundaries between one pays and another, and to examine differences within each type. We can exaggerate the contrast between pays, and we need to be more aware of the subtle variations within the same type of pays.

Indeed, perhaps we exaggerate the differences between settlements and landscapes. If historical regions are flexible entities it may never be possible either to demarcate exactly the boundaries between one pays and another or even to chart the precise evolution of those boundaries. Nevertheless, those boundaries, however nebulous, are important to the local historian because of the need to define the agricultural, economic and social identities of regions.

While the fundamental distinction in Warwickshire is between the forest and the fielden, as in most parts of England, that is to say between a predominantly wood-pasture society and a predominantly arable society, the county is actually composed of a number of notable pays (Fig. 1). Of passing interest only to this thesis are the East Warwickshire Plateau, Dunsmore Heath and the Arden. The East Warwickshire Plateau is framed by the river valleys of Tame-Blythe on the west, the Anker-Soar system on the north-east, and by the Avon-Leam valleys on the south-east and is of considerable importance to the coal-mining industry being occupied by distinctly unfertile Upper Coal Measures. Dunsmore Heath, a notorious haunt of criminals in the later middle ages, forms a low plateau and is spacious and desolate, its affinities, according to one topographical writer, being with the drab moorlands of neighbouring territories.

---

28 This is not a peculiarly English conundrum. For example, on pays-based social differences in the Pas-de-Calais region of northern France see G. Sivéry, 'Terroirs, villages et communautés rurales au moyen âge', in R. Muchembled and G. Sivéry, eds, Nos ancêtres, les paysans Aspects du monde rural dans le Nord Pas-de-Calais des origines à nos jours (Lille, 1983), pp. 71-72. For the view that 'the conventional division of early modern rural England into "fielden" and "forest" regions serves well neither agrarian nor social historians' see N. Davie, 'Chalk and cheese? "fielden" and "forest" communities in early modern England', Journal of Historical Sociology 4 (1991), pp. 1-31.
Fig. 1 The pays of Warwickshire
Northamptonshire. The Arden, in the context of its historic contrast with the Feldon, has been analysed by a number of topographical writers since the days of Camden and Dugdale. As pointed out by R.H. Hilton, 'there is...in fact, no generally accepted dividing line between the two areas...to lay down a rigid frontier...is impossible'.

Moreover, it may be all too easy to read too much into pays-based differences between the Arden and Feldon for it is quite possible that the inhabitants of the Arden simply discovered 'that their resources were better suited to a mixed use of land', being less pressured by high densities of population, whereas Feldon communities 'developed...a bias towards arable cultivation'. Of major importance to this thesis is the Feldon and the recently revived Wolds.

2.2.1 The Feldon

It is generally accepted that the Feldon broadly corresponds with a wide band of countryside bounded more or less by the river Avon on the north and by the scarp of the Cotswolds and North Oxfordshire/Northamptonshire uplands to the south-east, and is comprised of nucleated, open-field settlements on rich agricultural claylands.

A recent study of the woods of medieval Warwickshire has done much to challenge the unquestioning perception of the pronounced contrast between the well-wooded Arden and the bare champion Feldon, and includes the claim that

'Warwickshire south and east of the Avon cannot be described as woodless, nor virtually so, and its woods were not negligible features in the local topography...Ufton,

\[\text{References}\]

Carpenter, Locality and Polity, pp. 19, 21; McPherson, 'Warwickshire', p. 663.

R.H. Hilton, Social Structure of Rural Warwickshire in the Middle Ages, Dugdale Society Occasional Papers 9 (Oxford, 1950), p. 13. B.K. Roberts went further in discerning a 'sharp boundary' between the Feldon and Arden in the Coventry area. He used a combination of place-name evidence and Domesday data to map this boundary, which he dubbed the tunleah line, creating in the process the impression of a 'woodland edge': see B.K. Roberts, The Making of the English Village A Study in Historical Geography (Harlow, 1987), p.188. Likewise, the boundary between woodland and feldon in the Hainaut region of north-eastern France seemed to Sivry to be very sharply defined, like a battle frontier, which is an analogy not without irony given the recent history of this region: 'comme un front de combat entre /e bocage et /es paysages de champs ouverts': see G. Sivéry, Structures Agraires et Vie Rurale dans le Hainaut à la fin du Moyen-Age (Lille, 1977), p. 71.


Fig. 2 Some settlements in south Warwickshire with woodland
Perhaps the late medieval Feldon can no longer be regarded as entirely woodless but small amounts of woodland here and there, for example the intermittent stretch from Chesterton to Warwick, does not transform that area into a woodland region: maybe topographically, but not economically or socially. It cannot be claimed that the late medieval tenants of say Chesterton or Lighthorne were living chiefly off woodland resources in the way that the inhabitants of many an Arden parish were. Nor can it be claimed that woodland resources in the Feldon affected social structure in any way. Hilton has demonstrated very clearly differences in that respect between the Feldon and the Arden. Some late medieval communities in the Feldon were prudent in retaining vestiges of woodland such as at Chesterton, but this does not make it a woodland region. By contrast, many Arden parishes had a good deal of woodland and not just isolated peripheral woodland, which marked out the region as obviously different from the Feldon.

It has generally been accepted that the Arden and the Feldon complemented each other in their different resources. For example, it has been argued that the Arden originally

'served as a region of seasonal pasture for more intensively developed estates some distance away, especially for estates located in the heavily cultivated region of the Feldon.'

To give but one early example, the Feldon manor of Long Itchington held woodland in the distant Arden manor of Arley, as demonstrated in a charter dated 1001. But it has been suggested that many such links

---

33 S. J. Wager, Woods, Wolds and Groves: The Woodland of Medieval Warwickshire (Oxford, 1998), pp. 10, 16. Although it is feasible that the woodland cited (p. 226) as being in Long Itchington may have been in Arley, with which it had woodland links, other evidence suggests that the woodland was indeed in Long Itchington. Wager is careful to avoid use of the terms Feldon and Arden until late into her study, preferring 'south and east Warwickshire' and 'woodland' as respective alternatives.

34 Hilton, Social Structure.


'rather than showing these rights to be representative of some already long established association between the Feldon and Arden regions, as seems to be assumed...can rather more readily be seen actually to represent the inception of such links de novo...Given that Feldon communities in general, with their high medieval populations, tended to lack adequate woodland resources...the Arden, with its wealth of woodland, would be an obvious source for making good the shortages in the resources of Feldon communities, and thus links between them could be seen as the product of the developing medieval economy rather than the vestiges of an ancient one.'

Yet on the subject of detached resources and common rights the author of that quote concedes that 'it seems more or less impossible to find explicit evidence for the origins of such arrangements' and that some such links in Warwickshire 'clearly did originate before 1066'. 37 Thus links between some settlements could well be the product of the developing medieval economy but that should not exclude the possibility of other links being indeed of more ancient origin as is clearly the case between Long Itchington and Arley. This argument is likely to continue for some time, and may never be satisfactorily resolved given that Warwickshire is well known for its lack of 'explicit evidence'.

2.2. ii The Wolds

The Kentish Wolds, were certainly at an early date covered by continuous forest. They formed the outlying wald for communities of the river-peoples and were chiefly used for pastoral purposes. 38 Likewise in Leicestershire many parishes had an outlying wald, usually situated on higher land towards the edge of the parish. 39 Less well known are the Wolds of Warwickshire, alluded to by Dugdale when he described Coton juxta Church-over as

'Cotes super le waus (or Super waldas, as it is recorded 4. E. 1.) these Hilly parts being then, and after called Wouldes, as many other of that kind are to this day in other Counties'.


38 Everitt, 'River and wold', p. 12. In this instance he uses the phrase 'Kentish Wolds'.


In more recent times, S. Wager, in a strong criticism of H. S. A. Fox, stressed that:

"The distribution of Warwickshire's wolds...suggests some modification to the theory that Warwickshire's wolds were an extension of the Northamptonshire wolds into the eastern fringe of Warwickshire and formed with them a region which was distinct from both woodland and champion districts. The presence of individual areas called wolds throughout most of south and east Warwickshire, a traditional "champion" region, warns against an exclusive association between the term wold and a special kind of regional topography...[because] wolds tended to adjoin each other."

the implication being that the Wolds of Warwickshire do not adjoin each other.\(^{41}\) To return to Everitt's comments noted at the beginning of this chapter, historical regions are flexible entities. Even if it is accepted that wold place- and field-names are thinly distributed in the modern landscape, the historical evidence clearly points towards a swathe of such names spilling over from Northamptonshire into eastern Warwickshire across to the Cotswold fringe.\(^{42}\) At one time these wolds did indeed 'adjoin each other'. This topographical affinity across neighbouring counties is unsurprising. The county of Warwickshire itself was an artificial creation, cutting as it did across both geographical boundaries and territories of existing peoples.\(^{43}\)

Furthermore, a 'traditional "champion" region' need not be completely devoid of woodland, whether in the form of wolds or otherwise, a point constantly stressed elsewhere by Wager.\(^ {44}\) Moreover,

"strong support for an interpretation of a wald as a tract of countryside characterized by isolated stands of wood, perhaps amidst pasture and some cultivated land, comes from other place-name elements...in the wolds themselves [names such as]...leah are scattered rather than clustered."\(^ {45}\)

This is precisely the case in the Wolds of Warwickshire as demonstrated by, for example, the major place-name Ratley (Rot, red, + leah, a site within a forest clearing) and the several instances of minor place-names in this region terminating in

Interestingly, Coton lies on the boundary between Warwickshire and north-east Leicestershire, described by Carpenter as 'feldon': see Carpenter, Locality and Polity, p. 20. But it is clear that at one time this part of Warwickshire was perceived as being 'woldy' and quite distinct from the neighbouring Feldon.

\(^{41}\) Wager, Woods, Wolds and Groves, p. 188.
\(^{42}\) Fox, 'The people of the wolds', pp. 79-81. For a cluster in the Itchington area see later in this section.
\(^{43}\) Carpenter, Locality and Polity, pp. 25-27.
\(^{44}\) This is one of the dominant themes of Wager, Woods, Wolds and Groves.
\(^{45}\) Fox, 'The people of the wolds', p. 84.
leah mapped by W. J. Ford.\textsuperscript{48}

It has been suggested that wolds were cleared in about the ninth century - a period in which the word \textit{wald} is thought to have fallen out of common use for woodland - as a response to the shortage of pasture combined with a move towards a wholesale reorganisation of the land into a system of open fields.\textsuperscript{47} Wager questions why, therefore, did the wolds remain as separate, permanent areas of pasture rather than being absorbed into a system which combined common pasture with open fields? Two reasons may be suggested here. Firstly, the small number of Feldon villages which still had woodland in the post-Conquest period were evidently prudent in their keeping of such a valuable resource. Ever-increasing pressure on land in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries forced many communities to convert pasture to arable. It was, therefore, economically sensible to maintain woodland as a separate area of pasture. Secondly, the wolds of Chadshunt, to take but one example, may not be spectacularly high or steep, yet they are so, relative to the adjacent landscape; in fact, not unlike the wolds discussed in Fox's paper which he described as being 'lower where the land surface of adjacent vales is low, higher where it is high'. Furthermore,

\begin{quote}
\textquote{not all place-names containing \textit{wald} lie at high elevations. Southwold in Suffolk is situated in a very low coastal position...[it is] doubtful that \textit{wald} necessarily has an "upland" implication, but may be tentatively re-interpreted as 'country which was more "park-like"' and 'distinguished by isolated stands [of woodland].'}\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

The intractable boulder clay on the Chadshunt wolds would prove difficult to plough even today; better to keep this land as permanent pasture, particularly as it lies on the periphery. In the later middle ages areas of wold remained as pasture as part of a system of \textit{quasi} transhumance between river and wold, transhumance 'being an ancient solution to the problem of feeding animals where pasture is restricted or seasonal'.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{48} Fox, 'The people of the wolds', pp. 78, 82-83.
Wager concedes that if the wolds 'were indeed woodland at one stage, they put the topographical history of south and east Warwickshire into a new perspective.\textsuperscript{50} This brings us back to Dyer's observation that we need to be more aware of the subtle variations within the same type of pays.\textsuperscript{51} Thus we turn to the question of how typical of their pays were the Warwickshire manors of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.

2.2.iii Tachbrook

To what extent was Tachbrook (Fig. 3) a typical Feldon manor? Named after the water course which separated Tachbrook Episcopi from Tachbrook Mallory (under different lordship throughout the later middle ages), it was to all intents and purposes a typical Feldon manor in the later middle ages - a classic, nucleated, open-field settlement.\textsuperscript{52} Leland on his journey from Banbury to Warwick noted that he rode '12 miles by champayne ground, frutefull of corn and gresse, baren of woodde, and 2 miles by some enclosyd woodyd ground'. It has been argued that this was Oakley Wood, within Tachbrook, and not Chesterton Wood which is actually about 12 modern miles from Banbury, partly on the basis that Leland was using the measure of a long mile.\textsuperscript{53} It is obvious from account rolls of the fifteenth century and court rolls of the sixteenth century that Oakley Wood was potentially a valuable resource.\textsuperscript{54} Nor was Oakley Wood the only woodland within the manor. For example, in 1569 Peter Townysend and Richard Savage were amerced 20d. each for chopping wood near ffroghilhurst (hurst, woodland).\textsuperscript{55} Later the same year ffrogwell hurste, described as a parcel of waste, was the subject of a case heard in the Court of Requests no less when Thomas Olney, William Commander, John Savage, John Edes, Thomas Savage and Henry Eyres, all leading inhabitants of Tachbrook, claimed that the lord

\textsuperscript{50} Wager, Woods, Wolds and Groves, p. 160.
\textsuperscript{51} See note 27, above.
\textsuperscript{52} For a description of the field system and husbandry in Tachbrook see later in this chapter.
\textsuperscript{54} See Chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{55} BRL, 432692. For Frog hill Hurst, measuring 40 acres 32 perches, see WCRO, CR 1908/229/1, 2; WCRO, QS 75/113B2, map dated 1710; WCRO, Z 204/4(L), map dated 1729. Although it no longer appears on modern maps, Frog hill Hurst can be located as straddling SP 2960/2961.
Fig. 3 Tachbrook: some identifiable medieval topographical features
of the manor, Thomas Fisher, had ploughed up the said waste and enclosed it 'to his own peculier commodyte and gayne'. Fisher replied that as the land had ridge and furrow upon it, it must have been ploughed in the past, that it was lying fallow when he ploughed it, and that the enclosure was a temporary means of preventing the trespass of cattle. From by-laws we glean references to sheep near le oldewod in April 1536. And in May 1565 Richard and John Savage were amerced 3s. 4d. and 6d. respectively for allowing their sheep to wander in lez Woodheth.

Likewise, what seems to be a nicely compact settlement is anything but, under the surface. So-called 'dispersed settlement in nucleated areas' was the subject of a paper written by C. Taylor, having been prompted by some perceptive comments made by Fox in a review of the former's book on rural settlement in north-west Lincolnshire. Taylor paid tribute to the fact that

'Dr Harold Fox [had] picked up...that, in an area of classic nucleated villages, fieldwork and documentary research had produced evidence of considerable numbers of minor settlements scattered over the landscape...That is, in a region where nucleation was perceived to be the dominant form of settlement, there was also a sub-structure of dispersal.'  

Taylor argued for three generalized forms of dispersed settlement associated with nucleated villages viz (i) areas in which dispersed settlements predominated, perhaps Roman or even Celtic in origin and found, for example, in south-west England; (ii) areas where a largely abandoned settlement pattern prevailed, mostly of the early to mid-Saxon period and found in the English midlands; and (iii) areas of 'secondary' settlement which resulted from colonisation or reclamation of woodland in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

The second part of Taylor's paper consisted of a case-study of Sawston (Cambs.), a settlement which he described as:

---

56 PRO, REQ 2/248/22.
57 BRL, 432661, 432685.
59 Taylor, p. 27.
60 Taylor, p. 27.
'At first sight...a classic instance of a Midland-type parish...a large central nucleated village...The interest of the parish...is that it also has evidence for four other medieval settlements within it, each perhaps with a different origin.\textsuperscript{61}

Those different origins may be traceable by means of an analysis of place-names. Old English habitative place-names containing the element cot, worth, and tun found within minor place-names and field- and furlong-names are recognized as possible pointers to an underlying, earlier settlement pattern of scattered hamlets, inhabited during the pre-nucleation phase, at least as early as the tenth century.\textsuperscript{62} It is likely that cot and worth, frequently compounded with a personal name, record relatively humble settlements which were probably individual farmsteads.\textsuperscript{63}

How and why nucleation was achieved has been discussed a great deal. One group of historians has reached the conclusion that:

'We cannot be sure...of the mechanism by which nucleation was achieved. Was it a sudden upheaval or was it spread over many years? There may have been two stages, one leading to an irregular nucleated village, with the next, after an interval as long as a couple of centuries, setting up the planned village.'\textsuperscript{64}

But while it is 'still difficult to envisage...the transition to nucleation' it has been suggested that perhaps there existed 'islands of cultivation in a see of permanent pasture', the boundaries of which became difficult to manage as settlements expanded. Therefore a solution was sought by reserving half of the township (in a two-field system) for common grazing and by relocating property so the share of each husbandman was allocated equally between the two fields. The arable area was divided into strips, chiefly to make it difficult to withdraw from the system and as those strips were widely scattered it made 'a roughly central situation for settlement locationally desirable'. The 'removal of peasant houses towards a nucleated village' would not be a problem for peasants who frequently moved the sites of their

\textsuperscript{61} Taylor, pp. 31-32.
\textsuperscript{63} M. Costen, The Origins of Somerset (pb edn, Manchester, 1992), p. 93. When worth, which is 'very common in the names of minor places in regions of dispersed settlement', is found 'as a furlong name in a village field system there is some reason to think it may recall a dispersed site in the pre-village phase': H.S.A. Fox, 'The agrarian context', in H.S.A. Fox, ed., Origins of the Midland Village Economic History Society Annual Conference (unpubl. typescript, 1992), pp. 41, 42.
farmsteads.  

Late medieval Tachbrook, like Sawston, consisted of a number of what can be loosely described as appendages. Both Naspes, a hamlet (first known reference in 1195), and Hethcote (first known reference in the 1298 extent), a very minor habitative site, feature in the famous list of deserted settlements drawn up in about 1486 by John Rous, a chantry priest from Warwick. This 'sub-structure of dispersal' must be either a remnant of the pre-nucleation period or else it belongs to the post-Conquest period and is therefore the result of "secondary dispersal", that is new farmsteads formed after village nucleation and often in far-flung corners of parishes. Indeed both Naspes and Hethcote lie in far-flung corners of Tachbrook, therefore could be the result of 'secondary dispersal'. And yet the OE origin and topographical meaning of Naspes (aspen trees) and Hethcote (cottage settlement on the heath) strongly suggest 'primary dispersal', that is 'to the pre-village landscape before nucleation took place'.

There is a complex twist in the story of dispersed settlement within Tachbrook and that is clear in the name of its neighbour, Tachbrook Mallory. R.A. Dodgshon observed that, 'No scholar has thought it worthwhile to consider [the] origin [of split settlements] in depth'. The seeds were first sown by Maitland who had in mind pairs

---

65 Fox, 'The agrarian context', pp. 42-43, 49-50. More recently Fox has claimed that: 'Most historians now agree that nucleated villages and field systems evolved together, a single cluster of farmsteads (replacing more dispersed settlement) being more appropriate for a township-wide common field system within which the strips of each peasant holding were widely scattered.' H.S.A. Fox, 'The wolds before c. 1500', in J. Thirsk, ed., The English Rural Landscape (Oxford, 2000), p. 56.

66 There are two tantalizing fifteenth-century references to Naspes having its own field independent of Tachbrook; see WCRO, CR 1908/1, which refers to a grant made by John Olney to John Savage of a parcel of land which lay in the field of Naspes between the common fields of Barford and Tachbrook on the one part and the common heath of Naspes and the bishop's demesne of Tachbrook on the other part. The 'destructis villis & hamelectis' are listed in T. Hearne, ed., Joannis Rossi Antiquarii Warwicensis Historia Regum Angliae (Oxford, 1745), p. 122. Long before Rous compiled his woeful inventory of lost settlements, there is evidence that Hethcote was living up to its name. John Berewyk, minister of the house of St Trinity, Thelsford (situated within the neighbouring parish of Charlecote) came to court in 1400 to take up certain lands and a tenement in Hethcote for an annual rent of 6s. 8d. No entry fine was paid eo quod terra frisca: SBTRO, DR 10/2600. See below for further comment on the meaning of terra frisca.

67 Fox, Review of Everson, Taylor and Dunn, p. 77.

68 Gover, Mawer and Stenton, Place-Names of Warwickshire, pp. 259, 266: Fox, p. 77. Part of the neighbouring hamlet of Ashorne lay within the field system of Tachbrook, which adds emphasis to the dispersed nature of settlement.

of settlements that were distinguished from one another by prefixes such as Great/Little or by suffixes denoting ownership such as, in this case, Episcopi and Mallory. Maitland construed that such related groups of villages were the by-product of fission, with single settlements being split, probably post-Conquest, into two or more separate villages, an argument for which 'a strong case can still be marshalled' according to Dodgshon, a view reiterated by Mitchell-Fox who considered that

'the break-up of once larger units...most clearly apparent in the long-recognised phenomenon of paired villages sharing the same “surname”...surely [arises] from the fission of a unit into two smaller ones.'

But on whose initiative? Did lords found new settlements for extra tenants or did villages split on the initiative of peasants? In the overwhelming number of cases the answer must be that we do not know.72

We may hazard a guess that the division of Tachbrook was the direct result of 'the fragmentation of proprietary rights'.73 The minor water course, the Tachbrook, at one time part of a major hundredal boundary, gave its name to the original settlement, thus acting as a convenient marker when the fission into two smaller units was accomplished. When the split was executed is uncertain but two discrete settlements, listed in two different Hundreds, are recorded in Domesday Book.74 Perhaps the two settlements were never one in the first place. In which case, in the generally accepted four stage process of settlement nucleation viz (i) dispersed settlements, (ii) dual settlements, (iii) nucleated polyfocal settlements, and (iv) nucleated compact

Interpretation (London, 1980), pp. 108-109. Indeed Dodgshon noted that the grouping of farms, townships and villages into pairs, each bearing a common surname but 'distinguished from each other by place-name prefixes', was a 'widespread feature of the rural landscape'. He further affirmed Maitland's 'basic conclusion that paired or linked villages of England had largely originated through a process of splitting': R.A. Dodgshon, 'Symbolic classification and the development of the early celtic landscape', in E. Lyle, ed., Duality The Yearbook of the Traditional Cosmology Society 1 (1985/6), p. 61.

71 Mitchell-Fox, 'The character and development of territorial organisation in the Midlands', p. 97; Maitland, pp. 84-95. It is apparent from sixteenth-century court roll evidence that Tachbrook did not have a field system in common with its neighbour Tachbrook Mallory; for example, BRL, 432681.
73 Dodgshon, 'The origin of the two- and three-field system', p. 63.
settlements, the two Tachbrooks fit neatly into category (ii). But there is a problem in this argument - Tachbrook Mallory has never in its history been accorded parochial status, having always lain within the ecclesiastical parish of Tachbrook Episcopi, where a priest was recorded as early as the Domesday Survey. The nature of this ecclesiastical relationship strongly suggests that Tachbrook Mallory did indeed come into being as the result of 'the fission of an unit into two smaller ones'.

A tentative sequence may therefore be suggested: a number of dispersed settlements, including Naspes and Hethcote, formed into one settlement and became known as Tachbrook, after the local river; at some point before the Domesday survey - perhaps immediately after the Conquest - this unit split into two, the river acting as a convenient boundary, Naspes and Hethcote remaining part of Tachbrook Episcopi.

Apart from these major place-names, there are also some very interesting furlong-names at Tachbrook in the 1298 extent. 'Exceptionally exciting' is tunstall, meaning 'the place where a settlement (tun) used to be' because it may also take us back to 'primary dispersal'. Tonstalforlonge, consisting of 21½ acres 10 perches, was quite possibly the site of a former tun or farmstead, demonstrating 'that place-name givers were sometimes amateur antiquarians' and indeed that 'medieval villagers were conscious that they were living in an old landscape'.

The manor of Tachbrook not only derived some of its economic sustenance from woodland but also demonstrated in its morphology and furlong names echoes of a

---

75 Williams and Erskine, f. 238v. The short-lived chapel founded in Tachbrook Mallory in 1336 was a chantry chapel, built for John Mallory and not as a place of public worship. It had fallen out of use by 1493: see VCH Warwickshire, 5, (London, 1949), p. 165.
76 Fox, Review of Everson, Taylor and Dunn, p. 77. Where tunstall 'occurs way out in the open fields of a village it must surely carry the connotation “where a tun formerly stood”'. Such evidence 'adds considerably...to our appreciation of dispersal in the pre-village stage and...it tells of field systems which have expanded to engulf and consume an earlier pattern of settlement': Fox, 'The agrarian context', pp. 41,42.
77 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 4v; Fox, Review of Everson, Taylor and Dunn, p. 77; C. Dyer, 'Compton Verney: landscape and people in the middle ages', in R. Bearman, ed., Compton Verney A History of the House and its Owners (Stratford-upon-Avon, 2000), p. 57. Dunstall and Great Dunstall appear on an early eighteenth century map of Tachbrook: WCRO, QS 75/113B/2. Ford equated this reference to Dunstall, also quoted in Gover, Mawer and Stenton, Place-Names of Warwickshire, p. 374, to the modern Dunstable Hill, and therefore misinterpreted it as a stapol site rather than a tunstall site: see Ford, 'The pattern of settlement', p. 130. Dunstall is no longer to be found on modern maps but can be located as straddling SP 3062 and 3063 to the north-west of the present village. A similar site has recently been identified at Compton Verney, some seven miles to the south of Tachbrook: Dyer and Bond, Compton Murdak, section 4.1.
settlement pattern more typical of a woodland environment, giving emphasis to both the shifting nature of the boundaries of pays and, more particularly, to the differences which exist within pays. Tachbrook, at first sight a ‘classic instance’ of a large, central, nucleated village, is anything but on closer inspection, at least in topographical terms.

2.2.iv Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon

These three vills (Fig. 4), normally treated as being in the Feldon, will be explored in the context of the Wolds of Warwickshire. Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon possessed many of the characteristics typical of wold-type manors as defined by Everitt. The woodland within these three manors was situated on high ground towards the periphery; the administrative and ecclesiastical centre was at Nether Itchington, a river settlement (the tun on the river Itchen), where the manor court was held and the parish church situated, Upper Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon being chapelries. There is ample documentary evidence to show that the Itchington area was a wold-type landscape in the later middle ages. There is a thirteenth century reference to le wold and waldweie in Napton and its neighbour Southam, alluding to a continuous tract of wold; in Compton Verney wold appears in field names, suggesting that woodland once covered at least part of the village territory; and there is Kingemewolde in Tysoe. Furthermore, Ratley, mentioned earlier, lies about halfway between Tysoe and Itchington.

To give some more detailed examples, in a charter dated 1246 Mabel daughter of William Hagley quitclaimed to God and the church of All Saints, Itchington, 24 acres 1 rood, one acre of which was situated toward le Wold and another acre on le Wold.
Fig. 4 Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon: some identifiable medieval topographical features
April 1537 tenants of Itchington were told not to keep their sheep in the field *vocatur the olde*; in September 1555 there was an order for all tenants to mark out their land, selions and meadow in *le vailt*. And in 1564 when Roger Tompkins accepted a holding in Upper Itchington, which included *lez pykes* (an oddly-shaped corner of land) between *lez Westmedowe & lez Wolte*. Many Holt place-names find their origin in *wold*. It is therefore significant that Holt Farm, Kingston Holt and Itchington Holt, lying adjacent to each other in the modern landscape, are in the vicinity of *Geadon woulds* which appear on a very detailed estate map of the 'lordship and manour' of Kingston (Chesterton), dated 1697. Other inferences to woodland may be drawn from the fact that the bishop collected 18d. in the manor of Chadshunt in the early fourteenth century for pannage rights; and at the end of the fifteenth century his tenants there were ordered to keep their pigs out of the lord's wood, under pain of 12d. per offence.

Several furlong names at Itchington in the 1298 extent echo an underlying, earlier settlement pattern of scattered hamlets, such as *hallcote* and *Sibbesworth*. The combination of *Sibbes* and *worth* strongly suggests a small farmstead or enclosure held by an individual tenant perhaps as early as the seventh century. The furlong names at Chadshunt are replete with references to a hilly, wold-type landscape: *Clenturehull, Cleytonhull, houndeshull, doune, underdoune, Grehurst* (green wood), and *Walfforlonge* (wold). The second element *doune* is significant, as it is indicative of 'an old outfield drawn into regular cultivation'. Given that *underdoune, Walfforlonge* and *doune* are listed consecutively in the 1298 extent, we can see here the field system being driven right up to the wold edge and perhaps just beyond. It is a truism that 'the observant historian can still discern the distinctiveness of the wolds today'.

---

81 BRL, 432662, 432671. As late as 1683 *Olt* appears in a deed: SBTRO, DR 98/1379.
82 BRL, 432684.
83 WCRO, Z 228/1(L).
84 LJRO, D 30/N6 now D 30/11/102; SBTRO, DR 10/2604.
85 Costen, *Origins of Somerset*, pp. 93, 125.
86 SRO, D(W) 1734/22268, ff. 8r-8v.
2.3 Fields and furlongs

2.3.1 Tachbrook

Table 2.1 Demesne at Tachbrook, 1279 and 1298 compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>demesne</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>3 carucates</td>
<td>360 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>first <em>seisona</em></td>
<td>388 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second <em>seisona</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>189 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from the 1298 extent that a two-field system (Fig. 5) was being employed at Tachbrook, which accords with B.K. Roberts' assertion that 'in the Middle Ages the two-field system was widespread, indeed dominant, in the middle Avon, the Stour and upper Itchen valleys and over the intervening clay plains and limestone escarpments below Edge Hill'. Two similarities are immediately apparent in Table 2.1: firstly, the total demesne acreage in 1279 and 1298 and secondly, the dimensions of the two fields in the latter year. In his study of three estates - Glastonbury Abbey, the

---

89 Unless otherwise indicated, the sources for this section are 1279: John, *The Warwickshire Hundred Rolls*, pp. 187-189; 1298 extent: SRO, D(W) 1734/IJ2268, ff. 4v-5r.
90 Rounded down to the nearest acre. The 1279 total has been calculated by assuming that a carucate equals 120 acres; see, for example, J.B. Harley, 'Population and land utilisation in the Warwickshire hundreds of Stoneleigh and Kineton', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Birmingham (1960), pp. 70-71, 203. The 1298 figure excludes pasture (127 acres) and meadow (61 acres 1 rood) totalling 188 acres 1 rood. The extent, as a working document, was subsequently modified so that the acreages for Tachbrook were: first *seisona* 176½ acres, second *seisona* 173½ acres, total 350 acres. This very likely reflects a changing situation on the ground, evident in the great number of interlineations and crossings-out. Each *seisona* seems to have corresponded to the main divisions of the open fields, as was typical in the Midland village: T.A.M. Bishop, 'The rotation of crops at Westerham, 1297-1350', *ECHR* 9 (1938), p. 41; although it has also been argued that 'townships with a system of this kind had assigned each of their many fields and furlongs to a particular season in order to facilitate cropping, but had not experienced the need to introduce comprehensive fallowing arrangements': Fox, 'Approaches to the adoption of the midland system', p. 68.
91 B.K. Roberts, 'Field systems of the West Midlands', in A.R.H. Baker and R.A. Butlin, eds, *Studies of Field Systems in the British Isles* (Cambridge, 1973), p. 222. As mentioned above in note 66, there are two intriguing fifteenth-century references to Naspes having its own field independent of Tachbrook but it has not been possible to discover any more information about this; see WCRO, CR 1908/1, which refers to a grant made by John Olney to John Savage of a parcel of land which lay in the field of Naspes between the common fields of Barford and Tachbrook on the one part and the common heath of Naspes and the bishop's demesne of Tachbrook on the other part.
Fig. 5 Field system at Tachbrook
Bishopric of Ely and the Bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield - Fox noticed that 'demesnes were for the most part regularly apportioned between two or three fields, the acreages deviating from a "perfect" bipartite or tripartite division by only a few percent in most cases. On some manors the regularity of the disposition of the demesne between fields was remarkable: so careful had been the planning of the fields that extensive demesne holdings of several hundred acres had been divided into two or three parts whose sizes differed by no more than a few acres. 92

This was patently the case not only at Tachbrook but also at Itchington and Chadshunt (see below). The 1279 calculation for Tachbrook is somewhat crude given the uncertainty of the measurements and the rounding up of figures. There is no such doubt in the 1298 extent where not only the size of virgate is specified - 32 acres - but also the size of perch - a standard 16½ feet. 93

In neighbouring Northamptonshire the virgate or yardland was commonly between 20 and 30 acres but there were wide variations. There may have been a topographical element underlying this variation, the smaller values occurring in parishes with good quality, variable soils, and larger yardlands occurring in parishes with poorer soils or where there was once waste, heath or woodland. The only example notably at variance with the topographic and soil quality interpretation is Stonton in Warden, a deserted Midland Plain clay settlement, now in Warwickshire but historically in Northamptonshire, where there was a two-field system and 12 acres to the virgate. 94 In the manors of the bishopric of Worcester there was an even wider variation in yardland size, ranging from 24 acres in the river-valleys to as much as 50 acres on the Cotswolds. 95

The 1298 extent is very informative in listing the dimensions of individual furlongs together with their names. The number of large blocks of land in Tachbrook is very striking. For instance, abovenhethcote measured 39½ acres and Wiggerylong, 25 acres 2½ roods. By means of emphasis, the surveyors were careful to note that a

92 Fox, 'Approaches to the adoption of the midland system', p. 73.
total of 70 acres 2½ roods in the field of the adjacent hamlet of Ashorne lay per particulas, in other words, in strips and not in a block. Clearly the 70 or so acres in Ashorne were dispersed and probably consisted of scattered strips on the boundary, not easily rearranged into a more solid entity. The grouping of land into blocks at Tachbrook may have been the result of estate policy. Elsewhere on the bishop’s estate a similar arrangement obtained. For example, at Eccleshall (Staffs.), according to the 1298 extent, there were some very large stretches of land including the 235 acre Ruyl. There was likely a concerted effort to consolidate the demesne arable, as was the case on the Merton College manor of Cuxham (Oxon.), where compact blocks of demesne apparent in a terrier of 1447/8, can be seen forming as early as the mid-thirteenth century.

Some of the furlong names at Tachbrook are very telling such as Tonstalforlonge (discussed earlier), the adjacent Hungerhull (poor soil), Louweforlonge atte Touneshende and Blaxteresforlong (possibly an allusion to personal ownership). It is remarkable that some of the furlong names in the 1298 extent are still recognisable on early eighteenth-century maps, for example, Wireslade mead and Dunstall to the north-west of Windmill Hill, respectively Wyrshades and Tonstalforlonge in the extent.

Table 2.2 Overall distribution of land at Tachbrook, 1279 and 1298 compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>demesne arable</th>
<th>demesne pasture</th>
<th>demesne meadow</th>
<th>tenants</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>9½%</td>
<td>4½%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there is a wealth of information on the fields and furlongs of Tachbrook at the end of the thirteenth century, the arable occupied little more than a quarter of

---

98 WCR, Z 204/4(L) and QS 75/113/B2. Wyrshades is adjacent to binethemilne in the extent and is not to be confused with a modern farm called Wyslade, about two-thirds of a mile to the south-east of Windmill Hill.
demesne land (Table 2.2). Similar figures prevailed across thirteen bishopric of Worcester manors in 1299, where the majority of land was held by tenants. There is very little difference between the figures for 1279 and 1298. The drop in land held by tenants is accounted for by a reduction in the number of free tenants recorded in 1298, although in the meantime cottar acreages had doubled and it is likely that Hethcote was colonized by a small number of tenants not recorded in 1279. The tenants of Hethcote were of villein status yet paid money rent - 3s. 4d. for 18 acres apiece - and rendered light services centred exclusively on the meadow of Hethcote. That they are listed at the end of the Tachbrook entry in the 1298 extent, which otherwise fastidiously recorded tenants in order of legal and tenurial status, possibly bears out their late arrival on the landscape.

The small amount of meadow at Tachbrook was scattered in the vicinity of Hethcote. Most of the pasture was in Oakley wood. Both were valued at a low 3d. an acre (the same value as the arable), and nowhere near the 36d. an acre found, for example, in eastern Norfolk.

2.3.ii Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon

As noted under Tachbrook the two-field system was 'widespread, indeed dominant in the...upper Itchen valleys and over the intervening clay plains'. The demesne arable evidently underwent severe contraction between 1279 and 1298, somewhat earlier than at Tachbrook (Table 2.3). Nevertheless, as at Tachbrook, there is very little difference in 1298 between the first and second seisoна (Fig. 6). The 40-acre virgate which prevailed at Itchington is considerable. Several large blocks of land are also apparent at Itchington. For instance, Berhull, 42 acres 3½ roods, lambecote (indicative of a former specialized use), 33½ acres, and Watergalle.
Table 2.3 Demesne at Itchington, 1279 and 1298 compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>demesne</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>5 carucates</td>
<td>600 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>first seisona 207 acres</td>
<td>448 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second seisona 241 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Also the name of an adjacent hamlet), 30 acres. Many of the furlong names of Itchington listed in the 1298 extent also appear in the account rolls of 1307, 1310 and 1311 and for the most part in the same order. This suggests that the manorial officials maintained a routine and efficient method of recording these names, constantly referring back to previous records.

Table 2.4 Demesne at Chadshunt and Gaydon, 1279 and 1298 compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>demesne</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>6 carucates</td>
<td>720 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>first seisona 254 acres</td>
<td>506 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second seisona 252 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

104 Rounded down to the nearest acre. The 1279 total assumes a carucate to be equal to 120 acres and the 1298 figure excludes pasture (32 acres 3 roods) and meadow (49 acres 10 perches). In the extent a virgate equals 40 acres. The extent was a working document, constantly updated. In the Itchington demesne section the scribe's figures, barely legible, do not add up. The remarkable disposition of demesne between fields is noted in Fox, 'Approaches to the adoption of the midland system', p. 80. The totals in Table 2.3 reflect the actual total number of acres listed. The extent was subsequently annotated to reflect the fact that the first seisona had been modified to 223 acres 2¼ roods and the second seisona to 216 acres 2¼ roods. Indeed the first seisona had been expanded to 223 acres 2¼ roods according to the acreages recorded 'in an account roll dated 1311: LJRO, D 30/N8 now D 30/11/101.

105 LJRO, D 30/N7-9 now D 30/11/99-101.

106 P. D. A. Harvey, 'Mapping the village: the historical evidence', in D. Hooke, ed., Medieval Villages (Oxford, 1985), p. 37; and see Chapter 4 for the routine way in which tenants were recorded.

107 Rounded down to the nearest acre. In both the Hundred Rolls and the 1298 extent the demesne shared between these two townships is written up under Chadshunt. The 1279 total assumes a carucate to be equal to 120 acres and the 1298 figure excludes pasture (9½ acres), meadow (87 acres 1½ roods) and terra frisca (21 acres 3½ roods). In the extent a virgate equals 32 acres at Chadshunt and 20 acres at Gaydon. The scribe's total was later amended to 496 acres ¼ rood, taking into account that the first seisona had shrunk by 12 acres.
Fig. 6 Field system at Itchington: putative division using evidence from the 1298 extent
Fig. 7 Field system at Chadshunt and Gaydon: putative division
As at Tachbrook and Itchington, the similar size of the two fields at Chadshunt is very striking (Table 2.4, Fig. 7). The 20-acre virgate at Gaydon is surprisingly low for wold country. This may have reflected a better quality of soil but this does not really help in explaining the disparity in virgate size between Chadshunt and Gaydon, which will be discussed below. There are far fewer large blocks of demesne at Chadshunt, where the furlongs generally ranged from 11 to 19 acres. Two notable exceptions are the appropriately named Longeforlonge (40 acres 1½ roods) and le Doune (33 acres 1 rood).

Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon each operated under a two-field system. Unusually Upper and Nether Itchington, two separate townships, shared one field system.¹⁰⁸ In the account rolls the whole of Itchington is clearly divided between the west and east fields. Furthermore, in a mid-thirteenth century charter, land is granted in two separate fields in Itchington. And it is possible to match some of the furlong names that appear in the 1298 extent with those on the 1839 tithe map where the ancient division of the whole vill into two large fields, comprising of both Upper and Nether Itchington, is plain to see.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, whenever agrarian by-laws were agreed they always applied in both Upper and Nether Itchington. For example, the sheep quota in 1549 was set at forty sheep per virgate in both vills, the same ploughing arrangements in 1550 applied in both vills, and the same livestock stints in the early 1550s.¹¹⁰ The only puzzle is that tenants who came to the manor court to take up holdings were usually granted land in either Upper or Nether Itchington but never in both. A possible explanation is that when, for example, the scribe recorded that a messuage and a virgate had been accepted in Upper Itchington, it was to be understood that the messuage was in Upper Itchington but the land was divided

¹⁰⁸ Adjacent to Itchington, Northend and Knightcote in Burton Dassett shared the same field system but were not under common lordship, which suggests that the formation of these two settlements must have preceded the division of lordship. Furthermore, it is clear that the organisation of twin villages, not always under the same lord, has implications for the origin of nucleated villages, which was discussed earlier in this chapter: Dyer, 'Rural settlements', p. 124. In neighbouring Northamptonshire there are nothing more than hints that in some cases more than one township shared a field system: Hall, Open Fields, pp. 54, 63, 64, 300, 301, 311, 327.
¹⁰⁹ Savage, Magnum Registrum Album, pp. 90-91.
¹¹⁰ BRL, 432722, 432723, 432665, 432666.
equally between Upper and Nether Itchington. 111

How did Upper and Nether Itchington evolve into two townships sharing one field system? Could Maitland be right that paired villages came into being as a result of being split in the post-Conquest period? 112 And what about Dodgshon’s theories that such divisions were effected either for proprietary reasons or out of a desire to make the township layout smaller and more efficient? None of these hypotheses can be applied here because both Upper and Nether Itchington remained under common lordship throughout the middle ages and beyond. Furthermore had there been a desire to improve the layout of the township would it not have been logical for the field system to be divided up so that both townships had its own system as happened at Tachbrook Episcopi and Mallory? And yet the two Itchingtons continued to share the same field system. 113 More reasonably it may be argued that split townships with a common field system, such as Upper and Nether Itchington, were more likely to have been at one time two scattered settlements in which the process of nucleation was begun but not quite accomplished, and therefore not evolving beyond the stage of being a nucleated polyfocal settlement. 114

Dodgshon went further in his arguments by linking the splitting of townships with the equally thorny historical problem of the origin and development of the two- and three-field system. Accordingly, in the post-Conquest period settlements grew to such an extent that they became unwieldy so that ‘the early splitting and re-organization of townships provided a nursery for the development of what became the two- and three-field system’. 115 Again this does not work for the two Itchingtons, where, as we have just observed, if the splitting was executed in order to experiment with field

---

111 At Upper and Lower Weedon (Northants.) in the early fourteenth century there were two distinct two-field systems but in 1583 they were amalgamated into ‘a single system for both settlements’ and thereafter virgates were described as being in Upper and Lower Weedon or in the fields of Weedon but houses continued to be specified as being in one or other: Hall, Open Fields, pp. 63, 64.
113 Dodgshon, ‘The origin of the two- and three-field system’, p. 57: see also Dodgshon, The Origins of British Field Systems, pp. 108-110, 129-130. Nether Itchington was clearly the dominant settlement because this is where the parish church was founded. Upper Itchington was a chapelry.
114 See stage (iii) on p. 36, above.
115 Dodgshon, ‘The origin of the two- and three-field system’, p. 63. J. Kissock, in an article which he regarded as being highly speculative, suggested that the break-up of multiple estates could in itself have precipitated changes in field systems. Again this could not apply to Itchington or Chadshunt as there was no discontinuity in or fragmentation of lordship: see J. Kissock, ‘The origins of medieval nucleated rural settlements in Glamorgan: a conjectural model’, Morgannwg 35 (1991), p. 34.
systems, the respective townships would logically have developed their own discrete systems.

Dyer observed that ‘Chadshunt is typical of a number of south Warwickshire villages in that it was paired with another village, Gaydon’ and further wondered whether they shared the same field system.\textsuperscript{116} In fact on closer scrutiny of the evidence it seems that Chadshunt and Gaydon did not share a field system. Firstly, tenants’ holdings were always described as being in either Chadshunt or Gaydon and never dispersed between the two. Secondly, according to the 1298 extent and all subsequent account rolls, all the demesne arable was at Chadshunt. Had the two vills shared one field system this would have been a lopsided and unworkable arrangement. Thirdly, in the sixteenth century separate ploughing arrangements are in evidence in the two vills. For example, in 1551 at Gaydon one-twelfth of a virgate was to be left unploughed, whereas at Chadshunt four acres per virgate in the ffalowfyld were to be left unploughed.\textsuperscript{117} The situation here was quite different from that at Upper and Nether Itchington where, as we have seen, two townships shared one field system. How do we explain the fact that Chadshunt and Gaydon were paired together and yet did not share a field system?

Exceptionally attractive is Fox’s theory of post-Conquest ‘secondary dispersal’ when ‘new farmsteads [were] formed after village nucleation and often in far-flung corners of parishes.’\textsuperscript{118} In such cases the integrity of the parish remains unbreached. Following Fox’s theory, let us argue that Chadshunt became one complete nucleated settlement sometime pre-Conquest. Then in the post-Conquest period, as a result of ‘secondary’ dispersal, new farmsteads were formed in a far-flung corner of Chadshunt, subsequently dubbed ‘Gaydon’ after the rising promontory on the edge of the settlement, known since the early eighth century as Gaega’s dun. So quite plausibly Chadshunt and Gaydon developed their separate field systems because the latter settlement owed its existence to a process of post-nucleation secondary dispersal. Perhaps as a result of that process both townships adopted a differing

\textsuperscript{117} BRL, 432665.
\textsuperscript{118} Fox, Review of Everson, Taylor and Dunn, p. 77. Chadshunt was the primary settlement because this is where the parish church was founded, of which Gaydon was a chapelry. Both became chapellies of Nether Itchington sometime between 1248 and 1291.
virgate size: 32 acres to the virgate at Chadshunt but only 20 at Gaydon.

Table 2.5 Overall distribution of land at Itchington, 1279 and 1298 compared\(^{119}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>demesne arable</th>
<th>demesne pasture</th>
<th>demesne meadow</th>
<th>tenants</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whatever the reasons behind the sharing of field systems, the proportion of land under demesne arable was very low in Itchington (Table 2.5). Furthermore it is very noticeable that there was very little pasture or meadow, in fact barely two virgates in toto. Much of the pasture lay 'behind' hill-type features - behyndegrenhull, bihyndegoffenhull and Bihyndedodeslouwe (louwe/lhow, barrow), while the meadowland lay along the banks of the winding Itchen, as is apparent in names such as Childesham and Schamham (hamm, grass land in the bend of a river). The overwhelming part of the manor was held by tenants, who probably had a generous share in these resources.

Table 2.6 Overall distribution of land at Chadshunt and Gaydon, 1279 and 1298 compared\(^{120}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>demesne arable</th>
<th>demesne pasture</th>
<th>demesne meadow</th>
<th>tenants</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1298</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>64%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1279: Chadshunt, 21%, Gaydon, 35% 1298: Chadshunt, 21%, Gaydon, 43%

The distribution of land between demesne arable and tenants at Chadshunt (Table 2.6) is more like that at Tachbrook but the lack of demesne pasture and meadow is strikingly similar to Itchington. The reference to frisca is very interesting. This term

\(^{119}\) The Table includes all land in the manor apart from the glebe. It is uncertain whether the three carucates of demesne recorded in 1279 included pasture and meadow.

\(^{120}\) The Table includes all land in the manor apart from the glebe. Again it has been assumed that a carucate in the Hundred Rolls equalled 120 acres.
But in a Breckland context terra frisca may be interpreted as 'a longer recuperative fallow which [indicated] the use of convertible husbandry' and again in a more general Norfolk context as 'arable land lying unsown as part of a convertible husbandry system'. The small acreage of terra frisca at Chadshunt (21 acres 3½ roods) may be suggestive of land in poor condition and in need of being left waste. Alternatively, an interpretation of 'newly cultivated' land is equally valid because one of the furlong names here was Gorebrode (gore-, a corner of land), suggesting cultivation of the margin.

But there is one crucial point not to be ignored. The terra frisca was accorded a very low valuation of 2d. an acre. This is in marked contrast to the high rents being charged for waste on two manors of the bishop in Staffordshire, where assarting was continuing apace even in the opening decade of the fourteenth century. At Rugeley in the 1298 extent, three tenants are recorded as paying a total of 19s. 11d. for 41½ acres of nova terra and two acres of moor, land on which no heriot was to be rendered because the land was not heritable (non sunt astrarii). By contrast Thomas pistor who held two acres of nova terra and a Parrok (enclosure) was liable to give a heriot because his holding was heritable (astrarius). In neighbouring Cannock a total of 17 acres of newly assarted arable land was recorded on its demesne in 1298, the scribe noting that a perch was equal to 25½ feet, an exceptionally high figure indicative of the 'waste' nature of the terrain. And in 1308/9 26 tenants paid a total of £16. 1s. 3d. (about, 12s. 3d. each) for entering 31½ acres 1 rood of waste, subsequently paying 16s. ¾d. in rent per annum (about 8d. per capita), while in the same year new rents were paid for 66 acres of waste at 6d. an acre and entry fines of

---

121 Dyer, Lords and Peasants, pp. 68-69.
123 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 21r.
124 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 21v.
between 6s. 8d. and 10s. per acre. These much higher valuations of land when compared with the lowly 2d. an acre at Chadshunt strongly suggest that the terra frisca was indeed land 'allowed to revert from arable to grass'.

Conclusion

By the mid-thirteenth century the newly-consecrated bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, Roger Meuland, was in possession of a widely scattered estate. In order to consolidate his hold, he acquired from Henry III a number of much sought after privileges. These included several market grants, including the one to hold a weekly market and annual fair in Itchington. A desire to provide a convenient forum in which his tenants could trade may have formed part of his motive. But in blatantly disregarding the nisi sit ad nocumentum clause of the grant by electing to hold the annual fair at the very same time as the one in the neighbouring royal vill of Kineton, he was quite possibly making a direct challenge, albeit on a small scale, to the commercial dominance of Kineton in the area. The bishop succeeded in defending his various privileges in the Quo Warranto enquiry of 1285, privileges to which was added one more by his successor, Walter Langton: the franchise of return of all royal writs, thus establishing the whole of the bishop’s estate into a private shire.

It has been demonstrated that the bishop’s Warwickshire manors lay in very different settings. The settlement morphology of Tachbrook, on the surface a compact, nucleated, Feldon settlement, betrayed its fragmented pre-nucleation nature. Uncharacteristic, too, were its woodland resources. The furlong-names in particular in Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon, as well as the evidence from the surrounding area, have shown these vills to be in a distinctively wold-like region. The field systems of all the bishop’s Warwickshire manors have proven to be unusual in different ways: the splitting of Tachbrook Episcopi and Mallory, in terms of developing two discrete field systems, and the very complex and fascinating situation at Upper and Nether Itchington and Chadshunt and Gaydon.

Now that the bishop’s Warwickshire manors have been placed into an historical

---

125 LJRO, D 30/N10 now D 30/11/84; SRO, D (W) 1734/J2057, m. 1r.
and topographical context and their field systems have been analysed, it is proposed in the next chapter to explore ways in which the lord exploited the resources of the demesne at the turn of the fourteenth century when the rural economy was supposedly poised on a Malthusian knife-edge.
CHAPTER THREE

THE DEMESNE IN THE LATE THIRTEENTH AND EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURIES

Introduction

Having set the scene for the thesis by describing and analysing the topographical setting of the Warwickshire manors of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and investigating the evidence of field systems and furlong names, there follows in this chapter an exploration of the bishop's demesnes in their heyday. This will include an analysis of crops in the context of seeding rates, yields, prices and uses, followed by an analysis of types and numbers of livestock. Reference will also be made to inter-manorial co-operation. The aims of this chapter are twofold: to discover ways in which the landscape was exploited and to test the concept of 'the inertia of medieval agricultural productivity' against the more upbeat theories of agricultural progress and innovation. In so doing we shall seek out evidence of early signs of weaknesses and incipient problems or otherwise in the rural economy, in productivity and in ecology which may have contributed to later problems. Such evidence may help us in understanding the differing experiences of the manors within our area of study in later centuries.

---

1 M.M. Postan, 'Medieval agrarian society in its prime, pt 7: England', in M.M. Postan, ed., The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, 1, The Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages (Cambridge, 1966), p. 556; B.M.S. Campbell, 'Agricultural progress in medieval England: some evidence from eastern Norfolk', EcHR 2nd ser. 36 (1983), pp. 26-46, where the opening sentence laments the fact that: 'Thirteenth- and fourteenth-century English agriculture is currently held in low repute.' In similar vein and twelve years later Campbell stated in the opening sentence of another paper: 'The belief that medieval English agriculture was characterised by static technology, low productivity, and a tendency towards productivity decline dies hard': see B.M.S. Campbell, 'Progressiveness and backwardness in thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century English agriculture: the verdict of recent research', in J-M Duvosquel and E. Thoen, eds, Peasants and Townsmen in Medieval Europe Studia in Honorem Adriaan Verhulst (Ghent, 1995), p. 541. And most recently Campbell has commented that 'pessimistic verdicts upon medieval agriculture [for example, Malthusian]...are unduly harsh and ripe for reassessment. The achievements of English medieval agriculture are far from unimpressive': B.M.S. Campbell, English Seigniorial Agriculture, 1250-1450 (Cambridge, 2000), p. 20.
While R. Lennard was wondering 'whether the defects of medieval agriculture included progressive exhaustion of the soil', M.M. Postan was beginning to formulate what has become known as the 'Postan thesis'. He saw demographic expansion as a catalyst for land hunger in thirteenth-century rural England 'which must have worsened as the...century was drawing to its close'. The resulting increase in demand for food outstripped supply so that severe pressure was put on areas of pasture, meadow and marginal land. Thus fewer animals could be kept which meant a decrease in dung and a concomitant decrease in yields. Postan did concede that 'shortage of manure need not always have been the operative cause of dwindling yields and lapsing acres', a concession overlooked by some of his critics.

If a whole thesis were written on the 'Postan thesis' there would certainly be a great deal to say both for and against and we may well conclude that the crisis from about 1290 to the eve of the Black Death was a 'mid-term crisis', during which 'perhaps medieval England was not on so sharp a Malthusian knife-edge as Postan depicted...On the one hand, trends such as the abandonment of demesne arable began even before the hungry 1270s; on the other, assarting in some places continued even after the Black Death.

As H.E. Hallam and B.M.S. Campbell pointed out, Postan’s main evidence was drawn from the archives of the bishopric of Winchester, archives which have tended 'to loom

---


3 Postan, 'Medieval agrarian society', pp. 552-553; H.E. Hallam, Rural England 1066-1348 (London, 1981), pp. 10-11. England was not alone in its suffering at this time. For example, in the northern Pas-de-Calais region of France there was severe pressure on the fallow: see G. Sivéry, 'Terroirs, villages et communautés rurales au moyen âge', in R. Muchembled and G. Sivéry, eds, Nos ancêtres, les paysans Aspects du monde rural dans le Nord Pas-de-Calais des origines à nos jours (Lille, 1983), p. 63.


disproportionately large in all discussions of medieval productivity change. That 'Hampshire is not England' has been proven conclusively by Campbell in his work on another county, Norfolk, whose rural economy provides striking evidence of agricultural progress. The 'Postan thesis' has furthermore been criticized for its implication that 'early cultivators were ignorant, irrational, or completely custom bound', because they were unable, for example, to recognize methods of maintaining soil fertility such as the use of manure. Moreover, as Campbell contended, 'soil exhaustion was not an inevitable concomitant of attempts to intensify arable production'. R. Brenner, while conceding that the Malthusian model 'has a certain compelling logic' - that is to say that diminishing returns in agriculture caused by declining fertility of the soil together with the occupation of increasingly marginal land ought to lead to demand outrunning supply - argued that 'the Malthusian cycle of long-term stagnation, as well as other forms of economic backwardness, can only be fully understood as the product of established structures of class relations'.

