S.A Ball
BINFIELD

THE OXFORDSHIRE RECORD SOCIETY

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY

1936.

From John
Xmas 1950

The Oxfordshire Record Society.

EYNSHAM UNDER THE MONKS

OXFORDSHIRE RECORD SERIES—VOL. XVIII

From my Friend
J. M. Ballards

Oxfordshire Record Society

EYNSHAM UNDER THE MONKS

BY

SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, K.B.E., F.B.A.

OXFORD:
ISSUED FOR THE SOCIETY.
1936.

CONTENTS.

NOTE ON REFERENCES.

I abbreviate the constant references to H. E. Salter, *The Cartulary of the Abbey of Eynsham* (1907, 1908; *Oxford Historical Society*, xlix, li) into "S," generally followed by the charter number. Unreferenced notices of 1360 are from Charter 607; of 1366 from Charter 615; of 1605 from Hanborough Estate maps among the muniments of Corpus Christi College; of 1615 from Eynsham Estate maps in the same collection; of 1650 from *Bodleian Gough MS. Oxon* 53; of 1782 from an Eynsham map of that date by Thomas Pride, now in the possession of the Oxfordshire County Council; of 1802 from the Enclosure Awards and map in the same possession. My thanks are due to the College and the Council for the use of these documents, and to Mr. Hautenville Cope for that of some transcripts of Eynsham Court Rolls for 1560–72 made by the late Canon Oldfield.

Other references, although sometimes abbreviated, are, I hope, given with sufficient fullness for verification.

E.K.C.

EYNSHAM UNDER THE MONKS.

I. THE BEGINNINGS OF EYNSHAM.

Eynsham, in Oxfordshire, is an agricultural township of about 4,500 acres, lying mainly in an angle between the Upper Thames and its tributary the Evenlode. The town stands on a gravel ridge some twenty feet above river level. It is traversed by the main road from London and Oxford to Gloucester, which crosses the Thames at Swinford, five miles from Oxford and half a mile from the town. On the north-west the ground rises to a higher ridge, largely wooded, on which stands the comparatively modern hamlet of Freeland, recently detached. From the wood flows a stream, now called the Chil Brook, and from the west a Limb Brook which joins it at a hythe or wharf, a little to the south-east of the town, to form an arm of the Thames. There are traces of early settlement. Neolithic celts have been found in the town itself, a buckler of the bronze age at Swinford, and a palstave at Freeland. An earthwork of irregular outline is in the woodland, and a small circular one to the east of it.[1] Roman and Romano-British coins are occasionally dug up in the town. Haverfield, in 1895, noticed lines in the corn near Foxley Farm, to the south-west of the township, which suggested occupation, and of this confirmation has recently been found through an aerial survey by Major Allen, which disclosed a number of barrow rings and possibly other enclosures of the Bronze Age between that farm and the town.[2] Here too a map of 1615 shows a Barrow Hill, and that of 1782 a Round Hill. A "Deadmanes buriall" which stood in 1615 a little further to the south is not now discernible, but there are traces of a Torres Grave shown by another map of the same date, with a "meere" or boundary named from it, north of the town. Eynsham first enters recorded history in the *Saxon Chronicle*, a compilation of the late ninth century. Here we are told that in 571 Cuthwulf of Wessex fought the Britons at Bedcanforda, and

[1] *Archaeologia*, lxxi. 227. [2] *Antiquity*, vii. 290.

took Lygeanburg, Aegelesburg, Baenesingtun and Egoneshâm.[1] The last three places are clearly Aylesbury, Benson and Eynsham. Bedcanforda is more hesitatingly identified with Bedford and Lygeanburg with Limbury near Luton in Bedfordshire. But it is practically impossible that Britons should have been still holding out in these districts up to 571, and modern historians have freely reconstructed the event. Professor Oman thinks that Cuthwulf, who was a brother of Ceawlin, King of Wessex, was fighting not Britons, but a rival tribe of Saxons, perhaps the Chilternsaetas, who had settled north of the Thames.[2] Dr. Thurlow Leeds, more daring, suggests a complete misdating by the *Chronicle* of an episode in an invasion of Britain, a century earlier than 571, by West Saxons coming from the Wash by the Icknield Way along the Chilterns.[3] Whoever the victors may have been, the campaign evidently gave them control of two important river-crossings, at Swinford on the Upper Thames and at Wallingford near Benson on the Lower Thames. Eynsham may have seen more warfare about 777, when Offa of Mercia, again at Benson, defeated Cynewulf of Wessex, annexed the land of the Chilternsaetas, and according to the *Abingdon Chronicle*, made a *castellum super montem de Witham*, presumably on Beacon Hill, which commands Swinford from the south.[4]

Aegen, who left his name to the place, and Tilgar, who left his to its northern hamlet of Tilgarsley, had long occupied their barrows in peace, and Oxford may have already become an important town, before we again hear anything notable of Eynsham. It was in 1005, during a lull in the disastrous invasions of Sweyn the Viking, that Aethelmar, Earl of Cornwall, gave it with its thirty *mansiuncula*, or holdings, to be the site of a Benedictine monastery *in loco celebri*, and obtained a confirmatory charter from Aethelred II "the Redeless."[5] The first abbot was Aelfric, whose homilies and other writings form an important part of Anglo-Saxon literature. This foundation, however, did not survive the Conquest, when the brethren fled in terror, and their abode was devastated.[6] The land seems to have been taken by the Conqueror and granted by him to Remigius, the first Norman Bishop of Dorchester. A refoundation of the abbey may have been contemplated, but about 1073 the see of the bishopric was

[1] C. Plummer, *Two Saxon Chronicles*, i. 18.
[2] *England before the Norman Conquest*, 229.
[3] *History*, x. 97; *Antiquaries Journal*, xiii. 229.
[4] *Ab. Chron.*, i. 8; ii. 269. [5] S, 1.
[6] *Vita S. Hugonis*, 189.

moved from Dorchester to Lincoln, and as a result Remigius decided to re-found instead another derelict abbey at Stow in Lincolnshire, and to assign the Eynsham land for its maintenance. In 1086 the land was held by the bishop and under him by Columbanus the monk. But in 1091 the bishop's foundation charter for Stow gave it to that house, and appointed Columbanus as the abbot.[1] Stow, however, was not destined to endure. Robert Bloet, who became Bishop of Lincoln in 1093, reversed his predecessor's decision. Charters of William II consent to a *mutatio loci*, on condition that Abbot Columbanus is compensated for the land he had at Stow, and direct the sheriffs concerned to hand over to the Abbot of Eynsham his men and their money, wherever they may be found.[2] The actual transfer seems to have taken some time, since the abbey is still described as *hactenus desolatam et dissipatam* by a charter of Henry I in 1109, which sets out its estates and gives to the bishop the patronage, which the former kings had retained in their own hands.[3] The lands are to be held *ecclesiastico more*, that is to say, in return for spiritual and not military service, on some such tenure as later lawyers called frankalmoign. As now finally established, the abbey received, besides the township in which it stood, several properties elsewhere, which had formed part of Aethelmar's original endowment, and others granted in exchange by the bishop for those of Stow, to which came to be added many fresh donations by the faithful, notably by members of the great Oxfordshire family of D'Oili and the lesser Oxfordshire family of Chesney. At the close of the middle ages, it stood next after Oseney as the second richest of the religious houses in the county.

