

A THIRTEENTH CENTURY MANORIAL EXTENT
OF MARTHAM IN NORFOLK

Transcribed from British Museum Manuscript Stowe 936,
edited with an introduction.

A Thesis presented
to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
of the University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts

by

ANNE TIWARI
September 1980

A THIRTEENTH CENTURY MANORIAL EXTENT
OF MARTHAM IN NORFOLK

BY

ANNE TIWARI

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1980 ✓

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks are due first to my supervisor, for his aid and encouragements during the preparation of this thesis, and for his painstaking scrutiny of my transcription. Thanks are also due to Professor R. Egan and Professor M. J. Allen who also checked the transcription so carefully, and who, together with Professor J. Wortley, read and criticised by introductory material, and all of whom were members of my examining committee.

I am grateful too, to Father H. J. Drake for his assistance in the early stages, in obtaining interlibrary loan material for me from difficult and inadequate references.

Finally, my gratitude is also extended to Miss B. Dodwell formerly Reader in History at the University of Reading, Berkshire, who selected this topic for me, and gave me my first lessons in transcription and analysis of original documentary material.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
Abbreviations	iii
I: The Manuscript	1
II: The Manorial Extent of the Manor of Martham	13
Glossary of Terms	212
III: Topography	217
IV: Thirteenth Century England	222
V: Norwich Cathedral Priory	230
VI: The Manor of Martham	239
VII: The Martham Extent	298
VIII: General Conclusion	307
Appendix A: Groups of Holdings in Martham	311
Appendix B: The Expression of Square Measurements in the Demesne	318
Appendix C: Maps of the 'Island' of Fleg, and of Martham	319
Selected Bibliography	322

ABBREVIATIONS

a.	-	acre
Agric. H. R.	-	Agricultural History Review
Econ. H. R.	-	Economic History Review
Econ. H. R. 2nd Ser.	-	Economic History Review Second Series
fol.	-	folio
fr.	-	fronto
ft.	-	feet
Geog. Journ.	-	Geographical Journal
MS	-	manuscript
p.	-	page, perches
r.	-	roods
v.	-	verso
V.C.H.	-	<u>The Victoria County History of the County of Norfolk</u> , ed. by William Page, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1906, Volume II.

I: THE MANUSCRIPT

The manorial extent of the manor of Martham, made in 1292, was one of a series of such surveys made of the manors assigned to the Prior's department of Norwich Cathedral Priory. It is contained in an incomplete volume of 115 folios held by the British Museum, and catalogued as Stowe Manuscript 936. This volume contains surveys of the manors of Hindringham, Hindolveston, Newton, Trowse, Eton, Taverham, Elmham, Catton, Grange of the Monks, Plumstead and Heylesdon, as well as that of Martham, with the early part of the Hindringham surveys being missing. The first 11 surveys vary in length and content somewhat, but all are comparatively brief, comprising folios lv. to 34v. Although the manor of Martham was not the most extensive of the Priory's possessions, its survey was exceptionally full, and extends from fol. 37fr. to fol. 115v. Whilst the information it gives is similar in content and purpose to that of the other surveys in the volume, it includes a depth and detail not attempted for the other manors.

In 1930, Dr. H. W. Saunders discovered an additional nine double folios (38 pages), which he recognised as being part of the Stowe Manuscript 936. They contain surveys of the manors of Sechford, Denham, Audeby and Gnatington, that of Sechford also being quite lengthy, and probably incomplete, and that of Gnatington being incomplete too. Two more pages of Hindringham's Extent were included in the find, but the survey of that manor still has parts missing.¹ Surveys were also presumably made for the manors of Hemesby, Gatele,

¹ H. W. Saunders "A Problem in 'Wandered' M.SS." in Discovery, March 1930, p. 80.

and Thornham, but they have not been found.¹

The compilation of the information in the surveys contained in the Stowe manuscript, was mainly prepared with the aid of a body of jurors assembled for that purpose. Of these meetings of jurors, only four were dated: Newton was assembled in 1275-6, Taverham in 1279-80, Eton in 1276-7, and Martham in 1292-3. No juries are recorded for Trowse, which seems to have been entirely demesne, or for Grange of the Monks which also had no tenants. Heylesdon too has no jury mentioned, and Hindolveston has a jury though they are not named. In other cases the document merely says *dicunt quod*, leaving us to assume that this does in fact refer to a jury. Saunders believes that all the surveys were written in one hand, which must therefore have been in 1293 or after that date,² but whilst the style of the lettering is similar, the actual hands seem to differ considerably in some.