Nevertheless, the 'Postan thesis' continues to hold sway, albeit with occasional modification. There is much to be said for the claim made by E. Miller and J. Hatcher that 'even highly organized and superficially efficient estates were failing in one quite

---


9 Clark, 'The economics of exhaustion', p. 61.

8 Campbell, 'Agricultural progress', p. 43. More recently Campbell has contended that 'Medieval historians have long debated whether soil exhaustion may have depressed grain yields, but as yet there is little unambiguous evidence to support this thesis': Campbell, English Seigniorial Agriculture, p. 17.


basic requirement of good husbandry: the keeping of the land in good heart.' This contention has recently been given strong scientific support. In a fascinating and novel approach E.I. Newman and P.D.A. Harvey have demonstrated from a biochemical perspective that at Cuxham (Oxon.) soil fertility did decline, because of an unwitting failure to keep the farm in long-term balance for phosphorus. Failure to keep the land 'in good heart' may also have been the result of

'the whole of medieval society [having] a high rate of discount of future benefits, which led it to plough up permanently almost all the grassland and to sacrifice future yields for current output.'

Adverse weather, weediness of the soil and inadequate labour resources were other potential problems. And while there may be little agreement on the dynamism or otherwise of late thirteenth-century agricultural productivity, there is much truth in Campbell's claim that 'the feudal combination of lymphatic peasants and lackadaisical lords sapped the agricultural sector of dynamism and eroded its ecological base.'

Major decisions which ultimately affected agricultural productivity were generally left to local officials, particularly the reeve, that 'creature of local husbandry practice', who was best-placed to take account of climate, soil, and topography. And the records which those officials have left behind in the manorial archives of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, although they may never hope to rival those of Winchester or Canterbury, nevertheless contain enough material to give us at least a glimpse of trends in agrarian productivity at the end of the thirteenth century and into the opening

---

13 Clark, 'The economics of exhaustion', pp. 61, 68-79. Jordan found this contention interesting but felt that it needed more elaboration before being accepted: Jordan, *The Great Famine*, p. 27.  
decade of the fourteenth. The next section of this chapter will use mainly the evidence of account rolls from that archive to explore seeding rates, yields, prices, and uses of crops grown on the bishop's Warwickshire demesnes.

### 3.1 Crops

As there are no surviving account rolls for Tachbrook for the relevant period, the rest of this chapter will necessarily focus on Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon. Before dismissing Tachbrook out of hand, there is some evidence for cropping. We have already established that a two-course rotation was employed.\(^{17}\) According to a reference made in a *Liberate Roll* (dated 8 March, 1241/2) during a vacancy-in-see, the executors of the bishop were instructed to deliver to the keeper of the bishopric £6. 1s. 9d. for 22 quarters 2 strikes of rye (a winter-sown crop), 2½ quarters of beans, 1 quarter of dredge, and 34½ quarters of oats (all spring-sown crops) for seed and liveries of servants in the manor of Tachbrook.\(^{18}\) Without exception, the other manors mentioned in the same entry, regardless of geographical setting, were also to receive vast quantities of oats for seed and liveries, including 140 quarters to Sawley (Derbs.), 120 quarters to Berkswich (Staffs.), 92½ quarters to Prees (Salop) and 49½ sieves (*criblis*) to Tarvin (Ches.).\(^{19}\) Clearly, it was convenient for the keeper of the bishopric to deliver a crop which was easy to grow and needed no marketing, as its produce would be consumed on individual manors by servants and beasts.

Fortuitously, there is much better information available for trends in cropping at Itchington and Chadshunt.\(^{20}\) The rest of this section will concentrate on crops grown on the lord's demesne according mainly to the evidence of four surviving account

---

\(^{17}\) See Chapter 2 for the field system here.


\(^{19}\) *Liberate Rolls*, pp. 110-111. Payments for wheat, rye, barley, dredge, beans and peas were also delivered in varying combinations from each manor but the quantity was in no way comparable to that of oats.

\(^{20}\) Demesne activity was always recorded under Chadshunt. According to the evidence given at a view of frankpledge on 17 October, 1360, there was no demesne land at Gaydon: see SBTRO, DR 10/2593.
rolls: three for Itchington and one for Chadshunt. Perforce, far more attention will be
given to Itchington. Each crop will be taken in turn, namely wheat, dredge, oats and
peas.

3.1.i Wheat

The amount of wheat sown varied little in terms of quantity from year to year at
Itchington and was not dissimilar to the amount sown at Chadshunt (Appendix 1).
Furthermore the seeding rates in 1307 are the same for both manors. It is impossible
to tell from such slim evidence whether these decisions were the result of a regional
bias, as was the case, for example, in Norfolk. At Itchington the percentage of land
sown with wheat varied from year to year, although there was actually very little
difference in acreage sown. Whereas in 1307 wheat took up 39½% of sown land (108
acres 1 rood), in 1310 that figure increased to just over 52% (115½ acres), only to fall
back to about 41% in 1311 (90 acres). Infuriatingly, the possibility of comparing the
names of the furlongs sown in 1307 with those sown in 1311 is denied us. This is
because the account roll drawn up in the former year was done so by the King's
officials (the estate having been sequestered sometime during August 1307, because
of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield's imprisonment), who knew the estate less
well and were less precise than the bishop's officials in their recording: thus they

---

21 To avoid repetitive footnotes the references to these account rolls are: Itchington: LJRO, D 30/N9,
dated 1307; LJRO, D 30/N7, dated 1310; LJRO, D 30/N8, dated 1311; Chadshunt: LJRO, D 30/N6,
dated 1307 now D 30/111, 99, 100, 102. The date in each case refers to the Michaelmas when the
account was drawn up. Although a mere four account rolls survive, the information in them is of
exceptionable quality. Also, there is contemporary material which helps to boost the evidence.
Moreover, as Campbell noted, although, for example, the bishopric of Winchester with its continuous
series of Pipe Rolls had tended 'to loom disproportionately large in all discussions of medieval
productivity change' estates with more fragmentary material were also 'capable of adding very
considerably to knowledge and understanding': B.M.S. Campbell, 'Land, labour, livestock, and
productivity trends in English seigneurial agriculture, 1208-1450', in B.M.S. Campbell and M. Overton,
eds, Land, Labour and Livestock: Historical Studies in European Agricultural Productivity (Manchester,
1991), p. 150. More recently Campbell observed that: 'Three, four or five accounts are...quite
sufficient to reconstruct a robust profile of the husbandry and management of any one manor. Much
may be learnt even when only one account survives in isolation': Campbell, English Seigniorial
Agriculture, p. 27. For an example of a manorial study based on fragmentary material see J.P.
University of Birmingham (1997), particularly p. 245, where he dubs his thesis multum ex parvo and p.
246, where he expresses the hope that 'this research might still encourage others to undertake single
manor studies even where the prima facie evidence seems to be inadequate.'
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recorded no furlong names. The seeding rate was consistent in Itchington and Chadshunt at 2 bushels per acre until a surprising increase of 50% to 3 bushels per acre at Itchington in 1311. Certainly,

'in the most extensive cropping systems and on the poorest soils seed tended to be sown thinly, less than 2 bushels an acre for wheat'.

As to the calculation of how much was yielded, ideally we should hope for a good run of consecutive account rolls. In the absence of such luck some historians have engaged a statistical device dubbed the 'internal method', although it is prone to producing questionable data. We can see that in 1310 29 quarters 6 bushels of wheat sown at Itchington yielded 61 quarters 3 bushels or about 4.24 bushels per acre - just over twice the amount sown. This is an incredibly poor return even in terms of the low yields habitually produced on Winchester manors, where the lowest return in 1311 was of 6.4 bushels per acre. A key factor at Itchington may have been the weather. There is a telling reference in the account roll of 1311 to the purchase of an extra piece of steel for the plough, justified because of drought (propter siccitatem temporis). And Itchington was not alone in its suffering. Generally that year the harvest was at least 15% below average, floods in winter having been followed by a dry summer. On the Winchester manor of Fonthill (Wilts.) the meadow had proven impossible to mow because it was so dry on account of drought.

---


26 References to weather in account rolls are regarded as being superior to those which appear in chronicles, which were prone to 'colourful exaggeration and retrospective inaccuracies'. For weather in account rolls see J.Z. Titow, 'Evidence of weather in the account rolls of the bishopric of Winchester', *ECHR* 2nd ser. 12 (1959), pp. 360-407; J.Z. Titow, *Le climat à travers les rôles de comptabilité de l'évêché de Winchester (1350-1450)*, *Annales Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 25 (1970), pp. 312-348.

27 Titow, pp. 363, 383.

28 Titow, p. 384.
It is clear from the dramatic surge in the price of wheat between 1307 and 1310 that there was a crisis in Itchington towards the end of the decade. The extremely high price of 10s. a quarter paid to the parson of the adjacent parish of Chesterton sometime in 1310 has the hallmark of desperation. The reeve not only paid a very high price for the grain but he also bought it, not from a local or regional market, but from a neighbour who perhaps traded on that desperation. This crisis may explain why the reeve decided to increase the seeding rate by 50%. Significantly most of it was for seed. Perhaps the reeve was following Walter of Henley's advice to 'Chaunge yearely your seed corn at Mychaelmas', considering it 'good husbandry to buy the seed for winter corn rather than take home-grown corn for sowing...because...wheat grown elsewhere would bring better yield than home-grown seed.'

It is clear that 'the basic consumption needs of seigneurial households had first claim upon demesne production on many estates'. But even though consumption alone, for example, by the brethren of Peterborough Abbey made above average inroads into marketable yields, it is likely that there would have been surpluses of grain within the household, sold on in private transactions. Cereal production for the market was evidently unimportant throughout the estate of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield. That estate was certainly not part of a system of, in Postan's memorable phrase, 'federated grain factories'. Much of the wheat harvest was consumed in the form of liveries to servants and fodder for stock, leaving only a small proportion to be sold. Any surplus seems to have been sent to Lichfield to the lord's larder (ad lardarium domini). For example, in 1310 a total of 54 quarters 5 bushels

30 D. Oschinsky, Walter of Henley And Other Treatises On Estate Management and Accounting (Oxford, 1971), pp. 175, 325. On the continent, too, the benefits of bringing in new seed each year were recognized: G. Sivéry, Structures Agraires et Vie Rurale dans le Hainaut à la fin du Moyen-Age (2 vols, Lille, 1977, 1980), 1, pp. 328-329: 'les maîtres de culture connaissent au moins l'usage de semer des grains produits dans un terroir différent de celui qu'on veut ensemencer. C'est une condition indispensable pour maintenir les rendements.'
32 K. Biddick, The Other Economy Pastoral Husbandry on a Medieval Estate (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1989), pp. 73, 76.
33 M.M. Postan, Essays on Medieval Agriculture and General Problems of the Medieval Economy (Cambridge, 1973), p. 44.
was delivered from Itchington to Alex Janitor, an estate official at Lichfield, who used to receive regular contributions of grain from other bishopric manors. Exceptionally, there was a mass clear-out of wheat from Chadshunt in 1307, which was sold in bulk and probably in a private transaction.

3.1.ii Dredge

Dredge - a mixture of barley and oats, and sometimes peas - may have played a far less important role in the medieval rural economy, yet there is clear evidence of its increasing popularity at Itchington and Chadshunt. According to the evidence of the 1242 Liberate Rolls, the only manors on the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield's estate where dredge was sown were those in Warwickshire: clearly a regional bias here. At Itchington the opening decade of the fourteenth century saw a dramatic increase in the amount of dredge sown, from 25% of the demesne in 1307 to more than 45% by 1311 (Appendix 1). At Chadshunt in 1307 30% of sown acres were devoted to dredge (Appendix 1), the demesne having harvested a bumper crop of 246 quarters 5 bushels that year.

The only surefast yield figures are those for the crop sown at Itchington in 1310, which in 1311 yielded 5.62 bushels per acre - a low return from a seeding ratio of 4 bushels per acre. According to the evidence of the account rolls Itchington was normally self-sufficient in dredge. Yet, just as the reeve had been obliged to purchase wheat at a very high price from the parson of Chesterton in 1310, in that same year he was also forced to purchase dredge also at a high price and also from the same parson, which lends further credibility to the suggestion of a poor harvest that year. The reeve rarely found the need to sell any dredge but in 1307, just as there was a

---

34 Interestingly, wheat liveries delivered to Alex Janitor from the home farm at Lichfield in 1313 were specified to be used for the poor, as were liveries of mixed corn, and barley and oat malt: LJRO, D 30/N13 now D 30111180; see also LJRO, D 30/N3 now D 30111183; SRO, D(W) 1734/J2057, m. 2r. The bishop's visits to Itchington, his officials, and the food allowances made to manorial servants will be discussed in Chapter 4.

35 The size of the 'stack' is not specified where it is mentioned in the sales section on the recto side of the account roll and is left out of the grange account on the verso side. It was sold in grosso, indicative of a private, perhaps even local, transaction. This is borne out by the names of the purchasers: John de Chadshunt and Richard clericus; see also D. Postles, 'Markets for rural produce in Oxfordshire, 1086-1350', Midland History 12 (1987), p. 21.

36 Liberate Rolls, pp. 110-111.
clear-out of ‘old’ wheat, so were 5 quarters of ‘weak’ dredge sold together with a further 105 quarters 6 bushels. Noteworthy is the reference to some of it having been sold in Lichfield. This is the only indication in any of the four account rolls of the market destination of grain.37 There was a similar clear-out from Chadshunt as about two-thirds of its bumper crop was sold.

Although the price of wheat tended to set the price for other kinds of grain, remarkably the price of dredge in 1307 was on average 12% higher than that of wheat at Itchington and roughly on a par at Chadshunt, although this imbalance was rectified by the end of the decade when in 1310 dredge fetched 65% of the price of wheat and only 50% in 1311. This last figure is remarkably in line with the wider national trend of 55% which obtained between 1275 and 1324.38

Under normal circumstances, most of the dredge not sold from the demesne at Itchington was not used on the manor. For example, in 1310 nearly three-quarters of the harvest was sent to Lichfield as livery. The following year, once the seed had been accounted for (52 quarters 2 bushels), the reeve was left with barely five quarters but that was more than adequate for feeding the oxen. He therefore had no need of the 52 quarters delivered from Tachbrook nor of the 31 quarters from Chadshunt. That this extra-manorial contribution was all malted and then sent to Lichfield suggests that it made practical, as well as economic, sense to malt the dredge in one place in one single operation.

3.1.iii Oats

Oats, the general utility crop of medieval England, were grown chiefly for fodder. The amount of acreage occupied by this crop varied widely, as did the type of soil on which it was grown, although it is generally accepted that oats were grown on poor land.39 While Hallam saw in the ‘Postan thesis’ the suggestion that population

37 Campbell, Galloway, Keene and Murphy, A Medieval Capital and Its Grain Supply, p. 53, where it is noted that: 'While manorial accounts usually record the quantities of each grain sold with great precision, they rarely specify where the sale took place or who bought it. Sometimes there is evidence of merchants buying direct from demesnes. Other sales are said to be made in the market...or in the district...but the precise location of the sale remains unclear.'


expansion led to a compulsion to grow poorer grains as greater and greater areas of marginal land came under the plough, and, thus, an increase in the cultivation of oats, Postan himself claimed that in general oats were the crop to be reduced most in the later thirteenth century. And his claim is to some extent borne out by the evidence at Itchington. Before moving on to the central evidence it is worth noting that, like at Tachbrook, vast quantities of oats were sown here and at Chadshunt in 1242. A total of 50½ quarters of oats were delivered to Itchington for seed, which if sown at 4 bushels per acre as in later years would have covered 102 acres, or nearly half of sown land. A total of 87 quarters were delivered to Chadshunt for both seed and liveries.

It is clear that by the opening decade of the fourteenth century oats were no longer an important part of agrarian production here (Appendix 1). In 1307 this crop occupied barely 13% of sown land in Itchington, a lowly figure which dropped even further to 4½% by 1310. The following year, when there was an upsurge in the amount of dredge sown, an unspecified amount of oats was sown with 1½ quarters of dredge for fodder. It is highly significant that in 1307 some of the oats were sown in le heth, as this was not only poor land, it was also marginal. The seeding rate of 4 bushels per acre at Itchington and Chadshunt is comparable with the rate on Winchester manors, known for their low arable productivity. By marked contrast, in eastern and south-eastern England the seeding rates for oats were considerably higher. For example, in Norfolk oats were sown at 6 to 8 bushels per acre, 'clearly intended to act as a smother crop', and yielding an average of 13.2 bushels per acre; while on the Canterbury Cathedral Priory manor of Monkton the seeding rate was consistent at 6½ bushels per acre until 1302, whereafter it was increased to 7 bushels per acre.

41 Liberate Rolls, p. 111.
42 Campbell, Galloway, Keene and Murphy, *A Medieval Capital and its Grain Supply*, p. 136; G.H. Dury, 'Crop failures on the Winchester manors 1232-1349', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* new ser. 9 (1984), pp. 401-418. Dury's comments in this paper are criticized in Jordan, *The Great Famine*, p. 201, where he is described as 'one of the most insistent proponents of the 'Postan thesis'.
Typically, the oats produced at both Itchington and Chadshunt (Appendix 1) were used for feeding livestock, almost exclusively the cart-horses, and a small amount was made into potage for the famuli.\textsuperscript{44} At Itchington the lack of a good crop of oats was made good by liveries from other manors or by purchasing. In 1307, for example, 17 quarters came from the reeve of Chadshunt. In 1310 when there was no harvest of oats in Itchington 6 quarters 2 bushels were obtained from the reeve of Tachbrook. A further 22\(\frac{1}{2}\) quarters were purchased including 5 quarters 3 bushels for horse fodder and another quarter for potage.\textsuperscript{45} The meagre yield of 8 quarters in 1311 was supplemented by 3 quarters from the reeve of Chadshunt and the purchase of 18 quarters 6 bushels at various times of the year, as and when needed.

Even though there was a demand for oats on the manor, to feed both the horses and the famuli, and even though oats were the easiest of crops to grow, it is evident that a number of key decisions had been made. The acreage devoted to oats was to be gradually cut back. The demand for oats was to be met by using the surplus from other manors, and any deficiency made good by irregular purchasing. Dredge was to be sown in increasing amounts, in other words, oats mixed with barley, neither being sown as a discrete crop. Yet elsewhere on the bishop’s estate, oats retained their importance. For example, of about 50 quarters of grain sown at Berkswich (Staffs.) in 1313, nearly half were of oats, and an even larger proportion in 1316.\textsuperscript{46}

3.1.iv Peas

There has been, and continues to be, much disagreement on the exact role of peas in medieval agrarian cultivation. For some, like Titow and Farmer, the increase in leguminous crops and their effect on productivity was not to be exaggerated. Moreover, the Winchester manors

\begin{quote}
‘which gave most room to peas and beans and vetch certainly did no better than the others...It was the weeds the legumes nourished, not the wheat or rye which would come after the fallowing’.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{44} The amount dispensed to the livestock and to the famuli will be discussed respectively below and in Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{45} In a two-course system it was almost impossible to keep horses unless oats were imported from elsewhere: B.H. Slicher van Bath, The Agrarian History of Western Europe A.D. 500-1850 (London, 1963), p. 60.

\textsuperscript{46} LJRO, D 30/N1, N2 now D 30/11/81, 82.
And Farmer was quite certain that: 'Neither the presence nor the absence of legumes seems to have had any general effect on the grain harvest.' Yet even Postan viewed the expanding use of legumes, particularly where they were sown on portions of the fallow, as a 'remarkable technical advance' but, nevertheless, wondered whether medieval farmers were aware of the contribution that legumes made in replenishing the nitrates in the soil. In the midst of this argument Campbell is surely right in pointing out that 'for all the claims that have sometimes been made for them, legumes as a class were no panacea for the problems confronting agriculture at this time.'

We can only speculate as to whether the reeves at Itchington and Chadshunt appreciated the intrinsic ecological benefits of expanding the cultivation of peas. Certainly there was no marked increase in the cultivation of legumes as T.A.M. Bishop claimed for many parts of England during the first half of the fourteenth century, when 'medieval farmers began to take advantage of the nitrefying properties of leguminous plants in order to reduce the proportion of the fallow.' In reality, on many a demesne in the West Midlands only one-tenth of the arable was sown with legumes. Although more than one-fifth of the demesne at Itchington was sown with peas in 1307 (Appendix 1), this had fallen to barely 7% only three years later, recovering slightly to 13½% the following year. At Chadshunt in 1307 (Appendix 1) 14% of the demesne arable was sown with peas. Yet elsewhere on the bishop's estate, for example at Eccleshall in 1308 peas were more important than barley or rye and at Haywood peas were more important than rye, which is clearly a further

---

47 Titow, *Winchester Yields*, p. 31; Farmer, 'Crop yields, prices and wages', pp. 132-133, 149; D.L. Farmer, 'Grain yields on Westminster Abbey Manors, 1271-1410', *Canadian Journal of History* 18 (1983), pp. 341, 346-347. These arguments find no favour with Mate who has argued for legumes fulfilling 'the twin functions of enriching the nitrogenous content of the soil and providing a protein-rich source of fodder': Mate, 'Medieval agrarian practices', pp. 27, 31-32.


50 Bishop, 'The rotation of crops at Westerham', p. 43.

example of regional differences in cropping.52

The issue of the grange at Itchington in 1310 and 1311 was remarkably similar - 12 quarters and 11½ quarters respectively, and barely one-third of the issue of 1307. The only reliable guide to the yield of peas at Itchington is that for the crop sown in 1310. The erratic variation in the sowing of peas and the fact that they were sown, for example, in 1311 in le Inheth - cannot feasibly be interpreted as an attempt to reinvigorate heathy waste land because of the small amount involved. Yet four years earlier nearly 92% of peas were sown in le Inheth, amounting to 56 acres 1½ roods and 22½% of all sown land. Was the reeve experimenting with inhoking - 'the well-known practice by which a field due to be fallowed was partly sown with spring crops'?53 And was his experimentation abruptly terminated by the sequestration? It is significant that at Chadshunt in that same year, 1307, while only 14 quarters 2 bushels of peas were sown, which was not much more than the yield of the previous year of 13 quarters 2 bushels, the peas were sown super xxxvij acr' in camp Warr (in other words, in the fallow field) and super iij acr' in le doune, itself indicative of 'an old outfield drawn into regular cultivation': a clear case here of inhoking.54

The consistent seeding rate of 3 bushels per acre at both Itchington and Chadshunt is more generous than many other medieval manors. At Crawley (Hants.) the rate in the early fourteenth century was 2 bushels per acre, while in the same period the rate on the Peterborough Abbey estate was nearer 2½ bushels per acre. Yet these seeding rates are paltry when compared with the 5 bushels per acre on the estate of Canterbury Cathedral Priory.55

The only peas sold from Itchington and Chadshunt were in fact not sold at all because the transactions were made on account (super comptum), and very few

52 J.R. Birrell, 'Medieval agriculture', in M.W. Greenslade and D.A. Johnson, eds, VCH Staffordshire 6 (Oxford, 1979), p. 20. These figures come from a sequestration account of the whole of the bishopric estate but with one very disappointing oversight - the folio headed Warwickshire was never filled in: PRO, E 358/13.
53 Campbell, Galloway, Keene and Murphy, A Medieval Capital and Its Grain Supply, p. 134; Bishop, 'The rotation of crops at Westerham', p. 41.
were purchased.\textsuperscript{56} One quarter 5 bushels were purchased in Itchington in 1310 at the surprisingly high price of 6s. 8d., on a par with the price of wheat that year. Fortunately for the reeve, the price fell dramatically the following year when he was made accountable for 3 quarters 3 bushels at 3s. per quarter. The peas were mostly, as Biddick put it without a trace of irony or any comment, divided between workers and pigs.\textsuperscript{57} In 1307 about half of the crop at Itchington was distributed between the \textit{famuli} and livestock, while in 1310 just over half the yield was given to the \textit{famuli} and the remainder was either reserved for seed or fed to the pigs in winter.

\subsection*{3.2 Livestock}

Some historians have argued that a deficiency of livestock at times of population pressure jeopardized arable productivity.\textsuperscript{58} We shall now turn to an analysis of the livestock kept on the Warwickshire manors of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield and explore stock levels, deployment, prices, feeding, and inter-manorial co-operation.

There is no evidence of what livestock were maintained on the demesne at Tachbrook, although it is evident from the 1298 extent that the unfree tenants of the manor were expected to maintain a horse each, for the heriot from such tenants was to be the best beast but \textit{not} a horse, which was to remain for the heir.\textsuperscript{59} This was doubtless because without a horse, tenants would be unable to perform carrying and carting services. The account rolls for Itchington and Chadshunt are very full in their detail of livestock, but, as with crops, much of this section will focus on the former manor, given the better survival of evidence.

\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Super compotum} means produce unaccounted for, and for which the reeve was therefore held responsible. This system of sales was first described in J.S. Drew, 'Manorial Accounts of St. Swithun’s Priory, Winchester', \textit{EcHR} 62 (1947), pp. 29-30.

\textsuperscript{57} Biddick, \textit{The Other Economy}, p. 77.

\textsuperscript{58} For example, Campbell, 'Land, labour, livestock, and productivity', pp. 149, 164. Campbell also argues that in Norfolk in the fourteenth century: 'The abundance or otherwise of its harvests seems to bear little or no relation to the relative trend in livestock numbers'. And on Winchester manors after the Black Death, although stocking densities more than doubled there was no dramatic increase in mean yields.

\textsuperscript{59} SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 5v.
3.2.1 Oxen and horses

Arguably the most crucial beast was the ox, although on a number of medieval demesnes the horse was gradually assuming importance. Agricultural treatises were firm in their preference for the ox particularly as a plough beast and, moreover, it was thought that a horse cost four times more to maintain, although this calculation ignored the fact that an ox could be fattened up and sold for almost as much as it had originally cost. In his magisterial study of horses and oxen, J. Langdon included data from 19 Warwickshire demesnes for the period 1250-1320. For this county his overall conclusion was that oxen did indeed dominate - 357 in total against 63 work horses - with virtually all plough-teams consisting solely of oxen, generally numbering eight per team, although there was the occasional and noticeable variation, even within the same region.

Several of Langdon's key findings fit in well with the situation at Itchington and Chadshunt in the opening decade of the fourteenth century (even though he overlooked the account rolls which have formed the bedrock of this chapter). Oxen were dominant here (Appendix 2) and used as plough beasts, whereas the three or four horses, which were kept, were used for hauling. All the oxen purchased in 1311 were stated to be 'for the plough'. Furthermore, a horse, which was described as 'old', was sold at the beginning of August and replaced at the same time by another, specified to be 'for the carts'. This concords with Langdon's research into horses and oxen on 509 demesnes, on 71½% of which horses only were employed for hauling. This development meant that by the end of the thirteenth century 'horse hauling had effectively replaced ox hauling as the premier mode of vehicle transport'. Horses were a boon for small loads, simply because they were able to move twice as fast as

---

60 J. Langdon, 'The economics of horses and oxen in medieval England', AgHR 30 (1982), pp. 31-32; J. Langdon, Horses, Oxen and Technological Innovation The Use of Draught Animals in English Farming from 1066 to 1500 (Cambridge, 1986), p. 158. See later in this section for a comparison of costs.

61 For example, in the Arden, Knowle in 1294 had three plough-teams of twelve beasts each, whereas neighbouring Temple Balsall in 1310 had ten beasts in each of its three plough-teams: Langdon, Horses, Oxen and Technological Innovation, pp. 88, 108-110, 119; for the demesnes analysed and the data extracted see J. Langdon, 'Horses, oxen and technological innovation The use of draught animals in English farming from 1066 to 1500', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Birmingham (1986), pp. 435-436.
In both the 1307 and 1310 accounts for Itchington there is mention of five ploughmen, an odd number which defeats Langdon's suggestion of dividing the number of ploughmen by two in order to calculate the number of plough-teams. 63 Dividing the 42 oxen at Itchington from the 1310 account by the number of ploughmen, rather than dividing the ploughmen themselves by two, gives us a classic figure of eight oxen per plough-team with two oxen surplus to requirement, which explains why two were despatched to Sawley, an episcopal manor in Derbyshire. The following year, a large number of oxen was either sold or redistributed, for example, two were given to the reeve of Tachbrook. Furthermore, the number of ploughmen was reduced from five to four, a reduction which may possibly be linked to the death that year of Roger le Car(ec)ter, probably a plough-man like his namesake at Tachbrook, Henry le Car(ec)ter. 64 At Chadshunt the optimum number of oxen was about 54. As there were twelve ploughmen there in 1307, there were probably six teams of eight oxen apiece with a few surplus. Elsewhere on the bishop's estate there is some variation in the size and number of plough-teams, for example, 16 oxen and two teams at Berkswich, 54 oxen and seven teams at Eccleshall, and 36 oxen and four teams at Brewood (all in Staffs.). 65

The question must be asked: whatever the size or number of plough-teams, were they adequate to meet the needs of the demesne? The simple answer in the case of Itchington and Chadshunt is yes. On the basis of the evidence in the 1298 extent and the account rolls, the demesne arable at Itchington totalled about 448 acres, so that if the fallow half (224 acres) were ploughed twice in the year and the area sown with spring crops ploughed once (112 acres), the five plough-teams would have no

63 Langdon, 'Horses, oxen and technological innovation', pp. 153, 436. Some of the data in the Appendix to Langdon's thesis give the impression that one ploughman was allocated per plough-team in some Warwickshire manors; for example at both Tysoe and Studley, one ploughman and one team; and see PRO, SC 6/1040/21, f. 1: Tysoe, eight oxen, one plough, two ploughmen and f. 4: Studley, eight oxen, one plough, two ploughmen. As Homans observed, 'A single man could not both hold the plow and manage an eight-ox team...Two men went with such a team': G.C. Homans, English Villagers of the Thirteenth Century (2nd edn, New York, 1960), p. 46.
64 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 6r. The stipendiary ploughmen will be discussed in Chapter 4.
65 Birrell, 'Medieval agriculture', pp. 8, 19.
difficulty in covering the total of 560 acres at about 112 acres per team, assuming a minimum capacity of half an acre per team per working day. Employing the same calculation for Chadshunt, where the demesne in 1298 measured 506 acres - the end result is remarkably similar at about 105 acres per team. These figures are certainly much better than those for the bishopric of Worcester manors of Tredington and Hampton Lucy (both in south Warwickshire), where in 1299 teams had to cover in one year 151¼ acres and 173 acres respectively.66

Reeves were doubtless aware of the optimum level of horses and oxen needed on the demesne and, as may be expected, this was achieved by buying and selling and by inter-manorial co-operation. For example, at Itchington in 1307 while the number of horses remained unchanged throughout the year, the oxen were added to by the purchase of seven and the delivery of five from Tachbrook, which ties in exceedingly well with the expansion of arable discussed above. Five were sold by the instruction of John de undel at Martinmas, very likely at Lichfield, given that a man was paid 2d. to drive five oxen there.67 At Chadshunt that year none of the equine stock died or was sold, whereas of the oxen seven were sold at Lichfield and one died, all replaced by purchases.

Most of these transactions were entrusted to John le Warner, variously described as bailiff and serjeant (servientus) of Tachbrook.68 He did not always favour local markets as he travelled both far and near in conducting his business, probably in varying circumstances now lost to us. In 1310 he sold an ox apiece from Itchington to William de Sutham and Geoffrey the son of John and bought replacements in Warwick, all local transactions.69 By contrast, when there was a clear-out of oxen the following year, John le Warner purchased at least two oxen, and perhaps as many as eight, in London.70 Subsequent purchases of oxen were made late in the farming year.

---

67 John de undel was the bishop's steward.
68 He will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.
69 William de Sutham doubtless came from the neighbouring village of Southam.
70 He was not alone in looking to the metropolitan market, as it was not uncommon for livestock and livestock products to be sent to London from more than sixty miles away (Itchington is about 90 miles north of London); see also Campbell, 'Measuring the commercialisation of seigneurial agriculture', p.
at about the feast of St Botulph (17 June). Walter of Henley recommended purchasing stock between Easter and Whitsuntide 'because then beasts are in bad condition and cheap.' John le Warner was, therefore, not buying and selling at the best time of the year as Whitsunday in 1311 fell on 30 May and yet he paid a fair variety of prices ranging from 13s. 8d. to 17s. 7d. Seven oxen were sold at the same time, all fetching at least 10s. each, which bears out Langdon's argument that an ox could be fattened up and sold for almost as much as it had originally cost. It is clear that some effort was made to fatten up those oxen as pasturage, which in normal circumstances would have been leased out, was reserved that year for feeble oxen and cart-horses, whose condition was not helped by the drought.

The four cart-horses at Itchington were constantly on the move. For example, during 1309/10 they went to London on three occasions, a round trip of about 180 miles. In each case the purpose was the transporting of the bishop's victuals. On one such journey two carters and four horses - the full manorial complement - went to London to collect the bishop's victuals then took them on to Ranton, the site of an Augustinian House in Staffordshire, via Itchington, a total of about 142 miles taking four days. Sometimes the load was deemed light enough to send only one man and two horses, for instance, when taking corn to Lichfield on three separate occasions and poultry, geese and eggs on three other occasions, this journey of about 86 miles taking three days, about the average for a medieval horse.

Let us now return to Walter of Henley's theory that a horse was far more expensive to maintain than an ox. Although there are a number of things to bear in mind such as

---

137. But there may have been another reason why John le Warner purchased two oxen at Martinmas in London. According to the stock account two oxen were expended ad opus domini apud London. And indeed the bishop was in London at that time: see J.B. Hughes, 'The episcopate of Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1296-1321, with a calendar of his register', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Nottingham (1992), p. 1198. Liveries to the bishop including contributions to his larder will be discussed in Chapter 4.


72 This movement of victuals fits exactly with the bishop's itinerary for October 1310 when the bishop went from London to Ranton via Itchington: see Hughes, 'The episcopate of Walter Langton', p. 1197.
purchase price, feeding costs, maintenance of equipment, and disposal at the end of
the animal's working life, it is unrealistic to make such comparisons between the oxen
and horses at Itchington and Chadshunt because they were engaged for separate
and quite different tasks: the oxen ploughed and the horses carted, therefore their
needs were quite different. Thus while the oxen relied on pasture and were fed oats
only in very small quantities, costing a mere 1s. per annum per ox, about 11s. was
spent per horse for oats, and nearly double that amount in 1311, when the price of
oats was unusually high. Typically, each horse was fed with oats at the rate of one-
quarter or one-eighth of a bushel each night, depending on the season, each
consuming, for example, in 1307 6 quarters 2¼ bushels between Michaelmas and the
middle of July. This compares very poorly with the 11 quarters 5 bushels fed to each
cart-horse the following year at Eccleshall (Staffs.), but is about average according to
Langdon's research into annual consumption of oats on ten manors in the West
Midlands and Oxfordshire, where cart-horses received just over 6½ quarters each.73

At the end of its working life both the ox and the horse, dead or alive, were sold.
Generally the horse fetched very little whereas the ox, fattened up, could still fetch a
reasonable price. And even the hide of an ox (at 2s. 3d.) was worth nearly as much
as an old nag (at 3s.) at Itchington in 1311. Curiously that year, a cart-horse was
unaccounted for, as the reeve was charged 13s. 4d. for it, the high price clearly
indicating that the horse was not yet at the end of its working life, unlike the ox sold
that year on account (super compotum) for only 5s., when other oxen were sold for at
least 10s. each.

3.2. ii Other livestock

Sheep - 'the walking dung-cart[s]' - although mentioned in the 1307 account rolls,
have disappeared from view by 1310 (Appendix 2).74 In 1307 a total of 298 sheep
remained at Itchington from the previous year and 86 lambs were produced during the
year. By means of inter-manorial co-operation, 240 sheep were brought in from
Cannock (Staffs.) and 60 passed on to Chadshunt, where 163 remained from the

73 Birrell, 'Medieval agriculture', p. 21; Langdon, 'The economics of horses and oxen', p. 33.
74 M.J. Stephenson, 'The productivity of medieval sheep on the great estates 1100-1500', unpubl.

75
previous year. It is evident that

'a reading of any account roll series will normally reveal a picture of continual traffic between manors often over long distances...manors where the flocks had exceeded the available grazing sent stocks either to the central larder or to bolster numbers on neighbouring manors...the overwhelming impression of medieval sheep farming was its inter-manorial nature.'75

The appearance of extra sheep at Itchington, complementing the extra oxen which, as we have seen, were brought in from Tachbrook ties in well with the expansion in arable that year. No sheep were either bought or sold and, as the accounting year ended in sequestration the majority was delivered to the King.76

Three years on, in the next available account roll for Itchington, no sheep appear anywhere in the accounts. Does this mean that the sheep were being accounted for centrally? This particular system evolved, for example, in the late thirteenth-century on the estates of Crowland Abbey, and embraced all manors, whereby one definitive account was rendered to the lord by the head shepherd.77 Likewise, centralized organization of the sheep flock was evident at the turn of the fourteenth century on Peterborough Abbey manors.78 Other estates chose not to adopt this method of management. For example, sheep farming on the Ramsey Abbey estate, despite possessing clusters of manors, remained disposed towards the manorial grouping rather than becoming concentrated in one large specialized sheep-run, chiefly because of the availability of substantial meadow and accessible winter foldage. Moreover, disease was easier to check in smaller, dispersed flocks.79

Is the answer, then, that the sheep of Itchington and Chadshunt are hidden from our view because of the adoption of centralized accounting? Or perhaps the sheep were tendered on another demesne, as was the case on some Glastonbury Abbey manors. If either of these were the case, should we expect the sheep to leave a trace

75 Stephenson, pp. 39-40.
76 'One of the most important short-term influences on the livestock levels of ecclesiastical estates was vacancies. Thousands of animals could be disposed of on a large estate by the King's executors': Stephenson, p. 271. Clearly this explains the disposal of sheep from Itchington and Chadshunt.
78 Biddick, The Other Economy, p. 100.
somewhere in the accounts, even if not in the stock account? For instance, in the account roll of Knowle (Warw.), dated 1293, 250 sheep passed through the reeve’s hands but their details appear under cash expenses and not in the stock account. After extensive research into the management of sheep on the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield’s Staffordshire manors, J. Birrell came to the conclusion that the flocks were organized on a manorial basis, although there was a degree of centralization in the collection of fleeces. This is no more evident than in a very detailed sequestration account of 1308 in which separate flocks of sheep were recorded at Longdon, Brewood, Haywood and Berkswich but nearly 2,000 fleeces were assembled at Haywood from manors in Staffordshire and Shropshire. Indeed, when sheep or fleeces passed from one manor to another, this was recorded somewhere in the accounts of both manors, for example, when 60 sheep were moved from Itchington to Chadshunt in 1307 the transaction is recorded in both account rolls. During the sequestration of 1307/8 vast quantities of livestock across the bishop’s estate were delivered to the king or sold off and it seems that sheep were particularly targeted, perhaps because their maintenance was the costliest and most labour intensive. At Longdon in 1306 there were 372 sheep, supplemented by 65 from Brewood but by 1309 when the manor was restored to the bishop, none was recorded. Is this because there were none to record or had the bishop’s estate moved to centralized accounting which would then explain the non-recording of sheep at Itchington in 1310 and 1311? There is the lingering niggle of the complete absence of any reference whatsoever to sheep in those two accounts, for example, no mention of tar being purchased, which tilts the balance in favour of the argument for the complete absence of sheep. In 1307 all 460 sheep remaining in Itchington and Chadshunt were sequestered and delivered to the King. Perhaps four years later the demesne at

---

82 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2057.
83 According to Campbell ‘sheep are the least satisfactorily recorded of demesne livestock’ as a result of the increased tendency towards central accounts and therefore even when sheep fail to show up in a manor’s accounts this did not mean that sheep were necessarily absent throughout the year. Nevertheless Hilton’s argument stands, that the sheep ought to appear somewhere in the account, perhaps under cash expenses; see Campbell, English Seigniorial Agriculture, pp. 151-152.
Itchington, although long since restored to the bishop, was yet to have its flock restored. If so, this must clearly have represented a great loss to the demesne, not only of dung but also of fleeces. Of the 410 fleeces gathered in Itchington in 1307, 24 were rendered as tithe and the remaining 386, weighing 2 sacks 4½ stones, were given to Sir William de Thorp [Waterville], a steward of the bishop, while the reeve of Itchington received a handsome livery of 193 fleeces from Chadshunt. 84 What he did with them went unrecorded.

Most other categories of livestock were insignificant on the bishop's Warwickshire manors. Dairying was not an activity pursued at either Itchington or Chadshunt. Rather, the bishop concentrated his efforts in this respect on his central Staffordshire manors where, for instance, he had a herd of 45 cattle at Brewood. 85 While on the Ramsey estates extensive forests supplying plenty of pannage meant that pigs had been important from earliest times, the lack of such natural resources meant that typically only one boar and one or two sows were kept at Itchington and Chadshunt, producing about a dozen piglets during the year, which were either sold or expended. 86 Very few poultry were kept. Indeed the various figures are remarkably similar at Itchington in all three accounts. For example, one cock and five hens remained at the end of 1310 and 1311, having produced 25 chicks and 120 eggs in both years, an echo of the creative accounting noted by Drew. 87 Most of this produce was dispensed with in the form of liveries, and the rest sold. At Chadshunt the 1307 account also recorded six poultry at the beginning of the year, which produced 28

84 It was recorded that one stone equalled 14lbs, thus each fleece weighed 1.5 lbs, assuming that one sack weighed 258 lbs, although a sack could weigh as much as 364 lbs in which case each fleece would average an unusually high 2.04 lbs. Fleece weights were not measured consistently across the bishop's estate. For example, in 1312/13, 171 fleeces at Berkswich (Staffs.) were said to weigh 19 stone at 12lbs a stone, giving a fairly typical Midlands average of 1.3 lbs per fleece. In the same account 123 fleeces delivered from Tarvin (Ches.) to Berkswich weighed 13 stone 4 lbs, in this case a stone was said to be the equivalent of 16 lbs, giving a slightly higher average of 1.7 lbs per fleece: LJRO, D 30/N1 now D 30/1181. For an in-depth study of fleece weights see D. Postles, 'Fleece weights and the wool supply, c. 1250-c. 1350', Textile History 12 (1981), pp. 96-103.
85 Birrell, 'Medieval agriculture', p. 10.
86 Raftis, The Estates of Ramsey Abbey, p. 141.
87 Although Drew was suspicious of the account rolls of Winchester Cathedral Priory in which year on year each sow consistently produced fifteen piglets a year, each hen, twelve chicks and sixty eggs and so on, (as if, in P.D.A. Harvey's phrase, the livestock could be made to work to rule), at least these figures, give some idea of an expected level of livestock: Drew, 'Manorial Accounts', p. 39; P.D.A. Harvey, 'Manorial records', in M.L. Faull, ed., Medieval Manorial Records (Leeds, 1983), p. 14.
chicks, all either sold or expended. Again, the figures for peacocks and geese show little variation: two or three peacocks, fifteen or so peahens at Itchington in all three accounts and one gander and five geese being fairly typical at both Itchington and Chadshunt. In 1307, 22 of the 31 geese at Itchington and 19 of the 33 at Chadshunt were consumed, some of them by four men of the King who had come to collect the sequestered chattels of the bishop. It is interesting that the geese supplied to the bishop at Pentecost in 1310 did not come from the manorial stock but were purchased, even though that year one gander and three geese produced twenty offspring, most of which were sold. No swans are mentioned at either Itchington or Chadshunt, although they were bred at another episcopal manor, Longdon (Staffs.), where they were fed oats in the winter, not because they were 'highly considered', but as a means of fattening them up prior to slaughter.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter we have tried to find evidence of early signs of weaknesses and incipient problems or otherwise in the rural economy, in productivity and in ecology, which may help explain the differing fortunes in later centuries of the manors within our area of study. We have seen how between 1298 and 1307 there was an apparent expansion of arable at both Itchington and Chadshunt in favour of dredge, to be sure not a sign of weakness in productivity. In 1307, the expansion of arable, the sowing of peas on fallow land, the bumper crops of dredge, the bringing in of oxen and the expansion of the flock by means of inter-manorial co-operation, suggest an investment mentality, again not pointing to weaknesses in the rural economy.

---

88 The flock of peacocks was not only decorative but also brought in a few pence revenue whenever feathers were sold - for example, in 1307 8d. was raised from such sales. This was also the case elsewhere such as on Robert de Madingley's manor of Harston (Cambs.): see E. Miller, 'A judge of the early fourteenth century and his Cambridgeshire manor', in C. Richmond and I. Harvey, eds, Recognitions Essays Presented to Edmund Fryde (Aberystwyth, 1996), p. 132.

89 The bishop had arrived in Lichfield by 3 June, 1311 and was very likely still there four days later for Pentecost, one of the great festivals of the Church's year. By 13 June he was in Coventry: Hughes, 'The episcopate of Walter Langton', p. 1197.

90 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2057, m. 1v; Birrell, 'Medieval agriculture', p. 24.
Without a good run of account rolls it is impossible to make any definitive judgment but it may be that at Itchington and Chadshunt in the early fourteenth century there was a sense of progress being made in the rural economy. There is a strong temptation to speculate that any advancement was scuppered by the process of sequestration begun in August 1307, and which lasted more than a year. And by the end of that decade the impression is one of disaster caused mainly by adverse weather and the resultant high prices of grain and quite possibly by the disappearance of sheep from the landscape as a result of being sequestered and never restored. Certainly a lack of dung to fertilize the soil in itself would have had a serious impact on crop yields as argued according to the 'Postan thesis'. We do not know how the demesnes of the manors within our area of study fared during the disastrous agrarian crisis which lasted from 1315 to 1321. But in the wake of the Black Death and an unusually long vacancy in the see of Coventry and Lichfield from 1358 to 1360 tenant numbers suffered greatly as we shall see in the next chapter. A lack of tenants meant a lack of readily available labour to till the demesne therefore it comes as no surprise that the bishop's demesnes in Warwickshire were farmed out by the mid-1360s.91 It is to the tenants that we now turn.

91 SBTRO, DR 10/2593.
CHAPTER FOUR

LORD AND TENANTS IN THE LATE THIRTEENTH AND EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURIES

Introduction

Now that we have explored the ways in which the demesne was exploited in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, we shall move on to examine in detail man's role in this landscape. The 'Lord' in the title of this chapter is deliberate, for during most of the period in question there was only one lord, Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield from 1296 to 1321. Not only his lordship but also other aspects of his life and character will be explored. Naturally, his manors would not have operated smoothly without vast input both from his own officials and from the tenants inhabiting those manors. Although the first group will be analysed in the context of their position within the episcopal household, greater attention will be paid to the second group, who will be analysed in the context of landholding and tenurial obligations. Furthermore, indications of holdings being abandoned or being left vacant for long periods will be sought. Paid labour on the demesne will also be explored. The over-riding aim, as in Chapter 3, is to seek out evidence of weaknesses and incipient problems or otherwise in social structure and tenures within the manors in our area of study, which may help explain later problems, particularly at Nether Itchington and Chadshunt. Again, as in Chapter 3 the main evidence will be drawn from the 1298 extent and the four early-fourteenth century account rolls, as well as from account rolls from other manors belonging to the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield, vacancy-in-see accounts and the Hundred Rolls.
4.1 The lord: Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1296-1321

Walter Langton, like many a humble clerk in the Wardrobe of Edward I's system of government, gained rapid promotion in his political career as he eventually became Treasurer and virtually principal minister in the realm. Furthermore, he perpetuated the 'tradition of the civil servant prelate' on being elected bishop of Coventry and Lichfield on 20 February, 1296. No other medieval bishop of Coventry and Lichfield has attracted so much the attention of historians, although he has never been studied in the context of manorial lordship. It is clear that he was dedicated to amassing great wealth, mostly as a private individual. Some of his land he held by dint of being bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, including manors in Warwickshire. Did he regard these manors merely 'as a mark of status and privilege'? It is certainly no coincidence that as the Wardrobe account books, hitherto poorly organized, became at this time 'remarkably systematic', so, too, did the episcopal record-keeping in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield: the result of having a very able administrator - Walter Langton - in ultimate charge of both. To assist him in his


4 Beardwood, pp. 6, 33, 37. When his assets were seized in 1307 an inventory was drawn up, which included property owned by Walter in a private capacity spread across England, from Yorkshire down to Hampshire and Herefordshire across to Cambridgeshire: see PRO, E 358/13. So great was his wealth that he has been declared the 38th richest person in Britain of the last millennium in a supplement to the Sunday Times, 26 March, 2000.


6 M. Prestwich, 'English government records, 1250-1330', in R. Britnell, ed., Pragmatic Literacy East and West, 1200-1330 (Woodbridge, 1997), p. 96. Walter Langton's register was the first in the history of the diocese to be compiled neatly in folio form rather than haphazardly enrolled, which must
administration it is likely that Langton gathered very able men around him into his council.\(^7\) Nearly twelve months before his enthronement, a survey of his estates in the diocese was already being undertaken, which demonstrates his efficiency in administrating his temporalities.\(^6\) Two men were selected to conduct the survey, Richard Immer and Nicholas of Warwick. The former had already served as Langton's attorney during the two previous years and possessed an intimate knowledge of the Staffordshire countryside, and the latter, an intimate knowledge of Warwickshire.\(^9\)

The tenants of Itchington and Chadshunt were no strangers to Langton's officials, who visited regularly.\(^10\) For example, Sir William of Thorpe [Waterville] was paid in 1307 for sacking wool at both manors and received 386 fleeces as livery from the latter. This must have been a special task with which he was entrusted, for he was paid for undertaking the same at Longdon (Staffs.).\(^11\) In the same year Sir John de

__explain why his register is the earliest surviving one in the diocese.

\(^7\) As Denholm-Young observed, 'Seignorial councils do not appear much on the surface of medieval records...they only emerge occasionally and after much patient watching.' Certainly in the adjacent diocese of Worcester 'there is some tantalizing evidence of the existence of an episcopal council...to what extent it was a permanent body or prominent in diocesan affairs...we can only surmise'. It could not be said of Langton that 'his personality had little or no effect on the diocese as a whole', as is 'sometimes too readily assumed' of medieval bishops: see N. Denholm-Young, *Seignorial Administration in England* (Oxford, 1937), p. 25. R.M. Haines, *The Administration of the Diocese of Worcester in the First Half of the Fourteenth Century* (London, 1965), pp. 75, 97-98.

\(^6\) This survey is the 1298 extent: SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268. Hughes is mistaken in her claim that the survey was dated 2 March, 1298. In fact it was merely commenced on that date in Lichfield, an auspicious date for it is the feast of St Chad, the patron saint of the Cathedral there. Hughes also claims that the first folio is 'badly stained thus much information relating to the manor of Lichfield is illegible'. It is somewhat stained but not to the point of being illegible: see Hughes, 'The episcopate of Walter Langton', p. 295.

\(^9\) *Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward I*, vol. 3 (1292-1301) (London, 1895), pp. 191, 234. Richard Immer abused his authority in the diocese a few years later by claiming to be a clerk (and not by usurping an episcopal title as claimed by Despretz) in the (fictitious) diocese of Suhtwych in order to gain pecuniary advantages in Staffordshire at the expense of the Prior of Ware, for which Immer was amerced 40s.: see G. Wrottesley, ed., *Extracts from the Plea Rolls of the reign of Edward II*, Collections for a History of Staffordshire William Salt Archaeological Society 10 (Stafford, 1889), p. 9; C. Despretz, 'Désordre et instabilité dans l'Angleterre du xivème siècle', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Lille (1989), p. 166. Apart from his very obvious by-name, Nicholas of Warwick evidently held land in Warwickshire for after his death his widow, Joan, accused his executors, inter alia Stephen /e Bernereye of Chadshunt, of taking away his livestock from Fulbrook, Bearley and Pillerton, all in Warwickshire: see *Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward II*, vol. 1 (1307-1313) (London, 1894), p. 370.

\(^10\) There is space here only to refer to them briefly. For a more detailed insight into their activities see A. Beardwood, ed., *Records of the Trial of Walter Langeton Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield 1307-1312*, Camden 4th ser. 6 (London, 1969).

\(^11\) LJRO, D 30/N9, N6 now D 30/11/101, 102; SRO D(W) 1734/J2057 Longdon, mm. 8, 9. Sir William
Undel, steward, held court in Chadshunt, for which he was paid 6s. 11¾d. He also oversaw there the purchase of four oxen and instructed that five oxen be sold from Itchington.

Other officials were involved in the movement of demesne produce from manor to manor, mainly with the objective of sustaining Langton’s larder. Richard of Towcester, for example, ensured in 1310 the delivery of nine geese, 12 capons and 1,181 eggs from Itchington to Langton’s residence in London, and the following year paid two local garciones, William Cartar and Robert Magot, 20d. between them to take 24 hens from Itchington to Lichfield. Alex Janitor, based in Lichfield, frequently received a variety of produce from the bishop’s manors not always for the lord’s use. For example, 13 quarters of wheat and 15 quarters of oat malt which he received from Lichfield in 1313 were earmarked for the use of the poor.

When Langton’s gastronomic needs were more exotic (compared with everyday demesne fare) he looked elsewhere. For example, some time after the feast of the Epiphany in 1309 a garcio was sent from Lichfield to Bristol to collect ten tuns of wine. He was paid 2d. a day for 3 weeks and 3 days to lay down and look after the ten casks and was assisted in his endeavours by William le Tavemer (bailiff of Lichfield) whose task it was to ‘taste and search’ the wine, which was subsequently distributed between the episcopal residences at Lichfield, Brewood and Eccleshall (all in Staffs.). This attraction to Bristol was not unusual as many of Langton’s

was also entrusted with auditing accounts for the bishop. For example, he shared a payment of 66s. 17¼d. with two other officials, Thomas de Neville and William le Duyn, auditing the accounts of the manors of Tarvin, Wybunbury, Burton, Chester and Farndon, all in Cheshire, from 12 to 29 November, 1305: LJRO, D 30/N20 now D 30/11/91. At Thorpe Waterville (Northants.) Langton had a private residence, for which he was granted permission to crenellate in 1301: Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward I, vol. 3 (1292-1301) (London, 1895), p. 561. It is likely that he recruited Sir William from this place.

Some of his contemporaries were more choosy, like Walter de Wenlok, Abbot of Westminster Abbey, who, if he wanted fresh beef or mutton, bought it from a butcher rather than consume ‘the not very succulent rejects of [demesne] husbandry designed to produce plough-oxen...and wool-bearing wethers’: see B.F. Harvey, Westminster Abbey and its Estates in the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1977), pp. 134-135.

The eggs were delivered at the beginning of February 1310 when Langton was indeed in Lichfield: Hughes, ‘The episcopate of Walter Langton’, p. 1198. See below for food renders from the bishop’s Warwickshire tenants.

The choice of occasion was very
ecclesiastical contemporaries in the midlands, including the cellarer of Worcester priory and successive bishops of Worcester, turned to Bristol for its main attraction - high quality wine available in large quantities.\(^{16}\)

Langton enjoyed a steady flow of produce from his Warwickshire manors, which were visited regularly by his officials, but how often did he himself visit? There is no evidence that he ever visited Tachbrook, even though there was an episcopal residence there, but he certainly visited Itchington several times and more frequently towards the end of his episcopacy, even though this manor was remote from Lichfield.\(^{17}\) The first known visit to Itchington took place in October 1309, when two bakers were brought in from Warwick for two days.\(^{18}\) In September the following year Langton returned, this time to conduct an ordination service in the parish church. We can barely begin to imagine the excitement which the occasion must have caused locally. Even warp was purchased for the bishop's couches and the carpet in the Hall repaired.\(^{19}\) Following five subsequent visits to Itchington, Langton once more conducted an ordination here in December 1316, then visited at least three more times.

appropriate because wine dealing was a seasonal occupation centred on Christmas and the weeks immediately following. William le Taverner was clearly chosen because of his expert knowledge. 'Wine was an expensive and perishable commodity, calling for expert knowledge and great experience in selecting, blending, tasting, and assaying...special precautions had to be observed, for slight variations in appearance denoting...good or bad were often only visible to the eye of the expert and the amateur was often duped into buying the dregs': M.K. James, Studies in the Medieval Wine Trade (Oxford, 1971), pp. xvi, 161, 162.


\(^{17}\) Langton was not interested in visiting Coventry where he had not only a residence but a seat. Remarkably in a 25-year episcopate he only went to Coventry four times, including his enthronement and another occasion to conduct ordinations: see Hughes, 'The episcopate of Walter Langton', pp. 1189, 1190, 1193, 1197. It is possible that he recognized the dominance in Coventry of the Prior, whose strong position in that city is the subject of R.M. Goddard, 'Lordship and the growth of Coventry, 1043-1355', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Birmingham (1998). Nevertheless, Langton did not follow the trend of other ecclesiastical lords who often showed little interest in outlying manors; for example, the Prior of Coventry, who sold distant manors in order to make his estate more manageable: see Goddard, pp. 59-60.

\(^{18}\) LJRO, D 30/N7 now D 30/11/99. This occasion does not feature in Hughes' itinerary.