I shall not, however, concern myself with the outlying estates. Nor shall I attempt to rewrite the internal history of the abbey as an ecclesiastical organisation, which would be a mere affectation after the admirable handling by Dr. Salter. It may, however, be interesting to put together what can be gleaned of medieval life in Eynsham itself, under the domination of monks, who to the end of their days appear to have been typical agriculturists, rather than men of great learning, or even of astonishing piety. Even here, I am still largely dependent upon the documents collected by Dr. Salter and, in particular, upon the transcripts of deeds printed by him from two cartularies preserved at Christ Church, Oxford. The earlier of these was originally compiled about 1197 and received many additions up to the beginning of the fifteenth century.[4] The

[1] S, 5. [2] S, 6, 28. [3] S, 7. [4] S, I, xxxii.

later starts with a series of surveys of Eynsham estates about 1360, but also contains additions.[1] There are many Eynsham documents of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries among the *Harleian Rolls* in the British Museum, of which I have unfortunately been able to make little use. But to the cartularies can be added a survey of the Eynsham tenantry in the *Hundred Rolls* of 1279.[2] And the medieval evidence can be interpreted in the light of some estate maps of land belonging to Corpus Christi College in 1605 and 1615, of terriers for the same land in 1697 and 1788 ; of a complete survey of Eynsham in 1650, preserved as *Gough MS. Oxon* 53 in the Bodleian ; and of a map of 1782, by Thomas Pride, in the possession of the Oxfordshire County Council. At these dates the agricultural land of Eynsham was still very much in open fields of the medieval type, and even now, owing to the little hedging that was done when the land was redistributed under the Enclosure Act of 1800, the outlines of the medieval manor are still fairly traceable.

The Domesday record for Eynsham comes under a general heading for the land of the Bishop of Lincoln in Oxfordshire, and may be translated as follows[3] :—

> The Bishop himself holds Eglesham and Columbanus the monk holds of him.
>
> There are fifteen hides and a half belonging to the said church.
>
> There is land (*terra*) for eighteen ploughs and so many are found. In the demesne is land for two ploughs not geldable (*inland*).
>
> Now are three ploughs in the demesne and three knights (*milites*) with thirty-four townsmen (*villani*) and thirty-three cottagers (*bordarii*) have fifteen ploughs. There is a mill worth ten shillings and four hundred and fifty eels and two hundred and fifty-five acres of meadow and a hundred acres of pasture. A wood (*silva*) of a league and a half in length and a league and two furlongs (*quarentinae*) in width.
>
> When it is taxed (*oneratur*) it is worth twenty-five shillings. It was worth and is worth twenty pounds.

Domesday measurements cannot be translated with complete certainty into modern measurements, because the units employed were not yet standardized throughout the country. A typical hide consisted of 120 acres and was subdivided into

[1] S, II, 1.
[2] *H. Rolls* (R.O.), ii. 859.
[3] *D.B.* (R.O.), i. 155.

four virgates of 30 acres. In some parts of Oxfordshire, however, the hide was of 160 acres and the virgate of 40; there is insufficient reason for supposing that it was so in Eynsham. A typical acre, again, was a strip of one furlong or 40 perches long by four perches wide, but it is not certain that the standard perch of five and a half yards prevailed everywhere. In any case, the lie of agricultural fields does not permit of their always being cut up into strips of exactly the same size and shape, and it is clear from later measurements that the acres which we find in early Eynsham records averaged no more than about three-quarters of a standard acre. If we neglect these complications, it is possible to arrive at some estimate of the land under cultivation in 1086. We may also neglect the Domesday statement of hides. These were not areal hides, but represent a conventional assessment, probably dating from before the Conquest, of units for the incidence of the tax known as the Danegeld. From this two ploughlands forming part of the demesne, or land directly cultivated by the lord of the manor, and not held of him by tenants, had been exempted—this is the ordinary sense of *inland* in *Domesday Book*—and Eynsham appears to have been further underassessed by half a hide. Perhaps there had been an increase of arable since the assessment was made. On the other hand there were eighteen ploughlands, and by a ploughland we may reasonably understand a carucate, which is the same thing as an areal hide, regarded as the amount ploughable in a year by a team of eight oxen. Here again there is an element of convention in the reckoning, since medieval ploughing was often done by much smaller teams, and a team of two or four oxen would certainly plough more than a quarter or half as much as one of eight. Eighteen carucates would amount to 2,160 acres, so that arable cultivation was very fully exploited in the Eynsham of 1086. There must be added the 255 acres of meadow and the 100 acres of pasture and a very large wood, no doubt occupying the north-western part of the township. Exactly how large we cannot say, because we do not know whether the extreme or mean limits were measured. A medieval league was twelve furlongs, and if the wood was absolutely square, which it naturally was not, it would cover 2,560 acres. The rest of the area would be waste land not yet taken into cultivation and disregarded in *Domesday*. Nor can we say how much of the arable was demesne and how much tenant-land. There were at least three carucates of demesne, since the lord had the equivalent of three full plough teams of

his own, and an indefinite amount more, since we may assume that some, if not all, of the tenants had to contribute their ploughs and labour to the lord's cultivation.

The tenants had not all the same *status*; there were three knights, thirty-four *villani* and thirty-three *bordarii*. The knights must have been placed there by the Bishop of Lincoln, who held his lands from the crown as a lay barony, from which he was bound to provide his *quota* to the royal army. He did so by establishing knight's fees in his various estates, upon the holders of which the duty of actual military service devolved. Some of the Eynsham land, not yet occupied by the monks, was probably so granted. The same thing seems to have happened at Yarnton, which was part of Aethelmar's original gift to Eynsham, although the medieval abbey never succeeded in recovering it. Here *Domesday Book* shows Roger D'Ivri holding nine and a half hides, which is stated to be Eynsham land, of the bishop. We find no later mention of knight's fees at Eynsham. There are some faint traces of claims upon the abbot for scutage, as a money compensation for knight service, and there were still some knights under him in 1213.[1] But the lands concerned may not have been at Eynsham itself. The bishop's own tale of knights, which stood at sixty in 1166, had been reduced by the thirteenth century to five.[2] He presumably paid scutage, but there is no evidence that he received any from the abbey. Knighthood was not in itself hereditary, and possibly the successors of the Domesday knights are to be found among the larger tenants of the thirteenth century. But one of them, I think, may have been Nigel D'Oili, who before 1109 gave the abbey for the sake of his soul a hide, which he had held of them, with the consent of Bishop Robert Bloet.[3]

The *villani* of *Domesday Book* were probably a heterogeneous class, including both men of Norman origin holding their land more or less freely but under the protection of the abbot, and others descended from Saxon cultivators, who were in process of depression to the *status* of serfs. Their number shows that most of them were small men, whose arable holdings must be thought of in terms of virgates, rather than of hides. What precise dues they owed to the abbey, in labour services, food rents, or money rents, we cannot tell. The *bordarii* were smaller men still, probably holding no more than five or ten acres, not possessing ploughs of their own, and eking out a living by

[1] S, 711.
[2] H. M. Chew, *English Ecclesiastical Tenants*, II, 76, 78.
[3] S, 7.

serving the abbot or the larger tenants as hired labourers. The tenant land, we may be sure, lay not in compact blocks, but in separate acres and half-acres distributed over the arable fields of the township and cultivated, according to the old Saxon custom, by communal agreement. This may also have been so, in 1086, with the demesne land, although at a later date the abbot seems to have largely concentrated his holdings. Probably half of the arable lay fallow in each year. And to each holding were attached rights of pasturage, for cattle and sheep who wandered, under common herdsmen, over the fallow and waste, and over the meadows and cultivated arable, when the crops were cut, and for swine who nuzzled in the abbey wood.