Two other important Priory documents written at the end of the thirteenth century are also, according to Saunders, written in this same hand. These are the *Primum Registrum*, or first of the 11 registers of Norwich Cathedral Priory, and the Chronicle of Bartholomew de Cotton (British Museum Nero V).³ He believes they form a triad in the matters of chronology, identity of script and also in content, for they deal with the Cathedral's history from the three different aspects of national and civil background, the material establishment of the monastery, and the detailed economic base on which the Priory

¹ The statement in the early part of the Martham Extent, that the seed requirements and costs per acre are the same as those of Hemesby, seems to point to there having been an extent of that manor. MS fol. 37fr. p. 12.

² H. W. Saunders The First Register of Norwich Cathedral Priory, edit. P. Millican, Norwich, 1938 (Norfolk Record Society vol. 11) p. 7.

³ Ibid. p. 7.

rested. Although Dr. Luard, the editor of the Chronicle, believed that Bartholomew de Cotton had died before 1298, because his name is not found in the Obedientiary Rolls after that date, his death is actually recorded in a Letter of Fraternity found in the Chamberlain's Roll for 1322. Saunders suggests that the intervening years may have been spent in the Scriptorium of the Priory, and that Bartholomew de Cotton was actually the scribe responsible for these documents, or at least supervised their production.¹ Like many of the administrative documents of the Priory now extant, the extents contained in Stowe 936 are also presumably a fair copy made from original notes to provide a perpetual and readable source of reference.² The forms of letters used show types characteristic of both thirteenth and early fourteenth century documents, with some older styles in places.³ This would be in keeping with a situation where a monastery was abreast of some changes and modes, but retained numbers of its own traditional usages. Whilst it must have been produced after 1292, it is impossible to say just when the Stowe Manuscript 936 was actually made.⁴ Copying must account in part for a number of instances in which figures do not total correctly.⁵

¹ Saunders - First Register - pp. 8-10.

² H. W. Saunders Introduction to the Obedientiary and Manor Rolls of Norwich Cathedral Priory, Norwich 1930, pp. 149-150.

³ C. Johnson & Sir H. Jenkinson English Court Hand A.D. 1066 to 1500 illustrated chiefly from the Public Records, New York, F. Ungar Pub. Co., 1967, pp. 3-55.

⁴ Dating documents with any precision by their paleography is virtually impossible. Ibid. p. xvi.

⁵ If the tenements, stated holdings of present tenants, and total strips, are added up to chieve a total land area, then three separate and different totals would be reached.

As noted above, the survey of the manor of Martham is vastly longer and in much greater detail than the surveys produced for the other manors. In all the surveys, the demesne is first listed, sometimes giving the acreages of parcels, sometimes the value per acre, and sometimes a total value or profit. The surveys of Hindringham, Hindolveston, Newton, Eton, Taverham, Elmham and Catton then list holdings entitled *Homagia*, giving the names of the tenants, the size of their holdings, and sometimes the rents and services for which they hold them. Most enumerate communal services and rights separately. Totals for rents, labour dues and rents in kind are then given, as they are for Martham. Grange of the Monks mentions only demesne and a messuage, Trowse appears to contain only demesne, whilst Plumstead lists the demesne of the Priory and then enumerates its free tenants, together with the services they owe.

The extent for Martham, like its fellows, begins by listing the demesne of the Priory, giving first the size of the perch on which measurements at Martham were based. The perch was 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet, though in fact, where parcels of land were subdivided into minute division by feet, the perch seems to have been regarded as being 18 feet or square feet, presumably in order to make some kind of calculation feasible. This customary perch has obviously persisted despite the thirteenth century ordinance of weights and measures which set out a standard perch of 16 $\frac{1}{2}$ feet or 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ yards.¹ The demesne is listed with its acreages in each field or area, and in most cases the scribe seems to have attempted to provide the rough square measurements, and thus the approximate shape of the fields, though the expression is somewhat awkwardly phrased.² After the

¹ H. P. R. Finberg Agrarian History of England and Wales, gen. edit. H. P. R. Finberg, Vol. I, Pt. II, London, Cambridge U. P. 1967, p. 412.