\(^{19}\) LJRO, D 30/N7 now D 30/11/99; Hughes, 'The episcopate of Walter Langton', pp. 961-963, 1197, where Itchington is unfortunately placed in Staffordshire. The ordination numbers were on the low side: six men were made sub-deacon (significantly first on that list was William de Loges of neighbouring Chesterton, whose father was lord there), 13 made deacon, and 26 (25 according to Hughes) were ordained priest.
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times before his death. In fact, Itchington was the last place which he visited in his see before going to London in September 1321, where he died a few weeks later.

4.2 The tenants

Lords, landlords, peasants, the peasantry: it is all too easy to view medieval society, like Postan did, as a ‘wholly polarized two-class community’ comprised of an ‘elevated class of feudal magnates’ and an ‘inferior mass of rural humanity’. As suggested by M. Bailey, it is time to ‘disaggregate the peasantry’. But should type of tenure or size of landholding be the determinants? And what part should social structure play? Faced with a ‘bewildering variety of terminology used to describe villagers’, the tenants of Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon will be divided into free, unfree and cottar and analysed in terms of holding and obligations of tenure. It is hoped this way to highlight similarities and differences. Comment will also be made on the extent to which full tenurial capacity was maintained up to the middle of the fourteenth century. Firstly, it is worthwhile pausing to comment on the way in which the manor was divided up amongst the three groups of tenants.

The percentages presented in Appendix 4 (based on the data in Appendix 3) are in some respects quite different from those presented by Hilton for the whole of Kineton Hundred in 1279 (free: 31%, unfree: 47%, cottar: 22%). Furthermore, a comparison of Appendices 4 and 5 reveals quite strikingly the disproportion between the low

20 Hughes, pp. 519, 540, 571, 708, 722, 724, 796, 1065-1075, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1204, 1205.
21 Hughes, pp. 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1204, 1205.
26 See Chapter 2 for the division of land between demesne and tenants.
percentage of free tenants and the high percentage of land which they held, particularly at Tachbrook (where, as we shall see, there were one or two tenants holding several virgates between them for military service); but the inverse in the case of cottar tenants, particularly at Itchington. We shall now examine each category of tenant in more detail in terms of landholding and obligations, and use the evidence of the 1298 extent and three fourteenth-century vacancy accounts to gauge the degree to which tenant numbers were maintained.

4.2.1 The free tenantry

It is well-known that free tenants enjoyed a superiority of legal status, could buy, sell and alienate land, paid rent which was usually low or nominal, performed a few token labour services and were not subject to the financially onerous incidents of villeinage. The low percentage of free tenants on the bishop’s manors is very striking (Appendix 4) compared with Hilton’s figure of 31%. The amount of land each free tenant held varied greatly (Appendix 3) as did the rent. For example, in 1279 Richard de Wotton held five virgates in Tachbrook for military service, whereas Richard Saye held only two acres in Itchington. By 1298 the free tenants of these manors experienced a number of significant changes. Many in Tachbrook and Itchington who had been described as free in 1279 were now classed more precisely as molmen (molmanni). Clearly here was an attempt ‘to keep the two classes’

---

28 This section will not include cottars, the near-landless or the landless, even though they were often of free status. They will be dealt with in a separate section, below. To avoid repetitive footnotes the data for the Hundred Rolls are taken from T. John, ed., The Warwickshire Hundred Rolls of 1279-80 Stoneleigh and Kineton Hundreds (London, 1992), pp. 103-104, 185-186, 188; and for the 1298 extent, SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, ff. 5r, 6v-7r, 8v. Sub-tenants and tenants of the glebe are excluded from the statistics. Although the free are small in number, it is difficult to understand why they were completely ignored by Fryde in his analysis: see E.B. Fryde, ‘The tenants of the bishops of Coventry and Lichfield and of Worcester after the Plague of 1348-9’, in R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post, eds, Medieval Legal Records Edited in Memory of C.A.F. Meekings (London, 1978), p. 256.


30 Hilton, p. 16.

31 A total of nine virgates were held for military service in Tachbrook amounting to one-third of tenanted land. No land was held on such terms in Itchington, Chadshunt or Gaydon, demonstrating earlier differences in lordship, for in the eleventh century Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon had been held by Coventry Priory, and Tachbrook by the Bishop of Chester.

32 Molmen were ‘rent-paying tenants who...[were]. bound to some extra work, but who...[were]. very definitely distinguished from the custumarii...they were evidently becoming hardly distinguishable from freeholders’: see P. Vinogradoff, Villainage in England Essays in English Mediaeval History (Oxford,
and unfree] asunder’, as there was little change in either the size of holding or rent paid of those molmen who had earlier been listed in the Hundred Rolls.  

Of those who continued to enjoy fully free status, there was a remarkable turnover of tenants between 1279 and 1298 at Itchington (66%), and new ones emerging at Tachbrook (also a 66% increase). The doubling in percentage terms of free tenants at Gaydon may be the result of incomplete recording in 1279 as the scribe noted that the bishop had there ten free tenants but only three were named (other than sub-tenants). Significantly of the new tenants at Tachbrook one came from Wellesbourne, some three miles away, and two others had the by-names Carpenter and Smith. Many of the free tenants at Tachbrook sub-let their holdings, suggesting that they themselves were non-resident. For example, Richard Raven held a virgate (32 acres) in 1279 and had six cottar sub-tenants. All the free owed suit of court and a heriot at death, while some of them were additionally obliged to perform three days each of ploughing and reaping *per annum*.

The 1279 Hundred Rolls and the 1298 extent are the only two documents to survive from the middle ages which list all the Warwickshire tenants of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield by name. But additionally three vacancy-in-see account rolls survive from the early and mid-fourteenth century in which tenant numbers are either explicitly given or else may easily be calculated (Appendix 6). From these account rolls we learn that the number of free tenants and the rent paid at Tachbrook, Itchington and Chadshunt remained exactly the same between 1298 and 1360 but that the thirteen free tenants at Gaydon in 1298 had been reduced to only eight by 1321 and the rental income reduced from £1. 19s. 7d. to £1. 6s. We do not know why this happened but the overall stability in the number of free tenants may have been maintained because this group of tenants ‘had a status and often an inheritance, that were worth keeping’.  

---


33 *Vinogradoff*, p. 185.

4.2.ii The unfree tenantry

The unfree tenantry of medieval England have been described as ‘a seriously disadvantaged majority’ because they ‘could not assart, or benefit from market opportunities...and they were subject to the burdens of the lord.\(^\text{35}\) Certainly, they enjoyed, more often than not, adequacy of land as they ‘were probably only rarely among the poorest and most deprived members of village communities’. They also enjoyed the benefits of custom.\(^\text{36}\) Furthermore, although the law stated that the unfree could have no heirs it is clear that if they paid their rent and performed their services they ‘almost invariably enjoyed an absolute hereditary security of tenure’. Even if they defaulted the resulting fine would be small and ‘much time usually elapsed before the ultimate sanction was reluctantly applied’.\(^\text{37}\)

Both Kosminsky and Hilton in their respective analyses of the Hundred Rolls noticed in particular the high proportion of unfree tenants on the manors belonging to

\(^{35}\) C. Dyer, Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society The Estates of the Bishopric of Worcester, 680-1540 (Cambridge, 1980), p. 112. Yet it is clear from the 1298 extent of the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield that unfree tenants in Staffordshire were assarting; for example, Adam son of Isolde of Meece, held not only 22 acres of villein land but also 15 acres 1½ roods of nova terra: SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, ff. 18r, 20r, the latter folio has the marginal entry ‘villeins holding new land’. That Adam was unfree is confirmed by the statement against his name, ‘et erit prepositus’. Although Hilton was sure that ‘well-to-do villeins’ yearned after ‘the legal and social advantages of free status’, Hatcher remained convinced that ‘[t]he purchase of freedom, manumission, appears to have lain well down the list of priorities of even the wealthiest villeins, and to have been overshadowed by the attractions of the acquisition of more land.’ Moreover, villeins rarely voluntarily relinquished unfree holdings whereas examples of free men ‘willing, even anxious’ to accept land on unfree terms are common: see R.H. Hilton, The Decline of Serfdom in Medieval England, (London, 1969), p. 24; J. Hatcher, ‘English serfdom and villeinage: towards a re-assessment’, Past & Present 90 (1981), pp. 25-26. Hatcher’s arguments have been described as unconvincing: see C. Dyer, ‘Power and conflict in the medieval English village’, in C. Dyer, Everyday Life in Medieval England (London, 1994), p. 2.

\(^{36}\) Hatcher, p. 25. The importance of custom is clearly demonstrated by an extraordinary saga extracted from the court rolls of Itchington of the mid-fourteenth century: SBTRO, DR 10/2591, 2594 and mentioned in C. Dyer, ‘Tenant farming and tenant farmers: the west midlands’, in E. Miller, ed., The Agrarian History of England and Wales, III, 1348-1500 (Cambridge, 1991), p. 637. Briefly, in 1361 John Huwet, described as a nativus domini, claimed to be the due heir of his late uncle’s half virgate in Itchington, now occupied by a fellow villein, Matilda atte Broke. She in turn was able to prove that at a court held on 11 December, 1354, she had paid an entry fine of 13s. 4d. to enter that same land, after the homage of the vill had ruled that John, although heir to the holding, already held land in Gaydon and was therefore barred as it was contrary to custom to hold land in more than one vill. Very likely this was a custom formulated long ago when it was in the lord’s interest that tenants should be confined in tenurial terms to one vill, otherwise customary works and services may have been neglected. Matilda was permitted to continue with her occupation of the holding but there was a sting in the tail. She could only hold for the term of her life and was to pay 24s. for this privilege, and was doubtless grateful when the bailiff stepped forward to pledge for this amount.

\(^{37}\) Hatcher, p. 10.
the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield (Appendix 4), much higher than the average of 47% for Kineton Hundred. Although the bulk of the unfree on the bishop’s manors changed very little in number between 1279 and 1298 they were not a lumpen mass of villeinage. There were some crucial differences in landholding and in obligations. It seems from the evidence that sometime in the past, perhaps even in pre-Conquest days, the virgate had been the standard holding at Tachbrook, Itchington and Chadshunt. In the Hundred Rolls for Tachbrook and Chadshunt all the unfree were half-virgaters (Appendix 3) but were listed in pairs, not individually, indicating that the virgate continued to be regarded in administrative terms as an undivided unit of landholding. Furthermore, although the majority of the unfree at Itchington were also half-virgaters (Appendix 3) and were listed individually in the Hundred Rolls, the reeve continued anachronistically to use the virgate as the basis for the calculation of villein dues. Thus when he drew up his ‘works’ accounts, he did so on the basis of there being 21 customary ‘virgaters’ on the manor, where there were in fact 9 virgaters and 24 half-virgaters (9 + 12 = 21). If sub-division of the virgate did take place, we may ask why and by whom? The answer to the second question leads to the answer to the first. The neat division into half-virgate holdings was uniform, suggesting that it was not done on an ad hoc basis. Had the villeins themselves performed such an operation it would very likely have been piecemeal which it clearly was not. Rather, it was probably done in one fell swoop by the lord. And he was

39 To avoid repetitive footnotes the data for the Hundred Rolls are taken from John, The Warwickshire Hundred Rolls, pp. 100-102, 184-187; and for the 1298 extent, SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, ff. 5v, 7r-9v.
40 There is no clear correlation between the 11 villeins and 7 hides in Domesday Tachbrook and the 19 half-virgaters holding a total of 304 acres in 1279, or the 30 villeins and 5 hides in Domesday Itchington and the 9 virgaters and 31 half-virgaters holding a total of 980 acres in 1279, although intriguingly the capacity for customary tenants at Itchington in the fourteenth century was pegged at 30. Even more curious is the comparison between Chadshunt at Domesday and Chadshunt in 1279. At the first date there were 18 villeins and if we assume that each of them was already holding only half a virgate (15 acres) that equals 270 acres, which is virtually the same as in the Hundred Rolls - 17 villeins holding between them 272 acres. Furthermore in 1086 there were 12 bordars and at the end of the thirteenth century 12 ploughmen. Co-incidences? Gaydon is not mentioned in Domesday Book for reasons outlined in Chapter 2; see A. Williams and R. W. H. Erskine, eds, The Warwickshire Domesday (London, 1991), ff. 238v, 239.
41 See, for example, LJRO, D 30/N9 now D 30/11/101.
42 Arguing from a different viewpoint, Dyer has suggested that peasants to some extent ‘intensified
probably taking advantage of growing demographic pressure, possibly hoping at the same time to be able to exact the same services from his villeins despite the halving of their holdings. There were two other categories of unfree tenants at Itchington: firstly, those described as *custumari* whose landholding was varied and whose obligations differed very little from the *molmanni*, and, secondly, those described as *acremen* (*akermanni*).

There are topographical differences which affected size and type of holding. At Tachbrook the hard core of the unfree lived in the village itself and, as we shall see, owed very heavy services. By contrast, in parts of the manor where late colonisation had been effected (for example, at Hethcote as described in Chapter 2), there were unfree tenants, also half-virgaters, owing virtually no services. Possibly the lord had no need of their labour, beyond the odd day of ploughing, reaping and mowing, because the lord's labour needs on the demesne were more than adequately met by the unfree in the village of Tachbrook. A few of the unfree at Itchington, described as *custumari*, also enjoyed more favourable terms of tenure, compared with the large percentage of *nativi*, but it has so far proven impossible to establish whether there was a topographical element to this social division. Certainly the third group of villeins at Itchington, the *akermanni*, all lived in Nether Itchington, rather than in the secondary settlement of Upper Itchington.

Let us move on to an exploration of the obligations of the unfree by taking a model tenant from each manor, who appear in the 1279 Hundred Rolls and the 1298 extent: Henry in the Lane, a half-virgater (16 acres) of Tachbrook; Emma la Smekere alias Senekere, a half-virgater (20 acres) of Itchington; Richard son of Reginald alias Reignald, a half-virgater (16 acres) of Chadshunt and Robert Morice, a virgater (20


43 In fact this was the case at Chadshunt where the half-virgaters owed the same services as their neighbouring virgaters at Gaydon.

44 The acremen will be described in detail later in this chapter.
acres) of Gaydon. For Richard and Robert this meant three days every week, even though the former was a half-virgater, whereas Emma and Henry owed three such works every fortnight, the latter having to work Monday and Wednesday in one week and Tuesday in the other. Other obligations included ploughing, reaping, mowing and carrying. Incidental dues were paid for brewing ale, pasturing pigs and selling foals. Merchet was due when their daughters wished to be married. Ultimately a heriot had to be surrendered at death.

Up to ten days' ploughing was demanded and each tenant had to bring their own beasts, in addition to which Henry at Tachbrook had to bring his own plough if he possessed one. Much of the ploughing - valued at no more than 3d. a day - was performed in exchange for pasture rights (grescherthe). Reaping was organized in two ways and performed mostly by customary labour. Firstly, there was a three-day

---

45 Their obligations are listed in full in Appendix 7.
46 As we shall see, their total obligations were more onerous pro rata than a customary yardlander in the late thirteenth century 'on a typical west midland church manor': C. Dyer, 'Memories of freedom: attitudes towards serfdom in England, 1200-1350', in M.L. Bush, ed., Serfdom and Slavery Studies in Legal Bondage (London, 1996), p. 289. Indeed, there were only four other villages out of 48 in Kineton Hundred at this time where week-works were owed: Hilton, Social Structure, p. 17.
47 'Work' was, doubtless, 'an elastic term', as '[a]lmost certainly the labour need not be personally performed...probably the whole family of the tenant was impressed by him into service': see F.M. Page, The Estates of Crowland Abbey A Study in Manorial Organisation (Cambridge, 1934), pp. 99-100. The mention of Tuesdays is fascinating as this day, along with Thursday, was apparently rarely mentioned in lists of week-works. B. Harvey, 'Work and festa ferienda in medieval England', Journal of Ecclesiastical History 23 (1972), p. 294. In fact elsewhere on the bishop's estate - at Sawley (Derbs.) - the unfree owed two days' work each week, namely Monday and Thursday: SRO, D(W) 1734/J2288, f. 11r.
48 The question of how many beasts is perplexing. The phrase in the extent is cum quintu iungitur, which seems difficult to reconcile with the eight-ox plough-team of the demesne. When confronted with the phrase de iii iugis sive iii Hilton suggested that it meant 'with three or four pairs of animals' but iungitur cannot be equated grammatically with iugis: see Hilton, A Medieval Society, p. 106. And see H.G. Richardson, 'The medieval plough-team', History 26 (1942), pp. 287-296, where Richardson expresses the conviction that there 'seems no escape from the conclusion that for working purposes on the demesne the tenants' teams were comprised of the same number of beasts as the lord's'. See Chapter 3 for the size of plough-team on the bishop's manors.
49 For much higher values placed on ploughing see T.H. Lloyd, 'Ploughing services on the demesnes of the bishop of Worcester in the late thirteenth century', University of Birmingham Historical Journal 8 (1961/2), pp. 193-194. For details of unfree tenants at Tachbrook and Itchington who had the option of being full-time ploughmen see later in this chapter. It is clear from the account rolls for Itchington that full advantage was taken of grescherthe: see, for example, LJRO, D 30/N9 now D 30/11/101. At Chadshunt, in return for a cock and three hens at Martinmas, unfree tenants were permitted to enter the demesne pasture before the last sheaf had been lifted, another option which proved popular. In the 1307 account roll, all the customary tenants rendered their full quota of poultry: LJRO, D 30/N6 now D 30/11/102, and were still rendering the same half a century later: PRO, E 136/12/17.
50 LJRO, D 30/N8 now D 30/11/100. Hilton, unaware of the existence of the early fourteenth century
period, when it was understood that tenants would wish to remain on their holdings. That is to say, tenants were allowed to reap their own holdings and to send a substitute for the demesne reaping, as tenants would be extremely reluctant to be taken away from cutting their own corn. Therefore, Henry was permitted to send a man to reap on the demesne, Richard and Robert had to send two, whereas Emma could use members of her familia and was allowed in return as much grass as she could lift up with her scythe. Secondly, there was the love-boon (Bondmansbedrepe), the definition and practice of which varied considerably. Whereas Richard (with food) and Emma (with two men - clearly signifying a large demand for labour - and without food) had to perform an extra day’s reaping for the ‘love of the lord’, Henry and Robert’s three-day stint just mentioned was counted as love-boon with no other reaping demanded, that is to say, needed. While no mowing was demanded of either Richard or Robert at Chadshunt and Gaydon, Richard was obliged to mow at Tachbrook at will, where there must have been a greater demand for labour.

An onerous due without doubt was the obligation to cart firewood (busce) for use in the lord’s curia from as far away as Kenilworth, as much as eleven miles away. That this task was consistently commuted - and not even the reeves were exempted from payment - demonstrates its unpopularity, clearly because it involved travel away from

bishopric account rolls, guessed correctly that the reeve of Itchington was able to call on substantial reserves of servile labour at harvest and haymaking; see Hilton, A Medieval Society, pp. 126-127. For example, at Itchington in 1311 60 acres of corn were reaped by hired hands at a cost of 5d. per acre, 102½ acres by 19½ 'virgaters' and a further 61½ acres during the love-boon rendered by virtually every tenant in the manor, free and unfree alike. According to Farmer about 5d. per acre was the going rate for mowing, reaping and binding; see D.L. Farmer, 'Prices and wages', in H.E. Hallam, ed., The Agrarian History of England and Wales, II, 1042-1350 (Cambridge, 1988), p. 471; and see later in this chapter for the difference in work-rates between customary labourers and hired hands.

52 At hay-making lords 'felt the need to soften the burden of labour services by giving the peasants reciprocal benefits.' Thus Emma and her fellow tenants were able to take away as much grass as they could lift, ending 'a hard day's forced labour with a note of collective festivity as [they] gathered to compete in this trial of strength and skill': C. Dyer, 'Compton Verney: landscape and people in the middle ages', in R. Bearman, ed., Compton Verney A History of the House and its Owners (Stratford-upon-Avon, 2000), p. 82; see also C. Dyer, 'Work ethics in the fourteenth century', in J. Bothwell, P.J.P. Goldberg and W.M. Ormrod, eds, The Problem of Labour in Fourteenth-Century England (York, 2000), p. 23.
the manor. But far more onerous were the remaining carting services. Henry, Emma and Robert had to cart three strikes of hard corn or half a quarter of dredge, malt or oats to Lichfield, whereas Richard had to cart either official letters or a variety of poultry and game including ten hens, ten doves, ten larks, ten ducks, capons, a swan and a crane. These obligations have echoes of the 'ancient system of exploitation' as described by N. Neilson, who observed that 'a gift to the lord's larder was by no means unwelcome'.

Holy-days must have been welcomed with much relief. These were occasions 'when laymen should rest from labour and go to church'. Henry and Emma were allowed a week's holiday at Easter, Pentecost and Christmas and if any festival or its vigil occurred on a work day, a work was to be allowed. In this respect they were fortunate inasmuch as 'with scarcely an exception, all landlords seem to have denied the vigils of feasts as holidays to their villeins'. Saints' days observed at Itchington were mostly feasts of the apostles. For example, in 1306/7 holidays included SS Simon and Jude (Friday), St Andrew (Wednesday) and St Thomas the Apostle (Wednesday), as well as the Epiphany (Thursday) and Good Friday. Holidays were not mentioned in either Richard's or Robert's entry in the 1298 extent. The reason is clear in the 1307 account roll - commutation. That year Richard and Robert paid 6d. and 12d. respectively not to have to work between 29 September and 25 March, comparatively small amounts probably because the rates had been fixed in the mists

53 LJRO, D 30/N6, N9 now D 30/11/102, 101; PRO, SC 6/1132/5.
54 These services were clearly still being used in the late thirteenth century contrary to N.S.B. Gras' claim that they were in decline as early as the 1250s. For a criticism of Gras see D. Postles, 'Customary carrying services', Journal of Transport History 3rd ser. 5 no. 2 (1984), pp. 1-2.
55 Monastic houses were particularly dependent on regular food supplies from their manors. Neilson was unable to find any evidence of a recent origin for food rents, concluding that there must have been 'a connexion between them and some ancient, widely prevalent system of purveyance on the part of the lord.' Certainly the fact that three strikes of corn were demanded has connotations of antiquity. N. Neilson, Customary Rents, Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History 2 (1910), pp. 15, 20-21.
57 Harvey, 'Work and festa ferienda', pp. 294-296.
of time and become ossified.\textsuperscript{58}

We know that in 1321 there were no unfree holdings left vacant within our area of study (Appendix 6). But in the wake of the Black Death the situation changed dramatically. The brunt of this devastating epidemic seems to have been felt most keenly at Tachbrook where as late as 1360 ten out of nineteen villein half-virgate holdings remained unoccupied. At the same time nine half-virgate holdings at Itchington and four virgate-holdings at Gaydon remained vacant whereas this trend was completely bucked at Chadshunt where full tenurial capacity continued to be maintained. Quite startlingly this situation is almost entirely the reverse of what was to happen in the sixteenth century as we shall see in later chapters. The reason for the vacant holdings in 1360 was said to be that ‘no-one wanted to perform the said services which the previous tenants had been accustomed to render before the pestilence’.\textsuperscript{59} The fact that the unfree of Chadshunt and Gaydon had enjoyed commutation from at least the end of the thirteenth century may have been a strong factor in this respect. There are also signs in the court rolls of the early 1360s of turbulence amongst the unfree. Firstly, the land market in the early 1360s was particularly buoyant at Itchington. In one court alone in March 1361 Adam de la Hale, who was vicar of the parish, surrendered his family’s half-virgate holding (held in bondage and which had been in his family since at least the 1270s) to William

\textsuperscript{58} LJRO, D 30/N6 now D 30/11/102. By contrast works were sold on a more erratic basis at Itchington, for example, in 1307 521 out of 1,575 winter works were sold: LJRO, D 30/N9 now D 30/11/101. In the 1298 extent commutation was clearly outlined as an option in the phrase ‘or they are accustomed to give for the said works 4s. [at Itchington and Gaydon, 2s. at Chadshunt] per annum’: SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, ff. 7r, 9r, but its implementation was erratic. Universal commutation in all the bishop’s Warwickshire manors seems, up to 1360, only to have occurred during vacancies in see in 1321/1 and 1358/60, when the demesne was left untended therefore no villein works were needed. H.L. Gray observed these arrangements but, failing to take account of the unusual circumstances, assumed that commutation was the result of an executive decision made by the reeve. The situation at Itchington was more in line with Postan’s claim that ‘commutation was rare in the first quarter of the fourteenth century’ and Stone’s observation that ‘in the early fourteenth century customary labour was still a significant resource in many parts of England, especially in eastern, southern, and midland counties’: see H.L. Gray, ‘The commutation of villein services in England before the Black Death’, EHR 29 (1914), pp. 642, 648; M.M. Postan, ‘The chronology of labour services’, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 4th ser. 20 (1937), p. 169, revised in M.M. Postan, Essays on Medieval Agriculture and General Problems of the Medieval Economy (Cambridge, 1973), p. 89; D. Stone, ‘The productivity of hired and customary labour: evidence from Wisbech Barton in the fourteenth century’, ECHR 50 (1997), p. 641.

\textsuperscript{59} PRO, E 368/132, m 12 (now m. 235r): ‘pro dictis operibus faciendis, prout custumarii, qui terram illam ante pestilenciam tenerunt, prior facere consueverunt’. 
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Bedel. And four other unfree men took up a total of three half-virgate holdings, whilst Adam Knyght and John Haukyns, also unfree, undertook the joint tenancy of a virgate holding late of Henry Don. But, secondly, there were a number of villeins, mostly from Itchington, who decided to seek their fortunes elsewhere. In October 1360 it was reported that Thomas de Welneford had fled from Tachbrook to Staffordshire, and that of the three Adams brothers of Itchington, one had gone to Banbury, one to Coombe Abbey near Coventry, and the third had fled. The following year nine villeins were reported to be living away from Itchington including three members of the Toly family - Lucy at Willoughby (Warws.), Margery at Leicester (Leics.) and Henry at Haywood (Staffs.).

4.2.iii The cottar tenantry

Arguably the poorest and the most exploited in medieval England were the near-landless. They eked out an existence as 'jacks of all trades', hiring themselves out to their landholding neighbours, for example, as reapers. At Itchington and Tachbrook in the late thirteenth century the cottar tenants formed a substantial minority of tenants (about one-quarter of tenants; who were 'landless' in the sense that they did not own parts of the field system, although of course their cottage plots and appurtenances such as a curtilage gave them a minute 'toe-hold' of land), whereas there were only three or four at Chadshunt and none at Gaydon (Appendices 3, 4 and 5). The reason for this stark difference between manors has just been alluded to. The lot of the cottar was to be used as a cheap source of labour.

---

62 SBTRO, DR 10/2594. Adam must have been at least in his sixties as he had been vicar of Itchington since the early 1320s and very likely could no longer cope with his holding. His father, Adam, and grandfather, Richard, both reeves, are discussed above in the section on paid labour.
61 SBTRO, DR 10/2593.
62 SBTRO, DR 10/2594; BRL, 432654, mm. 10r, 11r.
64 A phrase first coined by F.R.H. DuBoulay and quoted in M. Mate, 'Labour and labour services on the estates of Canterbury Cathedral Priory in the fourteenth century', Southern History 7 (1985), p. 55; Fox, p. 561.
65 John, The Warwickshire Hundred Rolls, pp. 102-103, 187-188; SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, ff. 6r, 8r, 9v. The figure for Tachbrook excludes the 29 cottar sub-tenants, who if they were included would increase the ratio to 50% on that manor.
The villeins at Itchington and Tachbrook had ample need of such labour as they juggled the demands of tilling their own land with the demands of toiling on the lord’s demesne. By contrast, at Chadshunt and Gaydon commutation was well established by the end of the thirteenth century, which meant that the villeins there could pay 2s. or 4s. in order to be free of virtually all seigneurial obligations. They therefore had no need of extra cottar labour.

Who were the cottars who eked out such a seemingly bleak existence at Itchington and Tachbrook? Given the notorious under-recording of landless tenants we are fortunate to have some robust evidence of their identity. It is noticeable at Itchington that some of the cottars (all of whom were landless: Appendices 4 and 5) shared the same by-names as landholders, evidently sons waiting to take over the family holding. For example, in 1279 John Gery was a half-virgater, listed between Emma le Smekere and Richard in le Hale, while Robert Gery was a cottar. But by 1298 Robert had become a half-virgater, listed between Emma Senekere and Adam in le Hale, John having disappeared from the list. In a reversal of this scenario there are also widowed cottars, whose sons have probably already taken over the family holding, although the ubiquitous by-name la Veve renders impossible the establishment of family ties. More telling are the bynames Newcomene, Faber, and le Car(ec)ter. Richard, Hugh and John Newcomene were three cottar tenants at Itchington, clearly migrants who had taken up their meagre tenancies as a means of getting a toe-hold in the manor. In this respect Hugh, at least, was successful as he was still there in 1332, when he was taxed 3s. in the lay subsidy. Robert Faber junior, whose father held a half-virgate in return for servicing the demesne ploughs at Itchington, held a cottage and perhaps earned a living by working in the family trade. Henry le Car(ec)ter was, as his by-name suggests, a ploughman. He was set up in his cottage

66 When manorial surveys and tax assessments were compiled, ‘The most likely order for the clerk to choose (to make sure everyone was included) was topographical’, thus when families consistently appear in the same order we can assume that they are neighbours: see P.D.A. Harvey, ‘Mapping the village: the historical evidence’, in D. Hooke, ed., Medieval Villages (Oxford, 1985), pp. 37, 41. And indeed there is a remarkable continuity in the order of names of villeins in 1279, 1298 and 1327 at Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon making succession of holding relatively straightforward and making it possible to pinpoint which families have been omitted from the lay subsidy.

in Tachbrook by the lord in exchange for being a full-time demesne *famulus*. 68

Many of the by-names of the bishop's tenants listed in the 1279 Hundred Rolls recur in the 1327 lay subsidy, that is to say, at Gaydon, 61%, at Chadshunt, 53%, at Itchington, 47\(\frac{1}{2}\)%, and at Tachbrook, 33%. 69 But hardly any of those by-names belongs to any cottar, a group of tenants who are, not surprisingly, conspicuous by their absence from the subsidy. It is worth noting that the comparatively low percentage at Tachbrook is explained in terms of type of tenancy, for in that manor there were almost as many cottar sub-tenants as there were free and unfree tenants added together in the Hundred Rolls, which purported to list all tenants, whereas the lay subsidy only included those with goods above a certain value.

It seems that between 1298 and 1360 the number of cottar tenants remained almost unchanged (Appendix 6). This is quite surprising given that by 1360, as we have seen, several unfree holdings remained vacant and suggests a lack of economic promotion among the cottars. 70

4.3 Paid labour on the demesne

This section will examine in turn the bailiff, the reeve, the ploughmen, the carters, *garciones*, and casual labourers.

Two bailiffs are mentioned in the early fourteenth-century account rolls of Itchington and Chadshunt. Firstly Roger de Belgrave, described as *ballivus*, seemingly an outsider and occasional visitor, was paid a wage (*vadia*) and seems mostly to have been engaged in supervision. 71 Beneath him was John le Warner. Various described as *ballivus* and *servientus*, he was based at Tachbrook and responsible for most of the commercial transactions on all the bishop's Warwickshire

---

68 See below for his perks.
70 See Dyer, *Lords and Peasants*, p. 298 for the observation that Postan argued for 'economic promotion' whereby all groups increased their holdings at a time of decreasing population, whereas others such as Hilton saw 'differentiation at work, by which peasant society became more polarized between tenants of large holdings and wage-earning cottagers'.
manors. These transactions were quite varied. For example, in 1310 he arranged within the manor of Itchington the purchase of new timber for the kiln, for glass windows to be repaired, for robes and boots to be made for the bishop on his visit there, and for two oxen to be bought in Warwick.

The reeve was no anonymous figure for he was 'a man of the manor', who 'ruled with a rod of iron', whose local knowledge contributed much to the efficient working of the manor. Indeed, it was not unusual for a reeve to hold office for several years, probably because of competence but no doubt sometimes (with echoes of Chaucer) because of the hidden perks of the job, that is to say, being in a position to operate in the black economy and to draw an income 'much higher than...accounts record'. His duties were manifold and included organizing the tilling of the demesne, seeing that the grain was effectively threshed and properly stored, supervising the care of livestock and the maintenance of buildings, and at the end of the year handing over the profits of the manor.

At Itchington by the early fourteenth century a tradition of long service had been well established. In 1298 one of the cottages at Itchington was occupied by Agnes the daughter of Richard the reeve. He can be identified as Richard in le Hale whose half-virgate holding listed in the 1279 Hundred Rolls was eventually taken over by his son, Adam in le Hale. William, the reeve of Chadshunt (by-name unknown), likewise

---

72 The by-name Warner appears in no other documentation, only these account rolls, but it was not uncommon for a serjeant to be non-resident. Although a serjeant usually received a cash salary and an allowance of grain no reference is ever made in the account rolls to John le Warner's remuneration; see also J.S. Drew, 'Manorial Accounts of St. Swithin's Priory, Winchester', ECHR 62 (1947), p. 20 and R.H. Britnell, 'Minor landlords in England and medieval agrarian capitalism', in T.H. Aston, ed., Landlords, Peasants and Politics in Medieval England (Cambridge, 1987), p. 231. It has been noted that on the estate of the Bishop of Winchester, bailiffs were 'usually defined along geographic lines', for example, all the bishop's manors in Wiltshire were served by one bailiff: see M. Page, ed., The Pipe Roll of the Bishopric of Winchester 1301-2, Hampshire Record Series 14 (Winchester, 1996), p. xvii.

73 LJRO, D 30/N7 now D 30/11/99.


76 Page, The Pipe Roll of the Bishopric of Winchester, p. xviii.

77 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f 8r. The impact of the in le Hale family was such that Adam is the only
gave many years of service to the lord. Although only one of his account rolls survives, other sources tell of long drawn out proceedings in which he became involved as the result of the lord’s imprisonment and the subsequent sequestration of the manor. According to the account roll of 1307 one John of Chadshunt claimed to have paid to the King £26. 13s. 4d. for corn but the entry was disallowed at the final audit. A few months later when the sequestrators of the bishopric were pursuing outstanding debts John was summoned with four of his neighbours to answer for a total of £80, including the said £26. 13s. 4d.78 He insisted that he had paid the money to William the reeve and produced a tally as evidence. The case dragged on for four years because of constant adjournments, including one because a key witness was said to have died. Rather amusingly, when the court was next convened the same key witness was present having apparently ‘recovered his health’. Despite John’s protestations and despite the production of several witnesses he was not believed and was forced to pay the debt in instalments. This was no doubt a triumphant outcome for William the reeve who from many years of experience obviously knew a trick or two.79

Most interestingly, Adam in le Hale senior shared his duties as reeve at Itchington with Roger the reeve (by-name unknown). The changeover took place each year not at Michaelmas but sometime near Christmas, so that one man was responsible for
the winter sowing and the other for the spring sowing. The annual account was the work of both men and their debt to the lord was calculated pro rata. For example, of the outstanding sum of £65. 2s. 6¼d. in 1307, a total of £51. 15s. 8¾d. was deemed to be owing by Adam, and the remainder by Roger. But there is also a puzzling curiosity in the account rolls of both Itchington and Chadshunt concerning reeves. Although Adam, Roger and William were responsible for the annual accounts, there are regular references to prepositus de Berkswich (Staffs.) at Itchington and prepositus de Haywood (Staffs.) at Chadshunt, both seemingly outsiders. And yet according to the works accounts (works of which as reeves they were quit) the former held a virgate at Itchington and the latter half a virgate at Chadshunt. Neither held any apparent administrative responsibilities. How can we explain this very odd arrangement? Certainly it was not unusual for goods and labour to be distributed in inter-manorial fashion but that is not the same as having a ‘foreign’ reeve permanently present on the manor. Perhaps they were in fact natives of Itchington and Chadshunt and were sent to Staffordshire, for whatever reason, to act as reeves, in return being quit of the works which attached to their ‘home’ holding. This, indeed, would be highly unusual.

The demesne famuli at Itchington and Chadshunt included, fairly typically, ploughmen, carters, shepherds, swineherds and maid servants. No distinction was made between the first three in terms of remuneration (Table 4.1), each being paid 4s. 6d. a year and allowed 4 quarters 2½ bushels of grain. The pigmen’s much lower remuneration reflected the fact that they were only hired for the Michaelmas term.

---

80 LJRO, D 30/N9 now D 30/11/101. This arrangement had certainly petered out by the 1320s, its origin a mystery.
81 For Itchington see, for example, LJRO, D 30/N9 now D 30/11/101; and for Chadshunt, LJRO, D 30/N6 now D 30/11/102.
82 In the 1298 extent, for example, the cottars of Morwhale in Streethay (Staffs.), had to drive beasts to Sawley (Derbs.) and to Tachbrook, as well as to Brewood and Haywood (Staffs.), to which they also had to drive pigs, all sites of episcopal residences: SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, ff. 1v, 4r. And, as we have seen earlier in this chapter, the unfree of Chadshunt had to mow at Tachbrook.
83 This compares well with the average medieval famulus who typically received a money wage and between 4 and 4½ quarters of grain a year; see M.M Postan, *The Famulus: The Estate Labourer in the XIIth and XIIIth Centuries*, Economic History Review Supplement 2 (Cambridge, 1954), pp. 17-18, 22. Assuming the famuli were unmarried, these allowances compare very favourably with the 6 quarters 5 bushels of wheat, barley and oats which was the amount needed to sustain a family of five each year: see Dyer, *Standards of Living*, pp. 114, 134.
### Table 4.1 Demesne *famuli* allowances and stipends, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Allowances and Stipends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chadshunt | 1307 | 2 carters, 6 ploughmen, 1 shepherd  
4s. 6d. each *per annum*  
4 quarters 2½ bushels grain *per annum*  
1 maid servant  
3s. *per annum*  
3 quarters 2 bushels grain *per annum*  
1 pigman  
6d. for the Michaelmas term  
2 busheis of grain |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Allowances and Stipends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Itchington | 1307 | master carter  
4s. 6d. *per annum*  
4 quarters 2½ bushels wheat *per annum*  
1 carter, 5 ploughmen and 1 shepherd  
4s. 6d. each *per annum*  
4 quarters 2½ bushels grain *per annum*  
1 maid servant  
3s. *per annum*  
3 quarters 2 bushels of grain *per annum*  
1 pigman  
6½d.  
9 bushels of grain |

Sources: LJRO, D 30/N6, NG now D 30/11/102, 101.

The maid servants were paid 3s. and allowed 3 quarters 2 bushels of grain. Significantly, although the ploughmen, carters and shepherd received quantitatively the same amount of grain, one of the carters at Itchington - the ‘master’ carter - was given solely wheat whereas the others were given a mixture of wheat, peas and maslin. As the price of grain soared in the opening two decades of the fourteenth century payment in grain meant a very real increase but must be measured against...
the fact that payment in cash represented a decrease. Moreover, to counter rapidly rising grain prices, liveries were sometimes cut back. At Itchington in 1307 the grain livery was apportioned: wheat 46%, maslin 30% and peas 24%. Because of a dramatic surge in the price of wheat (as discussed in Chapter 3), by 1310 the total amount of livery remained the same but the proportions had changed to: wheat 34%, maslin 43% and peas 23% and by 1311: wheat 19%, maslin 68% and peas 13%. As the maslin came almost exclusively from the mill and therefore from tenants' contributions in kind to multure, the famuli experienced a spectacular decrease in the quality of their grain liveries in a matter of only four years. Let us now examine the work done by these famuli.

Stipendiary ploughmen (akermanni) were ‘mostly selected among the customary holders, and enjoy[ed] an immunity from ordinary work as long as they perform[ed] their special duty’. In Postan’s words they were given a ‘labour option’. This was the case at both Tachbrook and Itchington, although their respective arrangements were quite different. At Tachbrook there were three cottar akermanni: the first two were paired together in their duties and described as holding ten acres each, whereas the third had no partner and held 20 acres, half of which at one time must have been held by a fourth ploughman. All three were to benefit from the ‘Saturday plough’, whereby their own holdings were cultivated by the lord’s plough-team on Saturdays. The situation at Itchington was more complex. There were ten half-virgater akermanni, five of whom were women including three widows. Instead of being given the incentive of the ‘Saturday plough’, they were offered the option of paying 2s. each not

---

84 This was particularly the case where the famuli received the same payment not just for years but for decades. For example, on the Ramsey Abbey manor of Slepe the ploughmen’s stipend in 1252 was 3s. 8d. and was still the same amount in 1342: J.A. Rafits, The Estates of Ramsey Abbey A Study in Economic Growth and Organisation (Toronto, 1957), p. 204.

85 LJRO, D 30/N9, N7, N8 now D 30/11/101, 99, 100. By comparison, the famuli on Winchester manors saw their grain cut from one quarter every eight weeks to every ten weeks from 1306: Farmer, ‘Prices and wages’, p. 762.


87 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 6r; Postan, p. 21; Lloyd, ‘Ploughing services on the demesnes of the bishop of Worcester’, p. 190. The ten-acre cottars probably had few if any beasts of their own therefore the use of the lord’s team would have been a great benefit: see Homans, English Villagers, p. 247.

88 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 7v. The number ten ties in very neatly with the number of plough-teams - five - as discussed in Chapter 3. As women never ploughed, their duties were presumably performed by a son or servant: see Fox, ‘Exploitation of the landless’, p. 551.
to plough for the lord, or else they had to perform the full quota of week-works. It is clear from the works accounts of, for example, the 1307 account roll that they performed no week-works but neither did they pay 2s. each commutation therefore they must have been engaged in full-time ploughing. In the same account five ploughmen were remunerated in cash and five in grain, without it being clear whether the two groups of five were in fact one and the same. As stipends and grain allowances normally went hand in hand we may safely assume that only five ploughmen appear in the account rolls. What of their five counterparts?

It was not uncommon in medieval England for ploughmen to be divided into two groups, so that, as in the case of some Glastonbury Abbey manors, all the plough-drivers (fugatores) were stipendiary, and all the plough-holders (tenatores) were service familii, the latter generally being better paid. Is it possible that the ploughmen who appear in the account rolls at Itchington were plough-drivers and that their invisible counterparts were remunerated, for example, by being given rent-free accommodation? If so we should expect to find (as in the case of the reeve) details of their quit rent in the account rolls and that is not the case. Curiously, a similar situation prevailed at Chadshunt where there were six plough-teams and therefore the need for twelve ploughmen. In the 1307 account roll six were remunerated in cash and in grain. The tenurial capacity at Chadshunt from 1279 up to at least 1360 remained stubbornly at 17 unfree half-virgaters and 3, sometimes 4, cottars; and at

86 During vacancies in see when the demesne was left untilled they did indeed pay this money; see PRO, SC 6/1132/5 and E 136/12/17.
88 Farmer, 'The famuli in the later middle ages', p. 219. See also the Warwickshire manors of the Templars in the early fourteenth century when the plough-drivers were paid 4s. 1d. per annum, whereas the plough-holders were paid 5s. 1d. The exception was Studley where the figures were 3s. 6d. and 5s. respectively: PRO, SC 6/1040/21.
89 The tenant famuli on the Polden Hill manors who were engaged as ploughmen were quit of rent and of harvest boon-works and autumn works, facts which were recorded in the account rolls. They received neither a stipend nor a grain allowance. For example, of the eight demesne ploughmen at Walton in 1313, only two were stipendiary, both fugatores, and were paid 3s. 6d. per annum and received an allowance of 35 bushels of grain, whereas the other six ploughmen, 'who were in effect tenant famuli serving as ploughmen', received neither, but had use of the Saturday plough, as well as being quit of their rent and works: Thompson, 'The Polden Hill manors of Glastonbury Abbey', pp. 82, 176, 177, 179, 182, 187, 188, 199, 298.
Gaydon, 24 unfree virgaters and no cottars. (The number of free tenants varied little but is irrelevant to this argument.) In the account roll of 1307 all the unfree paid to have their works commuted. Therefore it is clear that none of them was employed as a stipendiary ploughman, because the need for commutation would have been redundant. There were far from enough cottars to make up the full complement of ploughmen. So who were they? Where did they live? Perhaps they were the sons of the unfree tenants on the manor, living at home and employed by the lord. In which case why does their remuneration not appear in the account rolls, for we cannot imagine that they worked for nothing? Perhaps they were outsiders who were accommodated when necessary in the lord’s hall at Itchington and at other times slept at night with the oxherd as recommended in the Seneschaucy.93

Two carters were employed at both Itchington and Chadshunt. Compared with many of the unfree tenants on these manors they seem to have led an adventurous life as they criss-crossed the midlands and beyond in the course of their duties. Most trips were made to Lichfield and London to the bishop’s residences, trips which became notably more frequent between 1307 and 1311, when Walter Langton was spending an increasing amount of time in his see.94 Intriguingly the carters were occasionally deployed into the private service of his brother, Robert Peverel, who held extensive property in Northamptonshire.95 For example, in 1307 one of the carters of Itchington was sent with a hired harrower to work ‘in the business’ of Robert, the cost of which was paid for out of Itchington manorial revenue. In the same year two carters - one each from Itchington and Chadshunt - were sent to Lichfield to collect and cart ‘board’ to Northamptonshire on behalf of Robert. Again, the costs were met from manorial revenue.96 Clearly, as the bishop’s Warwickshire manors were the nearest in the whole estate to Northamptonshire Robert Peverel was adept at persuading his brother to redeploy the occasional manorial servant.

94 In 1307 the carters at Itchington travelled less than 400 miles with the bishop’s provender but nearer 1,500 miles in 1311: LJRO, D 30/N9, N8 now D 30/11/101, 100.
95 Robert was in fact murdered on one of his Northamptonshire estates, Castle Ashby, in c. 1317: see Beardwood, ‘The trial of Walter Langton’, p. 38.
96 LJRO, D 30/N9, N6 now D 30/11/101, 102. Men were also hired from Itchington to drive Robert’s pigs.
At the bottom of the manorial heap of servants lay the *garciones*, for the most part undetectable. As demonstrated conclusively by H.S.A. Fox, they were usually landless and not necessarily young, as a *garcio* ‘so long as he never obtained land, remained one for the rest of his life.’ 97 There are small glimpses of their activities at Itchington and Chadshunt. For example, in 1307 one was sent to Cannock (Staffs.), a round trip of about 110 miles, to fetch 240 sheep, while two more were despatched to Lichfield, some 45 miles away, also to fetch sheep. 98

Whenever appropriate, casual labourers, that is to say occasional workers paid by the day, were hired to perform a multitude of tasks, many of them specialist. At Chadshunt in 1307 a roofer was employed to work on the kiln, the stable, the cattle shed and even the *garderobe*, all of which took just over a week and for which he was paid 1½d. a day. Two women were paid ½d. a day each to be of service to him - their tasks were not specified. The roofer hired to work on the grange at Itchington that year was paid more generously at 2d. a day. 99 In 1310 at Itchington repair work was carried out on the kiln, the stable, the hall, and the grange but only a few days were devoted to this, giving the impression that it was patch-up work done prior to an episcopal visit. 100

Work of a solely agrarian nature was mostly undertaken by customary, not casual, labour, even though there was a significant difference between their work-rates. For example, at Itchington when the 19½ ‘virgaters’ reaped and when the love-boon was rendered the work-rate was stated to be 3½ man-days per acre, whereas the hired hands were expected to spend only 2½ man-days on each acre. 101 But the vast reserves of customary labour, although ‘done with unwilling resignation’, could cover

---

97 Fox, ‘Exploitation of the landless’, p. 521.
98 LJRO, D 30/N9, N6 now D 30/11/101, 102.
100 LJRO, D 30/N7 now D 30/11/99.
101 The man-days have been calculated thus: each acre worked by customary labour was said to take up 3½ works and a work was usually equivalent to one man-day; each acre worked by hired hands bore a cost in stipend of 5d. and as the going rate at Itchington was 2d. a day regardless of the task involved, a payment of 5d. represents 2½ days’ work. This compares with a fourteenth-century average of 2.2 man-days per acre to harvest wheat: see B.H. Slicher van Bath, *The Agrarian History of Western Europe A.D. 500–1850* (London, 1963), pp. 183–184.
far more acres in a day far more cheaply.\footnote{Fox, 'Exploitation of the landless', p. 545. As noted by Stone, 'customary labourers were indeed less productive than hired workers in the tasks of mowing and haymaking' and doubtless in other tasks as 'on demesne farms in medieval England one man was clearly not as good as another': see Stone, 'The productivity of hired and customary labour', pp. 649, 654-655.} The reeve clearly had to weigh up time and cost effectiveness against efficiency.\footnote{See Stone, p. 641 for the comment that: 'Decisions about which type of labour to use on the demesnes must have been an important part of manorial administration.'}

Conclusion

Like many a medieval lord, Walter Langton was not personally present within local society, but the presence of his officials was strongly felt. He employed a variety of officials, engaged to ensure that the manorial machine was run as smoothly as possible, and was able to enjoy the fruits of his demesnes whether on visits or whilst abroad. It is impressive that he visited Itchington so frequently given that it was at the southernmost point of the diocese, although a number of his sojourns here were while he was en route to or from London.

The bulk of Langton's Warwickshire tenants were unfree, of whom the half-virgaters at Itchington seemed to have fared the best. They held twenty acres, which historians generally agree was more than adequate to support a family, and only had to work for the lord three days every fortnight.\footnote{For the adequacy of holdings see J.Z. Titow, \textit{English Rural Society 1200-1350} (London, 1969), pp. 78-93; Dyer, \textit{Standards of Living}, pp. 110-114.} By contrast the virgaters at Gaydon (20 acres), and the half-virgaters at Chadshunt (16 acres) had to work twice as much, although they did enjoy commutation from at least the end of the thirteenth century. The labour demands of the bishop's manors were otherwise met by means of a nicely structured workforce organized by the reeve and included ploughmen, carters, shepherds, swineherds, maid servants and \textit{garclones}, and, whenever necessary, occasional workers paid by the day.

By the middle of the fourteenth century the number of free tenants and the rent paid at Tachbrook, Itchington and Chadshunt remained exactly the same as in 1298, with a reduction from 13 free tenants to eight at Gaydon. While no unfree holdings
were vacant in 1321, in the wake of the Black Death at Tachbrook ten out of nineteen villein half-virgate holdings remained unoccupied, nine half-virgate holdings at Itchington and four virgate-holdings at Gaydon, but none at Chadshunt - an almost complete reversal of the situation that was to develop during the course of the sixteenth century. Surprisingly where unfree holdings remained vacant for a long period, as at Tachbrook, cottars stayed in their lowly dwellings rather than seek economic promotion. There are no clear indications of weaknesses or incipient problems in social structure or tenure before the mid-fourteenth century at either Chadshunt or Nether Itchington, nor are there any indications of the success that Tachbrook, Gaydon and Upper Itchington were to enjoy during the sixteenth century and into the modern period. Indeed even as late as 1360 there are no obvious signs at Chadshunt to mark it out as a ‘to-be-deserted’ settlement other than the fact that it was smaller than average and had an overwhelming predominance of customary tenants. And yet Tachbrook also had a large number of customary tenants as well as cottars, was in serious decline by 1360, but survives today in the landscape. Thus we must seek answers in a later period, so shall now move into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
CHAPTER FIVE
AGRICULTURE IN THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Introduction

A series of disasters in the fourteenth century, namely the agrarian crisis which extended from 1315 to 1321, the Black Death in 1348, the unusually long vacancy from 1358 to 1360 triggered by the death of Roger Northborough, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, during which time all the demesne land in Itchington, Tachbrook and Chadshunt lay uncultivated (frisca), and the so-called secunda pestilencia of 1361, culminated in the farming out of the same demesne land by the mid-1360s. The impact of such a momentous change in manorial administration is still keenly felt by the twenty-first century historian, for the farming out of demesnes signalled the end of the lord's requirement to be presented with detailed annual accounts of stock and grain, or of the famuli and their allowances, or of the seasonal works of the unfree. Therefore having left the previous chapter in the 1360s, the paucity of documentation forces us to leap forward to the mid-fifteenth century.

In the mid-1970s Hilton noted that there was 'no darker century [than the fifteenth] in the history of English rural society'. Fortuitously a number of important publications have since appeared which have done much to shed light onto 'one of the most formative but least researched periods in English agrarian history'. Indeed, to many an historian the fifteenth century is regarded as 'the waning of the middle ages', the

---

1 SBTRO, DR 10/2593.
period after 1475 remaining in particular 'a no-man’s-land between the main interests of medievalists and early modernists' failing consequently 'to receive the attention that it merits'. One major obstacle is the sharp decrease in manorial documentation which was the inevitable result in administrative terms of the farming out of manorial demesnes. In fact Campbell's latest work, an excellent in-depth analysis of seigneurial agriculture (but 'not...for the faint-hearted'), ends abruptly in chronological terms at 1450 because by then 'the era of the manorial account is effectively over.' This lacuna in the evidence has serious implications for the study of deserted settlements for it is generally accepted that most villages were deserted by a process of slow decline that went on through the fifteenth century, notwithstanding that the phase of rural depopulation of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries has at least received somewhat more attention than that which occurred up to the mid fifteenth century.

Rather remarkably (as described in the section on sources in Chapter 1) there is a wealth of hitherto untapped material available to enable us to trace the agrarian and social progress of those manors in Warwickshire belonging to the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, from the middle of the fifteenth century through to 1547 - and up to the end of the sixteenth century. In terms of lordship the year 1547 is important for that is when Bishop Richard Sampson sold the Warwickshire manors of the bishopric to Thomas Fisher, then Secretary to the Duke of Somerset because, according to Dugdale, the bishop having 'a good affection to the Romish religion' hoped to gain 'a friend in Court' so that if 'Popery' were abolished he would not be so easily 'heaved' out of his bishopric.

In this chapter we shall explore the landscape for evidence of change and

---

continuity, looking in particular at names in the landscape, the field system, and the ways in which the landscape was managed. Then we shall analyse the crops grown and the livestock reared. In these two topics there will be a distinctive difference from the pre-Black Death period because of the shift in focus from seigneurial to peasant agrarian activity as the result of the farming out of the manorial demesnes. The evidence will come from court rolls and account rolls as in previous chapters, and additionally from wills and inventories, parish registers, charters, and disputes centred on the glebe. Differences between the bishop’s manors will be highlighted and explained whenever possible, bearing in mind that Tachbrook is situated in the Feldon and Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon on the wold fringe of Warwickshire. That regional contrast is vital, as we know that later medieval depopulation was a very marked feature of the wolds in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, 73% of depopulated villages in the latter county being situated in the wolds; and moreover that Nether Itchington and Chadshunt lie deserted in the modern landscape.  

5.1 Landscape

5.1.1 Continuity and change: names

A fundamental change in the management of the landscape was the reversion by the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield to farming out his Warwickshire demesnes from the 1360s. Notwithstanding that change there is a great deal of evidence of continuity in the bishop’s manors. Well into the later middle ages and into the modern period there are even lingering reminders of a long-forgotten Anglo-Saxon occupancy. For example, in 1550 tenants in Chadshunt were ordered not to keep their sheep between Warwyck wey (now the B4100) and Dodlow (from the Anglo-Saxon Dodda’s hlaw, meaning a barrow) before 19 September. On the boundary between Itchington and Burton Dassett, lay Buryfyld, probably signifying a typically located Anglo-Saxon

---

9 For the location of the names mentioned in this section see Figs 4, 6 and 7 in Chapter 2.
10 BRL, 432723.
burial site (from the OE beorg, also meaning barrow). The meadow land listed in an account roll of 1459 is almost identical to that in the 1298 extent, suggesting a routine and efficient method of recording by constantly referring back to previous records. The recurrent suffix ham(m), for example, Childesham and Blakepol(e)ham(me) (OE in origin and meaning grass land in the bend of a river), not only paints an evocative picture of the banks of the winding Itchen, but also reinforces the impression of constancy. Most remarkable of all is the impressive survival of names between 1298 and 1839 at Nether Itchington: Little and Large Gofnall (Goffenhull), Smith meadow (Smethemedowe), Little and Great Daglow (Dodeslouwe), Lamcot ploughing, greenswards and meadow (lambecote). Much of this preservation must have something to do with the depopulation here - evident in the names Lower, Back and First Old Town (near the present Old Town House) - which led to a fossilization of the landscape and names.