The powers of the abbot over his tenants were largely derived from the conferment upon him, under royal charters, of a franchise jurisdiction within the limits of his manor, independent of the old county and hundred courts held by the sheriff and bailiffs. The grant seems to have been made by a second charter of Henry I, which is not preserved. But it was confirmed both by Stephen in 1135–39 and by his rival Matilda in 1141–42.[1] There is a slight difference in the terms employed. Stephen specifies the full privileges of soke and sake, tol and team, and infangenetheof. This is ancient language which became obscure to later lawyers. But, roughly speaking, soke and sake appear to give the right of holding a court, team that of deciding disputes as to property, tol that of taxing tenants, and infangenetheof that of hanging thieves taken within the manor. Matilda's charter, on the other hand, excludes theft, as well as murder, from the abbot's jurisdiction. The manorial court was held every three weeks, under the abbot's steward, and served also as a gathering at which the arrangements for communal agriculture were settled, and bye-laws made for the well-being of the township. Eynsham was in the Hundred of Wootton. This took its name from a township which formed part, with Old Woodstock, Hordeley, Combe, Stonesfield, Bladon and Hanborough, of the great royal demesne manor of Woodstock. With Woodstock the early relations of Eynsham must have been close. Here Henry I built a palace and made a chase, which bordered on the ancient forest of Wychwood, and here he often sojourned for the sake of hunting. Later kings followed his example, and the abbey was often burdened with finding quarters for royal servants, such as the

[1] S, 31, 699.

departments of the Chancery and the Exchequer, which accompanied the court. There is a warrant by Henry I which exempts the men of Eynsham from the duty of putting up barriers for the king's hunt, when his *familia* was located there.[1] Stephen granted the abbey another privilege of value, that of holding a market on Sundays, to which Henry II added annual fairs in the weeks after Pentecost and the Assumption (August 15). In 1440 the market was shifted to Monday and Friday, as more convenient days.[2] As a result there grew up in Eynsham, side by side with the agriculture, a trading borough. We know nothing of its precise origin, or of the boundary, if any, which delimited its houses from the agricultural homesteads. But it doubtless involved from the beginning a partition of the abbot's jurisdiction between two distinct courts, an ordinary manorial court for the agricultural tenants, and a portmote court for those in the borough. Probably also, since freedom in the disposal of property would attract trading folk, the inhabitants of the borough held their houses and shops upon tenures which could be easily disposed of by sale or even by will.

II. THE CARTULARY RECORDS.

About 1213, one Adam of Oxford, who had formerly been prior, and afterwards chaplain to St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, was appointed to the abbacy. He was a scholar, and compiled the narrative of a vision of purgatory, beheld in a trance by his brother Edmund, which is the sole contribution of Eynsham to medieval literature. But he seems not to have been a good man of business. He got the house into debt and wasted the woods; in 1228 he was deposed by the bishop, *tanquam periurus et dilapidator manifestus*. However this may be, the period of his rule was one of considerable changes in the township. We hear of a "new street" and a "new bridge" and a "new grange," near the old "barton" of the abbey. Moreover, the space of the borough appears to have been inadequate for the influx of settlers attracted by the market; and the difficulty was met, not by an extension of its boundaries, but by the creation of an entirely new borough, to the north of the old one. Of this we know more than of the old one, because we have the charter of the Newland (*Nova Terra*), witnessed by the abbey chapter, and delivered to the *communa* of burgesses in 1215.[3] By this the abbot and

[1] S, 698.
[2] S, 30, 702; *Cal. Charter Rolls*, vi. 8.
[3] S, 44A.

convent assign all the demesne land between the *villa* and the *strata* leading to Cassington bridge, together with an extent of half a furlong to the north of that *strata*, to be held in plots of a quarter of an acre and upwards, at the annual rent of four shillings an acre. The tenure is to be hereditary and free from any secular service to the abbey, and also, like the demesne itself, from "forinsec" service to any outside lord. Tenants may alienate their holdings to laymen, on payment to the abbey of 2*d.* by the vendor and 4*d.* by the purchaser. If chattels are not devised before death, a third is to go to sons, a third to a widow, and a third to be divided by the nearest relatives as they think fit. The tenants are to elect their own *praepositus* or headman, who shall do fealty both to them and the abbey. Pleas as to forfeiture and complaints may be held, presumably in a court under the *praepositus*, and amercements inflicted up to a limit of ten shillings. The burgesses are to enjoy all customs which the abbey can grant, as freely as those of Oxford or anywhere else in the shire. We may probably infer that these privileges, apart from the market and fairs, which only the crown could grant, were very much the same as those of the old borough. The Newland tenure was of the nature of what is called a burgage, practically a freehold, and a burgage in the old borough is noted in 1219.[1] These facts of 1213–28 are taken from the cartulary of 1197. This probably owes its inception to Adam himself, while still prior, at a time when the abbot's franchises were likely to be called in question before the king's courts. From additions made to it, mainly during the thirteenth century, and from other sources, much is to be learned about transactions in land and houses between the abbey and its freehold tenants. There were, of course, other tenants, whom these records do not touch. They were not freeholders, and when their lands changed hands, it was by a process of ceremonial surrender and admittance at a sitting of the manor court; and if any written record was made as early as the thirteenth century, it would be in the rolls of that court, which are not preserved, and not in the cartulary. The entries in this are copies of deeds sealed and executed in the presence of witnesses, as evidence of the delivery of seisin or actual possession of property by which conveyance was effected, and in explanation of the intention with which it was given. The names of the witnesses are often, although not always, copied in the cartulary. They are notables from neighbouring townships, or servants of the abbey or other freeholders of Eynsham.

[1] S, 186.

Probably the sealing took place with some ceremony on a court day or a festival when visitors were present. In 1178 donors swear to observe their gift upon the high altar.[1] In 1227 it was decided that grants by the abbey should be read in chapter before they were sealed.[2] Sometimes the transaction was consequential upon a previous lawsuit, real or fictitious, in the royal courts. A precise date is rarely recorded. The known history of a witness may help, and the entries in the cartulary of 1197 are more or less in chronological order. At the worst, the name of the abbot recited makes an approximate dating possible. The wording is, of course, in Latin. The earliest deed for a conveyance in Eynsham itself, which has reached us, is of about 1150, and may be thus translated[3] :—

> Be it known to those of the future, as well as to those of the present, that William Abbot of Eynsham and the whole convent of the same church, without dissent, have granted to Nicholas son of Sewolde of Leigh, himself and his heirs, the land of Frithe, to be held of them by hereditary right, free and quit of all service, for a mark of silver to be rendered annually at the feast of St. Michael ; and also that the said Nicholas in consideration thereof remits the claim of seven marks which they owed him of the debt of Abbot Walter the second. Of this agreement are witnesses, Walter the archdeacon, Nigel, Ralph the priest, William of Chesnei, Ralph of Worcester, Acsur, William of Stratford, William Waleys, Walter of Chesnei, Walter Piron, Geoffrey Lovell, Robert of Waste Land, Ranulph and his brother Richard, Gilbert the butler, Osmund and his son Walter, and all the servants of the house, and innumerable others.

With the beginning of the thirteenth century, the deeds become numerous. There are grants both from the abbey and to the abbey. They deal with properties of various extent ; sometimes with the whole of a tenant's holdings in Eynsham, not further specified ; sometimes with a substantial holding, such as a virgate ; sometimes with a few acres only, of arabel or of arable and meadow. There is often a dwelling-place (*messuagium*, *mansio*, *mansus*, *domus*, *cotagium*) attached. Sometimes there is nothing but a dwelling-place, which may have its courtyard (*curia*, *curtilagium*), croft, garden (*gardinum*, *ortolagium*), or dovecot (*columbarium*). The smaller holdings are carefully described. They are made up of acres or half acres, in localities which are clearly the furlongs known to us

[1] S, 168. [2] S, I, xx. [3] S, 658.

from later evidence as the units of agricultural cultivation; and each acre or half acre strip is further identified by naming the holders of those adjacent to it. Sometimes the locality on which the land abuts (*extendit se*) is named. Arable is generally said to be in the field (*campus*) or fields of Eynsham, but the fields in which the furlongs were grouped are never named. Nor is the term *cultura* used to indicate a furlong. Probably the more substantial holdings were similarly distributed over the furlongs, but in these cases there is no such specification of locality; it may be that schedules were appended to the original deeds, or were already in the possession of the abbey. The position of the houses is sometimes given with precision, by relation to neighbouring buildings, or by specifying a quarter (*vicus*), or the *Novus Burgus* of Newland. But often we only get "*in villa.*" No doubt this, as in the Newland charter, means the old borough, although *villa* can also signify a township as a whole.