² See below, Appendix B. p. 318.

statement of the demesne's arable, the enclosed (*separabilis*) pasture, scythable (*falcabile*) meadows, turbary, and a messuage are listed. Each has a total value given with its total acreage, An estimate of the value of the arable per acre is given as the sworn opinion of the jurors, followed by the brief statement that sowing requirements and costs are the same as at Hemesby.¹

Following the demesne, the manuscript enumerates, again on the evidence of the jurors, the lands of the manor whose rents and services are attached to that demesne. The jurors have recalled the original tenements, as far as possible, with the rents and services owed for them. They have then stated who now held parts of them, how much, and in what strips and in what fields they lay. Each strip is described as lying in a certain field, next to (*iuxta*) the land of one person on a particular side, and abutting on (*abuttat super*) the land of another on another side. Hudson is probably correct in interpreting the terms *iuxta* and *abuttat super* precisely, as inferring that one side was a long side and the other one of the narrow ends.² Despite the bulk of information, it presents difficulties, for these strips are intermingled with those of other inhabitants of the vill, who are not part of the manor, and though the area is given, the actual shape is not.

The tenants of the time are said to hold in either molland, socage or villeinage, though these tenures are not grouped by type as in other extents. A marginal note found by each of the former tenements describes the land as either *werk'* or *mull'* and with the latter gives the acreage. As a number of entries do not specify the tenure, we must rely on the marginal note. A long series of

¹ MS fol. 37fr. p. 12.

² W. Hudson "Traces of Primitive Agricultural Organisation as suggested by a Survey of the Manor of Martham, Norfolk" in Royal Historical Society Transactions 4th Series 1:28-55 (1918), p. 29.

totals is given followed by a list of village holdings in the turbarry at Suthfen. There are miscellaneous entries of abuttals and cottagers' holdings, and finally a second section of tenements, with their present holders, which differs considerably from the main body of the manuscript.

The evidence given in the extent is on the sworn word of a group of jurors. The use of a jury of the manor or vill for such a compilation was usual in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the period saw an increasing number of such surveys drawn up in this way. The juries varied considerably in size, the largest for which Lennard could find evidence being a jury of 18 listed in the Caen Survey of the manors of Avening and Minchinhampton in Gloucestershire.¹ In Stowe Manuscript 936 the information about the manor of Taverham was compiled on the evidence of three jurors, that of the manor of Eton by five jurors, and that for Elmham by seven jurors. The Martham Extent was compiled, however, by the evidence of 20 jurors, by any standard a large number. No clue is given as to the kind of jurors chosen, though it is possible that the tithingmen of the manor may have been used. It is not the largest of the Priory's manors and its total acreage was not particularly vast, yet it was found necessary to use a very large body of jurors to give evidence. Lennard has pointed out that the number of jurors does not correspond to the acreage of the manor involved as a rule,² so that some other significance must attach to this number. The jurors were men of different economic standing, some villeins, some molmen, but most holding both types of land. Their holdings varied in size from 17 acres 4 perches (Robert Stannard) to 2 acres 2 roods and 20 perches (Gerard Stiward). Hubert Edmund does not seem to hold in the manor at all, a situation found elsewhere by Lennard.³

¹ R. Lennard "Early Manorial Juries" in English Historical Review 77:511-518 (1962) pp. 512-3.

² Ibid. p. 514.

³ Ibid. p. 514.

The manuscript is written in a clear, square and neat hand. Quite a number of folios are palimpsests, and though some of these do show a darker background, only rarely is it really difficult to read. Each folio is ruled vertically for margins, and horizontally into 35 lines. The margin and number of lines per folio are regularly maintained throughout, and only on folio 36 fronto, where he is describing the demesne holdings of the manor, does the scribe overshoot the margins to any great extent.