By contrast at both Chadshunt and Gaydon the lack of continuity in field names is very striking. Of the wealth of names featured in the 1298 extent at Chadshunt, the only continuity detected is that of two pieces of meadow: Biribroke and Brademere in 1298 appear as Berybroke & Badymere in 1459. The glebe was scattered in strips amongst furlongs named in the 1298 extent and in a terrier dated 1619 but without any hint of continuity in furlong names. Nor indeed is there any between 1619 and the mid-nineteenth century. The evidence at Gaydon is far less robust but it is worth noting that the furlong names encountered in a glebe terrier of 1622 appear for the first time and the only survivals in the modern landscape are Thornhill and Banbury

---

11 BRL, 432661.
12 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 6v; LJRO, B/A/21/124075, m. 2r. The opening date of the account reflects the beginning of a new episcopacy as John Hals was enthroned as bishop of Coventry and Lichfield.
13 WCRO, CR 569/135.
14 SRO, D(W) 1734/J2268, f. 8v; LJRO, B/A/21/124075, m. 1v.
15 The details of the glebe are not given in the extent but a comprehensive list of furlong names is included amongst which some, if not all, of the glebe must have lain, given its highly scattered nature. This is clear in 1619 when the glebe in one of the two fields at Chadshunt consisted of eleven bundles of ‘lands’ totalling 64 ‘lands’ ranging in size from one rood two perches to more than two acres; and in the other field, 34 bundles of ‘lands’ amounting to 66 in toto, from one rood two perches in size to more than an acre. For the glebe terrier see PRO, E 178/4687 and for the mid-nineteenth-century evidence see SBTRO, DR 622/42, 165.
5.1.ii Continuity and change: field systems

There is also evidence of both continuity and change in the field systems of the bishop’s manors. At Itchington where names in the landscape persisted across the centuries, so too did the two-field system. In an account roll of 1459 it was noted that no revenue had been raised from the west field because during the year it had lain fallow as in every other year. And in account rolls up to the 1540s the same phraseology recurs, either the west or the east field being described as fallow. It is unknown what effect the gradual depopulation of Nether Itchington in the later sixteenth century had on the field system shared jointly with Upper Itchington as described in Chapter 2. But there is evidence of some exchanges of property being made between the lord, Thomas Fisher, and some of his tenants, which may have had an impact on the layout and management of the field system. For example, on the 30 September, 1556 Fisher exchanged houses and closes in Upper and Nether Itchington with Edward Tgmkns of Upper Itchington; and on 20 March, 1564 Richard Tomkyns of Upper Itchington sold two closes in Nether Itchington to Fisher, closes which had been in the Tomkyns family for at least sixty years.

At Chadshunt the two-field system persisted. Because of a dispute in 1618 between John Fulnetby, rector of Itchington, and John Newsham, lord of Chadshunt, a terrier was drawn up in which it is clear that the 50 scattered acres of glebe lay in two fields, 25 acres 13 perches on the ‘Kyneton side’ and 24 acres three roods 13 perches on the ‘Geydon side’.

In 1639, during another glebe dispute (this time at Gaydon) between Richard Hunt, vicar of Itchington, and John Askell and other inhabitants of Gaydon, a series of witnesses made an astounding revelation about a courageous change in the management of the landscape of Gaydon. According to William Burrowes of Wardington (Oxon.), a husbandman aged about 72 and Thomas Hawtrick of Kineton,
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16 The terrier is no longer extant but extracts survive at LJRO, D 30/4/9/199.
17 LJRO, BIA/21/124075, m. 2r; SRO, D(W) 1734/J1949, m. 18v.
18 SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, ff. 14r, 14v, 15r.
19 PRO, E 178/4687. The terrier was drawn up on 22 and 23 February, 1619.
20 PRO, E 134/15Chas1/Mich3.
a labourer aged about 68, the inhabitants of Gaydon decided by agreement (forty years ago or thereabouts according to the former, and at least twenty years ago according to the latter) to divide their fields into three fields, sowing two yearly with corn, leaving the third fallow, and to review the situation every six years. This was confirmed by other deponents without any further dates being proffered. There are several issues to address here. When is it likely that they made the changeover? Why? At whose instigation? Why review the situation every six years? There is no doubt that to change an ancient system of agrarian organization was a bold move. William Burrowes thought it had happened in the late 1590s. Although he was from Wardington, some 12 miles away, he must have had close links with Gaydon to have been able to suggest a date and it is likely that he was the son of the William Burrowes who in 1563 took on nearly three virgates at Gaydon and served as tithingman there between 1564 and 1566 and again in 1582. Had Burrowes senior been instrumental in executing the changeover it is likely that Burrowes junior would have mentioned this in his detailed deposition. Therefore the late 1590s seems a credible time for the changeover. The reason may simply have been a matter of imitation. There is evidence that the tenants of Gaydon traded regularly at the specialist cattle and sheep markets at Banbury in north Oxfordshire, only some ten miles to the south. For example, as early as 1550 'Burbery of Geydon' was selling oxen there. The link with Oxfordshire is pivotal because redivision of two-field systems was common in that county in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Very likely it was one of the topics of conversation at market. The transformation to a three-field system of course meant an increase in the arable land

As noted by Dr H.S.A. Fox, H.L. Gray was the first to uncover a fairly widespread movement in the early seventeenth century of a transformation of two-field systems: H.S.A. Fox, 'The alleged transformation from two-field to three-field systems in medieval England', ECHR 2nd ser. 39 (1986), p. 543.

BRL, 432681, 432683, 432676; SBTRO, DR 10/2613. He may have continued in this office for many more years but the court rolls cease in 1582.


N.W. Alcock, Warwickshire Grazier and London Skinner 1532-1555 (London, 1981), p. 75. The Burbery family was prominent at that time in the court rolls of Gaydon. For example, Robert held the mill in 1548 and Henry was elected sheep warden the following year: BRL, 432719, 432722.

M. Havinden, 'Agricultural progress in open-field Oxfordshire', AgHR 9 (1961), p. 78.
and a concomitant decrease in the fallow. According to Havinden the rationale was not to grow more wheat to feed a growing population but rather to grow more fodder crops to make up for the loss of fallow grazing. Indeed the fodder was sown on the fallow field, a process called 'hitching', and practised at first in a small way, developing into an 'ascending spiral of progress', beginning at a very basic level with an increase in the area of grass land by means of leys culminating in an increase of manure, improved fertility of the soil and better supply and quality of wheat. That was agricultural progress indeed. The change is most likely to have been made not by one individual imposing his will on the community but as a result of communal cooperation. The six-yearly review was based on the obvious fact that under a three-field system it would take three years to fulfil a cycle, therefore after seeing the cycle through twice the inhabitants then had the opportunity to learn vital lessons from any aberrations which chanced to repeat themselves.

At Tachbrook Thomas Fisher was busy re-ordering the landscape in a way which had a direct impact on the prevailing two-field system. In April 1573 he had several agreements drawn up. Firstly, he bought from John Savage a yeoman of the neighbouring village of Moreton Morrell all the land which the latter had intermixed with the land of Fisher and other freeholders in the west field. In the agreement mention was made of 'the olde enclosed grounds of the said Thomas ffissher & others' in part of the west field. Secondly, Fisher sold his own land in the east field to Savage, land which lay adjacent to 'the groundes of William Comaunder of Tachebroke yoman nowe newlye devyded boundyd and enclosyd', to 'the landes of

26 For an earlier period, Dyer has offered a different argument with the suggestion that if the area under wheat and rye were kept as small as possible, more of the arable fields would have been available for winter grazing: C. Dyer, Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society The Estates of the Bishopric of Worcester, 680-1540 (Cambridge, 1980), p. 321.
27 This line of argument fits in with David Hall's tenet that 'change from two to three fields would increase the yield by 33 percent...mathematically but of doubtful validity in practise [sic]'. See D. Hall, The Open Fields of Northamptonshire, Northamptonshire Record Society 38 (Northampton, 1995), pp. 62-63.
28 Havinden, 'Agricultural progress', pp. 78, 83.
29 It may even be possible that the willingness at Gaydon to be adventurous explains to a great degree why it survives today as a village whereas Chadshunt is a deserted settlement.
31 WCRO, CR 1908/105/1.
Henry Eires lykewyse newlye enclosed boundyd or lymytted' and to 'the landes of the 
said Henry Eires & one Thomas Olney gent lykewyse newlye enclosed boundyd or 
sette owte'. By this means of exchange John Savage was able to establish one 
compact holding in the east field where some of his neighbours had already 
demarcated their own consolidated holdings. Thirdly, William Commander was 
granted land by Fisher in the east field, land which also lay between newly divided 
and enclosed land of his neighbours, John Savage and Henry Eires. Fourthly, 
Thomas Fisher granted to the same Henry Eires, a yeoman of Tachbrook, land in 
both the west and east fields, who a few days earlier had already sold to Fisher 55 
acres in the west field. The constant repetition of the phrase 'newly divided and 
enclosed' in these agreements and the fact that nearly all the land was in the east 
field strongly suggests the end of communal agriculture at Tachbrook. Indeed in the 
early eighteenth century when two plans were drawn up prior to the enclosure 
agreement, it is clear that all but 688 acres had already been enclosed.

In the sixteenth-century engrossing and enclosing (two of the most controversial 
topics at the time in England) went hand in hand because the latter was only 
ultimately worthwhile when preceded by the former, namely the amalgamation of 
several strips by exchange or purchase. Classically enclosure involved 
'encroachments made by lords of manors or their farmers upon the land over which 
the manorial population had common rights or which lay in the open arable fields'. But enclosure could involve several processes including, for example, 'changes in
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32 WCRO, CR 1908/105/2. A few months earlier, in July 1572, Thomas Fisher had already agreed to 
sell to John Savage a barn and a close in Tachbrook, which was 'seised and delivered' to John in 
October: WCRO, CR 1908/103/1-4. A separate agreement with Thomas Olney has not survived but it 
is clear from later evidence that he exchanged lands with Fisher at this time: WCRO, CR 1908/112/1.
33 WCRO, CR 1908/105/3. Three years later this land was demised to William Commander by 
34 WCRO, CR 1908/105/4. WCRO, CR 1908/104/1-2, the 55 acres consisting of 40 acres of arable, 1 
acre of meadow, 10 acres of pasture, 1 acre of wood and 3 acres of heath. WCRO, CR 1908/73/1-2. 
Following these transactions, Thomas Fisher had drawn up for William Commander and Henry Eires 
a quitclaim each, releasing them both from those dues associated with unfreedom, including merchet, 
heriot and suit of court.
35 WCRO, CR 1908/229/1, 2; WCRO, Z 204/4(L); WCRO, QS 75/113B/2. On a map dated 1840 large 
blocks of land are shown in the east field still in the occupation of the Savage, Ayres and Commander 
families: WCRO, CR 1908/199/112.
36 J. Thirsk, 'Enclosing and engrossing', in J. Thirsk, ed., The Agrarian History of England and Wales, 
farm layouts and field boundaries'. 38 Another type of enclosure occurred when peasants exchanged land with each other in order to build up compact holdings which they then hedged and ditched. R.C. Allen observed that, 'In the midlands, enclosure, however it was effected, was usually accompanied by consolidation - the various owners exchanged strips to create large blocks of property' and 'common grazing was renounced so that exclusive private control over land was established'. 39 This is exactly what was happening at Tachbrook in the late sixteenth century. We can see how through the initiative of individual tenants arable holdings were consolidated 'by a process of exchange between tenants'. 40 At Tachbrook the enclosure was taking place by consent and its advantages would have proved overwhelming', for example, tenants would need worry no more about the trespass of neighbours' beasts. 41 Crucially the tenants' enclosure at Tachbrook did not result in evictions or depopulation. 42 At the same time there is no evidence of engrossment at Tachbrook.

5.1.iii Maintenance of the landscape through by-laws

However the field system was organized, its supporting structure in the form of boundaries, roads and ditches had to be properly maintained; ploughing and mowing strictly regulated; the resources of the heath fairly distributed; and the numbers and movements of livestock rigorously supervised. 43 This was essentially achieved by means of by-laws, which 'were enacted “by common consent”'. 44 As Ault claimed, 'villagers themselves were concerned to have agrarian by-laws and to have them

---

41 Tawney, p. 169.
42 Tawney, pp. 151-153.
43 A salutary example of what happened when the infrastructure of a manor was left neglected is apparent in a court roll for Compton Verney, a manor contiguous with Chadshunt. The boundaries were so neglected that in 1402 several trespasses were reported from three neighbouring manors including 200 mares from Lighthorne: SBTO, DR 98/64a, 67.
enforced' and 'common consent...meant what it said'. 45 This is amply demonstrated in a rare and interesting sixteenth-century volume of manorial precedents (which needs to be more widely studied) of a group of manors in south Warwickshire. 46 It includes a section entitled, 'A Cataloge of the Customs and usuages of the Manor of Kingswood in the County of Warwick transcribed out of an Ancient Customary Book', in which it is made clear that:

'The said Tenants have used time out of minde to make such By-Laws and ordinances in Court as to the Homage shall think fit and to inflict and to make paines in Court for breach of the same for reforming misorders and for their good ordering of their Commons and of other matters touching the weale benefitt or good of the Lord, Township, or any the Tenant or Tenants'. 47

With this in mind, let us examine the various types of agrarian by-laws passed within our area of study.

Only occasionally are the bounds of the vill mentioned in the court rolls, for example, in 1498 all tenants of Upper Itchington were ordered to renew the bounds 'where they have lain of old'; and in 1549 tenants of Upper and Nether Itchington were ordered to make adequate the limits of both vills by Easter (only eleven days away). 48 Of far greater concern were the boundaries between neighbours. 49 At Itchington in 1548 and in 1549 tenants were ordered to make adequate fences (cepes) between neighbours, the pain being dramatically increased from 12d. to 6s. 8d. in the interim, hinting at a wilful lack of regard. 50 In 1549 and in 1551 all tenants in

45 W. O. Ault, 'Village by-laws by common consent', Speculum 29 (1954), pp. 383, 394. But note also the view that a term such as tota villata was by the early fourteenth century 'no more than a fictional relic far detached from whatever meaning it may have possessed at an earlier date': R. M. Smith, "Modernisation" and the corporate medieval village community in England: some sceptical reflections', in A. R. H. Baker and D. Gregory, eds, Explorations in Historical Geography: Interpretative Essays (Cambridge, 1984), p. 174.
46 SBTRO, DR 98/1857, being a copy drawn up on 1 October, 1660 from an original written on 14 November, 1565. The manors are Barston, Balsall, Knowle, Hampton in Arden, Rowington, Brookhampton, Great Kineton, Combroke and Kingswood.
47 SBTRO, DR 98/1857, p. 229.
48 SBTRO; DR 10/2608; BRL, 432721.
49 While only two by-laws are to be found on this subject in all the surviving court rolls from 1349 to 1546 (the first dated 12 April, 1497 and relating to Tachbrook only, and the second, 18 November, 1546 and relating to Itchington only: SBTRO, DR 10/2607; BRL, 432664), a flurry of such measures are recorded in the court rolls from October 1549.
50 BRL, 432719, 432721.
Tachbrook and Gaydon were ordered to maintain hedges between neighbours. Recorded infringements were rare. One tenant alone was particularly troublesome. Thomas Trust of Gaydon was regularly amerced for maintaining his hedges too well inasmuch as he built too many with the view of enclosing his own land. In 1554 he was amerced 4d. for erecting hedges 'without his own land' and was to rectify this under pain of 40s. At the next view, having ignored the order of the court he was amerced a further 7s. 8d. and in 1563 another 4d., this time for not maintaining his hedges.

The repair of roads was essential to the good functioning of an open-field village. Years before the passing of the first Highway Act in 1555, according to which every landholder was expected to provide a horse and cart towards mending the highway, the tenants within our area of study were used to such demands and more. Those demands varied widely, very likely dictated by how much repair was needed. At Itchington (both Upper and Nether) in 1550 and again in 1555 tenants had to cart two loads of stone per virgate holding to the king's highway. At Tachbrook in 1551 the ratio was only one cartload of stones per virgate holding and the pain was only 4d. and at Gaydon demands varied from half a load per virgate holding in 1552 to one load in the next two years. On only one occasion was an uniform by-law passed and that was in 1555, the year of the Highway Act, when all tenants were instructed to

51 BRL, 432722, 432665.
52 BRL, 432688, 432669, 432682. His anti-social actions were no bar to his serving as constable of Gaydon in 1555 and between 1564 and 1566; see BRL, 432671, 432683, 432684, 432685, 432686. Examples have also been found of the boundary of the vill being breached: in 1550 tenants at Itchington encroached into the adjacent manor of Harbury: NRO, Spencer Court Rolls, no. 163; and in 1563 tenants from Tachbrook Mallory unlawfully enclosed 'the bridge grene', being waste land that lay on the edge of Bishops Tachbrook: BRIL, 432681. It is gratifying that there are several examples of such disputes within our area of study, given the general lack of evidence of encroachment in the region. It is likely that there was little such conflict in the open-field Feldon because as a result of centuries of open-field farming 'everyone knew the rules'. This point was made by Professor Chris Dyer in the second of his Ford lectures given at the University of Oxford, Hilary Term, 2001.
53 Ault, Open-Field Husbandry, p. 37.
55 BRL, 432723, 432671. The pain for neglect was doubled from 3s. 4d. in 1550 to 6s. 8d. in 1555. It is worth noting that by-laws were often specifically recorded only once or twice in the court rolls and thereafter covered by the all-embracing phrase that 'all the pains of the last court remain in full effect'. For example, John Tompkins was amerced in 1557 and in 1562 (BRL, 432673, 432680) for not carting stones to the highway and yet the last specific by-law on this matter was recorded in 1555.
56 BRL, 432665, 432666, 432667, 432668.
cart one load of stones to repair roads. Otherwise the different policy in each manor can best be explained in terms of local circumstance.

The maintenance of ditches was crucial to prevent the encroachment of weeds and to assist in drainage. At Tachbrook in 1546 tenants were ordered to repair the ditches apud le townemedoo end and in 1549 to scour the ditches at connery banke and around constable medowe. In the latter year, a number of tenants at Gaydon were amerced for not scouring their own ditches. The problem must have persisted because the following June the tenants there were ordered yet again that ditches between neighbours were to be cleaned.

Barely a court went by without by-laws being passed to ensure the regulation of ploughing and mowing. Of particular concern was the management of leys, those strips of land which were left unsown and unmown so that beasts could graze thereon. Leys were crucial in providing extra pasture and often heralded the first stage in agrarian change as mentioned earlier. Horses were tethered on leys laid down in the corn field, and cattle then sheep grazed upon those in the fallow field. By-laws were essential for specifying how many acres per yardland were be left to grass over. One or two were passed at Chadshunt, Itchington and Tachbrook in the mid-sixteenth century but a whole plethora at Gaydon. For example, from October 1548 'les swardes' between selions at Chadshunt were not to be ploughed and from June 1550 four acres of each virgate in the ffalowfylde were to be left unploughed until the morrow of Ascension (May-time) from henceforth. From the latter date land between selions was to be left unploughed in the ploughed fields of both Itchingtons, and from April 1553 one-sixth of a virgate was to be left unmown at the end of each selion. Finally from April 1551 half a furlong was to be left unploughed between each selion at Tachbrook. Several examples may be given from Gaydon, which is
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57 BRL, 432670.
58 BRL, 432664, 432722.
59 BRL, 432722, 432723.
62 BRL, 432720, 432723.
63 Ploughing was clearly continuing at Nether Itchington years after it was supposedly depopulated. BRL, 432723, 432667.
64 BRL, 432665.
interesting, remembering that this manor was to convert to a three-field system by the late 1590s, and that within an ascending spiral of agrarian progress the most basic level was an increase in the area left under grass. From October 1548 until the following Trinity six selions per virgate were to be left fallow; in October 1549 it was ordered that four selions per virgate were to be left unploughed for pasture vocatur leye and furlongs between selions were to be left grassed over; in April 1551 this was increased by 50% to six selions per virgate to be left fallow in the fallowe fyld until Trinity; and ultimately doubled to eight selions per virgate in 1553. Additionally in June 1550 it was ordered that one-twelfth of a virgate of each furlong should be left unploughed; from April 1551 tenants were to leave unploughed a specified amount of land between selions as well as one-fourteenth of a virgate at the end of each selion to be left unmown; and in 1553 and 1554 the end of each selion, measuring one-twentieth of a virgate, was to be left unmown in the first instance and unploughed in the second, after 1 August. If we unpick this detail it becomes clear that in even years, 1548, 1550 and 1554, the instructions were thus: x amount of land not to be ploughed until certain times, the amount to be left fallow decreasing over the years. Conversely, in odd years, 1549, 1551 and 1553, the amount increased, from four selions per virgate to six then to eight. Additionally, there was some experimentation. In 1551 six selions per virgate were to be left fallow in the fallowe fyld and one-fourteenth at the end of all selions were to be left unmown whereas in 1553 the ratios were respectively eight selions and one-twentieth.

Naturally tenants sometimes resented not being able to cultivate all their land. One such was Thomas Carter of Itchington. In 1554 he was amerced for mowing and ploughing furlongs when he should not have done so; in 1556 for ploughing and mowing the common metes; and in 1558 for mowing in the meadow of Upper Itchington. It is clear from the entry of his death in the court rolls in 1560 that he was no poor man for whom every sod of soil mattered, for he held five virgates.

65 BRL, 432720, 432722, 432665, 432667, 432723, 432668.
66 BRL, 432668, 432669, 432672, 432675.
67 BRL, 432724. His was the first burial to be recorded in Itchington parish register (20 June, 1560): WCRO, DR 60/1, f. 40r. As Dyer observed, 'The real enemies of the village community were not so much the poor, against whose idle, feckless, and criminal behaviour many by-laws were aimed, but the members of the village elite who pursued their own economic interests': C. Dyer, 'Tenant farming
By-laws ensured that pastureland was not overburdened and that the resources of the heath were protected. Oxen needed lush pasture ‘for the horses may be tedered or tyed upon leys, balkes, or hades, where as oxen may not be kept’, therefore they were given priority. In 1495 the tenants of Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon were reminded that the wold of Gaydon and Chadshunt was reserved for plough oxen as well as cows in milk. At Tachbrook by-laws were passed regularly to ensure that oxen had the best pasture. For example, in 1536 and in 1550 tenants were reminded that only oxen were allowed in le(z) oxe pasture. Sheep are well known for their ability to crop the ground closely. For that reason their access to the post-harvest stubble had to be restricted. For example, in 1498 tenants at Itchington were told to keep their sheep away from le Stubyll until mid-November; and at Chadshunt in 1550 sheep were forbidden to wander in lez fallow hey before mid-June and within lez stoble fy1de before mid-September.

The resources of the heath at Itchington were regulated with cottars particularly in mind. For example, the cottars were told in 1537 that they were not to carry away frysses (furze or gorse) on horseback, and more explicitly in 1548 that they could only take away les ffruces from the common heath on their heads. This must have been thought of as a clever way of limiting how much they could carry away but probably caused some ill-feeling, for in 1550 the by-law was modified so that cottars could take away two cartloads each. This did not prevent some like William Tompkyns from being greedy, who was amerced 4d. in 1548, 2s. 8d. in 1554, and a further 12d. in
1555 for carrying away more than his fair share.\textsuperscript{75} Indeed the community of the vill expressed regular concern that cottars should not take more than their allocated share of natural resources. Already in 1548 tenants of both Upper and Nether Itchington had been told not to lease common land to any incoming cottars unless they were established in a cottage and the following year four more by-laws were passed here restricting cottars' rights to the common and the heath including the order that present cottagers were not to lease common to any new cottager for sheep unless the lessor's and lessee's sheep were kept together.\textsuperscript{76} Because of general abuse and damage to the heath in the mid-1550s the community of the vill, trying hard to be fair, agreed in 1554 that \textit{lez ffrysses} were by assent and consent of all tenants to be assigned by share; and in 1555, that all those entitled to a share should meet at 7 a.m. on 1 October on the heath to share out the furze.\textsuperscript{77}

The community of the vill also tried hard to be fair when deciding the quota of beasts to tenants, for example, by not allowing any one virgater to have more animals than any other virgater in the village (Table 5.1). To some extent this involved experimentation and, with only rare exception, was decided on a manorial basis, that is to say there were clearly different concerns in each of the manors and differing resources which affected the nature of the by-laws which were passed, as will become apparent. The evidence at Tachbrook and Itchington is fairly robust. At Tachbrook there seems to have been no shortage of pasture as is clear in the rather generous sheep stints although there was some flexibility in the numbers. Experimentation is clear at Itchington in phrases such as ‘until the next view’ and in seasonal variations. The reduction from 40 sheep and three capuls in 1548 to 35 and two respectively in 1553 is telling of a shortage of pasture for whatever reason. The manor with the fewest recorded stints was Chadshunt and it is only in a glebe dispute of 1618 that any precise figures are given. At Gaydon the number of sheep permitted per virgate was increased from 30 in 1548 to 35 in the mid-1550s. This augmentation may well have been the result of extra pasture being available for sheep as horses

\textsuperscript{75} BRL, 432720, 432668, 432669, 432670.
\textsuperscript{76} BRL, 432720, 432721. The repeated use of the phrase ‘new cottars’ suggests inward migration as outsiders took on the humblest of dwellings as a way of gaining a ‘toe-hold’ in the manor. This is against the backdrop of supposed depopulation at Nether Itchington.
\textsuperscript{77} BRL, 432669, 432671.
### Table 5.1 Animal stints per virgate by manor (size of virgate unknown, and allocation presumed to be pro rata for half- and quarter-virgate holdings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tachbrook</th>
<th></th>
<th>Itchington</th>
<th></th>
<th>Chadshunt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>60 sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 sheep until next view</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Neel and Thomas Robyns have counted all avers and no-one to keep more than permitted for his tenure [no explicit numbers given]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>70 sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 capuls</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 gander, 1 goose per tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>70 sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 pigs</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 draught horses per rent of 6s. 8d.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>14 avers and capuls</td>
<td></td>
<td>cottars: 2 pigs, 1 gander, 1 goose in the common fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>the freeholders and tenants there keep per half yardland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>6 oxen</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 sheep to be kept per flock</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 horses, mares or geldings or 4 beasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>60 sheep summer and winter</td>
<td></td>
<td>35 sheep, surplus to be removed within 10 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>4 capuls and horses</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 avers, all may exchange a surplus aver with a capul</td>
<td></td>
<td>* probably 6 per virgate, as in the early sixteenth century the entry fine per virgate was uniformly rated at 13s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>6 working beasts</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 pigs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 avers and capuls</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 gander, 1 goose</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 gander, 1 goose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 avers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 draught horses per rent of 6s. 8d.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 capuls</td>
<td></td>
<td>the freeholders and tenants there keep per half yardland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 pigs</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 horses, mares or geldings or 4 beasts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: Virgate is a measure of land that was originally defined as the area that could be ploughed in one day by a team of oxen. Its size varied by region and time, but was generally around 1/6 of a square mile. In medieval England, the size of a virgate was often not precisely known, leading to variations in the number of animals allowed on a virgate, as shown in the table.
Table 5.1 (cotd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>30 sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>100 sheep to be kept per flock, surplus sheep to be removed within five weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>100 sheep to be kept per flock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>All surplus avers, capuls and sheep to be removed by 1 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35 sheep from 11 November-3 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>35 sheep until next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599</td>
<td>36 sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 beasts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: aver and capul occur several times in these court rolls, the latter in both Latin and English, and generally mean cattle and horse (probably a corruption of the Latin caballus meaning work-horse) respectively, although aver can mean livestock in general or sometimes even horse. For further clarification see J. Langdon, *Horses, Oxen and Technological Innovation: The Use of Draught Animals in English Farming from 1066 to 1500* (1986), pp. 294-297. For a fourteenth-century use of the word capul see R. Morris, ed., *Early English Poems in the West-Midland Dialect of the Fourteenth Century*, Early English Text Society 1 (1864), p. 73 line 1254.

Sources: BRL, 432661, 432664, 432719, 432720, 432721, 432722, 432695, 432665, 432666, 432667, 432668, 432669, 432670; PRO, E 178/4687, E 134/15Chas1/Mich3

and cattle were being moved onto the growing number of leys which were being laid down at this time. By the end of the century the number of sheep per virgate had increased marginally, suggesting that the gradual changes in the management of pasture were effective. If we were to assume that a virgate was of an uniform size, the most obvious difference in livestock quotas is in the number of sheep.

Doubtless some tenants resented being told how much livestock they could keep but recorded infringements are sporadic. Richard Smith of Gaydon had 40 more sheep than permitted in 1549; and Robert Smith of Itchington was 30 sheep over the limit in 1559, 20 over the limit in 1560, and had more than 120 sheep in his flock in 1564. At the other end of the scale tenants were occasionally presented for having one or two too many pigs or geese.

Another method of restricting livestock numbers was to regulate the number of cattle and sheep, described as ‘tack’ or ‘foreign’, which were brought in from outside the manor to agist; that is to say that if a tenant had spare capacity on his share of

---

78 BRL, 432722, 432677, 432724, 432683. Robert was well-suited to be elected one of four sheep wardens (dictorus ovinus) in 1549 (three at Itchington and one at Gaydon): BRL, 432722. For wardens elected to supervise by-laws see Ault, *Open-Field Husbandry*, pp. 43-46.

79 See, for example, BRL, 432720, 432669, 432723, 432672.
the common pasture he was permitted to take in other beasts for a small payment. At Tachbrook in 1548 only oxen for ploughing or cows in milk were to be accepted as ‘tack’, a by-law which was repeated in 1551. This possibly indicates spare capacity on tenants’ land for cattle but not for sheep which must mean that tenants kept their full quota of the latter. Four years later the tenants there were being discouraged from taking in ‘strangers’ cattle to agist if he may have any of his neighbours’, a move which was probably aimed at restricting the influx of outsiders, who could often pose a threat to the integrity of the manor.80 At Chadshunt in 1548 ‘tack’ beasts were initially banned but later that same year draught oxen and cows in milk were deemed acceptable, probably because there was sufficient pasture to accommodate them.81 At Itchington and Gaydon no ‘tack’ by-laws were recorded for cattle but a handful for sheep. Indeed Richard Dodde from the neighbouring manor of Avon Dassett bequeathed his tack rights at Gaydon to his son in 1555, and his inventory recorded 90 sheep.82 And in the court rolls of Itchington there is evidence that members of perhaps the most famous sheep-rearing family in sixteenth-century Warwickshire, the Spencers of Dassett and Wormleighton, pastured their sheep here, including Thomas Spencer in 1521 and the lady Spencer in 1536.83 There is also evidence of sheep from the adjacent manor of Burton Dassett being pastured in neighbouring villages in the 1540s.84 At both Itchingtons in 1548 tenants were reminded that no common was to be leased for any cottagers’ sheep unless kept with the sheep of the lessor, while at Gaydon in 1554 in similar vein tenants were told that any ‘foreign’ sheep received had to be kept with tenants’ own.85 There are clear manorial differences here inasmuch as cattle, which needed much lush pasture, were taken in at Tachbrook and Chadshunt, whereas sheep were taken in at Gaydon and Itchington, where sheep wardens (dictorus ovinus) were appointed in 1549 (but not at either Tachbrook

80 BRL, 432719, 432665, 432695. We know of at least one tenant from a neighbouring manor who kept tack beasts at Tachbrook, namely William Wright of Harbury who included in his will a request that ‘my sone shall have my tack in taychbrok fyld’: LJRO, William Wright, Harbury, 6 November, 1549.
81 BRL, 432719, 432720.
82 LJRO, Richard Dodde, Avon Dassett, 7 November, 1555, inventory 17 November, 1556.
83 SBTRO, DR 10/2610; BRL, 432661.
84 Alcock, Warwickshire Grazier, p. 86.
85 BRL, 432720, 432669.
or Chadshunt). Peasant ownership of livestock is a theme to which we shall return later in this chapter.

5.2 Crops

Before turning to the crops grown in our area of study in the sixteenth century, let us resume the theme of landscape maintenance by examining the measures that were taken to protect the growing grain. The common pound in each vill, never empty of rounded-up strays, had to be regularly maintained in order to be effective. It is worth noting that the pound at Nether Itchington was to be repaired in March 1548 and again in October 1558, 'within six weeks of the lord's assigning its location' - not orders that would have been made if the vill had been depopulated in 1547. But before strays were impounded immense damage could be done. The greatest worry was animals trampling about, particularly if they were put out to graze on leys in the corn fields. At Tachbrook in 1497 tenants were told to keep their horses tied with Rope et Stake (the scribe's grasp of Latin clearly under strain). From the 1530s to the 1550s barely a court went by without the order that animals (usually horses, mares or foals are referred to) kept in the grain fields had to be tethered securely but there was an element of experimentation according to circumstances. Occasionally only lez plowbestes were allowed into the grain fields as at Tachbrook in 1549 and in 1551, described as oxen at the plough in the latter year. At Chadshunt in 1546 horses were permitted in the grain fields if firmly tethered; only in 1551 for tethered capuls to be banned from any furlong where barley or wheat had been sown until after harvest; and in 1559 avers and horses were allowed into the sown fields so long as they were supervised. The harvested grain also needed protection therefore tenants were constantly being reminded not to tether their beasts within lez cocks granorum seu feni or lez shuckes grani or lez cokes et suckes feni seu grani. Sheep

---

86 BRL, 432722.  
87 BRL, 432719, 432675.  
88 SBTRO, DR 10/2607.  
90 BRL, 432664, 432665.  
91 BRL, 432664, 432665, 432677.  
92 This applied to all tenants in 1549, and to tenants in Chadshunt, both Itchingtons and Gaydon in
not surprisingly were banned completely from wandering amongst the grain at Tachbrook, where as we have seen the tenant sheep quota was much higher. In 1549 and 1553 sheep there were not to be kept in Great portwey until the peas had been harvested and in the former year were not to be kept in lez stoble felde after harvest until as late as the feast of St Katherine (25 November). 92

Tenants were occasionally careless like the stream of tenants from Itchington amerced in the 1550s and 1560s for allowing their foals and capuls to wander in the sown fields untethered. 93 The Smith family, encountered earlier, added to their offence of having far too many sheep by allowing them to wander in the corn fields: both Richard and Robert of Itchington in 1550, Robert in 1551, and both men again in 1559 for not keeping their sheep in their folds. 94

Pigs 'required the firmest and most vigorous handling' because of their propensity to cause immense damage when foraging for food. 95 Therefore rings firmly set into their snouts discouraged then from rooting too destructively. There was a flurry of by-laws from the mid-1540s to the mid-1550s, after which the tenants probably got the message. The format was almost always the same: pigs to be ringed by a certain date under pain of 4d.; for example, at Tachbrook by 30 November in 1546, within a month in October 1549, and before 8 April in 1552; at Gaydon within a fortnight in 1546, and by 21 October in 1554. 96 Offenders were often not the feckless poor but substantial tenants such as Richard Burbery of Gaydon in 1550 and Richard Tompkyns of Itchington in 1551. 97 Various strategies were deployed to ensure that pigs were ringed such as the threefold increase of the pain to 12d. at Gaydon in 1549 and at Itchington in 1552 and a crackdown at Tachbrook in 1554 when 24 tenants were amerced 2d. each. 98 As a last resort at Itchington four responsible men were

1550: BRL, 432721, 432723.
92 BRL, 432721, 432722, 432667.
93 BRL, 432666, 432671, 432680, 432689, 432692.
94 BRL, 432723, 432665, 432677.
95 Ault, Open-Field Husbandry, p. 27.
96 BRL, 432664, 432722, 432665, 432669.
97 BRL, 432723, 432665. At first sight it may seem ironic that those who formulated and imposed by-laws were often those who subsequently disregarded them. Dyer has suggested that this may have been because tenants were struggling with an ever-changing system: a comment made in his second Ford lecture.
98 BRL, 432722, 432666, 432669.
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appointed in 1555 to supervise pigs. The strategy must have been effective for amercements at Itchington for unringed pigs virtually cease from this date, apart from one or two exceptions including Robert Smythe in 1562, 1563 and 1567. Doubtless some pressure was being applied informally outside the forum of the court.

There are incidental references to tenants' crops in the court rolls and only very little probate evidence because much of that material was lost in the mid-seventeenth century. At Tachbrook in 1549 and in 1553 it was ordered that no sheep be kept in Great portwey until the peas had been harvested, and in 1554 tenants were told not to 'lease' (that is to say, let somebody else gather on one's own ground) either peas or barley. In 1557 Thomas Ronton, a cottar of Tachbrook, died and the heriot demanded was a selion of barley worth 6s. 8d. In 1548 Thomas Davey of Chadshunt bequeathed a quarter of malt and half a quarter of wheat to his parish church and a strike of barley to each of his servants. Some thirty years later the inventory of the goods of his widow Isabel (who had gone on to marry John Hyckman) recorded no arable crops whatsoever as she had probably already retired from tilling the soil.

From the neighbouring parishes of Avon Dassett, Burton Dassett, Fenny Compton, Harbury, Ladbroke and Wormleighton, a total of 17 sixteenth-century probate inventories survive wherein very precise information is given on crops (Appendix 8). The total value of each testator's arable is quite wide-ranging but fairly typically wheat and barley were the main crops grown, the latter tending to be more prolific. It is particularly instructive that in the sample of wills and inventories from Wormleighton there is no mention of any arable activity, suggesting that in this wold-edge/Feldon

---

99 BRL, 432671. Two were appointed at Upper Itchington and two at Nether Itchington: William Barnard (periodically constable and also holder of 2½ virgates) and Henry Howse (regularly a juror and holder of at least 2 virgates) at Upper Itchington and John Drwry (regularly a juror and holder of 1½ virgates) and Roger Vaux (tithingman) at Nether Itchington. The need for supervision of pigs at the latter place eight years after its supposed depopulation clearly shows that there was still a goodly number of tenants there.

100 BRL, 432679, 432681, 432688.

101 BRL, 432721, 432667, 432668, 432695.

102 BRL, 432673. He also held a quarter virgate. The fact that no best beast was demanded as a heriot was not necessarily an indication of poverty. As he was involved in the land market more than half a century earlier he was probably retired at the time of his death.

103 PRO, PROB 11/33, f. 133r (17 Coode), Thomas Davey, Chadshunt, 20 March, 1549.

104 LJRO, Isabell Hyckman, Chadshunt, 30 January, 1577, inventory, 25 June, 1577.
community the nature of the agrarian economy had moved inexorably from arable to pastoral.

5.3 Livestock

We have already seen the efforts that were made to control livestock numbers and movements so we now turn to the court rolls and probate material for peasant ownership of animals, bearing in mind that our 'knowledge of peasant stock-keeping depends largely on chance references.' Rather unfortunate was Thomas Brace of Itchington who was forced to withdraw from his tenement in 1492 because he had no beasts, paying a heriot of 3s. 4d. More normally a heriot was the tenant's best beast and whenever possible an ox.

Between 1521 and 1582 fifteen animal heriots were recorded at Tachbrook (Table 5.2). At Itchington between 1518 and 1582 twenty heriots were recorded. Curiously in 1521 William Newsam’s heriot was merely a bay mare for his three-virgate holding, as was Thomas Carter’s in 1560 for a five-virgate holding, perhaps because both were free tenants holding by indenture. Of the ten animal heriots recorded at Gaydon between 1521 and 1569 just over half were oxen, all from substantial landholders. Most interesting are the three red bullocks demanded from three widows who came to the same court in 1569 to surrender their holdings via the lord to their respective sons. It is probable that the lord was being practical in not demanding an ox from each of them, eager as he was to see the land continue to be tilled.

The court rolls are replete with references to tenants overpressing the common pasture or allowing their livestock to wander as we have already seen. There are two further instances concerning tenants and their livestock which are worth mentioning. Firstly, in 1536 Thomas Comannder from Tachbrook pursued a claim against Thomas Cleyments for beating his (Comannder’s) ox to death (usque ad mortem), an event so traumatic that Thomas Comannder was able to say very precisely that it had

105 Dyer, Lords and Peasants, p. 329.
106 BRL. 432656.
Table 5.2 Animal heirots by manor

Tachbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Holding</th>
<th>Heriot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>William Marten</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>mare worth 5s. (withdrawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>George Davy</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>red cow worth 12s. (withdrawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>John Umfrey</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>ox worth 12s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Thomas Trentham</td>
<td>1½ virgates</td>
<td>brown ox worth 14s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Robert Nycolson</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>black cow worth 12s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Emeline Bromfylde</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>bay mare worth 15s. (withdrawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Edmund Olney</td>
<td>3 virgates + ½ virgate</td>
<td>bay skewed horse with saddle, reins, sword, dagger, worth 40s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>Emeline Bromfylde</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>black ox worth 23s. 4d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Thomas Grandam</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>ox worth 30s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Elizabeth Trentham</td>
<td>1½ virgates</td>
<td>brown ox worth 26s. 8d. (withdrawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Ellen Grandam</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>black cow worth 28s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>Robert Comander</td>
<td>1¼ virgates</td>
<td>black ox worth 26s. 8d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>George Hinde</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>bay mare worth 43s. 4d. (death)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upper (Ul) and Nether (NI) Itchington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Holding</th>
<th>Heriot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Edward Tomkyns</td>
<td>1 virgate NI</td>
<td>ox worth 18s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>John Savage</td>
<td>1 virgate, cottage</td>
<td>horse worth 20s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>John Savege</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>horse worth 33s. 4d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>John Wattes</td>
<td>unspecified Ul</td>
<td>brown ox worth 12s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>John Ffaux</td>
<td>unspecified NI</td>
<td>ox worth 13s. 4d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>William Newsam</td>
<td>3 virgates Ul</td>
<td>bay mare in milk (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>William Smyth</td>
<td>2 virgates Ul</td>
<td>cow worth 11s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Thomas Ladbrok</td>
<td>1 virgate [NI]</td>
<td>brown ox worth 16s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548</td>
<td>William Stonley</td>
<td>1½ virgates NI</td>
<td>bay mare worth 23s. 4d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>Richard Neale</td>
<td>1½ virgates NI</td>
<td>horse worth 26s. 8d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>Richard Wattes</td>
<td>2 virgates NI</td>
<td>grey horse worth 26s. 8d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Thomas Tompkyns</td>
<td>4 virgates + 2 messuages Ul</td>
<td>grey mare worth 40s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>John Drwry</td>
<td>1½ virgates NI</td>
<td>black ox worth 32s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>John Bet</td>
<td>2¼ virgates Ul</td>
<td>black ox worth 32s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Thomas Carter</td>
<td>5 virgates</td>
<td>bay mare worth 33s. 4d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>John Tompkyns snr</td>
<td>1½ virgates</td>
<td>bullock worth 26s. 8d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>William Barnarde</td>
<td>2¼ virgates Ul</td>
<td>ox worth 40s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>William Camell</td>
<td>2 virgates Ul</td>
<td>brown ox worth 53s. 4d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582</td>
<td>Edward Tomkins</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>brown cow and black cow worth £3. 6s. 8d. (death)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chadshunt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Holding</th>
<th>Heriot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>John Davy</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>ox worth 12s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Thomas Davy</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>ox worth 12s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Margaret Neal</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>black cow worth 16s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Richard Wilkyns</td>
<td>1 virgate</td>
<td>mare in milk worth 16s. (death)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 (cotd)

Gaydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>holding</th>
<th>heriot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Robert Cady</td>
<td>2 virgates</td>
<td>red ox worth 14s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>David Owen</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>ox worth 17s. + relief of 6s. 2d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Agnes Caddye</td>
<td>2 virgates</td>
<td>black gelding worth 10s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>William Askell</td>
<td>2½ virgates</td>
<td>brown ox worth 36s. 8d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>John Davyes</td>
<td>2 virgates</td>
<td>black ox worth 36s. 8d. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>Joan Lawrence</td>
<td>3 virgates</td>
<td>black ox worth 40s. (surrender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>John Austen</td>
<td>3 virgates</td>
<td>red ox worth 40s. (death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>Isabella Austen</td>
<td>3 virgates</td>
<td>red bullock worth 20s. (surrender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>Agnes Caddye</td>
<td>2 virgates</td>
<td>red bullock worth 20s. (surrender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>Alice Hunscote</td>
<td>2 virgates</td>
<td>red bullock worth 20s. (surrender)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is to be understood that a messuage was included in all the above tenures.

Sources: SBTRO, DR10/2609, 2610; BRL, 432660, 432661, 432664, 432719, 432720, 432722, 432723, 432665, 432666, 432667, 432668, 432670, 432672, 432673, 432675, 432677, 432724, 432726, 432681, 432684, 432687, 432727, 432690, 432691; SBTRO, DR10/2613

happened on 4 October, 1535. Unfortunately the outcome of his claim is unknown. Secondly, it is instructive that neither Edward Cheslyn of Tachbrook, a half-virgater, nor his wife Agnes rendered a beast as heriot, Agnes handing over the best selion of grain worth 4s. in 1554 following Edward’s death the previous year, and following her own death in 1569 the lord demanded a heriot ‘to the value of 16s. 4d.’, unusually no animal being specified. And yet both Edward and Agnes appeared at separate times (in 1549 and in 1567) before the manorial court for housing cows in the sown fields. They were well into middle, if not old, age at the time and it is possible that the cows were ‘tack’ beasts and not their own, given that Tachbrook was a manor that took in cattle on that basis.

Even those tenants amongst the poorest could afford to invest in some livestock. From testamentary evidence we learn of Roger Shakespeare of Tachbrook, a weaver (son of Robert, also a weaver), who died in 1605 aged about 49. He left no crops or farm implements but did own six ‘kyne’, three calves, six sheep and a sow, worth £10. 6s. 8d. out a total inventory value of £12. 6s. 8d. Similarly, at Wormleighton, William Gryffyn, a shepherd in the employ of Sir John Spencer, left in his meagre.

107 BRL, 432661.
108 BRL, 432668, 432669, 432691, 432722, 432689.
109 LJRO, Roger Shakespeare, Bishops Tachbrook, 28 March, 1605; baptized 21 April, 1557, and buried 29 March, 1605; WCRO, DR 46/1, ff. 3v, 29v.
inventory seven cattle, a mare and six pigs (worth 55% of his goods; Appendix 8), and three loads of hay.\textsuperscript{110} Others were more fortunate in their ownership of livestock. Thomas Davey of Chadshunt in 1549 bequeathed 50 sheep to his brother.\textsuperscript{111} His widow, Isabel, (who went on to remarry as mentioned earlier) referred in her will to 40 sheep worth £13. 6s. 8d. 'in kyngston [within the neighbouring manor of Chesterton] lesues' (meaning leasows or pasture) and indeed her inventory included 45 sheep worth £14, as well as a mare, two colts and a cow worth £4. 6s. 8d. (the total being about half the value of her goods), but no plough-beasts.\textsuperscript{112} Henry Morcote, a yeoman of Tachbrook Mallory within the ecclesiastical parish of Bishop's Tachbrook, bequeathed to his sons William and Edward a team of oxen 'here in Tachebroke for doing of their necessarye business'.\textsuperscript{113} Walter Newsam of Chadshunt, whose father had become lord of the manor in 1552, bequeathed to his wife £100 in lieu of 200 sheep, six cattle and five carthorses, 'which the saied John hath allreadye receyved of me and ffrydeswide my wife'.\textsuperscript{114} The fact that John had already received such a vast legacy suggests that he had already taken on the family property. This probably happened a few years earlier when Walter wrote a previous will, believing himself to be on his deathbed. But even Walter Newsam could not compete with the likes of Henry Makepeace of Burton Dassett whose inventory recorded 1,100 sheep worth £120, representing half the value of his worldly goods, as well as seven horses, 24 oxen and 21 cattle (Appendix 8).\textsuperscript{115} He would no doubt have agreed with Master Fitzherbert that 'shepe...is the mooste profytablest cattell'.\textsuperscript{116}

Apart from the court rolls and probate material there is one other source which gives some interesting information on ownership of livestock at Tachbrook, Itchington, and Gaydon, namely an account book of Peter Temple of Burton Dassett and

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{110} LJRO, William Gryffyn, Wormleighton, 4 August, 1557, inventory, 1 October, 1557.
\item \textsuperscript{111} PRO, PROB 11/33, f. 133r (17 Coode), Thomas Davey, Chadshunt, 20 March, 1549.
\item \textsuperscript{112} LJRO, Isabella Hyckman, Chadshunt, 30 January, 1577, inventory, 25 June, 1577.
\item \textsuperscript{113} PRO, PROB 11/56, ff. 47v-50v (6 Martyn), Henry Morcote, Tachbrook Mallory, 18 June, 1573.
\item \textsuperscript{114} PRO, PROB 11/115, ff. 358r-359r (49 Wingfield), Walter Newsam, Chadshunt, 2 February, 1610.
\item \textsuperscript{115} See Chapter 6 for the Newsam acquisition of Chadshunt.
\item \textsuperscript{116} LJRO, Henry Makepeace, [Burton] Chipping Dassett, 2 December, 1537, inventory, 31 January, 1539.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{116} Skeat, The Book of Husbandry, p. 42.
Thomas Heritage of London. There are references to ‘Robyns of Tachebroke’ who, for example, in 1548 bought 240 ‘sherehoges’ and in 1551, a further 240 ‘wetherhogges’. This ‘Robyns’ may be identified with either Richard Robyns, for example, amerced in 1548 for rescuing his beasts from the pound or else with Thomas Robyns, who in 1556 withdrew from his composite two-and-a-half-virgate holding. One ‘Tomkyns of Ichington’ bought 240 ewes from Peter Temple at Michaelmas 1549, but it is impossible to identify him more precisely because this family was so prolific. Finally, Peter Temple bought 2 oxen from ‘Burbery of Geydon’ at Banbury on 22 September, 1550, who may have been Robert the miller, Henry the sheep warden or Richard, owner of a large number of sheep.

We should not doubt how valuable livestock was to the medieval peasant, however rich or poor. It was not unknown for cattle to be given names, although this is a fascinating subject yet to be written about in any detail. In 1538 Elizabeth Baker of Allesley (now on the outskirts of north-west Coventry) bequeathed to her son Robert ‘ij oxson namyt Tagge & Goldyng’ and ‘a kowe namyt Meke’; and ‘to Jhon Goldacur ij oxon hernte a' nd truluffe’ and ‘a kowe namyt luffely’. Some twenty years later Nicholas Worsley, also of Allesley, bequeathed to his wife ‘a cowe callyd blossom’, but before we become too sentimental, Nicholas further stipulated ‘I well the best Whether be kyllyd the day of my bereall & to be eaten amonge my neigbors’.

117 Alcock, Warwickshire Grazier.
118 Alcock, pp. 91, 93, 95, 217, 218.
119 BRL, 432720, 432672.
120 Alcock, Warwickshire Grazier, p. 93.
121 Alcock, p. 75.
123 LJRO, Elizabeth Baker, Allesley, 10 May, 1538.
124 LJRO, Nicholas Worsley, Allesley, 1 December, 1559.
Conclusion

In this chapter we have explored the landscape for evidence of change and continuity, looking in particular at names, and the field system in each manor. We have also seen how the landscape was managed. No particular regional contrast has emerged to divide Tachbrook in the Feldon from Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon on the wold fringe. Rather, more local circumstances have been of greater importance. The survival of so many landscape features at Nether Itchington from the thirteenth century well into the nineteenth and the lack of agrarian innovation at Chadshunt may both have been signs along the way of the decline of these two communities at a time when the inhabitants of Gaydon chose to convert to a three-field system and several of the more important tenants at Tachbrook were in the process of dividing and enclosing their land. We have seen how by-laws ensured that the infrastructure of the manor was maintained and that resources such as the heath were fairly managed so that no tenant could pursue his own economic interest at the expense of his neighbours'. To some extent this involved experimentation and sometimes provoked resentment and blatant disregard. From the scant evidence of the crops grown and livestock reared it is clear that there was a wide disparity between tenants but that even the humblest owned some livestock, even giving their cattle soppy (at least to the modern mind) names such as Truelove and Lovely. In the next chapter we shall move on to examine lordship in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
CHAPTER SIX

LORDSHIP IN THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Introduction

A crucial element in the endurance of a medieval village was lordship. In particular, the way in which lords responded to their tenants during times of crisis often determined whether a settlement survived or not. When seigneurial policy failed and depopulation ensued lords often found themselves being blamed for deliberately bringing about such a situation, when in fact the causes were multifarious.\(^1\) For example, according to Hilton tenants may have drifted away to the towns because of poverty or a lack of agricultural equipment, presumably because they could not buy or maintain such equipment as a result of their poverty.\(^2\) And yet it has been all too easy for historians to assume that if a settlement declined in the late fifteenth century or in the sixteenth century that the fault lay with lords whose motive was to convert arable land to more profitable cattle or sheep pastures. As Hilton observed 'the grazier has been cast as the villain of the piece'.\(^3\)

Perhaps the best-known sheep masters in sixteenth-century Warwickshire are the Spencers of Wormleighton, a village which now lies on that shoreline of abandoned...

---

\(^1\) As Bridbury noted sixteenth-century castigators of enclosures never saw depopulation without searching for a depopulator: A.R. Bridbury, 'Sixteenth-century farming', EcHR 2nd ser. 27 (1974), p. 550. Indeed many of the accusations made during the enclosure commission of 1517 were ultimately dismissed; see for example, C. Dyer, 'The occupation of the land: the west midlands', in E. Miller, ed., *The Agrarian History of England and Wales, III, 1348-1500* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 89. Nevertheless, Fryde was insistent in his view that most of the 1517 presentments had a factual basis, disliking the trend amongst historians to question the evidence of the 1517 commission, and adding without any evidence that if lords were acquitted, might it not have been merely on technical grounds and not because they were necessarily innocent. Noting that at Hodnell, Chapel Ascote and Radbourne there were no tenants, only pasture, by the mid-fifteenth century, Fryde claimed without offering any evidence that this situation came to pass when the Catesbys evicted their tenants: E.B. Fryde, *Peasants and Landlords in Later Medieval England c. 1380- c. 1525* (Stroud, 1996), pp. 199, 202.


\(^3\) Hilton, p. 162.
villages on the wold edge of the county. There, too, we find Nether Itchington — depopulated in 1547 by Thomas Fisher according to Dugdale — and Chadshunt. The indictments against Fisher, that is to say that he not only depopulated Nether Itchington, but that he also enclosed the field system and demolished the mother church of All Saints, have always been accepted without question. Dugdale made no reference to the depopulation of Chadshunt nor has Maurice Beresford ever included it in any of his lists of deserted villages in Warwickshire. On the shoreline of abandoned villages Gaydon stands out as a remarkable survival of whatever forces drowned out the life from its immediate neighbours.

In this chapter we shall examine lordship during the final hundred years of episcopal administration, from 1447 to 1547. During that time the demesne lands of Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon were farmed out. Apart from the farm rent, successive bishops of Coventry and Lichfield continued to collect revenue from other sources, most notably tenants' rents. In particular, seigneurial policy on rents will be explored. The year 1547 is very important for that is when Thomas Fisher entered onto the stage as at least half a millennium of episcopal rule came to a dramatic end. Fisher will be subject to close scrutiny in terms of his relationship with his tenants in Warwickshire. The manor of Chadshunt was sold in 1552 to the Newsam family and we shall also investigate their lordship up to the end of the sixteenth century.

A crucial issue to be addressed in this chapter centres on Dugdale's claim that Thomas Fisher depopulated Nether Itchington and demolished its parish church; indeed that Fisher was so greedy that he edged out the small-scale peasant farmers by expropriating the rural population from the land. If these allegations can be proven, this would lend weight to Brenner's argument as discussed in Chapter 1. If not, we

7 This is clear from a fragmented run of account rolls from 1448 to 1542. Although much of the information in them was copied verbatim year after year, subtle and often important changes were made. For all account rolls referred to in this chapter see Appendix 9 and Bibliography.
must look elsewhere to discover the reasons for the depopulation of Nether Itchington.

The evidence of this chapter is based on a wide variety of sources, both secular and ecclesiastical, local and national, including court rolls of the manors under study and of neighbouring manors, account rolls, parish registers, wills and inventories, guild records, family collections, the records of the Dean and Chapter at Lichfield, records of the Exchequer, the Court of Requests, the Star Chamber and of proceedings heard in Chancery, and printed matter found in the Patent Rolls and State Papers.

6.1 Lordship 1447-1547

As we saw in Chapter 4 Bishop Walter Langton in the early fourteenth century was fully able to enjoy the fruits of his demesnes as he made progress around his diocese. Inevitably, a combination of the commutation of works (including food rents) and the farming out of manorial demesnes had many consequences for the bishop and his household. Langton's successors ceased to receive regular contributions to their larders and rarely went on progress around their diocese, preferring to stay in Staffordshire. According to an itinerary of his activities when bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, William Booth (1447-1452) never visited his Warwickshire manors. But as we have seen for Walter Langton (Chapter 4), manorial documents sometimes refer to episcopal visits not recorded elsewhere. Indeed in an account roll of 1450 it is clear that Booth stayed at Itchington at least once, for 3s. was spent on 6 quarters of charcoal 'for the lord's hospitality'.