Two more examples of the forms taken by the deeds may now be given. The first is a grant to the abbey of 1197–1208.[1]

> Be it known to all to whom the present writing may come that I Richard de Submuro of Eynsham have given and granted and by the present charter have confirmed to God and to St. Mary of Eynsham and to our lord Robert the abbot and to the monks of the same place, for the welfare of my soul and of my ancestors and heirs, one virgate of land which I held of them in the territory of the township of Eynsham, that to wit which Henry Banastre had in custody, when I was under age, with all the crofts and meadow and one messuage at Tilgaresle belonging to the same, with all its appurtenances and customs. Moreover I have given and granted to the said abbot and monks all the land which I had at Ludemere with its meadow and appurtenances.

The other is a grant by the abbey in 1228–39.[2]

> Know that I Nicholas abbot of Eynsham and the whole convent of the same place have given and granted to Hugh, son of William Bacun, for his homage and service, two lands of two plough-beasts, to wit that land which Robert Bohun held, and that land which Roger Puke held, with the chief (*capitali*) manse which was Richard de Submuro's in the township of Eynsham, and likewise a certain meadow next Beterhale, which Roger Purchas once held of us; to be had and held of us for himself and his heirs

[1] S, 178. [2] S, 599.

by hereditary right, freely and quit of all service and demand, except three bedrips a year to be done for us by him and his heirs, to wit each with one man, the first on their own food, and the two next following on our food, and except two scythings in Wyreshey and Wrouthey, to wit in each meadow for one day with one man on our food, and except two loadings in Wyreshey and Wroughthey for two days with one man on their own food. Also the said Hugh and his heirs shall find one cart for two days for carrying hay from the said meadows to our barton on our food. Also the said Hugh and his heirs shall render to us annually from all the said lands ten shillings sterling at four terms of the year, to wit at the feast of St. Thomas the Apostle two shillings and sixpence, at the Annunciation of the blessed Mary two shillings and sixpence, at the Nativity of St. John the Baptist two shillings and sixpence, and at the feast of St. Michael two shillings and sixpence, and likewise four capons yearly, to wit at Christmas two capons and at Easter two capons; and the said Hugh and his heirs are to acquit the said manse of the royal service. Which said lands and said meadow and said house we will warrant to the said Hugh and his heirs against all men. And if we should not be able to warrant the said house to the said Hugh and his heirs, we will render to him and his heirs other land of as great width and length to the value of the said house in our township of Eynsham. The costs and expenses which Hugh or his heirs may have incurred on the said manse, both in buildings and in planting of trees, we will faithfully warrant to the plea of the said Hugh or his heirs. And for this donation and grant the said Hugh gave us forty shillings sterling as a fine on entry (*in gersummam*). And that this our gift and grant may be firm and undisturbed we have imposed our seal, with these witnesses, Master Peter de Stanes, Avenel, John the porter, Robert Marshall, Richard Bacun, John Bacun, Ralph son of the clerk, Ralph of Wootton, Amisius of Cassington, Peter of Cassington, W. Blund, and many others.

There is a link between these two deeds. *Terra*, standing by itself, always means arable land, and the *terra* of one plough-beast seems to mean an eighth of the hide conventionally regarded as the stint of a full plough-team of eight oxen. The land of two plough-beasts would therefore be a virgate, and the inclusion of Richard de Submuro's house suggests that the

virgate granted to Hugh Bacun in 1228–39 was the same which had been given to the abbey by Richard in 1197–1208, and that in the interval it had been divided between other tenants. We have not, of course, all the deeds needed to trace the devolution of the various holdings. Many of them were never entered in the cartulary and are lost. Deeds recording sales between tenant and tenant, moreover, only appear in the cartulary if the abbey had some special interest in them, such as a right to a reversion. And of such sales there were no doubt many.

The examples given illustrate the general character of the deeds, but there is a good deal of variation in details, as regards both substance and expression. The abbey grants, in the thirteenth century, are normally on an hereditary tenure, often emphasized as being "in perpetuity." Two grants are for life only.[1] One was made in return for the surrender of an hereditary claim to a smaller holding, the other to a widow, whose husband who had presumably died without heirs, in which case the holding would revert to the abbot as the lord of which it was held, subject to the widow's life-interest in a third as dower. In the fourteenth century, grants for the lives of husband, wife and specified sons begin to appear, and there is even a grant for a limited term of years.[2] Under practically all the thirteenth-century grants again, the tenant is to hold freely (*libere*). This is often amplified, in the way of lawyers. He shall hold "freely, quietly, completely, well, and in peace," and moreover, "in ways, in paths, in plains, in pastures, and in all liberties and customs pertaining to so much land." The term "freely" denotes the kind of tenure granted. It does not exclude all "service" to the grantor. The grants are generally expressed as being "for the homage and service" or "for the fealty and service" of the tenant. He will acknowledge the abbot as his lord. And there are always specific services reserved. At the least there is a rent (*redditus*), which is itself in one grant called a "free service." It is generally a sum of money, but a mere acknowledgment, such as half a pound of cummin, is not unknown. Sometimes as in the case of Hugh Bacun, there are also limited agricultural services to be done on the demesne, at busy times of the year. The freeholders, who do these services, are called *custumarii*.[3] Sometimes a tenant is required to do suit at the lord's court. It may be every three weeks, at the regular meetings of the manorial court, but more often only twice or even once a year.

[1] S, 316, 708. [2] S, 549, 569, 570. [3] S, 409.

At the courts he would be expected to act as a juryman. There may be minor trifles ; Hugh Bacun's capons at Christmas and Easter, or a payment called " pannage " for running pigs in the fields and wood. Whatever the tenant's dues, they are stated to be " for all secular service, exaction, and demand." This may be qualified by " except forinsec service." By " forinsec " is meant " external to the manor " ; the tenant remains liable to royal taxes. Similarly, the limitation by " secular " excludes spiritual dues, such as the payment of tithe. One may assume that a " free " tenant was entitled to dispose of his holding by sale, although not, under medieval law, by will. But even on this there are sometimes restrictions in the grants. The tenant " shall not have power to sell, give, assign, or alienate to any men of religion except to us or our successors, or to any magnate by whom we or our successors may in any way be vexed, or to pledge to the Jews without consulting us."[1] This is an exceptionally elaborate formula, but stipulations that the abbey must have the first offer, or that the sale must not be to another house of religion, are not infrequent. No such precaution was taken in the early grant of the Frithe, and at the dissolution the land had passed into the hands of the Abbey of Abingdon. There might, then, be many limitations on the freedom of a " free " tenant. Nevertheless he was " free " in a negative sense, in that he was not subject to the arbitrary exactions which, as we shall see, affected other tenants of the abbey, who were not " free." He had the protection of the king's courts to his rights under his title-deed ; and if he attended the lord's court, he did so as a free suitor, entitled to sit on the jury and give his voice in matters of dispute. It remains to be added that he generally paid a sum down (*pre manibus*) for his deed, according to the value of the holding. It was called a *gersumma*, which means a premium.