There are signs that a different scribe may have taken over on folio 80 fronto and verso. There are slight differences from one section to another, but most could well be accounted for by time gaps in the work etc. The style of lettering is consistent throughout. There are various groups of marginalia in different hands. These have been labelled Hands B, C, D and E as they occur, with the main body of the manuscript being regarded as being in Hand A. Hand C is the most frequently found, in marginal notes denoting the type of tenure, made in the outer margin next to the description of the former tenant and his tenement. Hand D usually occurs interlined in the text, rather than in the margin, in the form of alterations and corrections, and may in fact be the same hand as Hand A, though with much smaller lettering. Hand E occurs only once in a marginal note near the end of the manuscript. Hand B also occurs very little in the form of marginalia. Where such marginalia occur, they are noted in the footnotes.

In general the lettering is clear and the lower case letters present little or no difficulty, with the exception of the 'c' and 't' which are identical. There are two forms of small 'r' though both are quite clear. 'W' is sometimes represented by 'uu' and 'v' by 'u'. The capital letters occasionally present a little more difficulty. There are instances of two different letters being very similar, thus:

$\text{C} = \text{C}$	$\text{T} = \text{T}$	
$\text{K} = \text{K}$	$\text{R} = \text{R}$	
$\text{I} = \text{I}$	$\text{J} = \text{J}$	
$\text{S} = \text{S}$	$\text{B} = \text{B}$	$\text{M} = \text{M}$

Others have more than one version.

$\text{N} = \text{N}$ or N

$\text{S} = \text{S}$ or S

Most of the other capitals are straightforward and provide little difficulty of transcription.

The transcript attempts to stay as close to the original as possible, but certain modifications have seemed necessary for the sake of organisation and ease of reading. The manuscript organises its content only to the extent of starting again at the margin for each former tenement with a marginal decoration in the earlier part, (though this is dropped later), and by a double separation mark before the name of each of the present holders, thus: ff . In the transcript the former holdings have been more clearly and consistently separated from one another. The names of the former tenants have been underlined, as also have those of the present holders of land. The tenements are transcribed in the 'running-on' manner used by the scribe. The underlining of the holders of land makes it easier to find any one, an occupation which must have been time consuming if the Priory really did use this document for reference purposes. This, coupled with the lack of any index, must have been a serious flaw in the usefulness of the survey. Because the document is a long one without subdivisions of topic, it runs from folio to folio,

sometimes even breaking into the middle of a word, without any kind of natural break. The beginning of each folio, fronto and verso, has been noted in brackets in the course of the text, to maintain the flow.

The punctuation has also been altered though as little as possible. The scribe has used periods before and after every number and initial, and these have been omitted. Occasionally commas and periods have been added where the scribe has no punctuation, to clarify the meaning which he seems to have intended. His use of lower and higher case letters has been followed in general, except in the case of personal names, which have all been started with capitals in the transcript. The letter 'u' has been transcribed as 'u' when intended as a vowel, and as 'v' where it is used as a consonant. The same procedure has been followed with the letter 'j'. The roman numerals are reproduced in small or capital forms, as the scribe has used them.

Abbreviations are frequent throughout the manuscript, and in these, I have been largely guided by the following work:

Martin C. T. The Record Interpreter, London
Steven and Sons Ltd, 1949.

Where no help could be found in Martin's work, the decision has had to be more arbitrary.

Most of the abbreviations do not, in fact, seem very controversial, and some of those which seem doubtful, are not affected in meaning by the particular ending chosen. Where I have felt reasonably sure as to the version of a word intended, this has been transcribed in full without comment. Those abbreviations about which I have been less certain, are reproduced in italics. Any deviation from Martin's interpretation has been noted in the footnotes. Certain abbreviations have, however, been left unextended. Proper names, both of persons and places, have been left abbreviated, and the abbreviation marked with an apostrophe after the last letter, or a dash over the place where letters have been omitted. Exceptions to this rule are made where

the form of the name has seemed very clear as when a Christian name is used as a surname, or where the dash would in modern typeset cross through other letters and be confusing, eg. where the word *mull'* appears in the margins, it seemed clearer to use an apostrophe than a dash. The abbreviations for monetary units have also been retained.