Bishops, like all medieval lords, were aware that sustained levels of income could only be guaranteed if their manors remained attractive. Therefore the infrastructure of their manors had to be maintained, tenants' buildings kept in good repair and the tenants themselves not burdened with unreasonably high entry fines and rents. We shall now examine how the bishops of Coventry and Lichfield responded to these

---

8 LJRO, B/A/21/124079, m. 3r.
tests between 1447 and 1547.  

William Booth spent very little of his brief tenure as bishop of Coventry and Lichfield on diocesan business. He was described by a contemporary as unworthy, unlearned, greedy and foolish, a reputation two historians have recently sought to refute.  

As we shall see he did not neglect his tenants in distant Warwickshire. In 1450 a new stable was built at Itchington at a cost of £5. 19s. 5d. and was probably used by the bishop’s officials on their regular visits. By the end of Reginald Boulers’ equally brief episcopate (1453-1459) plans had been laid to build both a new hall and a windmill at Itchington, both completed by the time John Hals (1459-1490) had been installed as Boulers’ successor. The windmill in particular represented a bold investment inasmuch as it was uncommon for a new windmill to be built by lords after the Black Death. But for boldness here read over-ambition. The windmill was farmed out at only 20s. per annum, well below the early fourteenth-century rate of 33s. 4d.

Repairs, funded by the lord, often ate substantially into the farm rent, for example, 15s. in 1467. Perhaps as early as the mid-1460s the end of the windmill was foreseen as a horse mill was constructed, and leased thereafter at 6s. 8d. per annum. The last reference to the windmill appears in 1485 when it was said to be totally decayed for lack of repairs. Equally over-ambitious was a later bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, Geoffrey Blyth (1503-1531) who agreed in 1521 for a windmill to be built at

---

10 See Appendix 9 for details of episcopal income, the evidence of which is drawn from a broken run of account rolls dating from 1448 to 1542. Although the information in them is for the most part fossilized as a process of ossification, the account rolls still have some important data. For a rather negative view on the usefulness of fifteenth-century account rolls see E.M. Carus-Wilson, ‘Evidences of industrial growth on some fifteenth-century manors’, EcHR 2nd ser. 12 (1959), pp. 196-197; and for a more positive outlook see the ‘Introduction’ to R.H. Hilton, ed., Ministers’ Accounts of the Warwickshire Estates of the Duke of Clarence, 1479-80, Dugdale Society 21 (Oxford, 1952).


12 LJRO, B/A21/124079, m. 3r.


14 PRO, SC 6/1132/5, m. 4. Indeed major investment and regular maintenance could only be rewarded if the rent was high which was not the case here: Holt, p. 88.

15 SRO, D(W) 1734/3/2/4, m. 1r. Even the horse mill sometimes stood idle such as in 1505 when it remained in manu domini for lack of a tenant: LJRO, D 271/6, m. 1r. In the late fifteenth century the horse mill had its attractions even for a great institution like Glastonbury Abbey: Holt, pp. 168-170.

16 Holt, p. 177.
Gaydon at a cost of £2. 13s. 8d.\textsuperscript{17}

There is some evidence of further building work being undertaken during the early years of Hals’ episcopate. In 1462 34s. 2d. was spent on constructing a limekiln. This included 6d. for the carriage of limestone, 6d. for sand and 4d. for coal.\textsuperscript{18} As ‘it was usual to build a limekiln on the spot for the burning of the lime required for the mortar’ when undertaking any important building work, we must assume that this was the reason for the construction of this particular kiln. The process involved burning limestone using coal, extracting quicklime, and mixing it with sand which formed mortar which when set hard was invaluable in building work.\textsuperscript{19} Occasionally money was spent on repairing tenants’ property, for example, in 1464 12d. on the chaplain’s cottage at Chadshunt and in 1467, 10s. 8d. on two tenements at Itchington.\textsuperscript{20}

The main source of revenue for successive bishops was derived from leasing out the demesne and from tenants’ rents (Appendix 9). In 1455 John Savage became farmer of all the demesne land in Tachbrook for a term of sixty years for a modest payment of £13. 6s. 8d. \textit{per annum.} The agreement was recorded in Reginald Boulers’ register and was quoted \textit{verbatim} in all subsequent fifteenth-century account rolls.\textsuperscript{21} The situation was quite different at Itchington. In 1459 a detailed breakdown of the farm there shows that the demesne had been broken up into several pieces as both demesne pasture and meadow lay in severalty and had been let to a variety of tenants for a total rent of £10. 0s. 6d.\textsuperscript{22} When a new rental was drawn up on 12 November, 1466 the farm rates were set at £9. 11s. 8d. for the west field and £9. 7s. 3d. for the east field, and varied very little through to the 1540s. At Chadshunt and Gaydon demesne land was also leased to tenants, for a total of £8. 6s. 8d. at Chadshunt for most of the fifteenth century, and increased by a mere 2s. 9d. by 1505,

\textsuperscript{17} PRO, SC 6/HENVII/7154, m. 7r. The windmill at Gaydon was certainly defunct by the middle of the century. On 7 January, 1539 Richard Fulwood of Tanworth, and a free tenant in Gaydon, paid Richard Ede £8 to build a private windmill at Gaydon. This venture will be discussed below.
\textsuperscript{18} SRO, D(W) 1734/3/2/5, m. 9v.
\textsuperscript{20} SRO, D(W) 1734/J 1948, f. 2v; SRO, D(W) 1734/3/2/4, f. 1r.
\textsuperscript{22} LJRO, B/A/21/124075, m. 2r. This was the first account roll after John Hals was enthroned as bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, which may account for the detailed breakdown of farm revenue.
and for £1. 16s. 8d. at Gaydon in the first half of the fifteenth century but modified to £1. 6s. 8d. from at least 1448, remaining unchanged for the next hundred years.

The bishop's tenants were quite possibly aware that their neighbours were gaining rent concessions. At Chapel Ascote in the early fifteenth-century, the ladies of the manor, the prioresses of Nuneaton, made every effort to ensure that tenants' buildings were maintained. At Lighthorne in 1437, when 24 out of 56 holdings were already unoccupied and the remaining tenants were threatening to leave, rents were reduced by one-third, a concession which was to be enjoyed for at least the next forty years. Bishop William Booth, supposedly unworthy, unlearned, greedy and foolish, clearly demonstrated financial pragmatism, firstly in his drastic cut-back on episcopal residences, many of which he viewed as 'superfluous and useless'. Secondly, he left his mark on his Warwickshire tenants and their heirs by means of an overhaul of rents (Appendix 9). Even before his enthronement tenements at Itchington remained unfilled and some tenants were paying a reduced rent, suggesting a time of crisis. From a potential render of assize in 1448 of £23. 13s. 1d., as much as £3. 13s. 11d. was not levied. The following year a new rental was drawn up (now lost), into which a decayed rent of £3. 13s. 8d. was incorporated. It continued to be written off as a loss in subsequent account rolls until at least 1485 (despite another rental being drawn up in 1466 when the render was barely modified) suggesting a hope that true rental levels would one day be restored. From 1450 some truly ossified items were removed from the tenants' rent burden, including:

33s. 4d. from villein aid (auxilio Nativorum) at Michaelmas
6s. 10½d. from 33 ploughings due from two molmen and 9 customary tenants of which each does three
5s. 6d. from 33 boons in autumn from the said 2 molmen and 9 customary tenants of which they do three each at 2d. per boon

---

25 In 1448 a goodly number of the episcopal palaces were in a parlous state therefore Booth petitioned the Pope for permission to destroy a number of them - including the residence at Tachbrook, although its location and construction remain unknown - and to use the rubble to repair those to be preserved: P. Heath, 'The medieval Church', in M.W. Greenslade, ed., VCH Staffordshire, 3 (London, 1970), pp. 22-23; Calendar of Entries in the Papal Register relating to Great Britain and Ireland, AD 1447-1455, Papal Letters 10 (London, 1915), pp. 471-472.
26 LJRO, B/A/21/124079.
We have to go as far back as the late thirteenth century to make any sense of these items. Nine customary tenants and two molmen were recorded in that year at Itchington and their obligations included three days' ploughing each (worth 2d. + 2½d. + 3d. = 7½d. x 11 = 6s. 10½d.) and three days' reaping each (worth 6d x 11 = 5s. 6d.). In the same extent there were 11 cottars obliged to perform two works each in autumn worth a total of 3s. 8d. 27 It is incredible that well over a century later the same dues were still being recorded in the account rolls. Not surprisingly they were abandoned following the drawing up of a new rental in 1449, only to be replaced by two other seemingly anachronistic dues, which remained in the account rolls until at least 1542, namely 17s. 6d. ayd sylver and 17s. 6½d. for le Werk. 28 Neither ever appeared under 'respites', although le Werk was sometimes levied at only 12s. 2d., therefore we must assume that these payments were collectable. Between 1464 and 1542 rents remained fairly stagnant at both Upper and Nether Itchington.

At Tachbrook potential render of assize from 1421 to 1542 remained the same at £11. 4s. 11d. In 1448 barely a year into Booth's episcopate a new rental was drawn up into which was incorporated a decay of 4s. 7d. including the decayed rent of three cottages in les Naspes, worth 9s. 3d. per annum but let for only 6s. 8d., decay which was recorded verbatim in all account rolls up to 1542. Indeed whenever decay was recorded within the manor of Tachbrook it remained permanent, and noticeably, most of the decay was at les Naspes. For example, between 1464 and 1542 parcels of land in les Naspes worth 6s. 8d. apparently remained unlet. At Tachbrook some dues also became fossilized in the account rolls. A sum of 12s. from the ploughing works of the free tenants was apparently collectable whereas 11s. from a tallage (auxilium vocatur le Aye) on nine cottages was never collected in the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries and was added to the arrears year on year. For example, the slate was wiped clean when John Hals became bishop in 1459 but in 1485 it was noted that the

27 LJRO, B/A/21/124078, m. 3r; B/A/21/124079, m. 3r.
28 SRO, D(W) 1734/2268, ff. 6v-7r, 8r.
29 Ayd sylver was probably connected with payments in earlier times of 'aid' (auxilium). Payment for le Werk must have been 'in the place of some of the labour services, which were counted among the 'works' of the villein': N. Neilson, Customary Rents, Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History 2 (1910), pp. 48-50, 90-96.
tallage had not been collected for 26 years and the arrears on it amounted to £14.6s. The obsolete tallage was possibly connected to the nine cottages which were provided by the lord in the thirteenth century to house full-time demesne famuli, whose services had become redundant by the late fourteenth century.  

Bishop Booth inherited a very poor situation at Chadshunt and Gaydon. A total of 16 virgates, the majority at Gaydon, were subject to ‘decayed rent’ in both the 1448 and 1450 account rolls. Out of a total rental income of £18.12s. 10d., £11.10s. was subject to ‘decay’. The problem was addressed by the drawing up of a new rental (now lost) on 29 October, 1449. The rent burden at Chadshunt was reduced by £2.16s. 6d. but increased at Gaydon by £2.6s. 6d. Without being able to study the rental it is impossible to know what lay behind these decisions. The strategy was certainly successful, for at least up to 1542 only two isolated cases of rent reduction were subsequently recorded, notwithstanding the fact that rents remained barely unchanged in the same period despite inflation.

Apart from demesne and tenant rents, successive bishops of Coventry and Lichfield derived income from one other potentially valuable asset, the bishop’s wood at Tachbrook, known as Oakley wood. In 1455 Bishop Reginald Boulers thought it worthwhile to employ a local man, John Savage, as warden of the wood, the same John Savage to whom was leased the farm of the demesne as we saw earlier. Savage was to receive an annual stipend of 13s. 4d. and was to keep the wood well and sufficiently enclosed. He was further granted the horse mill there at 3s. 4d. per annum, evidence of ‘a...substitution of small-scale milling enterprise’ at a time when demesne mills were in decline. Savage was also responsible for wood sales. In some years he was very successful, for example, raising £44.7s. 8d. in 1472 and £25.19s. 10d. in 1473, but thereafter not only does the revenue plummet, so too did Savage develop a reluctance to pay the vicar the tithe due to him. In 1485 it was

30 See Chapter 4.
31 At Chadshunt in 1449 two new tenants were added to the rental, both accepting half a virgate for 10s. Their rents were subsequently always recorded separately from the render of assize in the account rolls.
32 LJRO, B/A/1/11, ff. 71r-v. The grants in the register appear verbatim in all the relevant surviving account rolls. See, for example, SRO, D(W) 1734/J1948, m. 1r.
noted that since 1473 a total of £128. 7s. 11½d. had been made from wood sales but
the vicar had received no tithe whatsoever. Was Savage cheating the lord as well
as the vicar?

6.2 Lordship from 1547

As the death of Henry VIII approached, the conservative Richard Sampson
apparently fretted over his future as bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, believing that
'there were those who had a mind...when Popery was abolisht, to heave him out of
his Bishoprick'. He therefore sought to curry favour at the highest level by courting
two of the most powerful men in the land - William Paget and Edward Seymour, the
latter soon to be installed as 'Protector of the realm and Governor of the King's
person' - by surrendering to them respectively the episcopal manors in Staffordshire
and Warwickshire. From his immediate successor through to modern historians
Sampson has been condemned for the equivalent of selling off the family silver. But
it is unlikely that he did so either lightly or wantonly. Given that Sampson acted 'at the
contemplacion and Request of the Right high and myghty prince Edward Duke of
Somerset', he very likely had little choice in the matter. Thomas Fisher, Secretary to
Seymour and a Warwickshire man, was well-placed to become lord of Tachbrook,
Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon. An annual rent of £50 was agreed, subsequently
waived on 14 December, 1548, only to be replaced by a rent of £82. 10s. the
following month.

34 PRO, SC 6/HENVII/1846, m. 1r.
35 Dugdale, Antiquities of Warwickshire, p. 283.
36 WCRO, CR 1908/72/1, 3. For a detailed exploration of two of the Staffordshire manors under Paget
lordship see C.J. Harrison, 'The social and economic history of Cannock and Rugeley 1546-1597,
37 Sampson's strategy has been condemned, for example, by Rosemary O'Day who viewed it as
being 'disastrous for the finances of the see': R. O'Day, 'Cumulative debt: the bishops of Coventry
and Lichfield and their economic problems', Midland History 3 (1975), pp. 78-79.
38 WCRO, CR 1908/72/1, 3.
several documents in which this grant is referred to survive: LJRO, D 30/2/1/4, ff. 148v-150r; WCRO,
CR 1908/71; WCRO, CR 1908/72/1, 2. See also Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward VI, vol. 2, 1548-
1549, (London, 1924), p. 403; SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, ff. 5v-6v, which is a cartulary commenced by
Thomas Fisher on 20 April, 1549 when he was aged 30. For the agreement to pay a revised rent of
£82. 10s. see WCRO, CR 1908/72/3. O'Day is not quite correct in her assertions that 'Sampson had
But Thomas Fisher did not only become lord of the manor in a secular sense. Sampson also granted him the advowsons of Tachbrook and Itchington, although they rightly lay in the gift of the Dean and Chapter at Lichfield, who nevertheless gave their assent. This was no small concession because both Tachbrook and Itchington were peculiar livings. The holders of those livings (known as prebendaries) ‘exercised the equivalent of episcopal or archidiaconal functions’. Tachbrook and Itchington, like the episcopal manors in the neighbouring diocese of Worcester

were...exempt from the archdeacon’s authority but subject to the bishop, which had their own deans of jurisdiction, capi
tular or rural, who exercised powers which were archidiaconal in character and to whom the bishop’s mandates were regularly directed.’

Furthermore, on 4 October, 1548 Hugh Palmer, rector of Itchington alienated his rectorial rights at Itchington to Fisher ‘in consideration of the great frendship extendid sundry wayes [by Fisher] unto the said Hughe Palmer’ and in consideration of a one-off payment to Palmer of 200 marks and the guarantee of £26. 13s. 4d. annually to Palmer and his successors for 99 years. Additionally, once or twice a year Fisher was to provide Palmer and his successors with convenient lodging within the parsonage of Itchington, which was to be repaired, maintained and upheld by Fisher and his successors, Palmer and his successors to provide the timber, brick, stone, lime and tile.

On 10 April, 1547, pre-empting the rector, the vicar of Itchington, Richard Judson, granted to Fisher the vicarage and church of Itchington with the mansion, barns, stables, dovehouses, orchards, gardens and all other edifices together with the chapels of Chadshunt, Upper Itchington (still a chapel then) and Gaydon and all tithes fixed an annual but nominal rent charge of £50 on the property, but by 1548...had surrendered claim even to this income’ and that his successor, Baynes, achieved ‘the settlement of an annual rent charge of £82. 10s. 0d. upon the lands acquired in fee-farm by Sir [sic, he was never knighted] Thomas Fisher’. She also mistakenly refers to Itchington as Islington: O’Day, ‘Cumulative debt’, pp. 81, 93.


SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, ff. 16r-16v; appended to this is counter permission from both the bishop and from the Dean and Chapter, dated 10 November, 1548. On 11 May, 1556 Palmer’s successor Henry Comberforde confirmed an ongoing arrangement: SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, ff. 17r-17v.
for 90 years in exchange for a one-off payment of £40 and an annual payment of £10. The outcome for Thomas Fisher was that he had absolute juridical authority over his tenants. This was too much for Sampson’s successor, Ralph Bayne (1554-1559), who argued that no part of the episcopal estate should have been granted to Thomas Fisher. The case went as far as the Court of Chancery. The final agreement made on 7 June, 1558 stipulated that Fisher should keep the manors but should surrender the advowsons.

Dugdale, in looking back at these events, viewed the whole matter as nothing less than a ‘sacrilegious acquisition’ adding that,

"[Fisher] was loath any should share with him therein; and therefore [made] an absolute depopulation of that part called Nether Itchington where the Church stood." 45

Thomas Fisher’s reputation was thus sealed forever. Without exception, historians who have had anything to say about Thomas Fisher, have accepted Dugdale’s accusation of depopulation. For example, the doyen of deserted village history, Maurice Beresford, stated as fact that Fisher had enclosed and depopulated Nether Itchington in 1547. 46 But is it true? The best way of answering this question is by examining very thoroughly Thomas Fisher’s relationship with his tenants at Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon, and his activities within those manors.

Thomas Fisher was born Thomas Hawkyns. 47 His father apparently sold fish at the Market Cross in Warwick and was very likely the Richard Hawkyns, a fisher of Warwick, who was a regular attendant of the feasts of the Corpus Christi and St

---

43 SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, ff. 17v-18r. See below for the reasons behind, as well as the implications of Judson’s actions. About a century later a successor of Judson, Richard Hunt, was engaged in litigation concerning glebe land. Deponents were asked whether they knew if Judson had granted the vicarage and church of Itchington and the chapels of Chadshunt and Gaydon and Upper Itchington to Thomas Fisher for 90 years for £10 per annum but none of them could offer any information on the matter: PRO, E 134/15/Chas1/Mich3.

44 WCRO, CR 1908/71; English copy of the agreement: WCRO, CR 1908/72/4; Latin copy of the agreement: LJRO D 30/M16 now D 30/11/18. The Dean and Chapter gave their assent on 1 September, 1558: SBTRO, DR 10/1314.

45 Dugdale, Antiquities of Warwickshire, p. 283.


Nicholas Guild in Coventry in the early 1500s. Thomas and his two brothers, Richard and John, adopted their father’s trade as their surname, a practice far more common in the thirteenth century than in the sixteenth, and odd in their case as none of them pursued their father’s trade. Thomas Fisher has variously been described as ‘a facetious writer [of whom] I can discover no traces’; as ‘a somewhat misty figure’; as ‘a self-made man’; and as someone who ‘woide flatter, ley, and play the knaw[e]’. He also gained a reputation as ‘a noted dealer in episcopal property’. His own opinion of himself was of someone ‘never ashamed for any untruth or unjust dealing’.

What impact did his early lordship have on those former episcopal manors in Warwickshire? It is known that he had already acquired other ecclesiastical property in the county, including the site of St Sepulchre’s Priory in Warwick in 1546, where he apparently set about demolishing the buildings and replacing them with his own mansion house. On 10 March, 1547, within days of acquiring the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield’s manors, Fisher gathered together Leonard Savage (a lawyer from the nearby borough of Kineton) and several tenants of Itchington to take possession of

48 CCRO, BA/B/Q/23/1, ff. 144r, 163r, 167r, 170v, 200r, 203r, from an unpublished transcript made by A.A. Upton. Dugdale admitted that he had no idea who Thomas Fisher’s father was but had heard that he used to sell fish in Warwick: Dugdale, Antiquities of Warwickshire, p. 364. Another source claims with no evidence that Thomas’s father was ‘Tho. Hawkens al’s Fisher’: J. Fetherston, ed., The Visitation of the County of Warwick in the year 1619 (London, 1877), p. 20. This must be incorrect for the will of Richard Hawkins alias Fisher of Warwick survives, albeit damaged and torn, at WRO. Three sons are named: Thomas, Richard and John, which concurs with Fetherston and much other historical evidence. According to his will, Richard had a wife named Elizabeth and two unnamed daughters, married respectively to Thomas Rowes and William Brokes, details which were not included by Fetherston. The will was proved on 27 November, 1553. John Fisher served as Deputy Recorder and Town Clerk of Warwick as well as M.P.: T. Kemp, ed., The Black Book of Warwick (Warwick, 1898); T. Kemp, ed., The Book of John Fisher (Warwick, c. 1900).


50 F. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 133-134. Fisher was in good company for: ‘Churchmen were well aware that even the most ostentatious of their evangelical allies among the nobility were plunderers of church property. Somerset House, the Duke of Somerset’s London home, was built on the site of three demolished homes of bishops, and it cannibalized stone from two London parish churches and from the precincts of St Paul’s Cathedral’: D. MacCulloch, Tudor Church Militant Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation (London, 1999), p. 155.


52 Dugdale, Antiquities of Warwickshire, p. 364.
his newly-acquired manors in what must have been a dramatic ceremony. Endorsed on the verso of the charter-type document which recorded seisin by Fisher of these manors are the names of 27 of those present, including all four tithingmen, all four aletasters and the constable, and many others (et multorum aliorum), who duly witnessed that

'possession lyv[er]ye & seascun was taken at the berye style in neyther Ichington leading into grenehyll in the name of all the premssis within writton'.

Having ensured quite spectacularly that his tenants knew who their new lord was, what kind of relationship did he have thereafter with them? By the time of Fisher's death in 1578 each of his Warwickshire manors had experienced radical change as we shall see. The experience in each manor under Fisher's lordship was unique therefore we shall examine each manor in turn.

6.2.1 Tachbrook

At least ten years before Thomas Fisher became lord of Tachbrook by-laws were being noted regularly in the court rolls and this continued during the early years of his lordship. They were mostly concerned with livestock quotas and movements, but occasionally expressed the moral concerns of the day. Given Fisher's frequent and prolonged absences from Warwickshire during early years of his lordship, it may be assumed that the by-laws were the work of the community of the vill, who in this respect were quite unaffected by the change of lordship. Nevertheless, Fisher may well have influenced the decision made in 1554 to trawl back through the court rolls as far as 1548 and to draw up a document recording in English all the by-laws made at Tachbrook during that time. Noticeably, thereafter the regular flow of by-laws all but ceased, suggesting that the one definitive English version was deemed sufficient.

53 WCRO, CR 1908/72/1. Of the 27, 12 were from Nether Itchington, 6 from Upper Itchington, five from Itchington (whether Nether or Upper cannot be established) two from Gaydon, and two from Kineton. The signatures included those of Leonard Worseley, Edward Tomkyns and Thomas Stonley, who signed their names, and the following intriguing 'marks' by less literate villagers: four X, one back-to-front F, one circle, one circle with a + through it, a t with a circumflex atop it, a back-to-front Z, a triangle crossed through with _ and a pair of scales.

54 For those by-laws of an agrarian nature see Chapter 5, and those of a moral nature see Chapter 7.

55 BRL, 432695, undated but dated by this author to 1554, using the information in the document itself.
There are only one or two obvious signs of conflict between Thomas Fisher and his tenants at Tachbrook. The tithingmen discharged their duties by regularly reporting offenders, sometimes quite zealously. For example, in October 1554, 24 tenants were amerced for not having their pigs ringed. A hint of discord recorded in the court rolls came in May 1568 when it was ordered that the tenants should mark out their land and distinguish it from the lord's. Three men, including the constable, William Comaunder, were appointed to oversee the task. In 1571 tensions boiled over when the same William Comaunder and some of the leading tenants of Tachbrook took their grievances against Fisher to the Court of Requests. They claimed that they used to have common of pasture at all times of the year for all manner of cattle in parcels of waste called *froghwell hurste* and *withibed heath* and that Fisher

'a man of greate power and weithe...hath not onlye now of late of his gredye and covytous mynde eared and plowed upp a greate parcell of the said Waste...but also entendeth and goythe aboute to enclose the same to his owne peculier commodyte and gayne.

Furthermore

'[he] hathe also now of late erected and made one Conyngrey uppon one other percell of commonlye grownde...called the churche yarde adjoyning uppon the corne ffeildes...wch conyes doe destroye and eate upp a greate percell of the corne'.

Fisher was not well enough to give evidence in person but claimed that the land in dispute had ridge and furrow on it, that he ploughed it only when it was fallow, and that it had been enclosed to protect the corn from the trespass of cattle. Unfortunately, the verdict has not survived but it is intriguing that the following year Fisher was willing to make several exchanges of land with those very same plaintiffs which heralded the end of communal agriculture in a substantial part of the manor (see Chapter 5). Perhaps the case heard in the Court of Requests was the catalyst for such fundamental change.

56 BRL, 432669.
57 BRL, 432727.
58 PRO, REQ 2/248/22. The other plaintiffs were Thomas Olney, John Savage, John Edes, Thomas Savage and Henry Eyres. The Court of Requests, once described as 'the poore mans Court', was a court for civil rather than criminal causes, the latter being heard in the Court of the Star Chamber: I.S. Leadam, ed., *Select Cases in the Court of Requests A.D. 1497-1569*, Selden Society 12 (London, 1898), pp. x-xi, xv.
6.2.ii Itchington

There is no doubt that at some point in history the bustling village of Nether Itchington and its grand medieval parish church disappeared from the landscape. That landscape lies empty today, its earlier history and people commemorated in the name of one of the few surviving buildings: Old Town House. The house itself and its environs are full of relics. Seemingly all that remains of the parish church is part of its east wall but step into Old Town House (of late sixteenth-century origin but the present building dating from 1730), situated beyond the limits of the west end of the church, and see incongruously incorporated into the fixtures and fittings recycled parts of the church. Dig anywhere in the garden or in the adjacent meadow and be sure to clank against great chunks of medieval masonry. What happened to the village and its inhabitants? How did the parish church become reduced to rubble when, in marked contrast, Upper Itchington today is an ever-expanding village?

Despite his impressive war record and service to the nation, Thomas Fisher is chiefly remembered for demolishing the parish church at Nether Itchington and depopulating the village. But how true are these allegations? Let us examine each in turn. Firstly, did he demolish the parish church? There is plentiful evidence available from a wide range of sources spread across a century and a half and from local as well as national records.

In 1682 John Willes, vicar of Upper Itchington, petitioned the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield for permission to

'pull down...the old Church or Chapell...at lower Itchington...now very much dilapidated and ruinated, and ready to fall to the ground, and the wood, stone and other materials and utensils thereof to remove and take away and them to employ to the sole use of repairing and enlarging the ruinous vicaridge house at Over Itchington'.

Indeed even in 1650 only the east end was still standing as is clear from a glebe terrier drawn up in that year, according to which:

'one Thomas ffisher...p[re]served & kept the Chancell...being tyed by Covenant in the said Lease to keep the Chancell...in good & sufficient repalre'.

59 I am very grateful to Barrie Goodyer, the present owner of Old Town House, for allowing me free rein in and around his property and for permitting several photographs to be taken.
60 LJRO, D 30/2/7/5/7.
61 Two copies survive: LJRO, D 30/LV, vol. ii now D 30/4/7/2; WCRO, DR 72A.
According to the same terrier:

'[the] said fisher...demolished all the houses, there being very many, to gather with the Church, & converted part of the Church-yard into a garden...All which considered we are likewise induced to believe'.

The last phrase is very telling in its uncertainty. After all, the commissioners who compiled the terrier in the wake of civil war were trying to establish how the parish church had come to be in such a ruined state, with no living witnesses and only hearsay on which to make a judgment.

It was clear that these dilapidated ruins had ceased to serve as a parish church for a long time, that role having been taken on by the chapel in Upper Itchington. Not surprisingly as Itchington was under peculiar jurisdiction, there is absolutely no evidence in the diocesan archives of the ecclesiastical switch being made, the first concrete evidence from ecclesiastical sources of its having been effected coming in 1609 in the parish register when permission was sought for authority to bury 'an infant son of Thomas Coxe the younger...in the chancell of ye olde church'. And in 1612 Joan Coxe, widow, was buried in the chancel of the 'now parish church' (in cancella[m] huis nunc ecclesie parochialis').

The former parish church is also mentioned in the Inquisitions of Depopulation of 1607 but unfortunately the context is impossible to discern because the document is very faded and in some places the ink has completely worn away. It is just about possible to pick out the phrase 'overthrowne So that there is not nowe therein which Church or house of husbandry', suggesting that not only the church but also all the houses have disappeared.

Moving back into the sixteenth century there is ample evidence to assist us in our search for the truth of what happened to the parish church at Nether Itchington. In April 1549 when Edward VI confirmed the granting to Thomas Fisher of various manors late of the bishops of Coventry and Lichfield and of Exeter the final phrase read:

'And pardon to the said Thomas Fisher of all entries upon the premises [not specified] without the King's licence and all trespasses, fines etc perpetrated or incurred.'

---

62 WCRO, DR 60/1, ff. 44r-44v.
63 PRO, C 205/5/4.
Could this have included the demolition of the parish church at Nether Itchington? In the late 1540s Fisher was indeed accused in the court of the Star Chamber of ecclesiastical pillage at Nether Itchington, as well as at Upper Itchington and at Chadshunt. When exactly the offences took place is unclear. The document is undated and has been catalogued at the PRO under the reign of Henry VIII. But the complaint begins 'one Thomas ffyssher esquier beynge nowe lorde of the said manor and lordship of Bussshops Itchyngton' - which he was not until the beginning of Edward VI's reign. The phrase 'beynge nowe lorde' perhaps suggests that at the time of the offences he was not yet lord but by the time the case came to be heard he had assumed lordship. This ties in with the pardon for all entries 'without the King's licence'.

Included amongst a raft of allegations made by all the commoners and inhabitants of Itchington (seven of whom were named) was the following:

'[there was] oone Chapell of Ease wherein there hath been tyme out of mynde mynystracon of all Sacramentes & Sacramentalles... into whych said Chapell of Ease the said Thomas ffyssher hath entryd and hath taken downe the leade of the same to the quantitie of ten sodes or above and also hath taken awaye iij belles oon Chalice of silver iij vestymentes and all other thynges whych there belongynge to the said Chappell to the value of oon hundred markes & above and hath solde & convertyd the same to his owne use and the stonne Iron tymber dores & wyndowes taken downe spoyled & caryed awaye to the great trouble and hynderaunce of your said supplyantes & other inhabytantes of the said Towne beynge one half myle dystant from the p(arlishe Church where in dede yf the same were any such Chapell as ought to be put downe as yt is not...also there be twoo other p(arlishe Churches wthyn the said lordship...all wyth leade he the said ffyssher hath lykewysse taken downe...he hath taken downe the leade of the porche of the p(arlishe Church of Itchyngeton...convertyd the same to his owne use wythout tytle or authortytie & coveryd the said porche wyth tyle and also hath taken downe and conveyed away the leade of the p(arlishe Church of Chadson worth xx ti markes and better whych is to the great dysquyetynge of the people there'.

What of these damning indictments against Fisher? Firstly, a caveat, for under Wolsey the Star Chamber had become an immensely popular legal forum because of his apparent willingness to provide better justice. Therefore plaintiffs were not unknown to exaggerate wildly in the hope that their case would be eye-catching and

---

65 PRO, STAC 2/17/214. Ironically, when Thomas Fisher (together with Thomas Dabrigecourte, gent) was granted estate of the late free chapel of Birmingham in 1549 the proviso was added: 'Except bells and leaden roofs of the said chantries, chapels and colleges': Patent Rolls Edward VI, vol. 2, p. 344.
therefore heard more rapidly.66 Sifting historical fact from hysterical fiction is never easy because ‘we can never know the [whole] truth about incidents recorded only in centuries-old partisan statements’.67 Dugdale was convinced that Fisher had demolished the parish church at Nether Itchington but in the Star Chamber Case it is the chapelry at Upper Itchington which he is accused of looting. If we peel away all the dramatic parts (without ignoring the fact that these men would never have thought of pursuing their case in the Star Chamber unless they had some significant grievances) we find an enigmatic phrase in the lament that their town [Upper Itchington] was

'one half myle dystant from the p[arlishe Church [in Nether Itchington] where in dede yf the same were any such Chapell as ought to be put downe as yt is not'.

Are they saying that it would be better if their chapel became the parish church and the parish church were ‘put down as yt is not’? The leader of the seven main petitioners, all from Upper Itchington, was Thomas Newsam whose family had held land next to the chapel for at least one hundred years.68 He probably had much affection for the chapel. Perhaps he saw here an opportunity to have the chapel afforded parochial status at the expense of the parish church being demoted to a chapel. Did Fisher in response to this case agree to confer parochial status on the chapelry in Upper Itchington and allow the parish church in Nether Itchington to fall into disuse? As the holder of absolute ecclesiastical authority it was within his powers to do so. In the absence of any other evidence this seems a fairly plausible scenario. But it is not the whole story as, with only four weeks to go before submitting this thesis, startling new evidence has been discovered which, if it is to be believed, clears Thomas Fisher quite comprehensively of the charge that he deliberately demolished the parish church. We shall return to that crucial evidence later in this section.

68 LJRO, B/A/21/124075, an account roll of 1459, in which was recorded 6d. new rent from William Newsam for a parcel of common land lying between the cemetery of the church of Upper Itchington & doddesplace.
There are strong indications which suggest that Newsam and his neighbours were
telling the truth when they claimed that

'Thomas ffyssher hath entryd [the chapel at Upper Itchington] and hath taken downe
the leade of the same to the quantitie of ten sodes or above and also hath taken
awaye iij belles oon Chalice of silver iij vestymentes and all other thynges whych
there belongynge to the said Chappell to the value of oon hundred markes & above
and hath solde & convertyd the same to his owne use and the stonne Iron tymber
dores & wyndowes taken downe spoyled & caryed awaye'.

In 1552 an order was made that:

'ther shud be takyn and made a just veu survey and inventory of all manner goodes
plate juells vestyments bells and other ornaments within every paryshe belonging or
in any wyse apperteynyng to any Churche Chapell Brothered Gyilde or Fraternity'.

Although the Warwickshire returns are very detailed, the information on at least fifty
places of worship is now lost, including all the parish churches within and in the
vicinity of Coventry. Under the entry headed 'Ichyngton Epi' (neither 'Nether' nor
'Upper' being specified) a reasonable complement of church goods was recorded:

two chalices
iiij belles a sauce bell a handbell and a small bell
a crosse of latyn
a pix latyn
two copes oon velvet oon bodkyn
two vestments oon velvet thother damask wth their implements
two old surpleses
two altarclothes lynen
iiij towells whereof oon is diaper
two corporys wth cases oon velvet oon bodkyn
two streamers lynen
a crosse clothe silke
two candelinstckes bras
a holywater pot bras
iiij paynted clothes
a senser of latyn.'

Where were these church goods? Let us continue with the assumption that Newsam
was telling the truth. Could the parishioners of Upper Itchington have afforded to
replace in the space of five years all that Fisher had taken as spoil? Bells, for

---

70 It has also been noted that in the county of Oxfordshire 'the inventories for the towns have almost
all disappeared': R. Graham, ed., Edwardian Inventories of Church Goods, Oxfordshire Record
71 PRO, E 315/513, p. 8. See also J. Fetherston, ed., 'Inventory of church goods, in the county of
example, were very expensive to purchase. A close reading of the list of church goods suggests that this in fact was a record of property at both the parish church and the chapel, indicating that some of the less costly items had been replaced - or else Newsam and his fellow plaintiffs exaggerated somewhat. It was decreed that parish churches and chapels were to be limited to only one chalice each. As there were two chalices at Itchington we may draw the inference that this was a composite list of goods at Nether (parish church) and Upper (chapel) Itchington. Furthermore, the return for Gaydon was apparently either lost or never drawn up in the first place. As two chalices were also recorded at Chadshunt we may assume that there, too, a composite list was drawn up which included the church goods of both Gaydon and Chadshunt.

In the year that the Inventory of Church Goods was drawn up a sharp drop in church revenue at Nether Itchington came to the attention of the Court of First Fruits and Tenths in 1552. Four gentlemen, William Pynnock, Thomas Shugburgh, Thomas Lysle and John Dymmock, were authorized to enquire and make return by 17 November the same year into the

72 In an analysis of about two hundred sixteenth-century Warwickshire wills, apart from the occasional 12d. towards the repair or maintenance of bells, in only two wills was any money left to the actual purchase of a bell: PRO, PROB 11/20, ff. 194r-195v (24 Maynwayng): John Spencer, Wormleighton, 12 April, 1522, f. 194v, 'and the ij bells in the stepull to be chaunged and the third bell to be bought and so to have ij bells of a good tewne'; PRO, PROB 11/68, ff. 216r-216v (27 Brudenell): John Wagstaffe, Harbury, 26 March, 1585, f. 216r, 'Item I give and bequeathe towarde the buyinge of a fourthe bell and the mendinge of the same bell Twentye pounds'. Typical examples of donations to bells: LJRO, Edward Smyth, Fenny Compton, 10 December, 1533, bequeathed 'to the bells xijd'; LJRO, Harry Man, Ladbrooke, 29 November, 1546, 'I beqwesthe to the mayntenans of the bells & torchys xijd'; LJRO, Thomas Collins, Knightcote [Burton Dassett], 13 April, 1547, bequeathed 'to ye bells xijd'; LJRO, William Alybonne, Ladbrooke, 20 April, 1557, 'I geve unto the belles xijd'.

73 Deputy Keeper, Appendix 2, pp. 312-314.

74 PRO, E 315/513, p. 32. See also Fetherston, 'Inventory of church goods', p. 275. The chapel at Chadshunt, although within the benefice of Itchington, had parochial rights, including baptism and burial. It was, moreover, in a different Hundred from Itchington which also explains why it was not recorded with the mother church. Almost all the parish churches in Warwickshire where two chalices were recorded had chapels which were not mentioned by name in the survey, for example, Dunchurch (parish church with a chapel at Thurlaston), Mancetter (parish church with a chapel at Atherstone), and Kingsbury (parish church with a chapel at Hurley): Fetherston, pp. 163, 248, 249. Also in Leicestershire and in the archdeaconry of Stafford, most churches had only one chalice: E. Hermitage Day, 'The Edwardian Inventories for Leicestershire', Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers 31 (1911-12), pp. 441-470; F. J. Wrottesley, ed., The Inventory of Church Goods and Ornaments taken in Staffordshire in 6 E. VI (1552) Archdeaconry of Stafford, Collections for a History of Staffordshire William Salt Archaeological Society new ser. 6 part 1 (Stafford, 1903).
lands tenements rents possessions tythes oblacens and other whatsoever yerely Revenues and profits as well spiritual as temporall which doo belong to the vicarage of Busshops Itchington...of what yerely the same bee'.

And

'if ye shall fynde the same vicarage to be of less yerely value then the same was at the first taxacon of all spuall promocons certified unto or sou'egne lorde the kings Courte of theschequere Then ye shall enquire and certifie into this Court what is the occasion of the decay thereof and how long it is sith the same so decayed'.

This was the only place in Warwickshire where men were appointed to make such an enquiry at this time. Despite extensive searches at the PRO, no return has thus far been discovered. But there are two other sources of evidence which help explain the fall in revenue and which contain rather compelling evidence concerning whether or not Thomas Fisher demolished the parish church at Nether Itchington. As that evidence is rather complex and needs to be placed into context, it is essential to include here some very necessary background information.

According to the Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1535 the living of Itchington, which comprised of the parish church at Nether Itchington and three chapels at Upper Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon, was worth £26. 13s. 4d, made up of tithes (£24. 8s.), profits of the glebe (£2. 2s.) and perquisites of court (3s. 4d.). In the wake of Valor Ecclesiasticus came the introduction of a new tax burden imposed on the clergy. From henceforth, whenever a vicar took up a living the whole of the first year's stipend was to be paid to the King, and one-tenth of the same every year thereafter under a system known as First Fruits and Tenths. We know from tax returns that in 1533 the vicar of Nether Itchington was paid an annual stipend of £12, and each of his three curates £4. But when Richard Judson became vicar in 1546 he

75 PRO, E 336/4. A few weeks after the commissioners were to have made their report, Thomas Fisher granted to some of his acquaintances, including William Pynnock, all rights in the demesnes and manors of Tachbrook, Upper and Nether Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon for the duration of the life of Fisher and his wife: SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, f. 11r.
76 J. Caley and J. Hunter, eds, Valor Ecclesiasticus temp. Henrici VIII, auctoritate regia institutis (6 vols, London, 1810-1834), 3, p. 131. The ecclesiastical relationship between Nether Itchington, the mother church, and its three chapelries at Upper Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon is very complex in terms of, for example, tithes. Essentially the arrangement as it pertained in the sixteenth century dated back to the late thirteenth century: see Chapter 2.
77 For a detailed analysis of First Fruits and Tenths in the archdeaconry of Coventry, of which Itchington was a part, see A.A. Upton, 'The parish clergy of the archdeaconry of Coventry c. 1500-c. 1600', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Leicester (in progress).
78 Information taken from A.A. Upton's transcript of BL, Harl MS 594, Clergy subsidy 1533/4.
'compounded' for the sum of £26. 13s. 4d., which meant paying that amount during the first year of his incumbency and 53s. 4d. (one-tenth) every year thereafter. Within a few months Thomas Fisher and Richard Judson came to an agreement whereby Fisher would give Judson a one-off payment of £40 and thereafter £10 per annum in return for all vicarial rights and profits. The Exchequer would henceforth receive only £1 per annum in tenths, a not insignificant reduction which came to the attention of the Court of First Fruits and Tenths in 1552 and hence four commissioners were appointed to make enquiries.

While their findings have yet to be located (if indeed still extant) a crucial piece of evidence has been found only four weeks before the submission of this thesis, which sheds new light on the fate of the parish church of Nether Itchington in the mid-sixteenth century. Pleas made to the Exchequer concerning all manner of difficulties with payments of first fruits and tenths were collated and enrolled on Plea Rolls. Unfortunately an index of their voluminous contents has yet to be published and their sheer size rather rules out casual browsing. But by perseverance this author came across a case concerning first fruits and tenths at Itchington in the early 1560s. The relevant Plea Roll reveals that an Inquisition was held at Itchington on 3 December, 1562, during which searching questions were asked about decay in the vicarial income, exactly the matter which had supposedly been investigated ten years earlier. Fourteen men from Itchington swore on oath that there was a mansion house at Itchington where the previous two vicars had lived (William Bothom and Richard Judson, his successor, who died in the 'flu epidemic in 1558), and that both had kept good house. But Judson, either in 1546 or in 1547 (the witnesses were unsure which), had been 'constrayned to succeasse his good hospitaltye and to geve over howse kepinge by reason of the lake and decale of the accustomede offringes and obacons that before tymé was yearlie made and done by sondrye people till that tymé to the ymage or picture of St Chadde within the Chapell of ease at Chaddestown als Chaddestone'.

79 LJRO, B/A/1/14iv, f. 41v.
80 SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, ff. 17v-18r. It was agreed that the arrangement was to stand for ninety years. The profits were derived from the mansion, barns, stables, dovehouses, orchards, gardens, and all other edifices together with the chapels of Chadshunt, Upper Itchington and Gaydon and all tithes.
81 PRO, E 337/4, no. 59.
82 PRO, E 348/1.
Apparently in about 1547 the offerings, worth about £16 a year, came to an abrupt end because 'the said Picture and Ymage of Chadde [was] broken downe and burnt'. As part of the complex financial and ecclesiastical relationship between the parish church at Nether Itchington and the chapel at Chadshunt which dated back to the late thirteenth century, it seems clear from this evidence that a great part of the stipend of the vicar of Nether Itchington was derived from offerings to an image of St Chad at Chadshunt. How this arrangement came about is unknown. Obviously once the image was removed, the vicar's income would have suffered great depreciation. With no other means of making good such a loss, no replacement could be found for Judson following his death in 1558 as Itchington was not deemed to be

'a compotente lyvinge for any preste or mynister to dwell upon withoутe the charitie of the poore parishioners to helpe and succouere hym...and noe mane dare take it ore venter uppon the saide vicaradge'.

The fourteen witnesses affirmed that although the vicarage was now only worth £10, in the view of the Exchequer it was still worth £26. 13s. 4d. as in Valor Ecclesiasticus.

---

83 Dugdale mentioned that an Inquisition in 1562 recorded that an oratory at Chadshunt used to receive offerings of about £16 a year. He gave no reference for this statement but he must have acquired his information from this very same document: Dugdale, Antiquities of Warwickshire, p. 284. It is also likely that he saw the letter sent to Sir Simon Archer from Thomas Newsam of Chadshunt, in which the latter recorded that he had 'heard our vicar Mr Hunte say hee hath seen a record of above 400 yeares antiquitie in the office of the Deane and Chapter of Lichfield which maketh mention of a Chapell that stood in the Church yard at Chadshunt wherein was the image of Sent Chad and that the offeringes of the pilgrimes which resorted thereunto amounted to 20 markes p annum in those times, and that the Church of Chadshadt was dedicated to that Sent': SBTRO, ER 1/65/388. It is not known to which record the vicar was apparently referring. The most likely possibility is the Magnum Registrum Album but that has no such reference in it, while mention is made of a chantry at Gaydon: H.E. Savage, ed., The Great Register of Lichfield Cathedral known as Magnum Registrum Album, Collections for a History of Staffordshire William Salt Archaeological Society (Stafford, 1924), pp. 84-86. The image of St Chad was probably linked with the ancient well to the north of the church, inasmuch as pilgrims doubtless made their offerings first then went to the well to be ritually cleansed. It is of exceptional interest that Chadshunt means Chad's well (OE Ceadel + Latin fontis). According to M. Gelling, in naming Chadshunt the Anglo-Saxons borrowed the Latin fontis in preference to their own word well. It is a reasonable hypothesis that Roman stonework was visible when the Anglo-Saxons first saw [the springs here] and that this was why they used the Latin-derived word.' M. Gelling, The West Midlands in the Early Middle Ages (Leicester, 1992), p. 59; M. Gelling, Place-Names in the Landscape (pb edn, London, 1993), pp. 22, 140. More plausible is Dyer's view that the incorporation of the Latin word fontis into the place-name of Chadshunt 'can only be explained by the survival of a native population who kept at least some words of Latin in their speech': Dyer, 'Compton Verney', p. 58; see also C. Dyer, 'Chadshunt', Medieval Settlement Research Group Annual Report 4 (1989), p. 35.

84 Following the death of an incumbent, the holder of the advowson was obliged to present a replacement within six months, after which he forfeited this right to the bishop, and after a further six months' default, the right was forfeited to the Crown. An interregnum of four years was highly unusual.
The witnesses insisted that the second figure included the offerings made to St Chad (Valor makes no reference to this). Indeed they claimed that the income of the vicarage now only amounted to £10. 2s. 1d., out of which the vicar had to meet expenses totalling £3. 7s. 4d. and had to pay according to custom £3s. 4d. to a priest to 'syngle, reade or saie dyvyn service and mynister all sacramentes and sacramentalls, wedde, burye, and christen within...the chapell of ease at Chaddeston', leaving a meagre balance of £4. 1s. 5d. to exist on.\textsuperscript{65}

The Inquisition moved into a second day, when several parishioners were given the opportunity to make individual depositions. Among the copious testimony, Thomas Bell, a husbandman aged 78, claimed that he had been farmer of the offerings 'of that Idolatrye' for four years of William Bothom's incumbency (sometime between 1530 and 1546).\textsuperscript{66} Richard Wattes, a husbandman aged 58, admitted that once or twice a quarter he had made offerings to the image, adding rather defensively 'as many others then usede of devocyon to doe'. Significantly he asserted that the vicarage house 'doe fall in dekaie and the parishioners many tymes unserved, and still will soe remayne unlesse soom spedye redresse maie be hade in new ratinge'.\textsuperscript{67}

Six further men came forward to agree with Richard Wattes' deposition, all averring that if they remained destitute of a vicar 'there young people [will remain] untaught in the feare of god and obedience to their pryme, and the houses and buildings about the said vicarage will daily more and more fall in great ruyne and utter decaie'.

Seven men from Chadshunt also gave evidence, agreeing in essence with Richard Wattes, and one of them, Roger Brye, added that in Bothom's day he was hired 'to attend [daily] in the saide chapell of ease at Chaddstone for the receyvynge of the

\textsuperscript{65} That no mention was made of the chapels at Upper Itchington or Gaydon suggests that the stipends of their respective curates were not the responsibility of the vicar of Itchington. In 1248 the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield decreed that the curate at Gaydon should be partly funded by the parishioners there, and partly by the Precentor of Lichfield Cathedral, who held the advowson of Itchington. It is probable that this arrangement survived into the sixteenth century: Savage, Magnum Registrum Album, pp. 84-86.

\textsuperscript{66} Nobody of this name ever appears in either the court rolls or the parish register.

\textsuperscript{67} This may be the Richard Wattes of Itchington who died in 1563: WCRO, DR 60/1, f. 40r.
then uside offeringes', for which he was paid £2 as well as meat and drink. He testified that he used to hand over about £4. 13s. 4d. to Bothom in offerings each quarter. Finally, six men from Gaydon swore that they agreed with the evidence of their neighbours from Chadshunt. After much discussion a decision was made that the vicarage of Nether Itchington should henceforth be valued at only £10.

This evidence is of crucial importance and the key date is 1547. In that year Thomas Fisher became lord of the manor. And in that year he made an agreement with Richard Judson, the vicar of Itchington, to pay him £10 per annum for all vicarial rights. Also in that year an injunction was made which

>ordered the clergy to "forthwith take down, or cause to be taken down and destroy"
>all such images in their cures as were abused with pilgrimages or offerings",

a perfect description (in the mind of the iconoclast) of the function of the image at Chadshunt.88 'Obliteration...was the order of the day' which explains why the image of St Chad was 'broken downe and burnt'.89 Little thought seems to have been given to the impact on the income of the vicarage so that in the fullness of time the vicar of Itchington now found that he could no longer keep house and 'was constrainèd to succesasse his good hospitalytie and to give over howse kepingel'.90 This very likely explains why Thomas Fisher, ever opportunistic, offered to 'buy him out' in exchange for a regular income of £10. If that sum of money was paltry compared with the amount that Richard Judson had been accustomed to, by the time of his death in 1558 it would have been worth much less in the wake of the ravages the 1550s which saw a terrible combination of poor harvests, soaring inflation and a series of debasements of coinage. The value of the corn which Fisher received as part of the profits of the vicarage would have soared in value, while the vicar saw the value of his annual payment of £10 erode inexorably in real terms. Small wonder that 'noe mane dare take it ore venter upon the saide vicaradge'.

With over thirty men all giving distinctly similar evidence on oath we may assume

---

89 Aston, p. 257.
90 More spectacularly at Chittlehampton in Devon the image of St Urith (whose elaborate niche still survives) drew some £50 from pilgrims every year so that its destruction caused a dramatic slump in income: R. Whiting, Local Responses to the English Reformation (London, 1998), pp. 85, 87.
that they were telling the truth. The mention of the vicarage house and its surrounding buildings falling more and more into utter decay and ruin is highly significant. For if the vicarage house was falling into decay because there was no vicar to live in it, it is likely that the parish church was also falling into decay. Thus it is possible to shift the blame for the outright demolition of the parish church of Nether Itchington from the shoulders of Thomas Fisher and to claim that an inexorable chain of events was to blame beginning with the break of the link with the Church of Rome which caused the reformation of the English Church which led to the dissolution of all religious houses and the abolition of anything which smacked of popery and idolatry. This included the giving of offerings to the image of St Chad at Chadshunt. The destruction of the image led to the decimation of the income of the vicar, Richard Judson, which meant that he was grateful to sell his vicarage and all its profits to Fisher. But following Judson’s death no man could be found to replace him for such a pittance so the mansion house fell into decay, then the church followed suit. But there remain some unresolved matters.

Fisher purchased all vicarial rights and profits from Judson in 1547 but this agreement cannot have been widely known because none of the witnesses in 1562 mentioned it and clearly the Exchequer knew nothing about it. Furthermore, once the agreement had been made it was then Fisher’s responsibility to maintain the vicar’s mansion house, including during any interregnum which he does not seem to have done but nothing was said about this in the 1562 inquisition. Also as holder of the advowson Fisher was responsible for appointing a successor to Judson within six months. Indeed a man named Edward Keble was instituted in 1558 but was non-resident and had given up the living by the following year. None of this was mentioned by any of the witnesses who believed that they had been served by no vicar since the death of Judson. As Keble was instituted by proxy at Lichfield and was non-resident there was no reason why they should have known of his existence but it demonstrates that they were not in full possession of the facts.

It was to be nearly thirty years before the parishioners of Itchington were to be served once more by a vicar (William Wigan), by which time we can imagine that the

91 LJRO, B/A/1/15, f. 11r; PRO, E 179/19/507.
mansion house and the parish church were in a state of irredeemable decay. We know from the parish register that Wigan was resident and it is likely that given the situation at Nether Itchington that it was about this time that successive vicars of Itchington began to live in Upper Itchington and that the chapel there was afforded full parochial rights.

We now come to the second allegation made against Thomas Fisher: that he depopulated Nether Itchington in 1547. Amongst the accusations made against Thomas Fisher in the Court of the Star Chamber in the late 1540s was the allegation that he had enclosed 500 acres of the demesne 'whych tyme out of mynde and remembrance of man' had been common, 20 acres of freehold land and 12 acres of meadow. We do not know what his defence was or whether or not he was found guilty. In the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century account rolls there are references to the lord's demesne being divided up and let on an annual basis to various tenants. It is possible that Fisher decided to bring the arrangement to an end, as he was entitled to. Although in 1549 Edward VI pardoned Fisher of all entries upon unspecified premises without the King's licence, we do not know whether this included Itchington.

In the same year the Protector Somerset appointed commissioners to enquire into the abuses arising out of the decay of tillage, a similar exercise having failed the previous year. The enquiry was chiefly concerned with the decay of towns, villages and houses of husbandry and the conversion of arable into pasture. Enclosures themselves were not viewed as a problem except when they caused decay. Unfortunately the 1549 commission was also destined to fail because of the precipitate fall of the Protector Somerset. M.L. Bush commented, perhaps unfairly, that: 'In comparison with Somerset's enclosure commissions, those of Wolsey were a

---

92 William Wigan was instituted on 14 September, 1586: LJRO, B/A2ii/1, p. 38. To be strictly correct it seems that two men served briefly before him but very little is known about them; ex inf. A.A. Upton.
93 William Wigan was married at Lillington in August 1590 and had five children baptized at Itchington during the 1590s, including the wonderfully-named Haniball who, according to the register, was born on 7 January, 1597 and baptized four days later: WCRO, DR 60/1, ff. 8v, 9r, 9v, 10r, 33v. How the Wigan family survived on only £10 a year is a mystery.
94 See, for example, SRO, D(W) 1734/J1948, m. 2r.
95 Patent Rolls, Edward VI, vol. 3, pp. 19-20, and for the original see PRO, C 66/821, mm. 16-17.
dazzling success. The original returns have not survived but we have Dugdale to thank for his diligence in 1653 when he made his own transcripts of the Warwickshire returns from papers then in the hands of the Hales family. Much of the information was a repetition of Wolsey's 1517 enquiry, for example the allegation that Sir Edward Belknap had depopulated 12 houses and enclosed 360 acres in Burton Dassett in 1498. A handful of new accusations was also presented, for example, the allegation that four messuages had been converted into cottages and 200 acres converted to pasture at Chelmscote in 1547, the year in which Thomas Fisher was said by Dugdale to have instigated the wholesale depopulation of Nether Itchington. And yet Dugdale's transcript of the 1549 commission is entirely silent on that matter. It truly beggars belief that Fisher could have been ignored by the commissioners, particularly as their chairman, Hales, was said to have 'acted very honestly in this commission and favourably to the commons'.