The grants by tenants to the abbey are, of course, of land previously held from the abbey. Many of them do not differ in language from those made to laymen. There is one case, as early as 1258, of a lease (*firma*) for forty years.[2] But others follow a special terminology. The land is said to be given to God and the blessed Mary of Eynsham and the abbot and monks " freely in perpetuity," and sometimes more fully, " in free pure and perpetual alms," to which may be added " quit of all secular service, as alms ought to be." A grant in free, pure and perpetual alms, if there was no reservation of

[1] S, 390. [2] S, 313.

rent or other service to the donor, was regarded by law as constituting a tenure in frankalmoign. Richard de Submuro gave his virgate for the welfare of his soul. This formula does not recur, but there are a good many other cases which look like free gifts, made sometimes, one may fear, under death-bed pressure. On the other hand, the fact that land was to be held as alms, or even as free, pure and perpetual alms, by no means always meant that the abbey did not give a valuable consideration for it. This took various forms. Other land might be given in exchange. The abbey might pay a *gersumma.* A rent was occasionally reserved. The abbey might take over small liabilities of the tenant, a rent-charge due to a neighbour, a payment to the prior, a penny or two to a light in the church or chapel.[1] Or it might grant a maintenance allowance for life, elsewhere known as a "corrody," which would serve as an old age pension. This is defined in one case as "a weekly sustentation as great as a prebendary has."[2] If the abbey paid anything like full value for land, there was not much profit in the transaction, beyond that of patronage in the choice of a new tenant. In two or three cases, the grant is made not to the abbey itself, but to the almoner, who seems to have held a small amount of land for charitable purposes.[3] Occasionally, also, a deed of grant by one tenant to another finds a place in the cartulary, but only, I think, because of some special interest, such as a right to a reversion, of the abbey in the transaction.

III. THE HUNDRED ROLLS.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century, the fragmentary evidence of the charters is filled out by a more systematic record in the *Hundred Rolls.* These contain the returns of commissioners appointed to investigate the franchises of lords of manors, and to report any unauthorised encroachments which they had made on the rights of the Crown. The first inquest was made under Henry III in 1255.[4] The return for Eynsham is badly mutilated, but it appears to have been in much the same terms as that to a second inquest under Edward I in 1274 or 1275, which is fully preserved.[5] It was reported that the abbot had the assize of bread and ale in his market; that he had a gallows, but the commissioners did not know by what warrant; that William Underwalle owed suit in the Hundred

[1] S, 313, 338.
[2] S. 338, 385.
[3] S, 219, 220, 225.
[4] *H. Rolls,* ii. 47.
[5] *H. Rolls,* ii. 34, 35.

of Wootton for a tenement, of part of which he had enfeoffed the abbot, but that neither he nor the abbot had done suit for ten years, damaging the king thereby of 6*d.* a year ; that the abbot had made an encroachment (*purprestura*) of fourteen perches on his land at Sandhulle out of pasture common to the tenants of Eynsham and Hanborough, and a clearing (*assarta*) of fifteen acres ; and that he had made a sluice at his mill on the Thames, whereby the meadows of the king's mother were annually flooded. The mill must really have been that on the Bladon, and not on the Thames, since it was in Hanborough that the king's mother held land. The purpresture and assart would be in Wychwood. As a result of this inquest, a Statute of Gloucester in 1278 directed that doubtful titles to franchises should be tried, on what are known as *Quo Warranto* proceedings, before the royal Justices in Eyre. Much resentment was felt by the lords of manors, and an amending statute authorised the Justices, in cases where no charter for the franchise was forthcoming, to accept evidence of actual user since the beginning of the reign of Richard I in 1189. Meanwhile there was a third inquest in 1279, the return to which for Eynsham raised some new points.[1] It opens with a general description of the manor. Again, I translate :

> Eynesham. The Abbot of Eynesham holds the manor, of which manor Almarus the Great was lord of the said manor and founded the abbey. And the same Abbot does suit to the county of Oxford and to the Hundred of Wootton from three weeks to three weeks for a certain tenement which was that of William Hunderwalle. And the Bishop of Lincoln has the custody of the said abbey in a time of vacancy, but by what warrant we know not. And the sheriff of Oxfordshire and the bailiff of Wootton will enter once a year and hold the view of frankpledge and have 8*s.* fixed and the perquisites of that day. And he [the abbot] has one wood which is called Le Frethe which is outside the inspection and a certain free fishery on the banks of the Thames, but by what warrant we know not. And the sheriff of Oxfordshire and the bailiff of Wootton are to receive annually 11*s.* of hidage of the township of Eynesham and Tilgardesleke a member of that township. And the same Abbot holds in demesne eight and a half hides of land, and the guardianship of that abbey in time of vacancy belongs to the Lord King, and is withdrawn by the Bishop of Lincoln, but by what

[1] *H. Rolls*, ii. 859.

warrant we know not. And they have one wood within the inspection of the forest of Wychwood, and are to have housbote and heybote by view of the foresters and verderers.

A note later in the Roll tells us that the bailiffs of Oxford receive 6*s.* 8*d.* a year from the township for toll-dues. This payment was represented in 1802 by a Toln acre of pasture held by the City.

The abbot, after the inquest of 1275, probably set about raising the banks of his mill-sluice. He would have no difficulty in showing his right to a fishery from Doomsday Book, or his right to a gallows from Stephen's charter, if that was accepted as against Matilda's. With Wychwood I will deal later, since that was a royal forest, and under a special jurisdiction. But the abbot did not altogether escape *Quo Warranto* proceedings. In 1285 he was called upon to meet the claim for suit at Wootton in respect of Underwall's tenement, which was of half a virgate, and also to substantiate his right to the assize of bread and ale.[1] On the first point he acknowledged that he owed suit, but denied that he had withheld it. The return of 1279 seems to show that he had at any rate resumed it. The assize, by which is meant the duty of controlling the measure and quality of bread and ale, he asserted to have been his from time immemorial, and asked for the decision of a jury. A jury was granted, and we hear no more, but certainly the abbot exercised the franchise in later years. One would have thought it implied in the grant of a market, but it is generally found attached to the view of frankpledge, and indeed it was not, in Eynsham, limited to the borough. But the abbot's right to hold the view of frankpledge also now came into question. Frankpledge was a system under which all persons, not exempted by rank or other reasons, had had to be enrolled in a tithing, originally a group of ten men, but later often co-extensive with a township or a hamlet, the members of which were mutually responsible for presenting each other for trial in criminal cases, or in event of failure for making damage good and paying any fines due. In the Hundred Court the sheriff checked the enrolment at a " view," originally held twice and later once a year, and the criminal offenders were presented by the reeve or other head of their tithing before a jury of freeholders, who inflicted fines and committed grave cases for trial by the royal justices. The franchises of some lords of manors had given them the right

[1] *Placita de Quo Warranto* (R.O.), 663.

to replace the sheriff's view by one of their own, at a "court leet," which became little more than a special sitting of the manorial court; and during the thirteenth century many others had assumed this privilege, perhaps on the assumption that it was inherent in the right to hold a court. The early charters to Eynsham did not specifically grant the view. It is, however, clear from the stipulations in the grants of land for suit twice a year, that it was in fact being held in the abbot's court, and on the other hand from the *Hundred Rolls* that it was the sheriff and not the abbot himself who held it. The issue came up for trial in 1290, and the position was then regularised by a formal grant to the abbot of the profits of the view by way of fees and fines, as his predecessors had received them, but with the reservation that the sheriff and his bailiff should hold it, and have a payment of 8*s*. with hospitality for the day.[1] In 1313 the abbot acquired the right to hold the view through his own officers.[2] But the fee to those of the crown is still traceable in 1390, and perhaps in 1471, in which year, moreover, an old allowance of two quarters of oats to the bailiff may represent hospitality.[3] But we shall see that in 1362 the bailiff of Wootton was still making a claim for an overriding right to hold a view for Eynsham at that place.[4] The Bishop of Lincoln had also to meet a claim of the crown in *Quo Warranto* proceedings of 1285 to hold the abbey, and no doubt take its profits, during a vacancy. This was an old issue, which had already been decided in the bishop's favour at the end of the twelfth century, and had probably been the occasion for the compilation of the first abbey cartulary. But it was now re-opened. The bishop had in fact a grant of patronage by Henry I's charter of 1109. A jury now gave a verdict for him, and the decision was accepted by Edward I in 1307 and by Edward II in 1317.[5]