For almost half of the manuscript, the former tenements have a marginal decoration attached to the first letter of the former holdings name. Where they appear, they have been noted in the footnotes, and called marginal rubric, though the latter term suggests more grandeur than they possess. They take the form of two long curlicues, sometimes extending as far as 10 lines below in the margin, but done in the same pen and ink as the manuscript. These are dropped in the later part of the document.

The latin used is very straightforward, if not always accurate. Abbreviations have been transcribed in full in the form of the word which seems most correct, though in two cases at least involving a word used constantly in abbreviated form, its full version conflicts with that used by the scribe when he does in fact write the word out in full. Thus he uses the form *perticate* whereas I have usually transcribed this word as *perticas*. Similarly, he twice uses the expression *viam regalem* but for all his numerous abbreviations I have used the form *viam regis*. The translations of medieval latin words have been taken largely from the following works:

Martin C. T. The Record Interpreter, London, Steven and Sons Ltd., 1949.

Latham R. E. Revised Medieval Latin Word List, London, Oxford University Press, 1965.

Elsewhere in the text these have been referred to only as Latham and Martin, with a page reference.

II: THE MANORIAL EXTENT OF THE MANOR OF MARTHAM

Dominica Terra

Numerus acrarum terre in Manerio de Martham mensuratus perticam
xviiij pedum et dimidium.

In una pecia que iacet iuxta portam ex parte aquilonali vj acre
dimidia, xv pertice et dimidia cum Helewys' aker.

In alia pecia iuxta portam versus austrum xij acre, i roda dimidia,
iiij pertice dimidia, vij pertice et dimidia in *latitudine* I pedis.¹

Item Clovenhil xij acre, iij rode dimidia iij pertice et xij pertice
in *latitudine* I pedis.

Item Grenecrof continet xxviiij acre, iij rode xiiij pertice et xvj
pertice in *latitudine* I pedis.

Item Scolewong xix acre dimidia, xix pertice et iij pertice *latit-*
udine I pedis.

Item Blakealdelond x acre dimidia, xiiij pertice et xij pertice
latitudine I pedis.

Item la Longelond super Hask' ix acre, i roda, ix pertice et xvj
pertice *latitudine* I pedis.

Item la Breche² xviiij acre, i roda dimidia, xiiij pertice et iij
quarterie.

Item Stannardeswong xx acre, iij rode et vj pertice.

Item Havercroft vj acre, ij pertice et vij pertice de *latitudine*
I pedis.

Item Heghask' viij acre, iij rode dimidia, iij pertice et iij

¹ The portion underlined is written above the line of which it appears to be a part in the manuscript, and is preceded by omission marks, thus:

² A Breck or Brech signified an intake. Perhaps this is an innam or intake which has become permanent.

pertice et dimidia latitudine I pedis.

Item Hangandewong x acre dimidia, xj pertice et iij quartie.

Item una pecia que iacet in Cytakres i roda dimidia, xv pertice et vij pertice et i quarterius latitudine I pedis.¹

Item Quatmannesaker I acra dimidia, xvj pertice et dimidia.

Item le Meduesik' i acra dimidia, i roda, i pertica et i quarterius.

(----r')² dicunt super sacramentum quod *quelibet* acra valet per annum ij s. x d.

Et possunt seminari, falcari, ligari et unari sicut ad Hemesby.

Pastura Separabile.³

Bi Dounesdik' vj acre dimidia, xj pertice dimidia, vj pertice et dimidia in latitudine unius pedis, et valet acra per annum viij d.

Item Hallebenk' i acra, i roda et x pertice. Et totum *appreciatur* per annum ad vij d.⁴

Pratum Falcabile.⁵

Westdoneshynge dimidia acra et dimidia roda pretii v d. per annum.

Item Northmedue iiiij acre dimidia, dimidia roda, viij pertice et iij quarterie.

Et totum *appreciatur* ad xij s. vj d. Cum pastura ij bova in eadem

¹ Added to the line below but separated by omission marks.