97 Bush, p. 57.
98 See I.S. Leadam, The Domesday of Inclosures 1517-1518, (2 vols, London, 1897), 2, pp. 656-666, 676-677, 680-681, 684-693. Leadam (p. 5) referred to 'Dugdale's abridgement of the Inquisition into Inclosures of 1549 for Warwickshire, of which no other record is known'. Amongst the Spencer papers Leadam found two petitions made by John Spencer in the wake of the earlier enquiry in 1517 (now NRO, Spencer Court Rolls, no. 230) but for some unknown reason did not notice an attached undated membrane in which a John Spencer gave evidence to a great Inquiry. Spencer rehearsed the fact that in Wormleighton William Coope had decayed 12 messuages and converted their appurtenant 12 score acres of arable to pasture and that John Spencer had subsequently restored them. On the day of the same Inquiry, John the son and heir of the late William Spencer, who was the son of the late John Spencer, declared that the same messuages were in good condition and sufficient for husbandmen. The membrane also mentions the late king, Henry VIII and must therefore be of a later date than 1547. Thus the John Spencer giving the evidence was obviously the son of William Spencer who died in 1532, who was the son of John Spencer who had made the two post-1517 petitions. Leadam (pp. 485-489) also transcribed two documents, in which John Spencer, in the wake of the 1517 enquiry, related in robust terms how much he had improved Wormleighton since William Coope's enclosure; see also NRO, Spencer Court Rolls, no. 230. Furthermore, the evidence given in the membrane exactly matches Dugdale's entry for Wormleighton (Leadam, pp. 657-658) in his own transcript of the 1549 Inquisition, and the rehearsal of the accusation against William Coope, first made in 1517, fits in with Leadam's assertion (p. 6) that 'Somerset's commissioners worked with the Returns of 1517 and 1518 in their hands'. This membrane must therefore be a rare survival of the 1549 Inquisition. For the Spencer genealogy see N.W. Alcock, Warwickshire Grazier and London Skinner 1532-1555, (London, 1981), p. 20.

99 Leadam, pp. 655-657. Dugdale, while writing in caustic tones about Thomas Fisher, accepted the view expressed after the 1518 inquisition that 'this decay of tillage in Birton Dassett is noe preiudice, but benefit to the publike' on the basis that the land was worth more under pasture than under tillage and as a result the benefice had increased in value, the church and the ornaments were better looked after and the standard of housing and of the children's education had improved (Leadam, p. 655).

100 Leadam, pp. 660, 676-677.
101 Leadam, p. 663.
As Nether Itchington became a place where ever after, in Goldsmith's evocative words,

'...the sounds of population fail
No cheerful murmurs fluctuate in the gale
No busy steps the grass-grown foot-way tread
For all the bloomy flush of life is dead'

it should be possible to see the decline of the village happening in front of our eyes if we scrutinize very carefully the court rolls. In the first extant court roll (22 March, 1548) after Thomas Fisher became lord, there were four tithingmen, two making presentments for Nether Itchington and two for Upper Itchington. The presentments for Nether Itchington were fairly typical - several defaulters of suit and one death reported, and furthermore the aletaster presented three women. At Upper Itchington two men were amerced for allowing their animals to wander in the *whete ffelde* and the aletaster presented two women.

There are plenty of signs of life continuing at Nether Itchington well after 1547. By-laws appear from time to time which were made for both Upper and Nether Itchington. For example, in April 1549 tenants in both vills were told that they were not to keep their capuls or foals in milk in 'lez ffallowe fyldes' day or night untethered or without supervision. At the next view (8 October, 1549) an order was made concerning the repair of the common pound in *both* vills. Indeed the following June six tenants from Nether Itchington were amerced for not assisting in the repair. In April 1551 identical livestock quotas were imposed in both vills and tenants in both vills were ordered to repair their tenements before Michaelmas. Eleven years after the supposed depopulation of Nether Itchington (October 1558) tenants there were reminded that they were to do their part of the common pound within six weeks of 'the lord's assigning its location'.

---

103 BRL, 432719. Unfortunately, no court roll survives for Thomas Fisher's first year as lord.
104 BRL, 432721.
105 BRL, 432722.
106 BRL, 432723.
107 BRL, 432665.
108 BRL, 432675.
Land transfers continued to be made after 1547 at Nether Itchington. In 1548 Richard Stonley, following his father's death, accepted a one-and-a-half-virgate holding (including a messuage) with a recently built cottage, to hold by indenture for the term of his life. The cottage was quite possibly built to accommodate a servant employed to work the land. Whatever the reason for its construction, it clearly demonstrates ongoing investment in the holding which sits awkwardly with the long-held view that Thomas Fisher was actively driving tenants out of Nether Itchington. When Richard Watts died in 1557 his two-virgate holding in Nether Itchington was taken on by his widow, Elena, a decade after the supposed depopulation. But there is evidence in the court rolls of empty holdings. For example, when Richard Neale died in 1553 he was declared to be the last tenant of his one-and-a-half virgate holding and there is no evidence that anybody came forward to take on the holding. Likewise in 1558 John Drwry's similarly sized holding was left empty for lack of an heir. But empty holdings were also a problem at Upper Itchington. This apparent failure to find heirs is uncharacteristic of England at large in this period.

Naturally, empty holdings were anathema to lords who 'were much concerned with the maintenance of their income from rents'. Moreover, untilled land and derelict buildings must have exuded an atmosphere of decay, posing a real threat to the commonweal of the manor. Periodic outbreaks of epidemic only exacerbated this problem, particularly between 1518 and 1522 and in the late 1550s, made worse in the latter period by rampant inflation. At Upper Itchington there is evidence of engrossing, suggesting that there was in general no keen competition for land. For example, in 1554 Henry Howse (already a landholder in the manor) accepted a messuage, a garden, and adjacent croft late of Henry Worrall, as well as a small croft called 'the wades yarde', another small croft opposite, another messuage, and two

---

109 BRL, 432719, 432720.
110 BRL, 432673. Elena was buried on 21 April, 1571: WCRO, DR 60/1, f. 40v. It is not known what happened to the family holding thereafter.
111 BRL, 432667.
112 BRL, 432675.
virgates with pasture on extremely favourable terms, paying a minuscule entry fine of 5s.\textsuperscript{116} Furthermore, it is clear that during the 1560s tenants were actively being encouraged to take up holdings at Upper Itchington, while the last reference to a land transaction at Nether Itchington occurs in the late 1550s. It seems that empty holdings were much easier to fill at Upper Itchington and this was due in no small part to seigneurial policy. For example, in one court alone in 1565 Thomas Man accepted a two virgate holding, with a garden, an orchard and a close but paid no entry fine \textit{in considera’ boni et fideli servicii}; Richard Watts also accepted a two virgate holding and again paid no entry fine \textit{eo quod edificavit novum domum super eandem}; and finally William Coles accepted a cottage, again with no entry fine \textit{eo quod edificavit dictum cotagium de novo}.\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, there is evidence that tenants were relinquishing their property in Nether Itchington to Thomas Fisher but the examples are not numerous which suggests that the tenants were not being coerced. For example, in 1556, four days after the Michaelmas view, an indenture was drawn up in which Fisher made an exchange with Edward Tomkyns of Upper Itchington, whereby Fisher took Tomkyns’ house and close in Nether Itchington, Tomkyns having in return a house and close in Upper Itchington.\textsuperscript{117} And in 1564, Richard Tomkyns of Upper Itchington sold his cottage with two closes and a grove in Nether Itchington to Thomas Fisher.\textsuperscript{118}

It is well known that decline in service provision within the community often contributed to depopulation. At Chapel Ascote, a deserted settlement lying adjacent to Itchington, ale brewing had petered out by the mid-fifteenth century, no doubt hastening the village's decline as tenants sought to move to more attractive

\textsuperscript{115} BRL, 432668. According to Joan Thirsk, engrossing was regarded as an evil in the countryside in the sixteenth century and injurious to the commonweal. And yet if tenants like Henry Howse had not stepped forward to take on such a patchwork of tenures, the land may have lain unoccupied for several years: see J. Thirsk, Tudor Enclosures (repr., London, 1970), p. 12.

\textsuperscript{116} BRL, 432668. Although the lord was keen to fill holdings tenants were still expected to maintain a basic level of repairs and this was the condition of all holdings taken on at Upper Itchington in the 1560s. The 'eviction of tenants was a rare last resort', one poor widow, Juliana Wattes, had her tenement seized in 1561 for letting it go into great ruin, having been fined 6s. 8d. four years earlier for the same offence: Dyer, 'The occupation of the land', p. 88; BRL, 432726, 432673.

\textsuperscript{117} SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, ff. 14r-14v.

\textsuperscript{118} SBTRO, DR 37/vol. 15, f. 15r.
settlements. In the years before Thomas Fisher became lord, Upper and Nether Itchington had an ale-taster each, presenting regularly between three and six women. Decline becomes noticeable in April 1551 when the two ale-tasters only had one woman to present from Upper Itchington. In September the following year the situation declined further when the recently deceased ale-taster at Nether Itchington was not replaced. Henceforth one ale-taster, Thomas Aleyne of Upper Itchington, presented for both vills. He turned out to be rather unreliable, a factor which made its own contribution to the decline of brewing not only in Nether Itchington but also in Upper Itchington. In October 1554 he presented one woman from Upper Itchington, in September 1555 declared that he had nothing to present, and a year later failed to turn up at the manor court. He was replaced by John Tompkins of Nether Itchington. In October 1557 he presented one man from Nether Itchington and one woman from Upper Itchington, which was fairly typical of his four years as ale-taster. Following his death in 1560 he was replaced by Robert Smythe, who made no presentments, other than one woman in April 1561. And apart from the tithingmen making one ale presentment in October 1568, brewing as a cottage industry was apparently dead in both Upper and Nether Itchington.

According to Judith Bennett, decline in assize presentments by the early sixteenth century reflects how 'many manorial jurisdictions had become perfunctory or even moribund'. For example, at Hevingham Bishops (Norf.) presentments for breaking the assize of ale stopped abruptly in the 1510s which was perhaps unsurprising given the tendency 'to elect people who were new to the manor or were not present at court at the time of the election...indicating that the office was not taken seriously'.

119 BL, Add Ch 49438, 28 June, 1451, one tenant amerced 2d. for brewing, the last such entry. In the 1460s the tithingmen doubled up as ale-tasters but made no ale presentments: BL, Add Ch 49441, 49443.
120 See, for example, BRL, 432664.
121 BRL, 432665.
122 BRL, 432666.
123 BRL, 432669, 432671, 432672.
124 BRL, 432673.
125 BRL, 432724, 432726.
126 BRL, 432690.
was patently not the case at Upper and Nether Itchington. Firstly manorial jurisdiction here remained robust well into the late sixteenth century. This included the enforcement of the assize of ale demonstrated by the fact that ale-tasters continued to attend the manorial court even when they had nothing to present. It is futile to argue that the end of brewing amercements did not mean the end of brewing as a cottage industry. In response to the question, ‘Do assize presentments tell us about all brewers?’ Bennett has compellingly argued that

‘ale-tasters had to be generally honest for a simple reason: their work was very public... Public oversight of aletasters was so compelling that some aletasters presented themselves or their own wives for brewing... In short, despite complaints about official malfeasance and despite regular amercements of aletasters in some jurisdictions, it seems likely that aletasters presented most brewers most of the time.’

Furthermore, while it is

‘impossible to estimate the extent to which brewers slipped through the supervisory web, escaping presentment and amercement and, hence, eluding historical recovery... this slippage was neither common nor widespread... in [either] medieval [or] early modern communities.’

Secondly, unlike at Hevingham Bishops (Norf.), the ale-tasters at Itchington came from local families and were usually present in court when elected. They also performed their duties seriously, for example, rarely being absent from court and regularly presenting family members.

While brewing had all but died out by the 1560s at Itchington, ale-tasters continued to be elected and to make presentments at Gaydon and Tachbrook in the late 1560s and into the 1570s. It is possible that at Itchington occasional brewing had lost its attractiveness and that its former practitioners sought out other opportunities, factors which in their own way may have contributed to the decline of Nether Itchington. Furthermore, it is unknown what impact the setting up of the alehouse within the community may have had in terms of commercial competition. Indeed, it was only

---

130 See, for example, BRL, 432690: in October, 1568, Thomas Sale was amerced 4d. for selling ale at Gaydon, and Peter Townysend at Tachbrook. It is unclear whether they themselves had brewed the ale.
from the sixteenth century that the alehouse 'became and ubiquitous, essential feature of the social world of ordinary folk' and by the 1570s the alehouse had become 'a well-established phenomenon'. In October 1548 William Tompkyns of Upper Itchington and John Tompson of Nether Itchington were forbidden from keeping an alehouse and from selling ale either in their homes or without. Apart from a by-law the following April forbidding alehouse-holders at Itchington to allow gambling on their premises, there are no further references to alehouses until 1568 when Thomas and Elizabeth Sale were amerced for keeping an alehouse without a licence. In April 1579 John Granam of Tachbrook, John Basford of Upper Itchington, Richard Ball of Gaydon and Anthony Watts of Chadshunt were each amerced 4d. for holding an alehouse. The arrival of the alehouse on the landscape certainly coincides with the decline of occasional brewing at Itchington.

Long after Thomas Fisher became lord, the inhabitants of Nether Itchington continued to elect two tithingmen. In March 1548 two tithingmen (John Mysselden and Philip Clerke) made presentments for Nether Itchington, and two for Upper Itchington (John Avree and William Barnard). In October 1549 Mysselden and Clerke relinquished their posts and were replaced by Thomas Neale and Roger Vause, while Mysselden was elected constable of Nether Itchington. The regular changeover of officials continued, as by April 1551 Neale and Vause had been replaced by John Drury and Thomas Stonley. Law enforcement was further strengthened when four men were elected to supervise the implementation of all by-laws: William Barnard and Henry Howse in Upper Itchington and John Drewry and Roger Vaux in Nether Itchington. Had there been serious depopulation in Nether Itchington we should

---

131 P. Clark, The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200-1830 (London, 1983), pp. 34, 43. While the 1577 returns of alehouses survive for Warwickshire, individual hostelries are unfortunately not listed: PRO, SP 12/96/408; SP 12/117/3. According to the latter document there were 100 alehouses, 4 innkeepers and no tavernkeepers in Knightlow Hundred. At the same time there were about 70 settlements in the same Hundred as indicated by volume 6 of VCH.

132 BRL, 432720.

133 BRL, 432721; BRL, 432727.

134 BRL, 432693.

135 BRL, 432719.

136 BRL, 432722.

137 BRL, 432665. There were also two new tithingmen at Upper Itchington: Thomas Tompkyns and William Barnard.

138 BRL, 432671.
expect no replacement to be made when Richard Wattes, one of two tithingmen there, died in 1557 but he was promptly replaced by Richard Tompkyns.¹³⁹ But from that court on, the changeover of tithingmen became less regular as Edward Tompkyns and Richard Camell served at Upper Itchington and John Myssenden and Richard Tompkyns at Nether Itchington until 1562 when Camell became constable to be replaced as tithingman by John Tompkyns, and Myssenden was replaced by Roger Tompkyns. This meant that all four tithingmen came from the one extended family.¹⁴⁰ Furthermore they were joined in 1564 by Thomas Tompkins when he was elected constable.¹⁴¹ In May 1565 for the first time in the sixteenth-century court rolls, the number of tithingmen was reduced to three: two at Upper Itchington (John Tompkyns and Henry Wattes) and only one at Nether Itchington (Roger Tompkyns).¹⁴² Why is a mystery because there is no recorded mention in the previous manor court (27 September, 1564) of either the reduction or of Henry Wattes' election.¹⁴³ The three men served continuously until October 1568 when their numbers were further reduced to two - one each at Upper and Nether Itchington - this time a reason being recorded viz that three were no longer wanted (quia noluit de certo habere tres decen).¹⁴⁴ Despite being reduced in number, they both continued to make vigorous presentments in the manor court until 1582 when our court roll evidence ceases.

It is clear from the court rolls that not only were there sufficient tenants to warrant such a law-enforcing presence, but tenants continued to live at Nether Itchington and indulge in indoor activities. For example, ale was being brewed and sold regularly well into the 1550s. A watch was kept on illicit activities. John Tompson of Nether Itchington was forbidden from keeping an ale-house or to sell ale in his house from November 1548, which did not prevent him from joining forces with one of his neighbours in Nether Itchington to play illegal games and to imbibe intemperately in

¹³⁹ BRL, 432673.
¹⁴⁰ BRL, 432680.
¹⁴¹ BRL, 432683.
¹⁴² BRL, 432685.
¹⁴³ BRL, 432684.
¹⁴⁴ BRL, 432690.
their houses in Nether Itchington. And as late as 1558 John Mysselden was amerced for allowing illicit entertainment in his house at time of divine service, giving hospitality to malevolent and suspect persons, brewing and selling without permission and harbouring in his house an unmarried woman who was pregnant.

The evidence that Thomas Fisher did not deliberately depopulate Nether Itchington in 1547 or soon afterwards is overwhelming. If he had done so before the summer of 1549 he would surely have been noticed by the commissioners investigating such actions but he appears nowhere in Dugdale’s transcript of their findings. According to the evidence of the court rolls, two tithingmen continued to make regular presentments as did an aletaster. By-laws continued to be made and in some cases disregarded. But from the late 1550s there is evidence of holdings remaining vacant and brewing in serious decline. The church was also in decline and the vicar’s mansion house was falling into decay. This was said to have been a direct result of the destruction of a fairly lucrative source of income, namely offerings made to an image of St Chad in the chapel at Chadshunt. It is possible that as the church was neglected and holdings remained difficult to fill and brewing went into decline that these all combined to sound the death knell for Nether Itchington as a viable community.

To this may be added a post script: evidence from the Inquisitions of Depopulation of 1607. A summarized copy of the 1607 document claimed that Edward Fisher (who succeeded his late father, Thomas, as lord in 1578) was responsible for depopulating Itchington, but only five houses and no arable. Following on from that enquiry,

145 BRL, 432720, 432721.
146 BRL, 432674, 432675.
147 PRO, C 205/5/4; PRO, SP 16/257/129. Tate thought the latter document was contemporary, whereas Beresford opted for the later date of 1633, since it is found amongst the State Papers of Charles I. John Martin is surely right in his claim that ‘the document is clearly a list...[drawn up] in 1607, in spite of being filed as a return of the Commissions of the 1630’s’. J. Martin, “Enclosure and the Inquisitions of 1607: an examination of Dr Kerridge’s article “The returns of the Inquisitions of Depopulation”, AgHR 30 (1982), p. 47 n. 38. Tate and Beresford also disagreed on how many houses were depopulated there, when and by whom. Tate claimed five houses and by Edward Fisher; Beresford misread a poorly written ‘5’ for ‘30’ and even though the document states quite clearly that Edward Fisher was the depopulator, Beresford insisted this was a mistake and that the depopulation referred to had taken place in 1547, pace Dugdale. The figure 5 must be correct because the total in the document is 106, a total which otherwise should be 131 if Beresford were right: W.E. Tate, ‘Enclosure Acts and Awards relating to Warwickshire’, Transactions of the Birmingham Archaeological Society 65 (1943/4), pp. 97-100; Beresford, ‘The deserted villages of Warwickshire’, pp. 61-62.
cases were brought in the Court of Star Chamber in 1608. The indictment against Edward Fisher read:

'And there were in the place called Bisshoppes Itchington ffaire houses of husbandry with their convenient Barnes...unto every of which house were belonging Twentie acres & the greatest parte thereof used in tillage One Edward ffisher w[i]thin theis Tenn yeres last past hath pulled down or suffered to decay most of the said houses...And hath converted or caused to be converted all the said arrable growndes into pasture & hath & still doth use or lett the same...By meanes whereof the old inhabitants are departed and dryven to forsake the said towne and the houses such as they are left standing either voide or inhabited with much fewer persons.'

There is no room to expand here on the accusation against Edward Fisher but suffice it to say that 'wi[th]in theis Tenn yeres last past' he had been languishing in prison.

6.2.iii Gaydon

Thomas Fisher seems to have had little interest in Gaydon and apparently sold off the freehold land to various inhabitants in 1571. The only apparent source of conflict was a privately-built windmill. In 1539, Richard Fulwood of Tanworth-in-Arden, who held free land in Gaydon, paid Richard Ede £8 to build a private windmill at Gaydon by 24 June the same year. The building of this windmill is remarkable for several reasons. It was extremely rare for such investment to be made by lords after the Black Death, let alone private individuals. Independent mills were uncommon because of 'the overwhelming hostility of lords to the construction of mills by anyone but themselves.' It is clear from the agreement made between Fulwood and Ede that the former, who lived in the timber-rich Arden, was to provide the 'tymbre caryage and saylicloths'. Here we have a man with plenty of timber at hand, and with no little entrepreneurial risk, wishing to make an investment on his holding in Gaydon. Ede, as carpenter, was

148 PRO, STAC 8/15/21, m. 3.  
149 Martin is dismissive of Kerridge's inability 'to provide one instance in which an encloser was positively adjudged to have been innocent'. Edward Fisher may well be a rare example of a man falsely accused although Martin does concede that 'the number of convictions obtained falls well short of the number of presentments', while arguing optimistically that 'many convictions have yet to be traced': Martin, 'The Inquisitions of 1607', pp. 42, 44-45, 47. For Kerridge's original article see E. Kerridge, 'The returns of the Inquisitions of Depopulation', EHR 70 (1955), pp. 212-228.  
150 PRO, E 134/15Chas1/Mich3.  
151 SBTRO, DR 37/box 35/2140; BRL, 432664, 432723.  
'to make or cause to be made as good and as substantiall wyndmylne as any is wtin Warrwikshire and to setit up rydy to go and to fynde and pay for all things that shalbelong therto as for hewyng sawyng fallkyng framyng mylstones yrne warke and all other thyngs therto belonging'.

The completed windmill encroached some seven feet onto the lord's land which caused some conflict. Repeated efforts were made to call Fulwood to account including in June 1550 the imposition of a 20s. pain. Once the mill was operational, a miller had to be found. From the court rolls there is one reference to a miller at Gaydon, when Robert Burbury was amerced 2d. in 1548 for excessive toll at his windmill. This reference possibly explains why two years earlier he appeared at the parva curia in pursuit of several debtors, who probably owed him mill dues. Furthermore, in 1522 it transpires that both Charles and John Burbury were not tenants of the bishop at Gaydon, but rather sub-tenants of Robert Fulwood. Richard Fulwood knew that his windmill would have to make a profit 'without the benefit of suit' and yet must have been confident enough that the mill 'even in the face of opposition from a manorial mill, could attract enough custom to prosper'. And it seems to have attracted custom to the detriment of the lord's mill. In April 1551 tenants at Upper and Nether Itchington and at Chadshunt and Gaydon were reminded that they were to grind their corn at the lord's mill at Itchington. This entailed a tiresome round trip of some three or more miles to use a mill which provided an unreliable service, given that the by-law was qualified by a rider: '(si ibidem bene serviri possuit)'. Not surprisingly all but one of those recorded as ignoring this by-law came from Gaydon, although it is not known whether they were patronising Fulwood's mill instead.

153 BRL, 432664, 432723.
154 BRL, 432719. Subsequent references in the court rolls refer to Thomas Myller, a common miller, and Robert Myller, a common miller. It is unclear whether these were aliases for Thomas and Robert Burbury. They are the only references to the surname Myller: BRL, 432720, 432721, 432722, 432723, 432665.
155 BRL, 432663.
156 PRO, SC 12/16/10.
158 BRL, 432685. The mill at Itchington was quite possibly the horse mill mentioned in the 1542 account roll, as there is no subsequent evidence of a windmill being built here.
159 For example, the seven who were amerced 6d. each in March 1564: BRL, 432683.
6.2.iv Chadshunt

Thomas Fisher also displayed disinterest towards Chadshunt to the extent that he sold this manor to Thomas Newsam five years after acquiring it. There were very few families in sixteenth-century Itchington who could claim to have lived in the manor for more than three hundred years. Possibly the Newsam family could make such a claim if they were indeed descended from the William Neusum who, on 18 October, 1319, was instituted as vicar of Itchington. The descent of the family from then on is unclear until the 1450s when William Newsam is known to have held land next to the cemetery in Upper Itchington. Within a hundred years (17 May, 1552) his great-grandson, Thomas, paid to Thomas Fisher £140 and gave up the family holding, said to have amounted to 13 virgates, in exchange for the manor of Chadshunt (excluding the advowson, all tithes and the church barn). From henceforth the tenants of Chadshunt were no longer obliged to attend the view of frankpledge, Thomas Newsam performing this duty on their behalf. In April, 1553 the tenants of Gaydon were given 'a day' to produce a gate and boundary between the lordships of Gaydon and Chadshunt, a physical symbol of the end of a relationship dating back to the eleventh century.

No sooner had Thomas Newsam become lord, he proceeded 'to expulse [his tenants] from their sev[er]all copyholdes', 'put in his cattell and beastes to feede in those p[ar]celles of the demeasnes' of the manor and attempted to abolish tillage, according to allegations made against him in the Court of Requests. This is the very same Thomas Newsam who only five years earlier had complained in the Court of the Star Chamber that he had been denied rights of common in Itchington by Thomas Fisher. Whatever the truth behind the allegations against Newsam, his tenants won their case as it was adjudged that the custom of the manor was to be upheld as well for the tenants there as for their heirs. Only two years later Newsam died and was

---

160 LJRO, B/A/1/1, f. 78v.
161 SBTRO, ER 1/65/384, 387, 388. The only record of this transaction comes from a mid-seventeenth century collection of genealogies. Thirteen virgates seems highly improbable as in 1521 Thomas inherited three virgates from his late father; SBTRO, DR 10/2610, confusingly recorded as four virgates in 1522 when Thomas came to court to swear fealty: BRL, 432660.
162 BRL, 432666, 432667.
163 PRO, REQ 2/23/14.
succeeded by his son, Walter, aged 24.164

Walter Newsam was not deterred by his father’s failed attempt to convert arable to pasture. At an unknown date Walter was accused in the Court of Requests by three tenants of Chadshunt, namely William Holbech, Robert Austyn and William Wilkyns, who complained that for many years they had enjoyed common of pasture for their cattle and had been able to collect brambles to their own use, but they were now being deprived of both.165 Indeed Newsam was accused of having by force and arms cut down ‘a greate quantitie of thornes about the number of twentie loades’, put on the common pasture ‘a greate number of his sheepe’, and with his servants

‘in most forcible man[n]er...vyolently & forcibly resisted the servauntes of your said suppliantes going about to impounde the said sheepe or put them out of the said beastes pasture’.

In consequence

‘your said suppliantes shall have nether any grasse or pasture for theire bestes wch shold till theire groundes nor yet for theire melch beastes towards the fynding and mayntaynaunce of theire said houses and families’.

The outcome of the case is unknown so there is nothing more we can say about the impact of the Newsam family on the decline of arable farming in Chadshunt.

164 PRO, C 142/112/164. Alcock (using Dugdale as his source) was puzzled as to why Walter’s monument in Chadshunt parish church recorded that he was 76 when he died in 1621 (therefore born in about 1545); for when Walter inherited the manor of Chadshunt in 1557 he was said to be 24 years old (therefore born in about 1533). In fact neither Dugdale nor the family monument records that Walter died aged 76 in 1621. The date 1621 appears on its own at the end of the inscription clearly indicating that this is the date of the memorial slab and not the date of Walter’s death. Of his four sons, Edward died in infancy, Thomas in 1597, George in 1612 and John not until 1645. Probably their mother, Frideswide, died in about 1620, hence the erection of the plaque at that time. Moreover, Walter Newsam’s will was written and proved in 1610, when he was 76, making him indeed 24 at the time of his father’s death: Alcock, Warwickshire Grazier, p. 238 n. 26; Dugdale, Antiquities of Warwickshire, p. 284; PRO, PROB 11/90, f. 284v (93 Cobham), Thomas Newsham, Chadshunt, 1 October, 1597; PRO, PROB 11/120, ff. 476r-477v (120 Fenner with sentence), George Newsam, Chadshunt, 10 October, 1610; PRO, PROB 11/115, ff. 358r-359v (49 Wingfield), Walter Newsam, Chadshunt, 2 February, 1610.

165 PRO, REQ 2/219/60. William Holbech, when tithingman in 1582, was assaulted by Walter Newsam: SBTRO, DR 10/2613.
Conclusion

It is a truism that large church estates in general failed to benefit from the economic upsurge of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. We have seen how successive bishops of Coventry and Lichfield from the mid-fifteenth century onwards made occasional investments in the infrastructure of one of their Warwickshire manors, Itchington. For example, a new windmill was built there by 1459, but was let out at a low rent and allowed to fall into disrepair by 1485. Efforts were also made to repair properties and the severe problem of 'decayed' rent was addressed in the late 1440s by William Booth early in his episcopate. But thereafter rental levels stagnated and later bishops did not take advantage of the improving economic situation to increase land values. It is apparent by 1500 that les Naspes, an outlying hamlet within the manor of Tachbrook, was in a state of decline as the few tenants there paid a reduced rent and parcels of land remained unlet. There seems to have been a failure to maintain a high level of income from Oakley wood from the mid-1470s when as much as £44. 7s. 8d. was generated from wood sales, plummeting to barely £5 per annum for the next sixty years.

Thomas Fisher, the son of a Warwick fish merchant, assumed lordship in 1547, heralding a period of radical change. His lordship of Tachbrook saw an emphasis on the importance of by-laws, which were accumulated and translated into English in 1554. There was little hint of conflict there until 1571 when some of the leading tenants accused Fisher in the Court of Requests of denying them their pasture rights. Co-incidentally or otherwise the following year the same tenants made exchanges of land with Fisher, the consequence of which was the virtual end of communal agriculture at Tachbrook.

At Itchington conflict between Fisher and his tenants erupted even before he had become lord. He has long been thought of as the demolisher of the parish church and depopulator of Nether Itchington. Indeed his tenants did accuse him in the court of the Star Chamber of ecclesiastical pillage, but chiefly at Upper Itchington, and of

enclosing demesne land. These latter offences were not recorded by those who in
1549 were entrusted with enquiring into the abuses arising out of the decay of tillage.
The court rolls bear witness to signs of life continuing at Nether Itchington well after
1547. By-laws continued to be passed there, the common pound continued to function, land continued to be inherited. Empty holdings were prevalent at Upper as well as Nether Itchington but crucially, because of seigneurial policy, holdings were easier to fill at Upper Itchington as Fisher made generous concessions, for example, waiving entry fines. At the same time tenants were relinquishing their property in Nether Itchington, although not in great numbers, suggesting a lack of coercion.

A decline in service provision perhaps made its own contribution to the ultimate decline of Nether Itchington. From April 1551 the ale-tasters made fewer and fewer presentments. But brewing died out at the same time in Upper Itchington. The decline in the function of the ale-tasters was followed by a reduction in the number of tithingmen. Until May 1565 there were two tithingmen at Nether Itchington, strongly suggesting a sufficient number of tenants. But that year one tithingman was made redundant. Thereafter until the court rolls cease in 1582 a tithingman continued to be elected at Nether Itchington. But according to the evidence of the Plea Rolls the ecclesiastical living of Nether Itchington was decimated by the destruction of the image of St Chad at Chadshunt, which used to attract offerings of about £16 a year. In 1547 that came to an abrupt end with the result that the vicar was unable to maintain his house and no successor could be found to follow him for nearly thirty years after his death. Without a resident vicar it is very likely that the parish church was neglected and hence fell into such disrepair that it probably fell down over the course of time. It is worth noting that as the holder of rectorial rights, Thomas Fisher was responsible for maintaining the chancel and it is clear that he and his successors diligently discharged that duty for even as late as 1682 it was still standing, while the remainder of the church had long since disappeared.

Thomas Fisher had very little interest in either Gaydon or Chadshunt. Five years after acquiring the latter manor, he sold it to Thomas Newsam. Both Newsam and his son and heir, Walter, were accused of attempting to convert arable to pasture thereby driving out tenants, but met stout resistance from their tenants.

Much new evidence has been uncovered of Thomas Fisher’s activities as lord of
Upper and Nether Itchington and as we have seen there is absolutely no proof that he
either depopulated Nether Itchington or demolished its parish church. There is no
proof that he expropriated the rural population from the land. Perhaps the ultimate
viability of Nether Itchington lay in the hands of the tenants themselves. Thus we now
turn our attention to the tenants of Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon in
the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
CHAPTER SEVEN

TENANTS IN THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES

Introduction

In this final chapter we shall be exploring tenants at the end of the middle ages in the context of the community of the vill, the land market, the landless, and population turnover, migration and contacts made beyond the manor. The community of the vill (communitas ville) was comprised of landholders and therefore not necessarily all-inclusive.¹ One of the community's most important tasks was the formulation of by-laws in which all landholders had an interest as land lay in scattered strips. For Hilton, the ultimate expression of communal solidarity lay in by-laws while Dyer considered that the village was strengthened in the later middle ages because of collective experiences of stresses and strains which in turn consolidated its unity.² The village itself found strength in its success as a coercive organisation which was able to contain the quarrels and conflicts in its midst. This was one way in which the community exercised its practical function.³ In this chapter we shall also consider the land market, in order to seek out evidence of empty holdings or ruinous buildings particularly at Nether Itchington and Chadshunt. Is there any evidence of a consolidation of several holdings or parts of holdings, into fewer and larger tenancies or of peasants expropriating each other through the land market or of tenants of medium-sized holdings falling victim to the actions of their more successful engrossing peers? We shall also explore evidence for those who were not normally

³ Dyer, pp. 421-429.
part of the decision-making of the vill, by virtue of being landless. The chapter will end with an investigation of population turnover, migration and contacts made beyond the manor in the sixteenth century.

7.1 Community of the vill and non-agrarian by-laws

In Chapter 5 we saw how the community of the vill formulated by-laws to regulate agrarian activity by, for example, setting livestock quotas. Here we shall turn our attention to non-agrarian by-laws. The by-laws to be explored include orders against gaming, the giving of hospitality, harbouring inmates, and unlawful pregnancy, and orders to repair buildings.

Gaming 'provides an opportunity to look more closely at the relation between national legislation and local enforcement'. There was general concern that gaming distracted men from their labours. And because alehouses were the frequent site of such activities they were often the target of by-laws. It was ordered at Itchington in 1549 that alehouse holders were not to permit gaming in their houses under pain of 20s. Such a heavy penalty reflected the fact that 'the young, poor, and transient were difficult to punish effectively'; therefore the community of the vill 'directed their efforts at those who permitted gaming in their establishments'. This by-law only applied to Itchington and in due course offenders appeared in the manor court. In 1551 John Cobbe, described as the servant of Richard Tompkyns, and William Tompkyns, a cottar, were amerced 12d. each for playing a ball game (luserunt ad spirulas). And in 1556 Thomas Tompkyns was amerced the same amount for allowing servants of neighbours to play games illicitly at night in his house. In the same court five men from Itchington were amerced for gaming illicitly at night in neighbours' houses against the form of the statute and although no local by-law had been passed in

---

5 BRL, 432721.
6 McIntosh, Controlling Misbehavior, p. 103.
7 BRL, 432665. It is unclear what the nature of their game was. Indeed this is often the case except where the scribe breaks into English. For example, at Priors Hardwick and Priors Marston, two or three miles away from Itchington, 10 men were amerced in 1578 for 'unlawfull playinge at bowles': NRO, Spencer Court Rolls, no. 212. This document, catalogued as a rental, is in fact an estreat roll.
8 BRL, 432672. The frequent mention of the Tomkyns family is because they were such a prolific family.
Gaydon nine men from there were also amerced for gaming (*spirulaverunt*), including Richard and George (no surnames given), the servants of Thomas Trust. The nature of apparently illicit activity is made clear in 1566 when John Barloo of Gaydon (whose wife, Edith, was a regular brewer of ale) was amerced 6d. for letting men gamble, in the words of the court roll, *ad joca illicita viz cart pict' et tabulas*, against form of the statute and Anthony Wattes, an alehouse holder of Chadshunt, was amerced in 1579 for allowing a similar activity *viz. tabulas et pictas cartas*. It is interesting that at the Easter view of frankpledge in 1582 a total of five alehouse holders were amerced for the last offence mentioned, one from Tachbrook, two from Gaydon and two from Itchington. Repeat offenders for gaming were rare suggesting that perhaps ways and means were found to conceal such activities. Two notable exceptions were Richard Austen and John Rychardes both of Gaydon who were amerced in two consecutive years, 1556 and 1557, 4d. each in the first instance and 20d. each in the second.

Irregular selling of ale was occasionally the subject of warnings in the court. In 1548 William Tomkyns of Upper Itchington and John Tompson of Nether Itchington were warned against selling ale either in their houses or without under pain of 10s. per offence. In the next view Tompson was amerced 20d. not only for allowing unlawful games (*ignotus ludere*) in his house at night but also for imbibing intemperately. This was just the kind of combination of behaviour which so vexed Tudor legislators. Apart from permitting gaming in their establishments, alehouse holders were also prone to giving hospitality to undesirable guests. At Upper and Nether Itchington in 1548 ale sellers were ordered not to offer hospitality to any vagabonds or beggars (*vacabundos seu mendicatores de dello [dole]*). There was also a widespread concern about the taking in of sub-tenants. They were often viewed with suspicion because they tended to be new arrivals with no

9 BRL, 432687, 432693. John Barloo was normally known as John Barley.
10 SBTRO, DR 10/2613.
11 BRL, 432672, 432673.
12 BRL, 432720.
13 BRL, 432721.
14 BRL, 432720. A similar by-law in the neighbouring manor of Ladbroke in 1530 was more all-embracing as all tenants of the demesne were forbidden from giving hospitality to any vagabonds or beggars under pain of 12d.: PRO, SC 2/207/52.
regular employment who therefore might resort to theft. While no by-laws were apparently made at Chadshunt or Gaydon on this subject, there is a hint that sub-tenants were not welcome at Itchington, despite it being in a locality suffering from depopulation. In September 1552 tenants there were reminded that the pain regarding 'inmakes' (inmates) remained. Only two further sixteenth-century references to sub-tenants survive at Itchington: in April 1555 Margaret Westeley, a widow, was ordered to remove Thomas Myddleton from her dwelling and in the early 1580s Thomas Tomkins, junior, of Upper Itchington was told that he 'shall make no undertenants and that he discharge the town thereof under pain of £5.

The problem seems to have been more serious at Tachbrook, perhaps because of its proximity to Warwick. In 1536 Thomas Olney of Tachbrook was fined 6s. 8d. for having two sub-tenants (duas persones vocatur inmakes) and was ordered to remove them. This entry was subsequently crossed out suggesting that he had already complied. In 1550 no 'inmakes' were to be received at Tachbrook 'except it be a common servant', which was a clear recognition that allowances had to be made for servants in husbandry who were provided with board and lodging. Disregard of this by-law was to incur a swingeing 20s. penalty. This demonstrates a willingness to present and punish neighbours 'for committing customary acts of charity' for after all many people 'had a deeply rooted sense that it was socially and morally right to offer personal assistance to their poor neighbors'. Thus in 1555 Robert Commannderd and William Wynbusshe, both of Tachbrook, were amerced for receiving and keeping 'inmakes' in their dwellings, but only 20d. each. In the same court the by-law was reinforced so that after Michaelmas (the end of the year in terms of servants')

15 McIntosh, Controlling Misbehavior, p. 93.
16 Signs of concern regarding sub-tenants were also apparent in the North and West in the late Elizabethan period 'even though these regions were probably net exporters of people at the time': McIntosh, p. 95.
17 BRL, 432666. Unfortunately, the court roll recording the previous court session has not survived, therefore the first mention of this by-law is lost. According to McIntosh sub-tenants were commonly called 'inmates' in local records. The term 'inmake', used invariably in the court rolls within our area of study, appears in her book in an example found at Pattingham (Staffs.) in 1583: McIntosh, pp. 93, 95.
18 BRL, 432670; SBTRO, DR 10/2615. This is the sole reference to Thomas Myddleton in the court rolls and Margaret Westeley only appears once more, indeed in the same court when she was told to repair her tenement under pain of 20s.
19 BRL, 432661.
20 BRL, 432695.
21 McIntosh, Controlling Misbehavior, p. 83.
contracts) no-one was to keep in their dwelling any single or married man unless they were either hired or related. In 1579 Robert Hare and Matthew Comander of Tachbrook were arraigned for giving hospitality and welfare to Robert Wykes and Richard Beale and their wives and family but, unusually in the manor court, were pardoned by the lord.

Allied to this concern about sub-tenants was the harbouring of unmarried pregnant women. The community of the vill must have felt that such wrongdoing 'not only represented a breakdown in governance but also made a mockery of socially beneficial behaviors and institutions'. Furthermore, sexual wrongdoing was liable 'to cause controversy within the community, thus linking it with concerns about social harmony.' And there was also a determination to curb the practices likely to result in unwanted and unsupported children. Although 'the really destitute in a rural parish were usually supported without any difficulty' and 'the requisite sums of money were collected regularly' there was clearly concern about illegitimacy and the burdens which it might impose on the system of poor relief. While compassion and aid to the poor was advocated throughout the sixteenth century, increasingly attitudes hardened. Indeed, 'Traditional charitable practices that had provided informal relief for the poor were swept aside in many of the later Elizabethan presentments and orders.'

At Tachbrook in 1550 the by-law concerning common servants mentioned earlier was followed by an order that no-one 'shall receive or keep in his house any woman being unlawfully gotten with chyld', the pain being the same at 20s. No such by-law was made in the other manors and yet that is where the known offenders came from.

---

22 BRL, 432671.
23 BRL, 432693. Robert Wykes married at Tachbrook in 1562 and had at least four children, two of them being buried within weeks of each other in late 1564 and early 1565. In the burial register in 1594 Robert was described as 'a poore laboringe man': WCRO, DR 46/1, ff. 5r, 17v, 20r, 26r, 28v. The sole mention of Richard Beale in the parish register is to his wife's burial in 1590: WCRO, 46/1, f. 28v.
24 McIntosh, Controlling Misbehavior, p. 71.
25 McIntosh, p. 71.
28 McIntosh, Controlling Misbehavior, pp. 83, 95.
29 BRL, 432695. At Kineton the following year an almost identical by-law was made to the effect that anyone receiving into his house a woman unlawfully pregnant would forfeit a pain of 20s: BRL, 184961, pp. 44-45.
John Mysselden of Nether Itchington was amerced 3s. 4d. in 1558 for keeping such a woman in his house, having been amerced 2s. in the previous court for allowing illicit entertainment in his house at time of divine service and giving hospitality to malevolent and suspect persons. There is the impression of a crackdown at Gaydon in the late 1560s as John Barley was accused of keeping not one but two women who were unlawfully pregnant but unusually the charge against him was scribbled out on the court roll. Leonard Wykes was dealt with more severely as he was amerced 10s. for keeping in his house a vagrant woman who had given birth, and for assisting and supporting her 'to the contempt of the vill'. She was to be removed within days or else he would be amerced a further 40s. Perhaps she, or another unfortunate woman in similar circumstances, was the victim of Thomas Stoneley's righteous indignation, who was amerced 12d. for 'striking a woman in the churchyard [of Itchington] in the stocks with his fist'.

The community of the vill was concerned that tenants should keep not only their lives well ordered, but also their buildings well maintained. Orders to repair can often be a key sign of engrossment. But within our area of study only four such orders appear in the sixteenth-century court rolls. In April 1537 all tenants were ordered to make adequate repairs on their dwellings. In 1551 tenants in both Upper and Nether Itchington were ordered to repair their tenements under pain of 20s. Likewise all tenants at Tachbrook were ordered in April 1555 to do all necessary repairs on their dwellings before Michaelmas, a full five months away suggesting a lack of urgency. But that same year the pain was doubled at Itchington suggesting that the by-law was

---

30 BRL, 432674, 432675. Perhaps Mysselden was running an informal brothel. His activities were no bar to his continuing in office as a tithingman.
31 BRL, 432689, 432727.
32 SBTR, DR 10/2615, undated note of presentments made at an Easter view c. 1580. The only other reference to stocks in the court rolls is an order to all vills within the lordship in 1536 to make sippes vocatur stockes for the punishment of vagabonds: BRL, 432661. See M. Ingram, "Scolding women cucked or washed": a crisis in gender relations in early modern England?", in J. Kermode and G. Walker, eds, Women, Crime and the Courts in Early Modern England (London, 1994), p. 60 for the comment that 'stocks...were applied not only to men but sometimes also to women for offences such as petty larceny and sexual immorality'.
33 BRL, 432662.
34 BRL, 432665.
35 BRL, 432670.
not being observed. Very occasionally individual tenants were singled out and they were all from Itchington. For example, in 1551 the by-law just mentioned, which applied to all tenants, was repeated and addressed particularly at Richard and Robert Smythe, whom we met in Chapter 5 as regular infringers of agrarian by-laws. The nature of their neglect is unclear but it is possible that they had taken on a multiple holding and allowed surplus buildings to fall into ruin. Juliana Watts, a widow of Itchington, was amerced 6s. 8d. in 1557 for not repairing her tenement and four years later suffered the ultimate penalty of being evicted. Where she went is unknown but she probably did not die at Itchington for her burial is not recorded in the parish register. It may be that she was either too poor or inefficient to maintain her dwelling. It is possible that from the 1560s seigneurial policy on repairs became more stringent as in that decade all tenants taking on a new holding specifically had to agree to keep up repairs at their own expense. For example, at Gaydon in 1569 William Austen took on his mother’s family holding of three virgates, agreeing to keep the property in good order, to fund all repairs and to desist from chopping down any trees without the lord’s permission.

It was noted in Chapter 5 that often the most blatant infringers of by-laws were not from the poorer sections of the community. Having said that, most of the by-laws were agrarian in nature and were for the most part aimed at landholders and those with more substantial holdings were inevitably the most affected. A small core of tenants appeared in the manor court year after year, such as Richard Camell of Nether Itchington amerced over many years for a wide range of offences including mowing all his furlongs, exceeding the sheep quota, allowing his pigs to wander unringed, tethering his horses in the grain fields, and not assisting with the repair of

---

36 BRL, 432671.
37 BRL, 432665.
38 See C. Dyer, ‘The occupation of the land: the west midlands’, in E. Miller, ed., The Agrarian History of England and Wales, III, 1348-1500 (Cambridge, 1991), p. 84. In the neighbouring manor of Wormleighton tenants were amerced for removing doors from their tenements. For example, in 1500: Richard Coste - *abcariavit duo hostia a tenure sua* and Robert Jeffes - *cepit et abcariavit tria hostia a tenure sua*: NRO, Spencer Court Rolls, nos 220, 222.
39 BRL, 432673, 432726.
40 BRL, 432691.
the common pound. The blatant disregard of agrarian by-laws was no doubt born out of a desire to pursue personal economic interests. But also it is likely that there was an on-going struggle to keep pace with an ever-changing agrarian and economic situation. By contrast there were very few repeat offenders against non-agrarian by-laws. For some men it was their only ever appearance in the court rolls, like John Cobbe of Itchington and William Hyggyns of Gaydon amerced for playing games in 1551 and 1556 respectively. That the overwhelming number of amercements in the manor court were for agrarian offences suggests that these were much more difficult to hide unlike moral misdemeanours. For example, sheep trespassing in the corn were very easily spotted, as was the damage which they wrought, whereas illicit card and ball games, often played at night, were relatively easier to conceal.

7.2 Land transfers

The peasant land market, defined as land moving 'by mutual agreement, from one living landholder to another' (not forgetting what happened to a peasant's land on his death) is a vast topic which continues to arouse much debate. Indeed some historians would argue that 'land market' ought to be defined very narrowly as constituting only those transactions made between two unrelated people, identified as inter vivos. This section of the chapter has necessarily been entitled 'Land transfers' as inter vivos transactions were apparently exceptionally rare within our area of study (as throughout the Midlands) according to the evidence of court rolls. Nevertheless it

---

41 BRL, 432720, 432666, 432671, 432724, 432683. He continued to serve as tithingman and in due course was elected to the ultimate office of constable.
42 BRL, 432665, 432672.
43 P.D.A. Harvey, 'Introduction', in P.D.A. Harvey, ed., The Peasant Land Market in England (Oxford, 1984), pp. 1, 4. A number of historians have come out to disagree with Ros Faith's view that 'keeping the [family] name on the land' was a long-held aspiration of the medieval peasantry; see, for example, Z. Razi, 'Family, land and the village community in later medieval England', Past & Present 93 (1981), pp. 8-9; J. Whittle, 'Individualism and the family bond: a reassessment of land transfer patterns among the English peasantry c. 1270-1580', Past & Present 160 (1998), pp. 26, 62. For the article which engendered the criticism mentioned (not forgetting that it was pioneering and notwithstanding Faith's assertion that 'keeping the name on the land...no longer reflected what was happening in the village') see R.J. Faith, 'Peasant families and inheritance customs in medieval England', AgHR 14 (1966), pp. 77-95.
44 Whittle, p. 49.
is important to remember that manorial documents alone do not tell the whole story of the land market. Postan identified Midland England as a *pays légal* 'where rigid manorial structures maintained standard sized landholdings and restricted sales of customary land', but hid as a result 'a large class of subtenants and an active market in short-term leases of land'. This is in complete contrast to the *pays réel* of eastern England 'where weaker manorial structures allowed the nature of the tenant land to be truthfully recorded'.

We shall now examine land transfers made *inter-vivos*, within the family, and to the lord.

### 7.2.1 Land transfers: *inter-vivos*

Between 1518 and 1582 only two *inter-vivos* transactions of land were recorded in the court rolls, both at Tachbrook (Table 7.1). In 1521 William Jenyns surrendered to the use of (*ad opus*) Thomas Yong a messuage, a cottage, a toft and $1\frac{1}{2}$ virgates, a profitable transaction for the lord as Jenyns had to render a heriot of 12s. and Yong had to pay an entry fine of 13s. 4d. Why this transaction was made we shall never know but perhaps it was a mutually beneficial arrangement whereby the 'transfer conveyed an hereditary title to land from the holder...in return for maintenance on that land for the remainder of the grantor's life'.

In the only other example, John Bromfylde, having been granted a virgate by his recently-widowed mother in 1549, promptly alienated it to Robert Hynde. John's alienation seems to all intents and purposes to have been an *inter-vivos* transfer but the twelve good men and true of the jury did not see it that way, for two years after Emeline's death (she died in 1553) they decided that John no longer had any right in this holding because in alienating the land to Robert, John had permanently foregone any future interest in

---


47 BRL, 432722.
Table 7.1 Analysis of land transfers recorded in the court rolls, 1518-1582

inter-vivos non-family includes only transactions made between two living tenants with different surnames, assumed therefore to be unrelated. within the family includes all transfers made to a widow, to a son, or to a close relative and nearly all happen to be post mortem. to the lord includes all transfers back to the lord where there was no heir, either when a living tenant surrendered land, or when a tenant died without an apparent successor, or when an incoming tenant took on a holding and from surname evidence was not apparently related to the previous tenant, or when the previous tenant is not named and it has been concluded from other evidence that no-one in the incoming tenant’s family had died recently.

Tachbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>date</th>
<th>inter-vivos non-family</th>
<th>within the family</th>
<th>to the lord</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Table 7.1 (cotd)
Upper (Ul) and Nether (NI) Itchington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Inter-vivos non-family</th>
<th>Within the family</th>
<th>To the lord</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>3 (location not specified)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>2 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>2 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>2 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564</td>
<td>2 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565</td>
<td>3 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td>1 Ul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chadshunt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Inter-vivos non-family</th>
<th>Within the family</th>
<th>To the lord</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gaydon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Inter-vivos non-family</th>
<th>Within the family</th>
<th>To the lord</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Court rolls passim at SBTRO and BRL (see Bibliography).
the land, therefore the holding was to revert to the lord. Whatever complexities lay behind the jury's verdict, this was bad news for Robert Hynde because within months of taking up the Bromfylde holding he had got married and started a family. After losing the holding in 1555 he disappears from both the court rolls and the parish register until 1592 when in recording Robert's burial the scribe added 'a pore old man'.

Notwithstanding the lack of *inter-vivos* transfers in the court rolls, there are certainly hints at Tachbrook in a clutch of surviving charters of a robust market in freely held land. For example, at Michaelmas 1461, Thomas Olney granted to John Symondes a messuage with a toft called *Elmeyarde in le Ravensende* which lay next to a certain lane called *le Twychenlane*. Only sixteen months later at Epiphany 1463 Thomas Olney, this time with his wife Agnes, granted to Sir Robert Shotteswell, vicar, John Savage of Bishops Tachbrook, Thomas Savage of Tachbrook Mallory, Richard Symondes and Richard Janyns both of Barford, the same toft, described as *Elmeyarde in le Ravenforde*, together with a messuage, 60 acres of arable, a parcel of meadow called *Thomannesdole* and a parcel of meadow called a *huyde*. A day short of twenty years later (5 January, 1483), Thomas and the two Richards granted this same holding in its entirety to John Symondes of Tachbrook. Nine years later (21 October, 1492) John granted the holding to his wife Agnes Laurens. Thereafter it is uncertain what happened to this land but it may have been part of the undescribed lands, tenements and meadows granted in 1514 by John Symondes to Roger Clerk, William Lydyate, William Brokden and Thomas Thorr.

---

48 BRL, 432670.
49 WCRO, DR 46/1, ff. 3r, 3v, 17r, 25r, 28v, 29r.
50 PRO, E 326/B4927 now E 326/4927; PRO, E 326/B4932 now E 326/4932.
51 PRO, E 326/B4929 now E 326/4929; PRO, E 326/B4930 now E 326/4930.
52 PRO, E 326/B4995 now E 326/4995. The other two occupiers of the land, Robert and John, had already died according to the charter. The toft was described as *Elmeyarde in le Ravensende* and the two parcels of meadow, *Twomannesdole* and *huyde*. Four days later John, son of Thomas Olney the grantor of 1463, added his own agreement to the transaction: PRO, E 326/B4952 now E 326/4952.
53 PRO, E 326/B4994 now E 326/4994.
54 PRO, E 326/B5725 now E 326/5725. For the quitclaim of this land the following year see PRO, E 326/B6806 now E 326/6806. The grantees had connections with Thelsford Priory, a few miles away, as a Robert Brogden was 'minister' [the equivalent of abbot] of Thelsford. In 1546 his kinsman John Brogden of Bishops Hampton (Warws.) successfully reclaimed ownership of property in Tachbrook which had been granted to Thelsford priory and seized at its dissolution, including the land mentioned in the charter quoted here: WCRO, CR 1908/98/1.
7.2.ii Land transfers: within the family

Almost all the land transfers to be explored in this section were made following a tenant's death. As can be seen in Table 7.1 the experience of each manor through the course of the sixteenth century was quite different. At Gaydon and Chadshunt land moved from one generation to the next even during the dearth-ridden early 1520s, which is reminiscent of the remarkable continuity in villein families in these two manors in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries (see Chapter 4). At Tachbrook land passed from one generation to the next except in years of crisis, whereas at Itchington land transfers were volatile throughout the century.

Many of those who succeeded to land were widows. How they coped depended on the size of their holding and whether or not there were other family members, preferably a son, available to help. One or two widows at Itchington succeeded to very large holdings, which presumably had been formed in the past by means of engrossing. For example, in 1557 Richard Wattes of Nether Itchington was succeeded by his widow, Elena, to his two-virgate holding, a decade after the supposed depopulation of this manor; and in 1558, Thomas Tomkyns of Upper Itchington by his widow, Alice, to a composite four-virgate holding, made up of two separate holdings as two heriots were demanded.  

There is no evidence of how Elena and Alice coped but elsewhere it is clear that ageing widows struggled with large holdings. For example, at Tachbrook Elizabeth Trentham took on her late husband’s one-and-a half-virgate holding in November 1546 but in October 1557 she withdrew from the tenure and the land remained in the lord’s hands as there was no heir.  

At Gaydon three widows turned up at the same court in 1569 and surrendered their land to the lord, with the intention that the land be taken up by their respective sons. The first widow was Isabella Austen who had only accepted her late husband’s three-virgate holding in the previous court. The other two widows, Agnes Caddye and Alice Hunscoate, both surrendered two-virgate

---

55 BRL, 432673, 432675.
56 BRL, 432664, 432673. He was buried on 28 October, 1546, she on 24 June, 1567: WCRO, DR 46/1, ff. 24v, 26v. Thomas Trentham left a will written in 1546 now lost, which had it survived would have been useful in establishing any potential heirs: LJRO, P/C/10/I.
57 BRL, 432691.
58 BRL, 432690.
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holdings, and their sons agreed that they (Agnes and Alice) should continue to enjoy the premises for the duration of their widowhood ‘without perturberance, contradiction or molestation’, no doubt having decided that they would prefer to give up their land in return for maintenance.\(^ {59}\) These transactions were of enormous benefit to the lord, firstly because of the crop of heriots and entry fines. In this court alone the lord received an ox worth 40s., a bullock worth 20s. and an entry fine of £5 from the Austen family; and a bullock worth 20s. and a £4 entry fine from both the Caddye and Hunscoote families. And secondly the three holdings, which made up a sizeable part of the manor, were now in the care of three young men rather than three ageing widows.