We have not yet done with the *Hundred Rolls* of 1297. After its descriptive opening the return repeats the statement that "Tilgardesle" is a "member" of Eynsham, and goes on to give a list of tenants, which clearly, from the acreage involved, covers the whole of the agricultural part of the township, and not, as the wording might suggest, Tilgarsley alone. The list may be summarized. It divides the tenants into three groups. The first consists of persons who are certainly not freeholders. There are no deeds by or to them in the cartularies. Each

[1] *Calendarium Genealogicum*, i. 419; *Cal. Inq. Misc.*, i. 424.
[2] S, 761.
[3] S, II, lxxvii., lxxxvi.
[4] Cf. p. 71.
[5] S, I, xxxiii, 462–64, 545–46; *Cal. P. Rolls*, (1313–17) 629.

holds of the abbot by a tallage at discretion and redeems his children at the abbot's will. There are twenty-six of them. Twenty have a virgate apiece. They are Adam le Franceys, Richard of Haneburge, Juliana of Sipeford, Robert Lenne, Adam the Bedel, Simon Joye, William Buleboc, Robert Scren, John Reyme, Cecelia the widow of Walter, Roger the son of Woodward, Robert the son of Adam the Woodward, William Gilberts, Hugh Atelard, Silvester the Paumere, John Bovebroke, Richard the Woodward, Hugh the Woodward, Agnes Bolling and Hugh Hereward. Six others, on a similar tenure, only have half virgates. They are John Stiward, Hugh Chichely, Richard Lurc, Robert Nighten, John Curteys and Lyger de la Frache. The second group are called *cotarii*. Each holds a cotland and is subject to tallage and redemption of children, like those in the first group. There are three only: William Gulku, Henry the Wyte, Agnes Pogemede. The third group consists of twenty *liberi*, whose holdings are far more varied, both in size and in conditions of tenure. The largest freeholder is John de Leya, who has a whole hide, for which he pays a mark. Henry de la Hulle has half a hide at 13*s*. 6*d*. But he also does agricultural services, mowing in Wyresey and Wrothey, carrying corn for one day in autumn, ploughing thrice, reaping thrice with two men, and supervising the mowers in person. Walter Bacun has a virgate at 10*s*. and he does similar services to those of Henry. Augustinus Clericus has a virgate and half at 5*s*. He reaps for one day, ploughs twice, mows twice, and like Henry and Walter supervises mowers. Richard Bonvallet has a virgate at 10*s*. Nothing is said in his case of agricultural service. Nicholas Goldine has 12 acres at 6*s*. and Margery, the widow of Walter le Keu, ten acres at half a mark. Robert of Kington has an acre only at 4*d*. All these hold direct of the abbey. But the position of four others is more complicated. Richard of Tywe and Ralph the Mason hold eighteen acres apiece at 16*d*., not of the abbey, but of *dominus* Henry de la Wade, whom we know to have been a tenant in chief in Stanton Harcourt. Presumably, however, he himself held those thirty-six acres of the abbey, although this is not stated. Peter the Porter has ten acres of the abbey at 2*s*. 6½*d*. and a pound of cumin, but also seven acres of Augustinus Clericus at 5*s*. Reginald de Boo has three acres of the abbey at 2*s*. 6*d*. and others of Richard Bonvallet at 7*d*. It is generally specified that a messuage goes with the holding, and that the tenant owes suit at the abbot's court; and probably both may be taken for granted in all cases. Finally there are eight *liberi* who have

messuages only. For these Matilda Sthephen and John Alrad pay 3*s*. each, and John le Gros, Richard Bulk, William Nel, William de Fauelore, Robert Edward, and William the Falconer, 2*s*. each. The small number makes it clear that the survey does not cover the two boroughs, and indeed the cartulary discloses the names of several householders, some at least of whom are likely to have been still at Eynsham in 1279. Nor does the survey take account of any small holdings in the hands of the almoner, although several of those are traceable at about its date.

If we compare the survey of 1279 with that of 1086 in *Domesday Book*, it becomes apparent that there had been no great change in the extent of arable cultivation during the two centuries which divide them. The hides of 1279 may be taken to be areal hides, corresponding to the plough-lands or carucates of *Domesday*, and not to its fiscal hides. And we may continue the assumption, which does not affect the comparison, that the Eynsham hide was 120 nominal acres and the virgate 30 acres, although in fact the holding of Henry de la Wade might suggest a virgate of 36 acres. In 1086 there were 18 carucates. In 1279 the demesne, the size of which we can for the first time determine, occupied eight and a half hides ; the *liberi* a little over three, the virgaters and semi-virgaters five and three quarters. We do not know what the holding of a *cotarius* was, but it is probably negligible here. One described at Cassington in the twelfth century was no more than an acre.[1] With a little allowance for the development of domestic crofts in the boroughs, we get much the same total as in 1086. It should be added that an "extent" of the manor of Eynsham, apparently compiled about 1270, shortly before the date of the survey in the *Hundred Roll*, puts the demesne at only six carucates, with which went eighty acres of meadow, and the arable "in villeinage" at four carucates.[2] I can only reconcile this with other evidence on the assumption that the return is incomplete, and that the figures given relate to that part of the manor which lay in Tilgarsley.[3]

When we turn to the classification of tenants, the survey of 1279 gives a very different account from that of 1086. As against three knights, thirty-four *villani* and thirty-three *bordarii*, there are now twenty *liberi*, twenty-six virgaters and semi-virgaters, and three *cotarii*. We can guess at some of the social changes that have been at work in the interval. The *cotarii* are doubtless much the same as the *bordarii*, but they

[1] S, 136. [2] S, I, p. 11. [3] Cf. p. 100.

OXFORDSHIRE RECORD SOCIETY.

47, OXFORD ROAD,
BANBURY.

11th.September 1946

Dear Mr.Ball,

I thank you for your letter of the 10th.of this month but I greatly regret that Vol.3.of our Works is out of print and very hard to obtain. In fact all our first seven books are very scarce mainly because they were printed in a small number to cover our then small membership. I have made a note that you desire a copy & should I get one returned to me I will send it you at a cost of one guinea,plus postage.

I enclose herewith Vols.18.21.&22 which I gather you would like to have.

OVER.

With the Treasurer's Compliments.

I also enclose a list of all the works we have so far published, kindly return this in due course.

We hope to issue another work this year, for the year 1943, if the printer can be made to do so.

Scarcity of labour, suitable paper and Government pressure are the main causes of our being so much in arrears.

Yours sincerely,

Cyril W. Hunt

Hon. Treas.

P.S. Vol 15. is out of stock but a copy shall be forwarded if it should be returned to me at any time. A note has been made to this effect.