² Most of this word has been trapped in the binding and has not appeared on the microfilm. Possibly *juritores*.

³ The beginning of the word is trapped in the binding.

⁴ Added to the end of the line below, but separated by omission marks.

⁵ The beginning of the word is trapped in the binding.

pecia.

Item Suthmedue iij acre dimidia, iij pertice et dimidia *pretii* v s.
per annum.

Item ad portam Aule I acra dimidia, vj pertice et iij *quarterie*
pretii xij d. per annum.

Item alia pecia I roda dimidia et xij pertice.

Item Meduesyk' iiiij acre, svj pertice et dimidia. Et totum *appre-*
ciatur ad ij s.

Turbaria.¹

Apud Meduesyk' ij acre dimidia, I roda et I pertice *pretii* viij d.
per annum. (fol. 37v.)

Item pastura apud Breyflet *appreciatur* ad iiiij d.

Mesuagium per circiutum continet iij acre, I rodam dimidia et
viij perticas.

Et *appreciatur* per annum ad iij s. cum fructu eiusdem.

Summa terre arabile ibidem viij^{xx} viij acre, iij rode, xvj pertice *et*²

Summa *valorum* *acrarum* in denariis xvij *libre*, viij s. iiiij d. ob.

Summa pasture separabile, prati falcabile et *turbarie* xxv acre
dimidia, dimidia roda, ix pertice dimidia et viij pertice *latitudine*
I *pedis*.

Summa omnium *summarum* supra ^{xx}x xvij acre dimidia, I roda dimidia,
xviij pertice et viij *latitudinis* *pedis*.

De Terris Redditibus consuetudinibus et omnibus *serviciis* de manerio
de Martham Anno Prioris H. de Lakenham iiiij^{to} per tales *juratos*,
Videlicet per Robertum Stannard, Rogerum Avaunt, Robertum de Sco,

¹ This word is partially trapped in the binding.

² This abbreviated form of the word *et* seems to be followed by something else trapped in the margin. It seems unlikely to be *dimidia* as this would make the sum of the arable land incorrect.

Alexanderum de Sco, Rogerum Rede, Gerardum Stiward, Hubertum Edmund, Humfridum de Syk, Robertum Blakyng junior, Rogerum Bolle, Johnnem Elsy, Willelmum Yware, Nicholaum Berte, Robertum Orger, Radulphum Prudume, Rogerum Walter, Willelmum Pechun, Ricardum Pechun, Robertum de Faldgate et Robertum Erl, qui dicunt quod

Rogerus de Hil¹ tenuit quondam x acre que vocantur mulelond et soluit inde annuatim ad censum iiiij s. Ad auxilium xj d. ob. qu. Et *faciet*² iij preces in Augusto pretium diei I d. ob. ad cibum domini, scilicet pro prima prece unum repastum, videlicet panem, potagium, cervisium unum *fasculum* carnis et caseum sive lac. Similiter pro aliis pro qualibet *precaris* unum repastum, scilicet panem, potagium, I *fasculum* piscis et caseum sive lac. Averabit apud Norwyc' unum averagium *scilicet* septimam partem unius mett, et unum mett, ut vocatur, continet iiiij summas ordeï sive brasei³ et habebit ibi (fol. 38fr.) I panem et I lagenam cervisi. Si non averat dabit I d. et ob. Cariabit per I diem in agosto si habet carectam propriam et si non habet carectam veniet *cum*⁴ si *precatus* fuerit, et habebit ibi pro cariatone vel pro se cum furca, unum repastum, scilicet panem de frumento, potagium, cervisium, carnes in die carniū sive piscem in die piscis. Faciet braseum *scilicet* septimam partem unius mett, vel dabit I d. et qu. Flagellabit per dimidiam diem sine cibe, vel dabit ob. Arabit si habet carucam propriam cum

¹ Marginalia (Hand C). *Mull' x agri.* Marginal rubric.

² I have used this tense because the scribe uses this tense in most of the passage, although describing the holding of a person supposedly in the past.