It is striking that at Tachbrook in all but one instance a son eventually inherited the family holding from widowed mothers. For example, in 1557 Thomas Grandam was succeeded to his virgate holding by his widow Elena, she in turn being succeeded by their son John in 1563.\(^ {60}\) That sons were available and willing to take on the family holding was an increasingly common trend in the sixteenth century as a growing population was matched by an ever increasing shortage of land.\(^ {61}\) Even in some cases when a widower or widow died and the court roll declared him or her to be the ‘last tenant’ and that ‘the land was now in the lord’s hands’, it can be demonstrated that a son did in fact come forward to take on the family holding. For instance, Robert Comander of Tachbrook died in 1565, two years after his wife, Agnes, and at the next manor court it was recorded that Robert was the last tenant of a one-and-a-quarter virgate holding. In 1543 they had had their son, Matthew, baptized but he was not placed in tithing until 1564 at the surprisingly late age of 21. Very likely at a time of demographic expansion and land shortage he had been away from the parish for several years earning a living whilst waiting to take on the family holding. In the same court which recorded his father’s death, Matthew took on a virgate holding, while one Robert Overton took on a quarter virgate. Put together this was probably the late Robert Comander’s holding even though the court roll is silent on who the previous

---

\(^ {59}\) BRL, 432691, 432690. The Hunscoote family held these two virgates as early as 1447: LJRO, B/A/21/124078, f. 4v. M. Mate, Daughters, Wives and Widows After the Black Death (Woodbridge, 1998), pp. 113-116.

\(^ {60}\) BRL, 432673. Thomas was buried on 25 September, 1557 and Elena on 23 March, 1563: WCRO, DR 46/1, f. 25v.

\(^ {61}\) I owe this comment to Professor Chris Dyer, made in his second Ford lecture.
tenants were. Within weeks of his father's death, Matthew Comander, now economically secure, married Alice Hawke in the nearby parish of Wellesbourne in January 1567 and between 1568 and 1590 had seven children baptized at Tachbrook, he being buried in 1600.62

7.2.iii Land transfers: to the lord

At Gaydon and Chadshunt it was rare for land to be surrendered to the lord and to remain in his hands (Table 7.1). In one instance at Chadshunt in 1518 William Broderton and his son Robert accepted a virgate of the late Thomas Hynd.63 If the lord had been concerned that Thomas had no heirs, he could now be reassured that the newly forged joint tenancy between father and son would help 'to bind the generations together and ensure inheritance'.64

In the wake of epidemics tenants were able to take advantage when there was a surge in vacant holdings. In 1522, William Smyth of Upper Itchington died and his two-virgate holding was taken on by John Wattes, member of a long-established family. In the same court, William Erytage accepted 1½ virgates in Nether Itchington late of Richard Faux, relinquishing his own two virgates in Upper Itchington to his brother Henry which their father John had previously held.65 Two other tenants, Roger Tompkins and Henry Howse, succeeded in building up composite holdings during their lifetime. When Roger died in 1554 he held in Upper Itchington a messuage, a garden, an adjacent croft, a dwelling called 'Browneshowse' and 2½ virgates with pasture.66 In the same court which recorded Roger’s death, Henry Howse (as we saw in Chapter 6) accepted in Upper Itchington a veritable patchwork of property on

---

62 BRL, 432683, 432687; WCRO, DR 69/1, f. 2v and DR 46/1, ff. 1v, 5r, 5v, 6r, 6v, 7r, 7v, 26r, 26v, 29v.
63 SBTRO, DR 10/2609.
65 BRL, 432660; SBTRO, DR 10/2610. John Heritage died in 1495 holding two virgates in Upper Itchington: SBTRO, DR 10/2606. It is worth noting that none of these three members of the Heritage family appears on the family tree drawn up by Nat Alcock, who observed that the surname Heritage was 'extremely uncommon, being virtually restricted to a small area of South Warwickshire': N.W. Alcock, Warwickshire Grazier and London Skinner 1532-1555 (London, 1981), pp. 15-16.
66 BRL, 432668. This may have been the same Roger Tompkins who at some time before 1548 took on the barn and dwellings in Upper Itchington late of George Watts but allowed them to fall into a ruinous state and was therefore made to forfeit them: BRL, 432719.
extremely favourable terms. It is not clear whether either Roger or Henry could be described as kulaks but there is certainly no evidence that they were expropriating their fellow villagers.

Landless tenants were able to take the opportunity to move onto the first rung of the tenurial ladder when land was plentiful. As we have seen when Robert Comander died, part of his holding at Tachbrook was taken up in 1566 by Robert Overton, whose poor economic state is obvious in the fact that he paid no entry fine _eo quod est pauper_. At Itchington in the same year John Meryck accepted a cottage with a mere acre of arable in the vill and fields of Itchington, paying 5s. _per annum_ in rent but no entry fine, again _eo quod est pauper_. He agreed to maintain his fences and to make all repairs at his own cost. Indeed this was the hallmark of all twelve tenures taken up in the 1560s within our area of study, which is in complete contrast to the situation earlier in the century, when, for example, the princely sum of 5s. 4d. was allocated 'by agreement of the lord' to repair a cottage newly occupied by John Jefferey at Tachbrook, whose entry fine was only 3s. 4d. Nevertheless, despite the lord's best efforts holdings were sometimes impossible to fill. Although there were transfers of land at Nether Itchington after its supposed depopulation in 1547, in the 1550s there was no heir to succeed in at least three cases following the death of a tenant, whereas in the same decade at Upper Itchington in nearly every case when a landholder died a new tenant was found.

Within our area of study, there is no evidence of peasants expropriating each other through the land market or of tenants of medium-sized holdings falling victim to the actions of their more successful engrossing peers. But there is some evidence of a consolidation of several holdings or parts of holdings, into fewer and larger tenancies.

67 BRL, 432668; see also Chapter 6 for the ways in which Thomas Fisher encouraged tenants to take up holdings in Upper Itchington.
68 BRL, 432687.
69 BRL, 432676.
70 As Bowden observed, on many holdings 'responsibility for the upkeep of buildings, generally assumed by the landlord at the beginning of the Tudor period, was increasingly placed on the tenant': P. Bowden, 'Agricultural prices, farm profits and rents', in J. Thirsk, ed., _The Agrarian History of England and Wales, IV, 1500-1640_ (Cambridge, 1967), p. 681. For John Jefferey's entry at Tachbrook see BRL, 432660. His cottage also had a quarter virgate attached.
71 See Chapter 6.
7.3 The landless

In this section we shall examine the evidence of those who made a not insignificant contribution to the economic interests of the manor but who rarely appeared in the court rolls as they held no land. Although Kussmaul noted that few records exist to assist in anything more than a sketchy analysis of their activities, we are fortunate in having available to us occasional references in court rolls, the 1522 muster, a parish register, and wills. ⁷²

The landless existed either by being employed as servants or as labourers. Normally, servants were young and unmarried, hired by the year, and lived in the household of their employer. By contrast, labourers were hired on a less rigid basis, were often older and married, and lived in their own accommodation. In addition to their regular wage, at the death of an employer servants could hope to receive a bequest. In 1538 John Audeley of Itchington bequeathed in his will:

‘[to] every servant I have...of my gifte half a yeres wagis over and beside that that is due...yf he have bene’in my service a yere And such parson as have doon me service under a yere to have a quart wagis over and besides’.

And he added

‘to all and evey suche of my servantes that ar married and dwell out of my house xxs’

indicating that contrary to common practice some of his servants were not young and unmarried. ⁷³

Very, very occasionally the landless or near-landless left wills. An extraordinary and inexplicable survival among the probate records at the PRO is the will of Nicholas Hawle, a shepherd of Itchington. ⁷⁴ In an extremely brief will he simply bequeathed all his goods to Edward Cowles, whom he made his executor. The only witness was the vicar, William Wigan. Nicholas was buried at Itchington on 7 January, 1599, his being the only entry in the parish register in the sixteenth century for the surname Hall. ⁷⁵

This fact, together with the lack of reference to any family or neighbours in his will,
suggests that he was unmarried and led the classically lonely existence of a shepherd. His affinity with Edward becomes apparent later in the burial register for at his death in 1614 Edward was recorded as a day labourer. Remarkably, Edward also left a will, sadly now lost, but we know that his goods were valued at £11.16s. 8d.

While 'few expected to die as servants' this was unfortunately the fate of some of the servants at Tachbrook. The burial register of Tachbrook is an extremely valuable source because it begins as early as 1538 and furthermore the parish clerk usually distinguished adults from children, and often noted the occupation of the deceased. Between 1538 and 1600 the burials of 23 servants were recorded at Tachbrook. Not surprisingly, for the majority this was the sole occasion when their surnames appear not only in the register but also in the court rolls. Some were even recorded without a surname such as Charles 'a poreman & herd', and one not even accorded a Christian name, identified only as 'a maide servannte of Agnes Cheslins'. Others were identified with their employer, including the quaintly anachronistic description of Richard Bradshaw in 1599 as famulus Willemi Olney.

Occasionally servants appear in the court rolls. As we saw earlier in this chapter, servants were fined for gaming, for example, Richard, the servant of Richard Tompkins in 1551 and Richard and George, the servants of Thomas Trust in 1556, none of them identified by a surname.

There is an enigmatic document, which furnishes information on the landless at Chadshunt and Gaydon. The document has been catalogued at the PRO as a valor

---

76 WCRO, DR 60/1, f. 45r. Interestingly the following year saw the burial of Joan Cooles, described as the wife of Raffe, 'shepherd & labourer'.
77 LJRO, P/C/10/I.
78 Kussmaul, Servants in Husbandry, p. 4.
79 WCRO, DR 46/1, ff. 26r, 27r.
80 WCRO, DR 46/1, f. 29r.
81 BRL, 432665, 432672.
82 PRO, SC 12/16/10. Unfortunately, although the document lists all adult males in Chadshunt and Gaydon it cannot in itself be used to examine either population levels or wealth structures. Firstly no late fourteenth-century poll tax returns (1377, 1379, 1381) survive for these two places. Secondly the 1524/1525 lay subsidy returns are also no longer extant. Thirdly the earliest extant parish register does not begin until the late seventeenth century. Fourthly the majority of those named in this document appear in no other record, not even the court rolls. The best we could do would be to guess by means of a multiplier how many people were living in Chadshunt and Gaydon in 1522 but without any other data to use for comparative purposes, such an exercise is clearly pointless.
or rental 'temp. Henry VIII'. It consists of only two membranes and is ostensibly undated. The first membrane has '39' written at the bottom of the recto side and the second membrane, 40, so they were obviously part of a book at one time. Here we have a list of tenants, their rent, to whom paid, a 'value' and, in some cases, arms. For example, John Eritage paid a rent of 24s. to the bishop, was worth 30s. and had a 'swyrd' and a bow and Richard Burbery paid a rent of 46s. to Sir David Owen, was worth £10 and had a bow and a bit. The document concludes with a list of

'ye singule' men Capt apud Byrton (?Burton Dassett) couram John Spencer milit' et Richard Verney armiger iij die aprielis'

Close examination of the document reveals a number of clues as to its date and purpose. Cross-referencing with the court rolls indicates that the free tenants of both Chadshunt and Gaydon are listed first, followed by the customary tenants firstly of Gaydon, then of Chadshunt. The formula of

'the name of all household heads...the amount of their rent, their landlord's name...an assessment of the value of their goods'

together with

'a statement of the arms which they possessed or had access to'

is exactly the one deployed in the compilation of the 1522 muster. It is also clear from the surviving muster for the adjacent Knightlow Hundred that the landless and servants were listed last of all. Besides, the designation of single men 'had some military relevance in view of the preference for unmarried soldiers'. To add to this, John Spencer came from Wormleighton and Richard Verney from Compton Verney,

83 M.H.M. Hulton, ed., Coventry and Its People in the 1520s, Dugdale Society 38 (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1999), p. 12. See the muster for Rutland in J. Cornwall, The County Community under Henry VIII (Oakham, 1980), where the information included where appropriate every tenant's name, lord, value of lands and of goods, and equipment.

84 This is the muster return, the loss of which Julian Cornwall lamented, believing it to have been the muster of the whole county of Warwickshire, which he had seen listed as a small folio book, recorded in 1911 amongst the Middleton manuscripts, but which had disappeared by the time those manuscripts were deposited at Nottingham University. Happily the folio book, which in fact contains only the returns for Knightlow Hundred, is now in the County Record Office in Warwick: J. Cornwall, 'A Tudor Domesday The musters of 1522', Journal of the Society of Archivists 3 (1965), p. 23; WCRO, HR 65/1.

both in Kineton Hundred. The date ‘ij die aprielis’ is highly significant because not only is that the month when the original commission and its responses were completed — indeed on the 25th March ‘Sir Henry Willoughby, a commissioner for Warwickshire...sat upon the mwster’ at Tamworth, and on the 29th did likewise at Birmingham’ — but also the last ‘ij die aprielis’ seen by John Spencer was in 1522 for he died ten days later.\textsuperscript{86} Furthermore, a warrant survives amongst the Spencer Manuscripts at the Northamptonshire Record Office.\textsuperscript{87} It is dated 28 March, the same week that Willoughby ‘sat upon the mwster’, and was drawn up by William Compton, Robert Fulwood, John Spencer and Richard Verney, commissioners of the King, and addressed to the sheriff, bailiffs and constables of Kineton Hundred as well as all curates, who were to ensure the appearance before the commissioners of all the King’s subjects aged 16 and above ‘for the warre and for the defence of the Realme’ and to bring with them ‘a bill of the namys [torn] placis, and harnes of the persons to be vewed wt the valuye of [torn]’. It has long been lamented that no warrant connected to the 1522 muster survives so this is a rare document indeed, until now apparently unknown to historians.\textsuperscript{88}

One final piece of evidence to assist us with dating the document: recorded amongst the tenants at Gaydon we have ‘Agnes Kady wedow’, whose husband died in 1521, and a number of others who had only recently inherited their holdings according to the court rolls. Put together this is very exciting for what else could the document be other than a fragmentary survival of the lost muster roll of 1522 for Kineton Hundred.\textsuperscript{89} Many of the 32 men listed as single (almost as many as the

\textsuperscript{85} Goring, p. 686. For John Spencer's Inquisition Post Mortem see PRO, C 142/40/83.
\textsuperscript{86} NRO, Spencer MSS, no. 1520.
\textsuperscript{87} For example, Cornwall, County Community, p. 3 and Hulton, Coventry and Its People, p. 12. Hulton noted that 'for the actual way in which citizens were gathered or otherwise approached, so that they could provide the vast amount of information needed to satisfy the King's request, we are limited to speculative imagination'. The Spencer Manuscript puts an end to speculation.
\textsuperscript{88} Unfortunately the lay subsidy of 1524/5 for Kineton Hundred is in very poor condition. The entry for Gaydon is lost and under Chadshunt only the names of three men survive (PRO, E 179/192/122), who all appear in PRO, SC 12/16/10. Nevertheless we know from the Commissioners' Certificates that the total tax from Chadshunt was 12s. and that from Gaydon, £1. 10s. 8d: J. Sheail (and R.W. Hoyle, ed.), The Regional Distribution of Wealth in England As Indicated in the 1524/5 Lay Subsidy Returns, List & Index Society Special Series 28, 29 (London, 1998), 29, pp. 365-366. If we take the values expressed in PRO, SC 12/16/10 and act as Tudor subsidy assessors, the tax assessment for Chadshunt works out at about 11s. 4d. and for Gaydon £1. 18s. 4d., neither of which is wildly different from the Commissioners' Certificates, remembering that between the compilation of the 1522 muster
number of customary tenants) are not traceable in the later court rolls. It is possible, therefore, that they were resident in the manor for only one contractual year as servants.

It is possible to identify in later court rolls the activities of a few of the single men named in the Gaydon muster. John Cady is possibly the same John Caddye who appears as a tithingman in 1546, a juror in 1552, and a tithingman again in the mid-1550s. He died sometime before 1569, holding two virgates, which would make him in his 60s if he was 16 or so in 1522.\(^90\) As far back as the mid-fifteenth century there was a Thomas Hunscoote holding two virgates in Gaydon for 15s. His putative descendant, Thomas Hunscoote listed as a single man in 1522, may be identified with Thomas Hunscoote who served as tithingman in 1548 and 1549, and as a juror occasionally in the 1550s, and who was dead by 1569.\(^91\) Coincidentally, the widows of both John and Thomas came to the same manor court in 1569 to surrender holdings to their respective sons, as discussed earlier.

At Itchington in the 1522 muster five servants and children were recorded, none of whom appears subsequently in the court rolls.\(^92\) Of the seventeen assessed as having no land and goods of no value, seven are not traceable in the court rolls. Of the remainder, some earned a living from non-agrarian occupations, while others were sons waiting to take on the family holding. For example, Richard Tydman earned his living by brewing ale, baking bread and selling meat, occasionally assisted by his wife, while Roger and Thomas Tomkyns and John and Richard Watts, members of the two most prolific and substantial families in sixteenth-century Itchington, appear in later court rolls as landholders.\(^93\)

and the 1524/5 subsidies not only were individuals added in and taken out but their contributions varied in both directions: Hulton, p. 14. There are three other known fragmentary survivals from the 1522 muster of Kineton Hundred: Long Compton, PRO, SP 1/29, ff. 147r-v; Cherington, PRO, SP 1/234, ff. 39r-v; Honington, PRO, SP 1/234, ff. 41v, 42r, 43r. They are all in a different hand but the layout of the latter two bear similarities to each other.

\(^90\) BRL, 432664, 432666, 432669, 432670, 432671, 432672, 432691.

\(^91\) LJRO, B/A/21/124078, m. 4v; BRL 432719, 432720, 432721, 432722, 432668, 432674, 432691.

\(^92\) WCRO, HR 65/1, pp. 48-49.

\(^93\) SBTRO, DR 10/2610; BRL, 432660.
Of course we have no real idea of the extent of sub-letting within our area of study for it is true that the extent of subtenure, as well as landlessness, 'remains one of the great unknowns of the sixteenth century.' But there are a few hints. According to the evidence of the newly-identified muster of Chadshunt and Gaydon, six of the eight free tenants, who were nearly all outsiders, sublet their holdings, so that of the eighteen customary tenants in Gaydon, seven were sub-tenants; and of the fourteen customary tenures at Chadshunt, three were occupied by sub-tenants. This suggests land shortage in both places (unlike the situation at Nether Itchington where heirs could apparently not be found for holdings).

7.4 Population turnover, migration and contacts made beyond the manor

As Tawney recognized, population trends are difficult to gauge accurately without 'a sufficient number of continuous series of surveys and rentals', none of which is available to us. But we do have the court rolls and two parish registers. To have both these sources is fortunate, if only to highlight deficiencies of the court rolls in gauging population trends. For example, at Tachbrook in 1557 and 1558 - two years of unusually high mortality - seventeen burials were recorded in the parish register, of which seven were servants and four were husbandmen. Not surprisingly none of the servants' deaths was recorded in the court rolls. Of the four husbandmen, heriots were demanded from the heirs of two of them. No mention is made in the court roll of the third, Thomas Eyres, and the fourth, John Baillie, was at the time of his death...

---

95 PRO, SC 12/16/10.
97 WCRQ, DR 46/1, f. 25v.
98 One of the servants did, in fact, appear in the court rolls in the year of his death. Philip Harries, described in the register as 'a servant man' must have held some land for the court steward noted in an almost illegible scribble, interlined between two expense entries at the end of the court record, that a heriot of 5s. had been paid from his (Philip's) estate: WCRO, DR 46/1, f. 25v; BRL, 432673.
99 They were Thomas Grandam who was buried on 25 September, 1557, and succeeded to his virgate holding by his wife, Elena; and Thomas Ronton, who was buried on May 13 the same year but who had no heir to his cottage and quarter virgate.
Fig. 8 Bishops Tachbrook parish register, 1540-1600
serving as tithingman. The local steward tended to write up parts of the court roll in advance, filling in known information such as the names of all the manorial officials and leaving periodic gaps for their presentments. As Baillie’s name was already written on the roll, the steward interlined it with the word mortis but nowhere on that roll are there any details of Baillie’s landholding, assuming that as both a husbandman and tithingman he held land.

Given the nature and function of the parish register, it paints a more complete picture of population trends. Moreover, we may be confident that in the sixteenth century the record of baptisms was more or less a record of births, and burials, of deaths. Figs 8 and 9 paint a dramatic picture of population trends at Tachbrook and Itchington in the sixteenth century. The devastating impact of epidemic and dearth in the 1550s and 1590s is clear at Tachbrook where the number of marriages dipped as the death rate increased. This was a typical demographic response during or following a mortality crisis. At Itchington the situation is less robust and there is no evident growth in the number of baptisms across the decades. And there is no explanation for a curious statistical aberration, namely that while only four baptisms took place in 1560, there were an astonishing 28 in 1561, including a cluster of four apiece on January 12, 19, 20 and 21, returning more normally to ten in 1562 and eleven in 1563.

An analysis of surnames in the parish register can prove a fruitful means of examining population trends. At Tachbrook between 1540 and 1549 forty-four surnames appear in the baptism and burial sections of the register, of which nineteen (44%) appeared only once (Table 7.2). By the 1590s the number of different surnames had risen to 57 of which twelve persisted from the 1540s. Generally far more surnames of burials than baptisms occur only once which suggests a more stable ageing population, notwithstanding the number of servants who died particularly in the 1550s. While the Itchington parish register does not begin until 1560

100 Thomas Eyres was buried on 12 September, 1557. There is a passing reference to his will (now lost) in 1561: BRL, 432726. John Baillie was buried on 26 May, 1557.
102 Wrigley and Schofield, pp. 359, 363.
103 All references to baptisms, marriages and burials at Tachbrook are taken from WCRO, DR 46/1.
### Table 7.2 Surnames in the parish register of Bishops Tachbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>No. of Surnames Recorded</th>
<th>No. Appearing Once: Baptisms</th>
<th>Burials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1540s</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19 (44%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550s</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23 (51%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560s</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23 (48%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570s</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16 (44%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580s</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18 (38%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590s</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29 (51%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB This Table excludes marriages because frequently either one or both parties were not parishioners.

1 includes one servant 2 includes six servants and two unmarried clergy 3 includes 2 servants (and excludes an unnamed servant), one cleric and one resident of Barford 4 includes two servants (but excludes two servants with no surname) and one newly-married cleric 5 includes two servants (but excludes one servant with no surname) 6 includes two servants 7 excludes one instance where a surname appears twice but is the same child firstly being baptized then buried 8 excludes two instances where a surname appears twice but is the same child firstly being baptized then buried.

And is far less informative than Tachbrook's, it is still possible to establish that from 1560 to 1569 a total of 41 surnames appear in the baptism and burial sections, of which 19 (46%) were recorded only once (Table 7.3).

### Table 7.3 Surnames in the parish register of Bishops Itchington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>No. of Surnames Recorded</th>
<th>No. Appearing Once: Baptisms</th>
<th>Burials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1560s</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19 (46%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570s</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1580s</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24 (50%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590s</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25 (50%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 includes Edward Fisher, son and heir of the lord of the manor 2 excludes one instance where a surname appears twice but is the same child firstly being baptized then buried.

What happened to those families who disappeared? We do not know but some families, although prolific in the earlier part of the register simply peter out. For example, Thomas Trentham had at least three sons, but two died in infancy, and

---

104 All references to baptisms, marriages and burials at Itchington are taken from WCRO, DR 60/1.
following his own death he was succeeded by his widow, Elizabeth, in 1546 who in 1557 withdrew from the 1½ virgate holding and the land remained in the lord's hands as there was no heir. Although William Trentham had several children baptized in the 1550s and 1560s and a later William Trentham was married at Tachbrook in 1568 and was tithingman in the 1580s, the Trenthams disappear from the record by 1590. The Ronton family up to the 1550s had a long record of residency in the manor but also petered out because of a lack of heirs. The last in the line was Thomas, who died in 1557 without an heir to his cottage and quarter-virgate holding. Some prolific families also disappeared from Itchington such as the Camell family, who first appeared in the court rolls in 1493, when Thomas served as a juror. The last in the line, Richard of Upper Itchington, was regularly amerced for disregarding by-laws in the mid-sixteenth century, and served as tithingman in the late 1550s and early 1560s, eventually becoming constable in 1562. He died in 1575 and thereafter there are no further references to this family in the parish register or the court rolls.

Individual members of stable families were also known to migrate. The Watts family first appear in the court rolls in the late fifteenth century and dominate the sixteenth-century court rolls and parish register. In a survey of the poor drawn up in Warwick in 1586, was recorded the following entry:

```
an Inmate Margery Watts of age xi ty yeres she hath ii chieldern Willm of age xij & Rudeford age viij they all beg. are appointed to go home to bishops Itchington.
```

This is probably the Margery Drury who married Anthony Wattes at Itchington in 1574 and who had a son, William, baptized in 1576 after which this branch of the family

---

105 BRL, 432664; BRL, 432673. WCRO, DR 46/1, ff. 2r, 2v, 3r, 24v, 25r, 26v. Thomas Trentham left a will written in 1546 but now lost, which had it survived would have been useful in establishing his heirs: LJRO, P/C/10/I. Elizabeth died in 1567.

106 WCRO, DR 46/1 passim; SBTRO, DR 10/2614.

107 WCRO, DR 46/1, f. 25v, BRL, 432673. In the fifteenth century an earlier Thomas Ronton served for a long period as bailiff of Tachbrook and Itchington: SRO, D(W) 1734/3/2/4; WSL, S. MS. 335 (1); LJRO, B/A/21/123984. The same Thomas in a charter of 1471 granted out land in Tachbrook belonging to his late wife Joan and in a charter of 1505 Thomas' son, John, regranted the same land: PRO, E 326/B4923 now E 326/4923; PRO, E 326/B4951 now E 326/4951; see also PRO, E 326/B4928 now E 326/4928.

108 BRL, 432657, SBTRO, DR 10/2609, 2610, BRL, 432660, 432681, and sixteenth-century court rolls passim.

disappears from the parish register. In the court rolls an Anthony Watts appears at Chadshunt in 1579 as the holder of an alehouse, his sole appearance in the court rolls and the only instance of this extensive family appearing anywhere other than Itchington. The distressing case of Margery Watts demonstrates that life beyond the manor could be very harsh indeed even in the thriving town of Warwick where there ought to have been ample opportunity to improve one's economic lot.

The twelve families who appear at Tachbrook from the 1540s up to the end of the century came from a wide social spectrum, ranging from the Olneys (members of the gentry) to the W(h)oods. The Olney family first appear in the court rolls in 1399. By the sixteenth century several members of the family appear with great frequency in both the court rolls and the parish register. One of its principals, Edmund, died in 1550 and was succeeded by his grandson, Thomas, then aged only 14, to a three-virgate holding and another half virgate. He was probably the Thomas Olney who sold land to William Commander in 1565 and was involved in land exchanges with Thomas Fisher in the early 1570s (Chapter 6). The Olneys were adept at marrying into other prosperous Tachbrook families and therein lay their durability. John Olney, said to be the son of the afore-mentioned Edmund, married in 1541 and had six children baptized between 1542 and 1556. Of his children, William was baptized in 1542 and in 1572 married Isabel Catesbie. Their daughter, Sara, married John, son of the late Henry Eires in 1594, by which time William had been widowed and subsequently married to Henry Eires' widow, Joan, who was the daughter of Henry Murcot. Joan had married Henry Eires (son of Thomas, and baptized at Tachbrook in 1546) in 1571 and they had five children, the last born after Henry's death in 1579. William Olney's sister, Anne, baptized in 1546, married Edward Murcote in 1574 but tragically died later the same year two days after the baptism of their only child.

---
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William Olney's brother, Abraham, baptized in 1554, married Susan, the daughter of William Comander, in 1580 and they had seven children, all but the youngest surviving into adulthood. Here is indeed a veritable list of the foremost families of sixteenth-century Tachbrook. Not surprisingly, in the 1543 lay subsidy three of the four wealthiest inhabitants of Tachbrook were Edmund, Michael (both with goods worth £10) and Thomas Olney (goods worth £9).  

When Thomas Olney sold land to William Commander in 1565, it included two messuages, one of which was occupied by Simon Whood. The sole reference to Simon in the court rolls is as the victim of assault, the perpetrator co-incidentally being the same William Commander although the incident was some 13 years earlier. But Simon's family appears regularly in the parish register, indeed, four generations may be traced between 1540 and 1600. Simon was recorded as a labourer in 1568 in the burial register. His son, Michael, was both baptized and married at Tachbrook, and in turn had two sons, one of whom, Richard, was also baptized and married there. And Richard had at least two sons baptized at Tachbrook. In the 1543 lay subsidy Simon Whood was assessed as having goods worth 20s. as were about one-third of those taxed at Tachbrook.  

Of the eleven families who remained at Itchington throughout the second half of the sixteenth century there were the Tomkyns's, a prolific family, who came to dominate land, manorial offices and the brewing trade in the sixteenth century at both Upper and Nether Itchington; and the Syvarnes, one simple nuclear family. The earliest reference to the Tomkyns family is in 1355 when it was noted that William Tomkyns of Itchington, the lord’s villein, was said to be staying in the adjacent manor of Ladbrooke. By the sixteenth century this family is so prolific in the court rolls and parish register that they are difficult to disentangle. There are some who only appear once or twice, such as Anthony who defaulted in his suit of court in 1557 and 1562; and Geoffrey of Upper Itchington whose unnamed wife was amerced for brewing in  

---  
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Conversely those named William, Thomas, John, Roger or Edward, both junior and senior and from Upper and Nether Itchington, seem innumerable. From a variety of sources a sketchy generational progress is possible. William Thomkyns of Nether Itchington had three sons according to his will drawn up in 1505, John, Richard (who had a son named William), and Thomas of Upper Itchington, the latter making his own will in 1513. This Thomas had four sons and two daughters, John, Richard, Thomas, George, Alice and Elizabeth. Richard’s son, William, was possibly the cottar of Upper Itchington who was amerced in 1548 for carting away furze from the common heath - an offence for which he was frequently arraigned - and was also barred from selling ale. In the same court his wife, Agnes, was amerced for brewing. Agnes was widowed in 1557 and accepted her late husband’s cottage, paying a heriot of 6s. 8d. She continued to brew for at least another four years. Also at Upper Itchington was another Thomas who was tithingman in 1551. He died in 1558 and was succeeded by his wife, Alice, to a composite four-virgate holding from which two heriots were due. In her widowhood she sold ale and was indeed debarred from doing so in 1565. An Edward also served as tithingman of Upper Itchington in the mid-1550s and was elected constable in 1565, in which year he was made to forfeit a half virgate which he had unlawfully leased to his brother, Thomas. Edward died in 1581 a few days after his wife, Isabel, and two heriots were demanded from his heir indicating that he must also have held a composite holding, its size was not specified. In his will he left bequests to his own parish church at Upper Itchington and to one other, significantly Ladbroke. His will revealed an incredible network of credit. He owed more than £12 to five different men, four of them from neighbouring manors, the fifth, Thomas Drury of Tanworth-in-Arden. But in
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turn he was owed over £50 by eighteen men and one woman. At least six of them were neighbours in Itchington, whereas others came from neighbouring manors and from the market towns of Southam and Stratford. Mostly the reasons for the debts are not specified but an exception was the 30s. owed by Thomas Drury for two lands of barley and two of peas and a further 9s. for peas.

At Nether Itchington Edward died in 1518 and was succeeded by his son, Richard, to a virgate, possibly the same who was ale-taster in Nether Itchington in 1548 and again in 1550, at the same time his wife was brewing. In 1552 a Richard junior accepted a virgate late of Thomas Ladbroke in Nether Itchington. Of four different Johns, one was elected ale-taster of Upper and Nether Itchington in 1556. He died in 1560 and was succeeded by a Roger Tompkins to his 1½ virgate holding in Nether Itchington. Of four different Thomas's, one from Nether Itchington was amerced for mowing all his furlongs in 1548 and for having unringed pigs in 1555. There were also at least three Rogers, one of which served as tithingman in 1518. Another was amerced in 1550 for not doing the common pound at Nether Itchington and was elected tithingman there in 1562. By the early 1560s all four tithingmen and even the constable (Thomas junior) were from the Tompkins family: John and Edward at Upper Itchington and Richard and Roger at Nether Itchington.

Interestingly there is only one instance between 1560 and 1600 of a male Tompkins marrying at Itchington and that was in 1560. This family was not acquiring land in Itchington through marriage. While the dominance of the Tompkins family is clear, there is no evidence that they expropriated their fellow villagers. It seems simply that they opportunistically took over unwanted vacant holdings (see also Chapter 6) and were also willing to take on manorial offices.

The Syvarne family provides a complete contrast. We learn from the will of Edward Tomkins of Upper Itchington that Humphrey Syvarne was a weaver, indeed he...
witnessed the will in 1581. Humphrey was baptized at Itchington in 1563 and married Katherin, the daughter of Henry Howse, a husbandman, in early 1572. They had five children baptized between 1591 and 1599. There are only two court roll references to the Syvarne family: in 1559 Humphrey was amerced for not helping his neighbours in a routine agrarian task and in 1579 for not grinding at the lord's mill.

The tenants within our area of study had many opportunities to make contact beyond the manor, including commercial transactions and membership of guilds. As we saw in Chapter 5, according to the evidence of a sixteenth-century account book of Peter Temple of Burton Dassett and Thomas Heritage of London, 'Robyns of Tachebroke' on one occasion bought 240 'sherehoges' and on another, a further 240 'wetherhogges' and 2 oxen were bought from 'Burbery of Geydon' at Banbury. From another source, The Book of John Fisher, we learn of the involvement of tenants at Tachbrook in the illegal speculation of corn. As a result of harvest failure in 1586 seventeen articles were issued in the town of Warwick, including a ban on engrossing corn with the intention of selling it on. Tachbrook, lying adjacent to Warwick, was well placed to attract speculators such as William Ichener, John Townesend, Thomas Grene and John Weale who went to Tachbrook and bought 'a close of barley Rye & Otes' growing there. Furthermore, the same Townesend bought five quarters of barley 'out of the market' from Michael Comaunder of Tachbrook.

Commercial as well as familial contacts are often apparent in bequests made in wills. Before the Reformation it was standard for donations to be made to the testator's parish church and to the mother church of the diocese. Donations to other churches often suggest familial as well as social links. William Thomkyns of Itchington bequeathed 10s. to the parish church at Nether Itchington and 3s. 4d. to the chapel at Upper Itchington as well as 4d. to the mother church. His wider contacts are evident
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in his bequest of 20d. to the church at Chesterton and a sheep to the church at Harbury. Apart from £2. 8s. 8d. and two torches bequeathed to the two places of worship in Itchington, William's son, Thomas, bequeathed 3s. 4d. each to the churches at Harbury, Ladbroke, Chesterton, Gaydon, Burton Dassett and Ufton, and further afield, Leamington, Oxhill, and Tysoe, and 12d. apiece to Radway and Ratley churches. As we saw earlier, Edward Tomkins was involved in an extensive network of credit, owing and being owed money to people from neighbouring manors, as well as Tanworth-in-Arden, and the market towns of Southam and Stratford.

Fraternities and guilds were not merely meetings of people devoted to the release of souls from Purgatory. They were an important point of social contact. One of the most important guilds in medieval Warwickshire was the one at Knowle, which became 'a focal point for the numbers of minor gentry and prosperous yeomen resident in the area'. In the sixteenth century members included John Tydname and his wife and John and Alice Savage from Itchington, seven couples from Chadshunt, representing more than a third of landholders there; eleven couples from Gaydon; and William and Joan Comawnder of Tachbrook. John Tomkyns of Itchington appears as a member of the Corpus Christi and St Nicholas Guild of Coventry in 1501, as do William Botham, vicar of Itchington, and Thomas Comawnder of Tachbrook in 1534. It may be observed that those who had contacts beyond the manor, whether commercial or religious, tended to be from the more affluent families.

144 PRO, PROB 11/15, f. 27v (4 Adeane): William Thomkyns, Bishops Itchington, 14 December, 1505. The Tomkins family was resident in Harbury in the early fourteenth century.
145 PRO, PROB 11/17, ff. 138r-138v (18 Fetiplace): Thomas Tomkyns, Bishops Itchington, 9 June, 1513.
147 Carpenter, Locality and Polity, p. 338. See also W.B. Bickley, ed., The Register of the Guild of Knowle in the County of Warwick 1451-1535 (Walsall, 1894) and A.A. Upton, The Collegiate Church of Saints John Baptist, Laurence and Anne of Knowle Warwickshire (Southsea, 1966).
149 John Tomkyns acted as his brother Thomas' executor in 1513, together with Thomas Comawnder of Warwick, whose family was gradually migrating into Tachbrook; CCRO, BA/B/Q/23/1, ff. 116v, 119v, 312v, 313r, from an unpublished transcript made by A.A. Upton; PRO, PROB 11/17, ff. 138r-138v (18 Fetiplace): Thomas Tomkyns, Bishops Itchington, 9 June, 1513.
Conclusion

The community of the vill formulated by-laws to regulate gaming, expressing particular concern about the activities of servants and those who facilitated such pursuits. The irregular sale of ale was also targeted, as well as the giving of hospitality to undesirable people, the taking in of sub-tenants - servants in husbandry being a permitted exception - and the harbouring of unmarried pregnant women. Concern was expressed about the maintenance of buildings, which was not always easy for tenants who had taken on a multiple holding and allowed surplus buildings to fall into ruin, or who lived in poverty.

There was virtually no evidence of land transfers being made inter-vivos within our area of study. At Gaydon and Chadshunt land moved from one generation to the next and it was rare for surrenders to be made to the lord. At Tachbrook this was also the case apart from in years of mortality crisis. Land transfers were more volatile at Itchington and some tenants, notably from the Tompkyns family, were able to take advantage at times of slack demand, to build up composite holdings. But there is no evidence that they were expropriating their neighbours. An analysis of the activities of the landless have shown them as servants being amerced for gaming and as beneficiaries of their masters' wills; and as sons waiting to take on the family holding.

A statistical study of the parish registers of Tachbrook and Itchington has highlighted the number of surnames which appeared only once. Of the long-staying families at Tachbrook, the Olneys consolidated their existence by marrying into other well-established families but even the lowly Whoode family remained for at least four generations. At Itchington the Tompkyns family dominated land, manorial offices and the brewing trade in the sixteenth century at both Upper and Nether Itchington but by being opportunistic. By contrast the Syvarnes survived as one nuclear family. Those who made contacts beyond the confines of the manor through commercial transactions or membership of guilds were often from the more prosperous families such as the Tompkyns's.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

We now return to the issues raised in the Introduction to this thesis. In the later middle ages did an acquisitive, capitalist-minded aristocracy expropriate the rural peasantry from the land as Brenner has argued or were the peasants themselves the agents of change as Whittle has robustly countered? The debate surrounding this important subject has a long history and many sides to it. Tawney noted the emergence by the mid-sixteenth century of fewer and larger tenancies as several holdings were consolidated and judged that this phenomenon was caused by the edging out of small-scale peasant farmers by greedy lords. While Beresford also put the emphasis on lords, as well as outsiders, Hilton was concerned to concentrate less on avaricious individuals and more on the overall social and economic troubles which beset the later middle ages. Enclosure and engrossing have also been favourite culprits in the disappearance of the English peasantry. According to the eviction model of enclosure, which accords well with Brenner's arguments, enclosures were effected by manorial lords who evicted their tenants, converted the land to pasture, and operated it as a large capitalist enterprise. Both Hilton and Dyer have successfully demonstrated that in fact between 1450 and 1525 depopulation preceded enclosure as a result of, for example, tenants drifting from marginal grain-growing areas to more productive farming districts. The abandoned land then passed into the hands of the manorial lord, and became ipso facto enclosed. In other
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circumstances, as Spufford observed, tenants of medium-sized holdings often fell victim to the actions of their more successful engrossing peers.⁶

In this thesis we have embarked on an in-depth study of the medieval Warwickshire manors of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield in the context of the issues which were explored in the Introduction in order to find reasons why Chadshunt and Nether Itchington succumbed to depopulation, whereas Gaydon, Upper Itchington and Tachbrook continue today to thrive. Chapter 2 set the scene in historical and geographical terms with an examination of the early history of the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield and the topographical setting and field system of each manor. Evidence of a dispersed pre-nucleation settlement layout was discovered at Tachbrook, on the surface a classic nucleated Feldon manor. Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon were found to lie in a distinctively wold-like region. The field systems of each manor proved to be unusual in different ways: the splitting of Tachbrook Episcopi and Tachbrook Mallory and the subsequent development of two discrete field systems; and the very complex and fascinating situation at Upper and Nether Itchington, and Chadshunt and Gaydon. The principal aim of both Chapters 3 and 4 was to seek out evidence of weaknesses and incipient problems or otherwise in both the rural economy and social structure in order to find early signs of the later problems which beset Chadshunt and Nether Itchington. In Chapter 3 the demesne economy in the late-thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries was explored, with the diametrically opposite views of Postan (according to whom there was an inertia in medieval agricultural productivity) and Campbell (who is more upbeat in his views of agricultural progress and innovation) borne in mind.⁷ Between 1298 and 1307 there was an apparent expansion of arable at both Itchington and Chadshunt;
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peas were sown on fallow land, extra oxen were brought in and the sheep flock was increased, all pointing to an investment mentality rather than weaknesses in the rural economy. But this was scuppered by a lengthy and disruptive process of sequestration. Furthermore the situation was not helped by the onset of adverse weather, a dramatic surge in the price of grain and the disappearance of sheep from the landscape as a result of being sequestered and never restored. In Chapter 4 the relationship between the lord of the manor (exemplified by Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, 1296-1321) and his tenants was explored and the tenants analysed in the context of landholding and tenurial obligations. The *famuli* also emerged from the shadows. Although the manors lay at the periphery of the bishop's vast estate Walter Langton visited regularly. The majority of his tenants were unfree but some at least enjoyed commutation of very heavy labour services from the late thirteenth century. By the middle of the fourteenth century while the number of free tenants and the rent paid had changed little since 1298, the number of unfree had been drastically reduced at Tachbrook, and not inconsiderably at Itchington and Gaydon. But at Chadshunt unfree holdings remained filled. We cannot therefore say that there were inherent problems in social structure in the fourteenth century at Chadshunt which may have contributed to later problems. Nor that the sixteenth-century survival and prosperity of Tachbrook lay in its fourteenth-century prospects. As late as 1360 there are no obvious signs at Chadshunt to mark it out as a 'to-be-deserted' settlement, albeit it was smaller than average and had a high proportion of customary tenants. But Tachbrook also had a large number of customary tenants as well as cottars and was in serious decline by 1360, belying the success which it was to enjoy in the sixteenth-century.

In Chapter 5 we saw evidence of both continuity and change in the landscape, including the very bold transition from a two- to a three-field system at Gaydon by the end of the sixteenth century. Indeed such agrarian innovation may help explain Gaydon's durability as a viable settlement. Agrarian by-laws ensured that the infrastructure of each manor was maintained and that resources such as the heath were fairly managed. An analysis of peasant cultivation of crops and ownership of livestock highlighted the wide economic disparity between tenants. In Chapter 6 it was made apparent that successive bishops of Coventry and Lichfield; in common
with many great ecclesiastical landowners, generally failed to benefit from the economic upsurge of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, although efforts were made particularly in the mid-fifteenth century to lower rents in order to maintain tenant numbers. The arrival of Thomas Fisher as lord in 1547 heralded many changes. Since the days of Dugdale he has been held up as a blatant example of a capitalist-minded member of the gentry who was engaged in the expropriation of the rural population from the land at Nether Itchington, and has also been blamed for demolishing the parish church. In this thesis it has been argued that Fisher was not guilty of either offence. Instead it is now possible to point to a decline in ale-brewing, a lack of heirs at Nether Itchington from 1550s, a seigneurial policy whereby tenants were encouraged by very favourable terms to take up holdings in Upper Itchington, and the turbulence caused by the Reformation. The desertion of Nether Itchington is highly unusual for a number of reasons. It was the main centre of population which declined and the secondary settlement, Upper Itchington, which continued to thrive. The desertion happened long after the main period of depopulation in Warwickshire, which had mostly been effected by the end of the fifteenth century. Fisher was also not responsible for the decline of Chadshunt. He sold the lordship of that manor to the Newsam family whose enclosing activities in the mid- and late-sixteenth century probably sowed the early seeds of ultimate decline. Fisher’s period of lordship saw the beginning of the end of communal agriculture at Tachbrook as leading tenants exchanged strips in order to build up compact holdings. This radical change in the management of the landscape may well have contributed to Tachbrook’s stability. In Chapter 7 we explored how the community of the vill formulated by-laws in order to maintain order. An analysis of land transfers highlighted the lack of inter-vivos transactions. At Gaydon and Chadshunt land moved from one generation to the next and it was rare for surrenders to be made to the lord. At Tachbrook this was also the case apart from in years of mortality crisis. Land transfers were more volatile at Itchington and some tenants, notably from the Tompkins family, were able to take advantage at times of slack demand, to build up composite holdings. Holdings were being consolidated into fewer and larger tenancies but there is no evidence of tenants being expropriated or of tenants of medium-sized holdings falling victim to the actions of their more successful engrossing peers. An analysis of the activities of the landless
has revealed them as servants being amerced for gaming and as beneficiaries of their masters' wills; and as sons waiting to take on the family holding. A statistical study of the parish registers of Tachbrook and Itchington highlighted the number of surnames which appeared only once. The greater number of surnames in the burial register at Tachbrook suggested a more stable ageing population, while at Itchington the preponderance of surnames in the baptism register occurring only once hinted at a more transient and younger population. Of the long-staying families at Tachbrook, the Olneys consolidated their existence by marrying into other well-established families but even the lowly Whoode family remained for at least four generations. At Itchington the Tompkins family dominated land, manorial offices and the brewing trade in the sixteenth century at both Upper and Nether Itchington. By contrast the Syvarnes survived as one nuclear family and rarely featured in the court rolls. Those who made contacts beyond the confines of the manor through commercial transactions or membership of guilds were often from the more prosperous families such as the Tompkins's.

It is suggested that Tachbrook and Gaydon survived principally because of innovative agrarian reorganisation in the sixteenth century, the presence of long-staying families such as the Olneys and Caddys, and continuity in inheritance with land rarely being left vacant. Upper Itchington to a great extent owed its viability to the fact that tenants were encouraged by the lord to settle there, and that tenants were able to build up composite holdings. The seeds of decline at Chadshunt seem to have been sown by the Newsam family and their enclosing activities. Nether Itchington declined because of a lack of heirs from the 1550s, a loss of facilities such as brewing, and an unusually lengthy interregnum during which the vicarage and the parish church fell into decay. So where bustling communities once lay at Chadshunt and Nether Itchington, 'the sounds of population fail'. Only open-field emptiness remains.

---

APPENDIX 1

CROPS AT CHADSHUNT AND ITCHINGTON,
EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY

Wheat sown in Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yield of previous year</th>
<th>Amount sown</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Seeding ratio</th>
<th>Subsequent yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt 1307</td>
<td>28 qrs 2 bs</td>
<td>31 qrs 4 bs</td>
<td>120 a</td>
<td>2 bs per acre</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington 1307</td>
<td>115 qrs ½ bs 1 peck</td>
<td>27 qrs 3 bs</td>
<td>108 a 1 r</td>
<td>2 bs per acre</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>illegible</td>
<td>29 qrs 6 bs</td>
<td>115½ a 10 p</td>
<td>2 bs per acre</td>
<td>61 qrs 3 bs/4.24 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>61 qrs 3 bs</td>
<td>29 qrs 6 bs</td>
<td>90 a</td>
<td>3 bs per acre</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Sources: LJRO, D 30/N6 now D 30/11/102, Account roll Chadshunt, 1306-1307; D 30/N9 now D 30/11/101, Account roll Itchington, 1306-1307; D 30/N7 now D 30/11/99, Account roll Itchington, 1309-1310; D 30/N8 now D 30/11/100, Account roll Itchington, 1310-1311. Occasionally figures do not add up but the data have not been modified to take this into account.

2 The figures include both tithe and seed. Lennard was certain that the tithe element of the corn crop was deducted before the manorial account was drawn up therefore 'the statistician seeking for figures of medieval corn production must add one-ninth to the quantities given': R. Lennard, 'Statistics of corn yields in medieval England: some critical questions,' Economic History 3 no. 11 (1936), pp. 174, 183. It is clear in the account rolls that tithe was not deducted at either Itchington or Chadshunt before the accounts were drawn up.
Wheat purchased, Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>amount purchased</th>
<th>reason</th>
<th>price per qr</th>
<th>total cost</th>
<th>total % of year's wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>5 qr s</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>3s. 1d.</td>
<td>£5. 16s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 qr s 6 bs</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>3s. 2d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 qr s</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>3s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 bs</td>
<td>famuli</td>
<td>2s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total: 37 qr s 3 bs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>2 qr s</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>3s. 2d.</td>
<td>£5. 0s. 6¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 qr s 3 bs</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>3s. 1d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 qr 2 bs</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>3s. 9d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total: 19 qr s 5 bs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>10 qr s 6 bs</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>10s.</td>
<td>£7. 2s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 qr s²</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>6s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 qr s²</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>5s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total: 16 qr s 6 bs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>3½ qr s 1 bs</td>
<td>famuli³</td>
<td>6s.</td>
<td>£1. 19s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 qr s 7 bs</td>
<td>new grain</td>
<td>6s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total: 6½ qr s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 bought from the parson of Chesterton (an adjacent manor)
2 bought from the Precentor, the holder of the advowson
3 maslin
### Wheat sold from Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount Sold</th>
<th>Price per qr</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total % of Year's Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chadshunt | 1307 | 5 qrs 1 bs  
1 'stack'\(^1\)  
3 qrs 1½ bs s.c.  
Total: 6 qrs 2½ bs and 1 'stack' | 3s. 1d.  
£6. 13s. 4d.  
2s. 10d. | £7. 18s. 3¾d.  
18% |
| Itchington | 1307 | 8 qrs 'old'  
5 qrs 5 bs  
3 qrs  
4 bs s.c.  
Total: 17 qrs 1 bs | 2s. 6d.  
2s. 6d.  
2s. 8d.  
3s. | £2. 3s. 6¾d.  
15% |
|  | 1310 | 23 qrs  
1 bs s.c. | 6s. 8d.  
6s. 8d. | £7. 14s. 2d.  
unknown |
|  | 1311 | 4 qrs 6 bs  
2½ qrs  
Total: 7 qrs 2 bs | 6s.  
6s. | |

---

1 The size of the 'stack' is not specified where it is mentioned in the sales section on the *recto* side of the account roll and is left out of the grange account on the *verso* side, therefore is not included in the % of year's yield.

s.c.: *super compotum*, that is to say, unaccounted wheat for which the reeve was held responsible, a system first described by Drew in his analysis of Winchester Cathedral Priory records: see J.S. Drew, 'Manorial Accounts of St. Swithun's Priory, Winchester', *Economic History Review* 62 (1947), pp. 29-30.
Other disposal of wheat, Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>recipient</th>
<th>amount</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>beadle</td>
<td>3 qrs</td>
<td>26½ qrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>famuli</em></td>
<td>14½ qrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>serjeant of Tachbrook</td>
<td>9 qrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>master carter</td>
<td>4 qrs 2½ bs</td>
<td>61 qrs 2½ bs ½ peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beadle</td>
<td>3 qrs 5½ bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>famuli</em></td>
<td>16 qrs 7 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>serjeant of Tachbrook</td>
<td>2½ qrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reeve of Chadshunt</td>
<td>1 qr 3 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King's bailiff</td>
<td>24 qrs 2 bs ½ peck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precentor, tithe</td>
<td>8 qrs 2½ bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>master carter</td>
<td>4 qrs 2½ bs</td>
<td>103 qrs 5 bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beadle</td>
<td>3 qrs 5½ bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>famuli</em></td>
<td>10 qrs 2 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lardarium domini</td>
<td>54 qrs 5 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bishop's visits</td>
<td>7½ qrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manorial court</td>
<td>2 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precentor, tithe</td>
<td>8 qrs 2½ bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>master carter</td>
<td>4 qrs 2½ bs</td>
<td>34 qrs 7 bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beadle</td>
<td>3 qrs 5½ bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>famuli</em></td>
<td>4 qrs 7 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hog</td>
<td>1 qr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lardarium domini</td>
<td>19 qrs 6 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bishop's visits</td>
<td>2 bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precentor, tithe</td>
<td>8 qrs 2½ bs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Dredge sown in Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yield of Previous Year</th>
<th>Amount Sown</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Seeding Ratio</th>
<th>Subsequent Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>246 qrs 5 bs</td>
<td>44½ qrs</td>
<td>88½ a</td>
<td>4 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>159 qrs&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>37½ qrs</td>
<td>67 a 3½ r</td>
<td>4 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>58 qrs&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>40½ qrs</td>
<td>81 a</td>
<td>4 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>57 qrs&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>52 qrs 2 bs</td>
<td>99 a 1 r</td>
<td>4 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 supplemented by 11 qrs from Chadshunt
2 supplemented by the purchase of 27 qrs 2 bs from the parson of Chesterton
3 supplemented by 31 qrs from Chadshunt and 52 qrs from Tachbrook
### Disposal of dredge, Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount Sold</th>
<th>Price per qr</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt 1307</td>
<td>121 qrs 6 bs 50 qrs 3 bs (as malt) 6 qrs 3 bs s.c.</td>
<td>3s. 3s. 4d. 3s.</td>
<td>£19. 19s. 4¾d.</td>
<td>44½ qrs seed 11 qrs to the reeve of Itchington 11 qrs to the reeve of Tachbrook total: 66½ qrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington 1307</td>
<td>5 qrs ‘weak’ 75 qrs 6 bs 30 qrs³</td>
<td>2s. 8d. 3s. 7d.</td>
<td>£13. 4d. £11. 7s. 3d. £5. 7s. 4d. total: £19. 3s. 11d.</td>
<td>37½ qrs seed 4 qrs 2 bs to the King total: 41 qrs 6 bs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>6 qrs 2 bs</td>
<td>4s. 4d.</td>
<td>£27. 1d.</td>
<td>40½ qrs seed 34½ qrs ad lardarium domini 3 qrs ox fodder total: 78 qrs⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>3 qrs 12 qrs</td>
<td>3s. 3s. 4d.</td>
<td>£9.</td>
<td>52 qrs 2 bs seed 3 qrs ox fodder 80 qrs 2bs malted ad lardarium domini total: 135½ qrs⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total: 15 qrs/26% of yield</td>
<td></td>
<td>total: £2. 9s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 none purchased
2 52 qrs was made into malt but a small amount was not sold
3 sold at Lichfield
4 27 qrs 2 bs of which was purchased from Chesterton at 6s. per qr
5 including 12 qrs left over from previous year, 31 qrs from Chadshunt and 52 qrs from Tachbrook
## Oats sown in Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yield of Previous Year</th>
<th>Amount Sown</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Seeding Ratio</th>
<th>Subsequent Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>72 qrs 1 bs</td>
<td>22 qrs 5 bs</td>
<td>44½ a³</td>
<td>4 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>22 qrs</td>
<td>18 qrs 3 bs</td>
<td>36½ a</td>
<td>4 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5 qrs</td>
<td>10 a</td>
<td>4 bs per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>8 qrs</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120 further acres were sown but the accountant omitted the seed total.