C.W.H.

are much fewer in number. Possibly some had been absorbed as abbey servants, in the house itself or on the demesne, or had become traders in the boroughs. The few who survived were probably employed as hired labourers and cultivated their own small plots with the spade. The knights have vanished, since the manor is not now burdened with provision for military service. But the *villani* of 1086, whom we suspected to be of more than one type, have now differentiated into a smaller class of *liberi* and a larger class who are distinguished in the *Hundred Roll* from the *liberi*, and among them hold the greater part of the arable outside the demesne, in units which look as if they had all at one time been virgates, although in a few cases they had been split. The tenure of these men was that known to lawyers as villeinage. We learn more about their condition from an incident of 1345. In that year twelve of the abbey tenants approached the Court of King's Bench and claimed protection, under what was known as a writ of *Monstraverunt*, against their lord.[1] Their names were Walter Blake, Bodde, Robert Revesone, John Cryps, Richard the Loder, Robert Hankyn, Alan Gybone, William the Herte, Richard Walters, John Streen, Robert Leovon, and Adam le Blake. They asserted that by right they were tenants in ancient demesne, and each claimed descent from a named ancestor who in the time of William the Conqueror had held his one or two virgates at 5*s*. or 10*s*. apiece, with a double payment on succession. But now the abbot imposes illegal exactions upon them. They are called upon to plough the abbot's land on three days a week with one plough and eight plough-beasts, to sow and harrow the land, to manure it with their own carts, to mow all the abbot's meadows, to toss and gather the hay and carry it to the abbot's house, to hoe, reap and gather his corn, carry it to his manor, and thresh it. And all this not merely on ordinary working days, but even on the Christmas and Easter and other double feast-days, wherever he chooses to direct the carriage and carting, provided that they can return home on the same day. Moreover, the abbot fixes fines on succession at his own will; he takes redemption of flesh and blood from the tenants and their offspring; he taxes them high and low at pleasure, with many other extortions, fines, tallages, and diverse services innumerable, through heavy and intolerable distraints; he makes them act as his reeves. In reply the abbot claimed that three of the plaintiffs were his villeins and produced technical pleas against others. The

[1] L. O. Pike, *Year-Books of Edw. III* (R.S.), ann. xix,

Court adjourned the case for proof that the Eynsham manor was one of ancient demesne, and "thereafter," says the record, "they did not pursue." This was natural enough. A manor of ancient demesne was one which had been in the hands of the crown on 5 January, 1066, "the day on which Edward the Confessor was alive and dead," and had subsequently been alienated. Villein tenants in ancient demesne could bring an action in the royal courts by a writ of *Monstraverunt*, for protection against any infringement of the custom of their manor. Villein tenants on ordinary manors could not; the royal courts would not interfere with the jurisdiction of the manorial court itself. Eynsham may still have been abbey land when Edward the Confessor died; we do not know exactly when the monks abandoned it. But *Domesday Book* was taken by the courts as authoritative on the point, and in this the Bishop of Lincoln held. In any case there must, one fears, have been something bogus about the plea of 1345. The allegation of specific ancestors may have been no more than a legal fiction. But the villeinage list of 1279 only contains three names, Lenne, Scren, which may be Stren, and Walter, corresponding to those of litigants. The rest of those may be men who had acquired through marriage or otherwise the holdings of older families. Records of 1360 and 1370 tell us of an Adam Blake and a Henry Leovene, who were born in Tilgarsley.[1] The name Blake still survives in Eynsham. The services repudiated in 1345 are the normal service of tenure in villeinage; ploughing and the like throughout the period of cultivation, harvesting the hay and corn in their seasons. These are not specified in 1279, but they are for Tilgarsley in the extent of about 1270.[2] Here each villein must work for the lord, not three, but four days in the week, and must also do three bedrips, one with one man each at his own cost, without food from the lord, and two with two men, on the lord's food. Five ordinary dayworks were worth to the lord 2*d.* in winter and 1*d.* in summer. A bedrip was worth 1*d.* a man, but a day's food cost the lord two-thirds of that. Similarly, the other grievances of 1345 are the ordinary "incidents" of villeinage tenure. The lord might impose a money tax or tallage at his discretion. The Tilgarsley tallage yielded about a mark a year in 1270. On succession to a holding, a heriot might be taken out of chattels, as well as the relief which all tenants paid for land. A villeinage tenant was liable to be called upon to superintend the labour and represent the tithing as a reeve.

[1] S. 607, 662. [2] S, I, p. 11.

His redemption of flesh and blood meant a fine for licence to a son to take orders, a " merchet " for licence to a daughter to marry, a " leyrwhit " for a marriage without licence or for unchastity. The services of a family must not be lost to the lord without compensation. On the other hand, the villeinage tenants of the thirteenth century usually paid no money rent. It was so with those of the abbey in 1279. In the fourteenth century, however, began a change by which the customary services of such tenantry were largely commuted for money rents. Reading between the lines, one may guess that this had been so in Eynsham, and that later a new abbot had attempted to reverse the process and return to the old services. The year 1344 was one of grave trouble in the abbey. Nicholas de Upton had been deposed from the abbey in favour of William de Staunford, and had expelled his predecessor by armed force.[1] The villein tenants may well have taken the opportunity to put forward a claim in which the law did not bear them out.

There is, however, another distinction to be made. It has been noted that the *villani* of *Domesday Book* probably included men, some of Norman and some of Saxon origin, whose relations to their lord may not have been uniform. In the thirteenth century men are classified, not merely by tenure, but also by personal *status*. They are either *liberi*, free, or they are unfree. The unfree are often called *servi* or *nativi*, but they are also the typical *villani* of manorial records, and their characteristic tenure is tenure in villeinage. There is, however, a complication ; the classifications by tenure and by *status* overlap. Only a *liber* holds his land on a free tenure, but he can also hold it, or part of it, in villeinage. A *liber* could claim the protection of the royal law courts against injustice from his lord, but a *nativus* they would not hear ; his only remedy was in his lord's own court. The determination of *status* was often a matter of difficulty. Sometimes the courts regarded liability to tallage, heriot, merchet or the like as evidence of unfreedom, but sometimes as incidents of tenure rather than of *status*. Admission of villeinage in court was conclusive. If, on the other hand, the lord had entered into a contract with a tenant, it was taken as an acknowledgment of freedom. Short of such evidence, a tenant was generally regarded as free when he held mainly by rent, even though there might also be some limited labour services ; and as unfree when he held only by labour services, especially if the nature of these was at the lord's option. A *liber* who held in villeinage was

[1] S, I, xxiv.

subject to the incidents of villeinage, so long as his tenure lasted, but he had the advantage that, if he chose, he could throw it up and take his chattels with him. A *nativus*, on the other hand, was *adscriptus glebae*. He could not leave his manor without his lord's permission, for which he had to pay a poll-tax known as *chevage*. If he fled, he might be pursued and retaken, unless he could find refuge for a year and a day in a borough or on a manor of ancient demesne. He was free in relation to third parties, but if he bought land from them the lord might take it. His chattels too, except possibly the wainage, the plough and plough-beasts, without which he could not till the land, were the lord's. He was himself indeed, in legal theory at least, little more than the lord's chattel, liable to fine and imprisonment at will, although the criminal courts would punish murder or acts of gross violence. Finally, a *nativus* and his family might be given or sold by one lord to another. About 1150 Geoffrey de Clinton of Cassington gave the abbey Hugh de Sumerford as compensation for a cope which he had borrowed and lost.[1] John Morel of Eynsham, whose family is long traceable there, was the son of Henry Morel of Cassington, whom Amisius of Woodstock sold to Richard Blund in 1220–50 "with his whole *sequela* and all his chattels" for a sum of 20*s*. In this case it was a condition that Morel should receive his freedom.[2] Probably sales of *nativi* without the land to which they belonged, were rare; a landless man was not of much use to a lord, so long as labour was cheap. Similarly the theoretical helplessness of a *nativus* was in practice much modified by the economic value of his labour on the demesne. It was to the lord's profit that he should be able to make a living. Many villeins did in fact, for all their legal disabilities, become well-to-do men, and were allowed to purchase their freedom. Manumission, as it was called, was commended to the church as an act of devotion, and was sometimes recorded on the fly-leaves of liturgical books. A charter, of the sixteenth century and not from Eynsham, gives a formula[3]:—

> Whereas from the beginning God created all men free by nature, and afterwards the law of man placed some under the yoke of servitude, we believe it to be a pious thing, and acceptable to God and consonant with Christian charity, to make wholly free certain who have been thrown into villeinage to us and our successors, and bound in servitude.