³ Marginalia (Hand B). *Ho' se' mett.* (*Non septimam mett?*)

⁴ From what follows, it seems possible that the scribe omitted the word *furca* at this point.

tot averia quot habet in caruca sua propria, et habebit pro caruca integra iij panes quam magni fieri possunt, xl panes de vj busellibus ordeï et ix allecia, sed si non habet carucam propriam, non arat. Herciabit per dimidiam diem *post*¹ nonam quamvis habeat proprium affrum vel non cum I affro vel dabit I d. Et dabit I gallinam et v ova de *pretio* I d. ob. De quibus nunc sunt xj tenentes, videlicet Robertus de Hil senieor tenet I acram et I rodam, xxiiij perticas et vj pedes quorum dimidia acra iacet in Tofto suo cum mesuagio iuxta terram Galfridi Brunstan ex parte occidentali et abuttat super viam regalem que ducit de Martham ad Reppes versus austrum. Item iij perticate et vj pedes iacent in Campo de Rolesby iuxta terram Johannis Bene ex parte australi et abuttat super terram Galfridi de Sco versus occidentem. Item xxvj pertice et xij pedes iacent in Campo de Rolesby iuxta terram Willelmi Richild ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Roberti de Sco versus orientem. Item xx pertice iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Alexanderi de Sco ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Nicholai Drie versus occidentem. Item x pertice iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Roberti Sangestrye ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Rogeri filii Ricardi versus occidentem. Item xiiij pertice et vj pedes iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Galfridi de Sco ex parte orientali et abuttat super viam regiam que ducit de Martham ad Reppes versus aquilonem. Item xxvj pertice et xij pedes iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Johannis Walle ex parte orientali et abuttat super viam regis que ducit de Martham ad Reppes versus austrum. Item x pertice iacent in Campo de Martham iuxta terram Hunfridi de Syk' ex parte occidentali et abuttat super terram Roberti de Syk'. Johannes de Hil tenet I acram et I rodam et xxiiij perticas et vj pedes, quorum dimidia acra iacet in Tofto suo cum mesuagio iuxta terram Roberti de (fol. 38v.) Hyl ex parte occidentali et abuttat super viam regis

¹ The translation of the particular abbreviation used here is given in Martin as *portus* but that would make little sense in this context.

versus austrum. Item iij pertice et vj pedes iacent in Campo de Rolesby iuxta terram Roberti de Hil ex parte australi et abuttat super terram Galfridi de Sco versus occidentem. Item tertia pars dimidie acre iacet in Campo de Rolesby iuxta¹ Roberti de Hyl ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Nicholai Orte versus occidentem. Item x pertice iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Roberti de Hil ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Rogeri filii Ricardi versus occidentem. Item xiiij pertice et vj pedes iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Roberti de Hil ex parte orientali et abuttat super viam regis que ducit de Martham ad Reppes versus aquilonem. Item dimidia acra iacet in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Roberti de Hil ex parte orientali et abuttat super viam regis predictam versus austrum. Item xxiiij pertice et vj pedes iacent in Campo de Martham iuxta toftum Ade Hardyng ex parte occidentali et abuttat super terram Willelmi de Holweston' versus austrum. Item x pertice iacent in Westfeld iuxta terram Roberti de Hil ex parte occidentali et abuttat super terram Roberti de Syk versus austrum. Robertus de Hil tenet I acram et I rodam et xxxiiij perticas et vj pedes. De quibus dimidia acra iacet in tofto suo cum mesuagio iuxta terram Johannis de Hil ex parte occidentali et abuttat super viam regis versus austrum que ducit de Martham ad Reppes. Item iij pertice et vj pedes iacent in campo de Rolesby iuxta terram Johannis Bene ex parte australi et abuttat super terram Galfridi de Sco versus occidentem. Item tertia pars dimidie acre iacet in Campo de Rolesby iuxta terram Johannis de Hil ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Roberti de Sco versus orientem. Item xx pertice iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Johannis de Hil ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Nicholai Drye versus occidentem. Item x pertice iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Johannis de Hil ex parte aquilonali et abuttat super terram Rogeri filii Ricardi versus occidentem. Item xiiij pertice et vj pedes iacent in Campo de Sco iuxta terram Johannis de Hil ex parte

¹ The word *terram* appears to be missing here.