## Purchase and disposal of oats, Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount Purchased</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Price Per Qr</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>11 qrs 6 bs</td>
<td>fodder</td>
<td>1s. 6d.</td>
<td>17s. 7½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 qrs</td>
<td>potage</td>
<td>1s. 8d.</td>
<td>3s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 qrs</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2s.</td>
<td>8s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total: 17qrs 6 bs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total: 28s. 11½d.</td>
<td>22 qrs 5 bs seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 qrs cattle fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 qrs 3 bs horse fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5½ bs visiting horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 qrs to the reeve of Itchington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 qrs potage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½ bs remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total: 89 qrs 7 bs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Purchase and disposal of oats, Chadshunt and Itchington, early fourteenth century (cotd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1307&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1310&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4½ qrs</td>
<td>horse fodder</td>
<td>1s. 6d.</td>
<td>1s. 8d.</td>
<td>6s. 9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>1 qr 6 bs</td>
<td>horse fodder</td>
<td>1s. 8d.</td>
<td>2s. 11d.</td>
<td>9½ qrs cattle fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 qrs</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>1s. 10d.</td>
<td>5s. 7d.</td>
<td>25 qrs 3 bs horse fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9½ qrs</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1s. 7d.</td>
<td>15s. ½d.</td>
<td>9 bs visiting horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 qrs</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1s. 8d.</td>
<td>3s. 4d.</td>
<td>3 qrs 3 bs potage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total:</td>
<td>20 qrs 6 bs</td>
<td></td>
<td>total:</td>
<td>£1. 13s. 7½d.</td>
<td>total:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1311&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5½ qrs</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 qrs</td>
<td>fodder</td>
<td>2s. 6d.</td>
<td>14s. 8d.</td>
<td>19 qrs 2½ bs horse fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2½ qrs</td>
<td>fodder</td>
<td>2s. 8d.</td>
<td>12s. 6d.</td>
<td>1 qr horses of Tachbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 qrs 6 bs</td>
<td>fodder</td>
<td>2s. 4d.</td>
<td>6s. 9d.</td>
<td>1 qr 6 bs visiting horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 qrs</td>
<td>potage</td>
<td>2s. 8d.</td>
<td>8s. 9d.</td>
<td>1 qr 1 bs at court for horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total:</td>
<td>18 qrs 6 bs</td>
<td></td>
<td>total:</td>
<td>£2. 5s. 11d.</td>
<td>total:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 2 qrs sold <i>super compotum</i> at 1s. 6d. per qr
2 1 qr 1 bs sold <i>super compotum</i> at 3s. per qr and 6 qrs 2 bs brought in from Tachbrook
3 and 3 qrs brought in from Chadshunt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Price (Currency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1 qr 5 bs</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>6s. 8d.</td>
<td>9s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total: 1 qr 5 bs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total: 9s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1311³</td>
<td>6½ qrs beans and peas</td>
<td>seed</td>
<td>4s. 2d.</td>
<td>£1. 7s. 1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 qrs</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>4s.</td>
<td>12s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 qrs 1½ bs</td>
<td>livery</td>
<td>3s. 6d.</td>
<td>7s. 7¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total: 11 qrs 5½ bs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total: £2. 6s. 8¾d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 none sold
2 sold *super compotum* 1 bs for 2½d and 4 qrs 2 bs brought in from Itchington
3 sold *super compotum* 3 bs for 6s. 9d.
## APPENDIX 2

### LIVESTOCK AT CHADSHUNT AND ITCHINGTON, EARLY FOURTEENTH CENTURY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chadshunt</th>
<th>1307 oxen</th>
<th>Itchington</th>
<th>1307 oxen</th>
<th>Itchington</th>
<th>1310 oxen</th>
<th>Itchington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+14 bought</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1 heriot</td>
<td>+7 bought</td>
<td></td>
<td>+2 bought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 dead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1 dead</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2 sold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7 sold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-6 sold</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2, delivered to Sawley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 remain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47 remain</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 yearlings, delivered to the King

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>horses</th>
<th>3 cart-horses</th>
<th>3 foals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 cart-horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 foal, delivered to Longdon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>horses</th>
<th>4 cart-horses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+1 bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 sold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 sold super compotum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other livestock</td>
<td>other livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 sheep</td>
<td>298 sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+60 from Itchington</td>
<td>+240 from Cannock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-17 dead</td>
<td>-11 dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206 remain, delivered to the King</td>
<td>-60, delivered to Chadshunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-213, delivered to Tachbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>254 remain, delivered to the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 lambs remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pigs, 1 sow and</td>
<td>17 pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 piglets from Itchington</td>
<td>-4, delivered to Chadshunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+7 bought</td>
<td>13 remain, delivered to the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3 sold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 remain, delivered to the King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 geese</td>
<td>6 geese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+28 of issue</td>
<td>+25 of issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 in tithe</td>
<td>-3 dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 dead</td>
<td>-22 expended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-19 expended</td>
<td>6 remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5 super comptum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 peacocks</td>
<td>14 peacocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1 of issue</td>
<td>+4 of issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4 dead</td>
<td>-1 dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 remain</td>
<td>17 remain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

NUMBER OF TENANTS AND SIZE OF HOLDINGS,
1279 AND 1298 COMPARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1279 Manor</th>
<th>No. of Free</th>
<th>Total of Free Land</th>
<th>No. of Unfree</th>
<th>Total of Unfree Land</th>
<th>No. of Cottars</th>
<th>Total of Cottar Land</th>
<th>Total No. of Tenants</th>
<th>Total Land Held by Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tachbrook</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15 ½ virgates*</td>
<td>19 half-virgates</td>
<td>9 ½ virgates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50 acres**</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26 virgates and 18 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: one virgate = 32 acres
* one five-virgater, one four virgater, two two-virgaters, two virgaters and one half-virgater
** 8 cottages with 5 acres apiece and one cottage with 10 acres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1298 Manor</th>
<th>No. of Free</th>
<th>Total of Free Land</th>
<th>No. of Unfree</th>
<th>Total of Unfree Land</th>
<th>No. of Cottars</th>
<th>Total of Cottar Land</th>
<th>Total No. of Tenants</th>
<th>Total Land Held by Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tachbrook</td>
<td>2 free</td>
<td>1½ virgates and ½ league*</td>
<td>19 half-virgaters</td>
<td>9½ virgates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100 acres***</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16 virgates, ½ league and 4 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 molmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>5½ virgates** and 20 acres</td>
<td>4 half-virgaters at Hethcote</td>
<td>2 virgates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: one virgate = 32 acres
* one holding of half a league with half a virgate and another holding of a virgate
** two two-virgaters, one virgater, one half-virgater, one 20-acre holding and two messuages without land
*** 8 cottages with 10 acres apiece and one cottage with 20 acres
### 1279

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manor</th>
<th>No. of Free</th>
<th>Total of Free Land</th>
<th>No. of Unfree</th>
<th>Total of Unfree Land</th>
<th>No. of Cottars</th>
<th>Total of Cottar Land</th>
<th>Total No. of Tenants</th>
<th>Total Land Held by Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 virgates and 14 acres*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33⅓ virgates**</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41 virgates and 24 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** one virgate = 40 acres

* one two-virgater, one one-and-a-half virgater, four virgaters, one 20-acre holding, one 12-acre holding and one 2-acre holding

** grouped together as nine virgaters, 31 half-virgaters, three half-virgaters, one virgater, one one-and-a-half-virgater, three virgaters and a composite holding of one-and-three-quarter virgates

### 1298

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manor</th>
<th>No. of Free</th>
<th>Total of Free Land</th>
<th>No. of Unfree</th>
<th>Total of Unfree Land</th>
<th>No. of Cottars</th>
<th>Total of Cottar Land</th>
<th>Total No. of Tenants</th>
<th>Total Land Held by Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>10 free</td>
<td>9 virgates and 23½ acres*</td>
<td>56***</td>
<td>34 virgates + 34 acres</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>47 virgates and 29½ acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 molmen</td>
<td>3 virgates and 12 acres**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** one virgate = 40 acres

* one two-and-a-half virgate holding, one two-virgate holding, four virgaters, two half-virgaters, one one-acre holding and one 2½-acre holding

** one two-virgate holding, one virgater and a holding comprised of 1⅓ virgates and 2 acres

*** grouped together as ten customary tenants comprised of a mixture of holdings totalling 7 virgates and 30 acres; nine virgaters, 24 half-virgaters, 10 half-virgater acresmen, one half-virgater smith and two pigmen holding 12 acres each
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manor</th>
<th>No. of Free</th>
<th>Total of Free Land</th>
<th>No. of Unfree</th>
<th>Total of Unfree Land</th>
<th>No. of Cottars</th>
<th>Total of Cottar Land</th>
<th>Total No. of Tenants</th>
<th>Total Land Held by Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaydon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 virgates*</td>
<td>22 virgaters</td>
<td>22 virgates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29 virgates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: one virgate = 20 acres
* one four-virgater, one two-virgater and one virgater.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manor</th>
<th>No. of Free</th>
<th>Total of Free Land</th>
<th>No. of Unfree</th>
<th>Total of Unfree Land</th>
<th>No. of Cottars</th>
<th>Total of Cottar Land</th>
<th>Total No. of Tenants</th>
<th>Total Land Held by Tenants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaydon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14 virgates*</td>
<td>24 virgaters</td>
<td>24 virgates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38 virgates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: one virgate = 20 acres
* four two-virgaters, three virgates, one virgate held jointly by a mother and son, four half-virgaters

Sources: John, The Warwickshire Hundred Rolls, pp. 100-104, 184-188; SRO, D(8) 1734/J2268, ff. 4v-9v. The Table excludes glebe and sub-tenants, for example, the 29 sub-tenants at Tachbrook who held cottages of free tenants. The data in Harley's pioneering study of the 1279 Hundred Rolls do not accord with those presented here; firstly because he included sub-tenants and tenants of the glebe as he was interested in calculating overall population statistics whereas I am only interested in those tenants who held directly of the bishop; secondly because he assumed that when an entry began, for example, 'there are ten free tenants there', that there were ten free tenants there, which was often not the case, and finally because he assumed, understandably, that as the Tachbrook and Chadshunt villein entries began respectively 'Radulphus Martyn et Robertus filius Rogeri tenent i virgatam terre' and 'Johannes atte Welle et Augerus Toky tenent i virgatam terre' that all four held a virgate each. He therefore thought, for example, that at Tachbrook the 19 unfree villeins consisted of 18 virgaters and one half-virgater. But it is clear from the 1298 extent that each held a half-virgate only. There are only two other examples in the Warwickshire Hundred Rolls where half-virgaters were listed in pairs - Wasperton and Wormleighton, which happen to be adjacent to Tachbrook and Itchington respectively: see J.B. Harley, 'Population and land utilisation in the Warwickshire hundreds of Stoneleigh and Kinerton', unpubl. Ph.D. thesis, University of Birmingham (1960), pp. 60, 70-71; John, The Warwickshire Hundred Rolls, pp. 59-60, 70-71, 178-9, 213-214. There are also differences between Fryde's data for size of holdings of the unfree in 1279 and those presented here, for example, he inexplicably counted 14 virgaters and 5 half-virgaters at Tachbrook. Fryde, 'The tenants of the bishops of Coventry and Lichfield', p. 256.


APPENDIX 4

PERCENTAGE OF FREE, UNFREE AND COTTAR TENANTS,
1279 AND 1298 COMPARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>manor</th>
<th>free</th>
<th>unfree</th>
<th>cottar</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>free</th>
<th>unfree</th>
<th>cottar</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tachbrook</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaydon</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Appendix does not include tenants of the glebe or sub-tenants.

APPENDIX 5

PERCENTAGE OF TENANT LAND OCCUPIED BY FREE, UNFREE AND COTTAR, 1279 AND 1298 COMPARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>manor</th>
<th>1279 free</th>
<th>1279 unfree</th>
<th>1279 cottar</th>
<th>1279 total</th>
<th>1298 free</th>
<th>1298 unfree</th>
<th>1298 cottar</th>
<th>1298 total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tachbrook</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaydon</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Appendix includes all tenanted land other than glebe.
APPENDIX 6

NUMBER OF TENANTS, 1298, 1321 AND 1360 COMPARED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>manor</th>
<th>1298 free</th>
<th>1298 unfree</th>
<th>1298 cottar</th>
<th>1321 free</th>
<th>1321 unfree</th>
<th>1321 cottar</th>
<th>1360 free</th>
<th>1360 unfree</th>
<th>1360 cottar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tachbrook</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5:6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39'</td>
<td>41'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39'</td>
<td>32'</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadshunt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaydon</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Appendix does not include tenants of the glebe or sub-tenants. The total of unfree in each manor in 1321 has been augmented by one to include the reeve who was excluded from that extent but included in the 1360 extent in each manor except Tachbrook.

1 Ten half-virgate holdings vacant in Tachbrook. It is unclear what had become of the four villeins in Hethcote.
2 This figure includes an unknown number of cottars.
3 There seem to be five fewer unfree but this figure is deceptive as it probably excludes the smith and two pigmen. Furthermore, four half-virgate holdings were merged into two virgate holdings between 1298 and 1321 when two female half-virgaters (Emma Senekere and Agnes Lottur) died without heirs and their holdings were taken up by their respective neighbours (Adam Gery and Thomas Osmund).
4 Nine half-virgate holdings vacant in Nether Itchington.
5 The evidence suggests that this figure included 4 cottars.
6 Four virgate holdings vacant.

Sources:
1298: SRO, D(W)1734/J2268, ff. 5r-5v, 6v-7r, 8v-9v
1321: PRO, SC6/1132/5, PRO, E 143/9/1
1360: PRO, E 136/12/17, E 143/9/4 and E 368/132 m. 12 (now m. 235r); BL, Add MS 6165 being a modern transcript of PRO, E 143/9/4
## APPENDIX 7

### OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNFREE, LATE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>manor</th>
<th>sample tenant</th>
<th>holding</th>
<th>works owed</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tachbrook</td>
<td>Henry in the Lane</td>
<td>half-virgate</td>
<td>38 winter works x ½d. 19 summer works x ¾d. 19 autumn works x ¾d. 19 days mowing 3 days ploughing with his own plough if he owned one 3 days reaping with a man and without food carrying to Lichfield carrying</td>
<td>1s. 7d. 1s. 2½d. 2s. 4½d. 3s. 2d. or 19 days' work 6d. 4½d. 4d. or three works 1d. total value: 9s. 7½d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**other dues**
- St Peter's Pence
- pannage
- brewing
- selling a foal
- merchet
- heriot of the best beast other than his horse

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. per pig</td>
<td>1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d.</td>
<td>1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manor</td>
<td>sample tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itchington</td>
<td>Emma Senekere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
manor  Chadshunt
sample tenant  Richard Reignald
holding  half-virgate

works owed
75 winter works x ½d.
39 summer works x ¾d.
42 autumn works x 1¼d.

- mows at Tachbrook at will
- 9 days ploughing
- 3 days reaping with two men without food
- 5½ days reaping
- great boonwork with food and all his familia
- carrying firewood (busce)
- carrying to Lichfield
- malting the lord's corn
- driving beasts to Lichfield
- a cock and three hens

other dues
- St Peter's Pence
- pannage
- brewing
- selling a foal
- tallage
- merchet
- heriot of the best beast other than his horse

value
3s. 1½d.
2s. 5¼d.
5s. 3d.
[or 2s. in lieu of above works]
1 work
27d.
9d.
11½d. or 5½ works

¼d. or 1 work
3 works
4 works
3 works
4d.
total value: at least 15s. 2d.
1 d.
1d. per pig, ½d. per piglet
1d.
1d.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>manor</th>
<th>sample tenant</th>
<th>holding</th>
<th>works owed</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaydon</td>
<td>Robert Morice</td>
<td>virgate</td>
<td>75 winter works x ½d.</td>
<td>3s. 1½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 summer works x ¾d.</td>
<td>2s. 5¾d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 autumn works x 1¾d.</td>
<td>5s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 days ploughing</td>
<td>[or 4s. in lieu of above works]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 days reaping with two men without food</td>
<td>27d. or 9 works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 cartloads of hay from Gaydon to Chadshunt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 cart of firewood (<em>busce</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>carrying to Lichfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>other dues</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St Peter’s Pence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pannage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brewing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>selling a foal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tallage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>merchet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>heiriot of the best beast other than his horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SRO, D(W) 1734/12268, ff. 5v, 7r-9v.
I have transcribed the probate material of some 225 testators at LJRO, PRO, and WRO, the vast majority of it from parishes contiguous to the area under study including between 1495 and 1616 the majority of testators in Ashorne, Avon Dassett, Burton Dassett, Chesterton, Farnborough, Fenny Compton, Harbury, Knightcote, Ladbrooke, Leamington Priors, Long Itchington, Napton, Priors Hardwick, Priors Marston, Radbourne, Radway, Ratley, Shotteswell, Southam, Tachbrook Mailory, Warmington and Wormleighton, as well as all those for Tachbrook, Itchington, Chadshunt and Gaydon. The cross-section tabulated here (all from LJRO) represents those instances where an inventory survives (and in most cases a will as well) and where the arable is described in detail rather than in generic terms (such as ‘crop on the ground’ or corn in the barn’).

Sources: LJRO, William Enocke, Avon Dassett, will, [undated] 1537, inventory 22 September, 1537; Hugh Man, Avon Dassett, will, 12 January, 1539, inventory, 12 January, 1539; Thomas Geffes, Avon Dassett, (no will), inventory, [undated] 1545; Joan Enocke (widow of William), Avon Dassett, (no will), inventory, 13 February, 1545; Henry Makepeace, [Burton] Chipping Dassett, will, 2 December, 1537, inventory, 31 January, 1539; Robert Eyres, [Burton] Great Dassett, will, 14 May, 1544, undated inventory; Edward Smyth, Fenny Compton, will, 10 December, 1533, undated inventory; Thomas Gryffyn, Fenny Compton, will, 20 January, 1536, inventory, 24 June, 1539; Richard Dod, Fenny Compton, will, 18 July, 1556, inventory, 26 April, 1557; Alice Dod (widow of Richard), Fenny Compton, will, 14 January, 1557, inventory, 26 April, 1557; John Farmon, Harbury, will, 22 September, 1544, inventory, 8 October, 1544; William Wright, Harbury, will, 6 November, 1549, inventory, 12 January [1550]; John Croke, Ladbrooke, will, 1 May, 1539, inventory, 26 June, 1539; Richard Garit, Ladbrooke, will, 30 March, 1529, inventory, 27 June 1539; John Adams, Wormleighton, will, 3 November, 1545, inventory, 8 February, 1546; Thomas Blackeinhalle, Wormleighton, will, 9 January, 1555, undated inventory; William Gryffyn, Wormleighton, will, 4 August, 1557, inventory, 1 October, 1557.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Testator</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Inventory total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon Dassett</td>
<td>William Enocke</td>
<td>22 September, 1537</td>
<td>£34. 4s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Dassett</td>
<td>Hugh Man</td>
<td>12 January, 1539</td>
<td>£17. 13s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>wheat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>barley</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) not specified</td>
<td>(i) £2. 10s. (includes rye)</td>
<td>(i) not specified</td>
<td>(i) £4. 10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>peas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) not specified</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total value of arable</strong></td>
<td>£7. 8s.</td>
<td><strong>total value of livestock</strong></td>
<td>£19. 2s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>oxen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>other cattle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 2 cows and 4 young beasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £3. 12s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) £4. 9s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>horses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>other livestock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 3 mares</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 60 sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 3 colts</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 2 'stores', 3 geese, 6 hens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 2 steers</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) poultry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) 3 heifers</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) 1 hive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £1. 16s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) £6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 2s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) £1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) £1. 3s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total value of livestock</strong></td>
<td>£19. 2s. 6d.</td>
<td><strong>as % of inventory</strong></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Testator</td>
<td>Inventory total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon Dassett</td>
<td>Thomas Geffes</td>
<td>£14. 10s. 5d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Testator</th>
<th>Inventory total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Joan Enocke</td>
<td>£6. 11s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wheat</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 4 qrs (includes rye)</td>
<td>(£2)</td>
<td>(ii) 16s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 6 acres (includes rye)</td>
<td>(£2. 8s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>barley</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 6 qrs</td>
<td>(£2. 8s.)</td>
<td>(ii) 12d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>peas</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 2 qrs (includes oats)</td>
<td>(£2.8s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 8s.</td>
<td>(£1. 2s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oats</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 2 qrs</td>
<td>(£2. 8s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 12d.</td>
<td>(£1. 2s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total value of arable as % of inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£5. 12s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1. 7s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oxen</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 2 young</td>
<td>(£1. 6s. 8d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>other cattle</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 4 cows, 2 steers</td>
<td>(£2. 13s. 4d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 2 weaning calves</td>
<td>(£1. 5s. (includes 2 mares))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>horses</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 2 mares</td>
<td>(appraised with other cattle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) a mare, 2 colts</td>
<td>(£1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) a steer</td>
<td>(£10s.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>other livestock</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) a colt, 6 sheep, 2 'hoges'</td>
<td>(£16s.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 2 geese, 10 hens a cock</td>
<td>(£2. 4d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total value of livestock as % of inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£4. 16s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4. 10s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Burton Dassett

**Testator:** Henry Makepeace  
**Date:** 31 January, 1539  
**Inventory total:** £215. 0s. 10d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wheat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Barley</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 30 qrs</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>(i) 30 qrs and 4 qrs malted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oats</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 2 qrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 6s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total value of arable</strong></td>
<td>£13. 1s.</td>
<td><strong>As % of inventory</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other cattle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 20 cows, a bull</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £26. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) £16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other livestock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 5 horses, 2 colts</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 1,100 sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 20 hens and capons, 12 ducks and drakes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 6 swine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 1 sow</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 4 mares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total value of livestock</strong></td>
<td>£167. 19s.</td>
<td><strong>As % of inventory</strong></td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Burton Dassett

**Testator:** Robert Eyres  
**Date:** [1544]  
**Inventory total:** £8. 10s. 2d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wheat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Barley</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 3 lands</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 10 strikes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oats</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 9 strikes (beans)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 4s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total value of arable</strong></td>
<td>17s. 4d.</td>
<td><strong>As % of inventory</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other cattle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 2 cows, sold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 2 cows (of which one sold)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) £1. 10s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) £1. 4s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other livestock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 4 mares</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 6 swine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £1. 12s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 1 sow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total value of livestock</strong></td>
<td>£4. 18s. 6d.</td>
<td><strong>As % of inventory</strong></td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Testator</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Inventory total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenny Compton</td>
<td>Edward Smyth</td>
<td>24 June, 1539</td>
<td>E34.6s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grain</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>(i) 12 qrs</td>
<td>£3. 6s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 40 lands</td>
<td>£4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>(i) 30 qrs</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 10 qrs malt</td>
<td>2. 10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>(i) 10 qrs</td>
<td>£1. 13s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>(i) 20 qrs</td>
<td>£3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total value of arable as % of inventory | 20%        | 12%                  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>(i) 4</td>
<td>£2. 13s. 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cattle</td>
<td>(i) 14 cows</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 16 steers and heifers</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>(i) 4 horses</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 2 mares</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) five colts</td>
<td>£2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other livestock</td>
<td>(i) 400 sheep</td>
<td>£40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 7 swine</td>
<td>£7s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 40 hens and a cock, 7 geese, 14 ducks</td>
<td>7s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of livestock as % of inventory</td>
<td>£59.1%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trot</td>
<td>Testator</td>
<td>Inventory total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Fenny Compton</td>
<td>£94. 2s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>26 April, 1557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) a wey</td>
<td>(i) a wey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 2½ qrs unharvested</td>
<td>(ii) unharvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £8</td>
<td>(i) £8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) £7</td>
<td>(ii) £7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 2 weys</td>
<td>(i) a wey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 2 qrs malt</td>
<td>(ii) 1½ qrs malt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £13. 10s.</td>
<td>(i) £6. 15s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) £2. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(ii) £1. 16s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peas</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 1 qr</td>
<td>(i) 1 qr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £1</td>
<td>(i) £1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 8s.</td>
<td>(ii) 8s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oats</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 1 qr</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 8s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total value of arable</td>
<td>£32. 4s. 8d.</td>
<td>£24. 19s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as % of inventory</td>
<td>34½%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxen</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other cattle</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 4 cows</td>
<td>(i) 4 cows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 3 calves</td>
<td>(ii) 3 calves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £6</td>
<td>(i) £6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) £1</td>
<td>(ii) £1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horses</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 4 horses, mares</td>
<td>(i) 2 capuls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £6. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>(i) £3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other livestock</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 50 sheep</td>
<td>(i) 10 sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 4 'hoggs'</td>
<td>(ii) 4 'hoggs'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) goose, gander, 10 hens, cock</td>
<td>(iii) goose, gander, 10 hens, cock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>value</td>
<td>value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) £15</td>
<td>(i) £3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 16s.</td>
<td>(ii) 16s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) 6s. 4d.</td>
<td>(iii) 6s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total value of livestock</td>
<td>£37. 15s. 8d.</td>
<td>£14. 2s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as % of inventory</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24½%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Testator</td>
<td>Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbury</td>
<td>John Farmon</td>
<td>Harbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>8 October, 1544</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory total</td>
<td>£15. 12s. 10d.</td>
<td>Inventory total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>(i) 2 qrs</td>
<td>(i) £1</td>
<td>(i) 3 qrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 14 lands tilth sown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 1 qr malt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>(i) 5 qrs</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>(i) 4 qrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 14 lands tilth not sown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 1 qr malt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>(i) 12 strikes</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>(i) 1 qr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>(i) 5s.</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(ii) £2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(iii) £2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of arable as % of inventory</td>
<td>£2. 18s. 4d.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£3 (includes some wood)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxen</td>
<td>(i) 1</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 3 bullocks, 2 kine, a heifer, a calf and a mare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 1 bullock</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 3 cows</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) £2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 1 heifer</td>
<td>(iii) £2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(i) £2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) £2</td>
<td>(ii) 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(ii) £2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>(i) a horse and mare</td>
<td>(i) £2</td>
<td>(i) 30 sheep</td>
<td>poultry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 3 mares</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) poultry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) a colt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 15s.</td>
<td>(i) £2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(ii) 2s.</td>
<td>(ii) £2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 2s.</td>
<td>(iii) 2s.</td>
<td>(iii) 2s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 30 sheep</td>
<td>poultry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) 19 'old schepe'</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) 17 lambs</td>
<td>(ii) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 4 'hoggis'</td>
<td>(iii) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) a gander, goose and poultry</td>
<td>(iv) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td>(i) £2</td>
<td>(i) £1. 13s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) £1. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(ii) 2s.</td>
<td>(ii) £1. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>(iii) 2s.</td>
<td>(iii) 6s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) 1s. 4d.</td>
<td>(iv) 2s.</td>
<td>(iv) 1s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of livestock as % of inventory</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>£4. 6s.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 56 lands</td>
<td>(i) £4.10s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) ½ qr old, in the barn</td>
<td>(ii) £1.8s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 60 lands</td>
<td>(i) £5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 1 qr of malt</td>
<td>(ii) 15s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) 14 lands</td>
<td>(i) £5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 16s.</td>
<td>(ii) 5s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>(i) £2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total value of arable as % of inventory | 13% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oxen</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 8</td>
<td>(i) £5.13s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other cattle</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 10 cows</td>
<td>(i) £5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 11 yearling calves</td>
<td>(ii) £2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 6 horses</td>
<td>(i) £5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 4 mares</td>
<td>(ii) £2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other livestock</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) 15 score sheep</td>
<td>(i) £28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 220 'cuppuls' and 6 'ode schepe'</td>
<td>(ii) £22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) a boar, 2 sows, 9 hoggs and 10 store pigs</td>
<td>(iii) £1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) 16 geese, 14 ducks and drakes, 2 cocks, 2 capons, 14 hens</td>
<td>(iv) 8s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total value of livestock as % of inventory | 73⅔% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes Testator</th>
<th>Inventory total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Ladbroke</td>
<td>£96.14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>26 June, 1539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Croke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladbroke Richard Garit</td>
<td>£8.18s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Testator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wormleighton</td>
<td>John Adams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wheat</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peas</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oats</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total value of arable</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oxen</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other cattle</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) 16 cows
(ii) 2 heifers and 2 yearlings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>(i) £11. 13s. 4d.</th>
<th>(ii) £1. 13s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| horses | quantity | x |

(i) 2 mares and a colt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>(i) £2. 12s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| other livestock | quantity | x |

(i) 5 sheep
(ii) 5 store pigs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>(i) 10s.</th>
<th>(ii) 5s. 6d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total value of livestock</th>
<th>£16. 13s. 10d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as % of inventory</td>
<td>72 1/4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Testator</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Inventory total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wormleighton</td>
<td>Thomas Blackeinhalle</td>
<td>[1555]</td>
<td>£9. 17s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wheat</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peas</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oats</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total value of arable</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oxen</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>other cattle</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) 16 cows
(ii) 2 heifers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>(i) £4</th>
<th>(ii) £1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| horses | quantity | x |

(i) 2 mares and a colt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>(i) £1. 3s. 4d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| other livestock | quantity | x |

(i) 5 sheep
(ii) 5 store pigs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>(i) 8s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total value of livestock</th>
<th>£6. 11s. 4d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as % of inventory</td>
<td>66 1/2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wheat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as % of inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other cattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total value of livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as % of inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 9

## SELECT ASPECTS OF MANORIAL INCOME AND EXPENDITURE, 1448-1542

### TACHBROOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farm of the demesne</th>
<th>Total potential rent</th>
<th>Plus commuted works</th>
<th>Less decayed rent and allowances</th>
<th>Repairs</th>
<th>Wood sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>£8</td>
<td>£11.4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s.6</td>
<td>4s.7d.</td>
<td>£2.1s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>£13 6s. 8d. 2</td>
<td>£11.4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s.5</td>
<td>4s.7d.</td>
<td>£25.19s. 10d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>£13 6s. 8d. 2</td>
<td>£11.4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s.6</td>
<td>4s.7d.</td>
<td>£23.11s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>£13 6s. 8d. 2</td>
<td>£11.4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s.5</td>
<td>4s.7d.</td>
<td>£2.1s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>£13 6s. 8d. 2</td>
<td>£11.4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s.6</td>
<td>4s.7d.</td>
<td>£4.13s. 10d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>£13 6s. 8d. 2</td>
<td>£11.4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s.5</td>
<td>4s.7d.</td>
<td>5s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
<td>Value 4</td>
<td>Value 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>£13. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£11. 4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s. 5d.</td>
<td>4s. 7d.</td>
<td>£7. 4s. 4d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3s. 4d. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530</td>
<td>£13. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£11. 4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s. 5d.</td>
<td>4s. 7d.</td>
<td>£4. 13s. 2d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3s. 4d. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>£13. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£11. 4s. 11d.</td>
<td>12s. 5d.</td>
<td>4s. 7d.</td>
<td>£4. 3s. 10d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3s. 4d. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. also recorded in the 1485 account roll:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1472</td>
<td>£44. 7s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>£2. 16s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>£4. 19s. 10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>£1. 12s. 10d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>£5. 13s. 10½d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>£4. 14s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482</td>
<td>£2. 15s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483</td>
<td>£2. 9s. 9d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. of the manor and demesne land, meadow and pasture in Tachbrook, with all the land, meadow, pasture, messuages and cottages within the vill or hamlet of Naspes, and a messuage with land, meadow and pasture in the vill and field of Ashorne

3. horse mill

4. less 5s. 8½d. in 1542 from the late house of friars or ministers at Thelsford extinguished by an act of parliament

5. from ploughings and autumn works due from the free tenants

6. from the tallage (auxilium) of 9 cottages called le Ayesilver, never collected

7. a messuage and ½ virgate worth 10s. decayed by 2s. and 3 cottages in les Naspes worth 9s. 3d. decayed by 2s. 7d.

8. allowed of the reeve
9. allowance (for unspecified reasons) of
8s. 2d. rent for a messuage in Tachbrook
3s. 1d. from the rent of a cottage in Tachbrook
6s. 8d. from certain parcels of land in lez Naspes
12s. from a messuage in Ashorne
12d. rent from a piece of land in the field of Ashorne
10. toft, barn and a virgate worth 13s. 4d. decayed by 10s. and a barn and a quarter of land worth 4s. decayed by 2s.
11. cottage, barn and three quarters of arable land worth 21s. 8d. decayed by 15s. but worth nothing as now in the lord's hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>farm of the demesne</th>
<th>total potential rent</th>
<th>less decayed rent and allowances</th>
<th>repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>£8. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£10. 11s. 6d.</td>
<td>18s.¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>£8. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£8. 15s.</td>
<td>6s. 8d.²</td>
<td>12d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>£8. 9s. 5d.</td>
<td>£8. 15s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>£8. 9s. 5d.</td>
<td>£8. 15s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. half a virgate worth 13s. 6d. decayed by 1s. 6d.
2. half a virgate worth 13s. 6d. decayed by 3s. 6d.
3. a messuage and a virgate worth 23s. 6d. decayed by 3s. 6d.
4. a messuage and a virgate worth 13s. 6d. decayed by 3s. 6d.
5. a cottage and an acre worth 18d. decayed by 6d.
6. a messuage and half a virgate worth 12s. decayed by 2s.
7. a messuage and half a virgate worth 13s. 6d. decayed by 3s. 6d.

**nb** while all the entries for decayed rent name tenants, most fail to identify the location of the holding therefore deductions have been made in conjunction with court roll evidence

2. allowed of the reeve
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farm of Demesne Meadow</th>
<th>Total Potential Rent</th>
<th>Less Decayed Rent</th>
<th>Repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>£1. 16s. 8d.¹</td>
<td>£8. 1s. 4d.</td>
<td>£1. 17s. 4d.²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>£1. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£10. 7s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>£1. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£10. 7s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>£1. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£10. 7s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>£1. 6s. 8d.</td>
<td>£10. 7s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. only £1. 6s. 8d. was levied
2. a tenement worth 14s. 6d. decayed by 4s. 6d.
a messuage and 2 virgates worth 20s. decayed by 4s.
2 tofts and 2 virgates worth 20s. decayed by 6s. 8d.
a messuage and a virgate worth 8s. decayed by 1s. 4d.
a messuage and 2 virgates worth 18s. decayed by 2s.
a messuage and 2 virgates worth 20s. decayed by 5s. 4d.
a messuage and half a virgate worth 13s. 6d. decayed by 3s. 6d.
2 messuages and 2 virgates worth 17s. decayed by 2s.
a messuage and half a virgate worth 8s. in the Lord's hand

NB while all the entries for decayed rent name tenants, most fail to identify the location of the holding therefore deductions have been made in conjunction with Court Roll evidence

3. for the new construction of a windmill
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farm of the Demesne</th>
<th>Total Potential Rent</th>
<th>Plus Works</th>
<th>Less Decayed Rent and Allowances</th>
<th>Repairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1448</td>
<td>£9. 0s. 6d.</td>
<td>£23. 13s. 1d.</td>
<td>£2. 9s. 4½d.</td>
<td>£3. 13s. 11d. 7</td>
<td>£4. 13s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>£9. 0s. 6d.</td>
<td>£23. 13s. 1d.</td>
<td>£2. 9s. 4½d.</td>
<td>£3. 13s. 8d. 9</td>
<td>£6. 14s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464</td>
<td>£10. 15s. 2d.</td>
<td>£23. 3s. 11½d. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3. 13s. 8d. 9</td>
<td>£1. 5s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1467</td>
<td>£12. 17s. 3d.</td>
<td>£23. 5s. 9½d. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3. 13s. 8d. 9</td>
<td>£1. 5s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473</td>
<td>£12. 17s. 3d.</td>
<td>£23. 4s. 11½d. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3. 13s. 8d. 9</td>
<td>£1. 5s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>£11. 11s. 8d.</td>
<td>£23. 4s. 11½d. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3. 13s. 8d. 9</td>
<td>£1. 5s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>£10. 11s. 11d.</td>
<td>£23. 4s. 11½d. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3. 13s. 8d. 9</td>
<td>£1. 5s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>£9. 10s. 7d.</td>
<td>£23. 1s. 10½d. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17s. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1542</td>
<td>£10. 0s. 7d.</td>
<td>£23. 1s. 10½d. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. £11. 5s. 3d. render in Upper Itchington  
   £10. 2s. render in Nether Itchington  
   (the render was net of £3. 13s. 8d. decayed rent and 15s. allowed of the reeve's rent)  
   17s. 6d. for le aye  
   17s. 6½d. for le Werk  
   4d from a lb of cumin  
   16d. new rent  

2. £11. 11s. 4d. render in Upper Itchington  
   £10. 3s. 5½d. render in Nether Itchington  
   (the render was net of £3. 13s. 8d. decayed rent and 15s. allowed of the reeve's rent)  
   17s. 6d. for le aye  
   12s. 2d. for le Werk with 2 hens and 2 cocks  
   16d. new rent
3. £11. 11s. 4d. render in Upper Ichington
£10. 3s. 5½d. render in Nether Ichington
(the render was net of £3. 13s. 8d. decayed rent and 15s. allowed of the reeve's rent)
17s. 6d. for le aye
12s. 2d. for le Werk with 2 hens and 2 cocks
6d. new rent
4. £12. 7s. 8½d. render in Upper Ichington
£9. 4s. 6d. render in Nether Ichington
17s. 6d. for Ayd sylver
12s. 2d. for le Werk with 2 hens and 2 cocks
5. as 4. and additionally
4s. 5d. increase of render
£1. 11s. 2d. render lately concealed
6. 33s. 4d. from villein aid (auxilio Nativorum) at Michaelmas
6s. 10½d. from 33 ploughings due from two molmen and 9 customary tenants of which each does three
5s. 6d. from 33 boons in autumn from the said 2 molmen and 9 customary tenants of which they do three each at 2d. per boon
3s. 8d. from 11 cottars and 22 autumn works of which each cottar does 2 at 2d. each
7. £2. 10s. 9d. for tenements in the lord's hand for lack of tenants
a cottage worth 6d. but in the lord's hand
a parcel of land worth 6d. but in the lord's hand
a cottage and 2 acres worth 4s. 1d. but in the lord's hand
a messuage and half a hide of land worth 12s. 9d. decayed by 3s. 7d.
a cottage worth 12d. decayed by 4d.
half a virgate worth 6s. decayed by 1s. 6d.
a messuage and a toft and 2 virgates worth 26s. 8d. decayed by 2s. 8d.
a messuage and half a virgate worth 13s. 4d. decayed by 1s. 4d.
a messuage and half a virgate worth 13s. 4d. decayed by 1s. 4d.
a messuage and a virgate worth 13s. 4d. decayed by 1s. 4d.
the farm of a messuage 2 cottages and 2 virgates worth 26s. 8d. decayed by 2s. 8d.
a messuage a toft and half a virgate worth 6s. 8d. decayed by 8d.
a messuage and half a virgate worth 6s. 8d. decayed by 8d.
a messuage and half a virgate and a toft and half a virgate worth 14s. 2d. decayed by 1s. 2d.
a messuage 2 cottages and a virgate worth 15s. 2d. decayed by 3s. 2d.
8. allowed of the reeve, which is an example of double accounting, for the reeve’s rent was also included under decayed rent in 1, 2 and 3
9. the same decay as in 7, apart from the second item which in 1450 read:
a cottage worth 6d. now let and decayed by 3d.
10. £5. 19s. 5d. for making a new stable
12s. 8d. for repairing the windmill
2s. 6d. for repairing the chapel
11. 15s. on the windmill
10s. 8d. on repairing two tenements
12. 2s. 8d. on the windmill
14s. 4d. for old timber for le Shepcote

Sources:
1448: LJRO, B/A/21/124078, mm. 3r-4v
1450: LJRO, B/A/21/124079, mm. 3r, 4r, 5r
1464: SRO, D(W) 1734/J1948, mm. 1r-2v
1467: SRO, D(W) 1734/3/2/4, mm. 1r-1v, 7r-7v
1473: WSL, S. MS. 335 (1), mm. 1r-2v
1476: LJRO, B/A/21/123984, mm. 2r-3v
1485: PRO, SC 6/HENVII/1846, mm. 1r-3r
1505: LJRO, D 271/4, mm. 1r-1v, D 271/6, m. 1r
1522: PRO, SC 6/HENVIII/7154, mm. 5v-7r
1530: PRO, SC 6/HENVIII/7155, mm. 10r-11r
1542: SRO, D(W) 1734/J1949, mm. 17r-19r
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Court rolls Itchington, Tachbrook, Chadshunt and Gaydon:
BRL, 432654,
m. 4r, 10 June, 30 June, 1350
m. 4v, 22 July, 1350
m. 3r, 14 September, 1350
m. 3v, BLANK
m. 5r, 13 January, 3 February, 1351
m. 5v, 24 February, 28 April, 1351
m. 6r, 14 September, 1351
m. 6v, BLANK
m. 7r, 25 December, 1353, 15 January, 5 February, 1354
m. 7v, 26 February, 19 March, 9 April, 1354
m. 8r, 25 July, 1354
m. 8v, BLANK
m. 15r, 11 June, 1 July, 1355
m. 15v, 23 July, 13 August, 3 September, 1355
m. 9r, 12 March, 31 December, 1360
m. 9v, 21 January, 18 February, 1361
m. 10r, 22 April, 24 May, 1361
m. 10v, [continued from faded end of previous membrane]
m. 11r, 16 February, 1362
m. 11v, 9 March, 1362
m. 12r, 1 June, 29 June, 1362
m. 12v, 4 January, 5 July, 14 September, 1363
m. 13r, 11 January, 24 January, 14 February, 1364
m. 13v, 6 March, 27 March, 1364
m. 14r, 31 July, 21 August, 1364
m. 14v, 11 September, 1364
m. 1r, 24 December, 1366, 7 January, 1367
m. 1v, 2 March, 23 March, 13 April, 1367
m. 2r, 27 July, 10 August, 1367
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>432655</td>
<td>29 October, 1488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432656</td>
<td>5 January, 1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432659</td>
<td>23 October, 1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432657</td>
<td>6 August, 1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432658</td>
<td>4 October, 1498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432660</td>
<td>3 October, 1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432661</td>
<td>26 April, 1536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432662</td>
<td>19 April, 1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432663</td>
<td>11 January, 1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432663</td>
<td>24 February, 1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432664</td>
<td>18 November, 1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432719</td>
<td>22 March, 1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432720</td>
<td>23 October, 1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432721</td>
<td>9 April, 1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432722</td>
<td>8 October, 1549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432723</td>
<td>9 June, 1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432665</td>
<td>1 April, 1551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432666</td>
<td>12 September, 1552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432667</td>
<td>13 April, 1553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432668</td>
<td>7 June, 1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432669</td>
<td>11 October, 1554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432670</td>
<td>18 April, 1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432671</td>
<td>25 September, 1555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432672</td>
<td>25 September, 1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432673</td>
<td>1 October, 1557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432674</td>
<td>4 April, 1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432675</td>
<td>18 October, 1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432677</td>
<td>23 October, 1559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432725</td>
<td>9 April, 1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432724</td>
<td>4 October, 1560 [incorrectly catalogued as 4 December, 1559]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432726</td>
<td>10 April, 1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432678</td>
<td>9 October, 1561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432679</td>
<td>18 March, 1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432680</td>
<td>22 September, 1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432681</td>
<td>1 April, 1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432682</td>
<td>after Michaelmas, 1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432683</td>
<td>20 March, 1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432684</td>
<td>27 September, 1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432685</td>
<td>3 May, 1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432686</td>
<td>9 October, 1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432687</td>
<td>5 April, 1566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432676</td>
<td>9 October, 1566 [incorrectly catalogued as 1559]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432688</td>
<td>9 April, 1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432689</td>
<td>15 October, 1567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432727</td>
<td>3 May, 1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432690</td>
<td>19 October, 1568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432691</td>
<td>4 May, 1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432692</td>
<td>25 October, 1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432693</td>
<td>8 April, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432695</td>
<td>undated orders and pains [dated to 1554 by this author]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432728</td>
<td>undated admission [dated to 1546 by this author]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432694</td>
<td>undated admission [dated to 1569 by this author]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BRL, 184961, Collections towards the history of Kinerton and Combrook in the County of Warwick compiled entirely from MSS authorities by J. Harvey Bloom MA Rector of Whitchurch 1904

Cheshire Record Office

DCH/0/8, Account roll bishopric, 1420 to 1421

Coventry City Record Office

BA/B/Q/23/1, The Corpus Christi and St Nicholas Guild Book

Lichfield Joint Record Office

B/A/1/1, Register of Walter Langton, 1296-1321
B/A/1/11, Register of Reginald Boulers, 1453-1459
B/A/1/14iv, Register of Richard Sampson, 1543-1554
B/A/1/15, Register of Ralph Baynes, 1554-1559
B/A/2l/1, Draft register Coventry archdeaconry, 1537-1603

D 30/2/1/3, Chapter Act Book 1490-1523 (microfiche copy, original now at Lichfield Cathedral Library)
D 30/2/1/4, Chapter Act Book 1521-1575 (microfiche copy, original now at Lichfield Cathedral Library)
B/A/21/124078, Account roll bishopric, 1447-1448
B/A/21/124079, Account roll bishopric, 1449-1450
B/A/21/124075, Account roll bishopric, 25 March-29 September, 1459
D 271/4, 6, Account roll bishopric, 1504-1505

D 30/N1 now D 30/11/81, Account roll Berkswich, 1312-1313
D 30/N3 now D 30/11/83, Account roll Berkswich, 1313-1314
D 30/N2 now D 30/11/82, Account roll Berkswich, 1315-1316

D 30/N10 now D 30/11/84, Account roll Cannock, 1308-1309
D 30/N5 now D 30/11/85, Account roll Cannock, 1315-1316

D 30/N6 now D 30/11/102, Account roll Chadshunt, 1306-1307

D 30/N9 now D 30/11/101, Account roll Itchington, 1306-1307
D 30/N7 now D 30/11/99, Account roll Itchington, 1309-1310
D 30/N8 now D 30/11/100, Account roll Itchington, 1310-1311

D 30/N12 now D 30/11/79, Account roll Lichfield, 1308-1309
D 30/N13 now D 30/11/80, Account roll Lichfield, 1312-1313

D 30/N14 now D 30/11/86, Account roll Longdon, 1318-1319

D 30/N15 now D 30/11/87, Account roll Rugeley, 1310-1311
D 30/N16 now D 30/11/88, Account roll Rugeley, 1313-1314

D 30/N27 now D 30/11/93, Account roll Tarvin etc, 1299-1305
D 30/N20 now D 30/11/91, Account roll Tarvin, 1304-1305

D 30/M16 now D 30/11/18, Final concord between Ralph Bayne and Thomas Fisher, 1558

D 30/2/7/5/7, letter from John Willes, vicar of Itchington, to the Dean and Chapter, 28 June, 1682
D 30/LV, vol. ii now D 30/4/7/2, Oliverian survey of Itchington, 1650
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Wills of:
John Adams, Wormleighton, 3 November, 1545, inventory, 8 February, 1546
William Alybonne, Ladbroke, 20 April, 1557, inventory, 13 August, 1557
Elizabeth Baker, Allesley, 10 May, 1538, undated inventory
Thomas Blackeinhalle, Wormleighton, 9 January, 1555, undated inventory
Thomas Collins, Knightcote [Burton Dassett], 13 April, 1547, undated inventory
John Croke, Ladbroke, will, 1 May, 1539, inventory, 26 June, 1539
Alice Dod (widow of Richard), Fenny Compton, will, 14 January, 1557, inventory, 26 April, 1557
Richard Dod, Fenny Compton, will, 18 July, 1556, inventory, 26 April, 1557
Richard Dodde, Avon Dassett, 7 November, 1555, inventory 17 November, 1556
William Enocke, Avon Dassett, will, [undated] 1537, inventory 22 September, 1537
Joan Enocke (widow of William), Avon Dassett, (no will). inventory, 13 February, 1545
Robert Eyres, [Burton] Great Dassett, will, 14 May, 1544, undated inventory
John Farmon, Harbury, will, 22 September, 1544, inventory, 8 October, 1544
Richard Garit, Ladbroke, 30 March, 1529, inventory 27 June, 1539
Thomas Geffes, Avon Dassett, (no will), inventory, [undated] 1545
William Gryffyn, Fenny Compton, will, 20 January, 1536, inventory, 24 June, 1539
William Gryffyn, Wormleighton, 4 August, 1557, inventory, 1 October, 1557
Isabell Hyckman, Chadshunt, 30 January, 1577, inventory, 25 June, 1577
Henry Makepeace, [Burton] Chipping Dassett, 2 December, 1537, inventory, 31 January, 1539
Harry Man, Ladbroke, 29 November, 1546, no inventory surviving
Hugh Man, Avon Dassett, will, 12 January, 1539, inventory, 12 January, 1539
Roger Shakespeare, Bishops Tachbrook, 28 March, 1605, inventory, [torn] 1605
Edward Smyth, Fenny Compton, 10 December, 1533, undated inventory
Nicholas Worsley, Allesley, 1 December, 1559, inventory, 17 May, 1559
William Wright, Harbury, 6 November, 1549, inventory, 12 January [1550]

P/C10/0, Seventeenth-century index of peculiar wills and administrations (1460-1626) [all now lost]

**Northamptonshire Record Office**

Spencer Court Rolls, no. 163, View of frankpledge, Fenny Compton, 8 April and 5 December, 1550
Spencer Court Rolls, no. 212, Estreat roll, Priors Hardwick and Marston, 1578
Spencer Court Rolls, nos 220, 221, 222, 230, Wormleighton, 21 April, 1500, 12 October, 1499, 2 October, 1500
Spencer Court Rolls, no. 230, Declaration by John Spencer concerning decay of tillage

Spencer MSS. no. 1515, Re. 'sureties in the will of Thomas Tomkyns'.
Spencer MSS. no. 1520, Warrant to the sheriff etc of Kineton Hundred [1522]

**Public Record Office**

C 66/821, Patent Roll, 1549
C 142/40/83, John Spencer IPM, 1523
C 142/112/164, Thomas Newsam IPM, 1557
C 205/5/4, Depopulation Inquisition, 1607
E 41/164, Copy of will of John Spencer, 1522
E 134/15Chas1/Mich3, Richard Hunt vs John Askell and others, 1639
E 136/12/17, Extent of the temporalities of the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield, 1358-1359
E 143/9/1, Inventory of Walter Langton’s property, 1321-22
E 143/9/4, Extent of the temporalities of the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield, 1360
E 178/4687, John Ffulnetbie vs John Newsham, 1618
E 179/192/122, Kineton Hundred lay subsidy, 1524
E 179/192/153, Kineton Hundred lay subsidy, 1543
E 179/192/120, Knightlow Hundred lay subsidy, 1524
E 179/19/507, Clergy tenths owing, 1559
E 315/513, Inventory of church goods, 1552
E 326/B4927 now E 326/4927, grant by Thomas Olney of Tachbrook to John Symondes of the same of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, Michaelmas 1461
E 326/B4932 now E 326/4932, grant by Thomas Olney of Tachbrook to John Symondes of the same of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, Michaelmas 1461
E 326/B4929 now E 326/4929, grant by Thomas and Agnes Olney of Tachbrook to Sir Robert Shotteswell, vicar of Tachbrook, and others, of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, Epiphany 1463
E 326/B4930 now E 326/4930, duplicate of E 326/B4929 now E 326/4929, Epiphany 1463
E 326/B4928 now E 326/4928, grant by Robert Shotteswell, vicar of Tachbrook, and Thomas Mallory of Tachbrook Mallory to William and Agnes Wollaston of land in Tachbrook, 3 February, 1467
E 326/B4923 now E 326/4923, grant by Thomas Ronton of Tachbrook to Thomas Savage of Tachbrook Mallory, and others, of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, 12 September, 1471
E 326/B4995 now E 326/4995, grant by Thomas Savage of Tachbrook Mallory, and others to John Symondes of Tachbrook of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, 5 January, 1483
E 326/B4952 now E 326/4952, grant by John Olney of Tachbrook to John Symondes of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, 9 January, 1483
E 326/B4994 now E 326/4994, grant by John Symondes of Tachbrook to Agnes Laurens, his wife, of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, 21 October, 1492
E 326/B4951 now E 326/4951, grant by John Ronton of Tachbrook to Robert Brokden and others, of a messuage and land in Tachbrook, 14 January, 1505
E 326/B5725 now E 326/5725, grant by John Symondes of Tachbrook to Roger Clerk and others, of lands in Tachbrook, 12 June, 1514
E 326/B6806 now E 326/6806, quitclaim by John Symondes of Tachbrook of Roger Clerk and others of land in Tachbrook, 14 June, 1515
E 336/4, Commission to enquire into decay of vicarage at Itchington, 1552
E 337/4, Plea roll, 1561-1564
E 348/1, Manuscript index to the plea rolls, I Mary-27 George II
E 358/13, Sequestration account of the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield, 1307-1308

E 368/132, Extent of the temporalities of the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield, 1360

PROB 11/27, f. 162r (F 20 Dyneygey): John Audeley, Bishops Itchington, 16 August, 1538
PROB 11/107, f. 77v (10 Stafford): John Burbur, Gaydon, 16 December, 1605
PROB 11/33, f. 133r (17 Coode), Thomas Davey, Chadshunt, 20 March, 1549
PROB 11/94, f. 401r-401v (98 Kidd): Nicholas Hawle, Bishops Itchington, 8 November, 1598
PROB 11/31, f. 387v (49 Ailen): William Jowse, Chadshunt, 6 March, 1547
PROB 11/56, ff. 47v-50v (6 Martyn), Henry Morcote, Tachbrook Mallory, 18 June, 1573
PROB 11/120, ff. 476r-477v (120 Fenner with sentence), George Newsam, Chadshunt, 10 October, 1610
PROB 11/90, f. 284v (93 Cobham), Thomas Newsham, Chadshunt, 1 October, 1597
PROB 11/115, ff. 358r-359v (49 Wingfield), Walter Newsam, Chadshunt, 2 February, 1610
PROB 11/20, ff. 18v-19r (3 Maynwaryng): John Savage, Bishops Itchington, 11 June, 1518
PROB 11/20, ff. 194r-195v (24 Maynwaryng): John Spencer, Wormleighton, 12 April, 1522
PROB 11/65, ff. 248r-248v (31 Rowe): Edward Tomkins, Upper Itchington, 11 August, 1581
PROB 11/17, ff. 138r-138v (18 Fetiplace): Thomas Tomkyns, Bishops Itchington, 9 June, 1513
PROB 11/91, ff. 408r-409r (52 Lewyn): Thomas Tomkyns, Bishops Itchington, 21 November, 1597
PROB 11/15, f. 27v (4 Adeane): William Thomkyns, Bishops Itchington, 14 December, 1505
PROB 11/68, ff. 216r-216v (27 Brudeneil): John Wagstaffe, Harbury, 26 March, 1585

REQ 2/23/14, John Hickman and others vs Thomas Newsam, 1555
REQ 2/219/60, William Holbech and others vs Walter Newsam, [late sixteenth century]
REQ 2/248/22, Thomas Olney and others vs Thomas Fisher, 1570

SC 2/207/52, Ladbroke, Court roll, 1530

SC 6/HEN/VII/1846, Account roll bishopric, 1484-1485
SC 6/HEN/VIII/7154, Account roll bishopric, 1521-1522
SC 6/HEN/VIII/7154, Account roll bishopric, 1529-1530

PRO, SC 6/1040/21, Account roll, Templar manors, 1310-1311

SC 6/1132/5, Extent of the temporalities of the bishopric of Coventry and Lichfield, 1322

SC 12/16/10, Fragment of Kineton Hundred, lost muster of 1522 [identified as such by the author of this thesis, but catalogued as a valor at the PRO]

SP 1/29, ff. 147r-v, 1522 muster, Long Compton
SP 1/234, ff. 39r-v, 1522 muster, Cherington
SP 1/234, ff. 41v, 42r, 43r, 1522 muster, Honington

SP 12/96/408, Certificate of the inns and ale-houses in Warwickshire, 1577
SP 12/117/3, Certificate of the inns and ale-houses in Warwickshire, 1577

SP 16/257/129, Depopulation Inquisition, 1607

STAC 2/17/214, Thomas Newsam and others vs Thomas Fisher, [c. 1547].
STAC 8/15/21, Depopulation accusation against Edward Fisher, 1608
Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Records Office, Stratford-upon-Avon

DR 10/1314, Copy of final concord between Ralph Bayne and Thomas Fisher, 1558

Court rolls of Itchington, Tachbrook, Chadshunt and Gaydon:
DR 10/
2585, 15 October, 5 November, 26 November, 17 December, 1349, 7 January, 1350
2586, 28 January, 22 February, 18 March, 8 April, 29 April, 20 May, 1350
2587, 7 October, 28 October, 30 November, 21 December, 1350
2588, 28 April, 19 May, 9 June, 30 June, 1 August, 1351
2589, 2 October, 23 October, 13 November, 4 December, 1353
2590, 1354 [illegible because of damp]
2591, 6 October, 27 October, 20 November, 11 December, 1354
2592, 22 January, 12 February, 12 March, 29 April, 1355
2593, 17 October, 1360
2594, 4 March, 1 April, 1361
2595, 2 October, 8 November, 1361
2596, 30 March, 20 April, 11 May, 1362
2597, 17 April, 8 May, 30 May, 19 June, 10 July, 1364
2598, 4 May, 8 June, 1367
2599, 5 December, 1399, 8 January, 29 January, 1400
2600, 1 April, 21 April, 1400
2601, [date lost] April, 13 June, 4 August, 20 September, 1403
2602, 1 October, 1 December, 1407
2603, 24 April, 9 July, 1414
2604, 8 October, 12 August, 1493
2605, 21 October, 1494
2606, 29 April, 13 October, 1495
2607, 12 April, 1497
2608, 8 May, 1498
2609, 1 May, 1518
2609, 12 November, 1518
2610, 18 April, 1521
2610, 5 October, 1521
2612, 20 March 1572
2613, 19 April, 1582
2614, 3 October, 1582
2611, undated suit roll [dated to April 1582 by this author
2615, undated draft presentments [dated to early 1580s by this author]

DR 98/753, 754, 756, Itchington, early fourteenth-century charters
DR 37/vol. 15, Fisher cartulary
DR 98/1379, Itchington, sale of lands 1683
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