[1] S, 102. [2] S, 389.
[3] *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.* (2nd Series), xvii. 299.

A cynic may note that neither here nor in the liturgical books is anything said of the fees paid by the villeins for their privilege. These, however, are entered in manorial records. At Eynsham, for example, Richard the Loder, one of the litigants of 1345, had paid 10*s.* for the freedom of his two daughters in 1337, and a little earlier Adam Bovebroke, presumably a son of the John who was a villein in 1279, bought his own freedom for 6*s.* 8*d.*[1] These and other references make it fairly clear that some, but not all, of the Eynsham tenants in villeinage of 1279 were also villeins by *status*. We are told specifically that there had been *nativi* in Tilgarsley before 1348.[2] Henry Leovene, who inherited the name of one of the litigants of 1345, was still holding "native" land in 1360, and in that year the full claims of the lord were still being asserted.[3]

> William Brewster, the lord's *nativus*, holds a plot of meadow and arable in Langdale, which his father Adam acquired, and since whatever a *servus* acquires is acquired to the lord, the lord may do with it what he thinks fit.

The manumission of a *nativus* freed him from the degrading incidents of personal serfdom, but it did not affect the tenure of his land. This remained subject to its old conditions of agricultural service or of rent by way of commutation, and of transfer not by deed but by consent of the lord in the manorial court. He became a *liber* holding in villeinage. The Eynsham *liberi* of 1279, however, so far as we can judge, were *liberi* in the fullest sense, free in *status*, and holding their lands freely. They are a much more heterogeneous group than the villeins, both as regards the size of their holdings, which range from a hide to no more than a messuage, and as regards the conditions of tenure. The rents, in particular, vary so much, that they cannot represent the economic value of land at any one time. This diversity may point to differences of origin. Some of the holdings may derive from predecessors who were already free at the time of Domesday; others from later grants made by the abbey itself, either to outsiders not resident in Eynsham, such as Henry de la Wade, or as provision for men of its own household, or in the case of the isolated messuages to accommodate traders for whom there was not room in the boroughs. And there may have been much buying and selling before 1279. Sometimes the charters enable us to trace it. The hide held by John of Leigh is probably the land of Frithe granted to Nicholas of Leigh about 1150. The virgate of Walter Bacun is

[1] S, II, xlv. [2] S, 633. [3] S, 607.

that granted to Hugh Bacun in 1228–39. That of Richard Bonvallet was sold to him by William of Eynsham about 1260.[1] Peter Porter's land seems to have come from his grandmother Matilda, whose family name is unknown.[2] It is to be observed that the *liberi* are not all entirely free from agricultural services. These, however, are of a special character. They do not do the regular weekly work of the villeins. They plough thrice in the year ; it is not clear whether this means for three days only, or throughout the one annual ploughing where crops were to be sown and the two annual ploughings given to the fallow. And they are called upon to help personally with their men, and also as supervisors, in the specially busy seasons of hay-making and harvest. These employments are " boonworks " or " bedrips " (*precariae*, *bederipae*). A " rip " is primarily a " reap." Villeins also did boonworks, but in theory they were acts of courtesy, such as even a free man, without loss of *status*, may be " prayed " or " bidden " to do for his lord. Not that he had the right of refusing. If the service was once of grace, it had hardened into a custom attaching to certain holdings in the thirteenth century, and is provided for in charters. The *Hundred Rolls* do not always state the specific obligations in just the same terms as the charters. An extreme case is that of Richard Bonvallet, who was to do boonworks when he bought his land, but to whom the *Rolls* assign none. Either the *Rolls* were carelessly prepared or the boonworks were matter of adjustment from time to time. The charters suggest that even some of the borough tenants did boonworks, and a record of 1360 throws some fuller light on the conditions of the employment.[3]

> Robert Jordan has a tenement with a curtilage and a croft in Hythe End . . . He shall lift hay with one man for one day in the meadow which is called Wroghtehey, taking nothing from the lord, and in the same way he shall lift hay in the meadow which is called Wyrresey ; and in the same way he shall make the hay-cocks of each meadow with one man for one day, taking nothing of the lord as aforesaid ; then also he shall do one bedrip with one man for one day at his own cost, and two bedrips, each with one man, taking of the lord on each day one commons in the day, and he shall come to the lifting of hay and the making of heaps and the cutting of corn, so that he may be at his work before the ringing of the bell of the mass

[1] S, 594.
[2] Cf. p. 33.
[3] S, 266, 316, 413, 607.

of St. Mary. Nor shall he sit down to breakfast or otherwise throughout the day before the repast, unless leave is given, and on the said two days when he is at the lord's table he shall have a sergeant-loaf (*panem de peys sergeaunt*) of the weight of a monk's loaf, and a flagon of mixed ale and three herrings, of whatever kind the day has been, at the will of the cellarer.

IV. THE EARLY FAMILIES.

Putting together the records of the *Hundred Rolls* and the charters one can dimly trace the members of certain families which rose and fell, and for a time played their busy parts in Eynsham, and are now unconsidered dust. An early name is that of Hernaldus Frankelanus, whose manse in the town is noted by 1228. It is a latinisation of Franklin, and came to means no more than "freeholder," although by origin it was probably the same as the *Francus* and *Francigena*, which sometimes appear as descriptions in *Domesday Book*. Naturally many of the early freeholders were of Norman birth. There were Franklins also in other Oxfordshire manors of the abbey, in Shifford, in South Stoke, in Little Rollright. The Shifford Franklin also appears as Fremon. Both Franklin and Freeman are still local names. From Hernaldus may descend a Robert son of Robert Frankelanus, who exchanged his land about 1268 for the promise of a *servitium* for life in the hall or guesthouse of the abbey, and also a Thomas Frankeleyn who had a house in Newlands in 1366.[1] Early, too, was *magister* Peter de Staninge, who with Margaret de Baskervile in 1229, as the result of litigation, surrendered to the abbey the mills on the Bladon and much adjacent arable and pasture, on condition of retaining considerable portions as tenants for the terms of their lives.[2] I have already noted the manumission at Cassington of the serf Henry Morel and his *sequela*. That, no doubt, found its way into the cartulary, because Henry's son John bought a house and dovecot at Eynsham some years later.[3] He often appears as a witness to charters. But he still retained an interest in Cassington, for in 1295 he was a defendant, with several Cassington magnates, in an action for diverting water from the abbey mill.[4] Later we find an Augustine Morel of 1325, a Robert Morel of 1344, who took part in an assault on Sir John Lovel at Eynsham, and another Robert Morel of 1418, who conveyed land to William Foly of Pynclele, which is

[1] S, 197, 219, 367, 615. [2] *Oxf. Fines* (O.R.S.), 86. [3] S, 390.
[4] Cf. p. 65.

Pinkhill.[1] Probably those Roberts were descendants of John, since against the charter for John's house a later hand has written "*nota pro* Roberto Morel." Morrells are well-known to-day in Oxford. A still earlier name than any of these is Banastre. Probably the Banastres were people of position. An Adelard Banastre was Sheriff of Oxfordshire from 1170 to 1175.[2] A Richard is a charter witness about 1178 and a Henry very frequently between 1175 and 1206. A house, once his, was granted to another about 1217.[3] And, as we have seen, he was guardian to Richard de Submuro in his minority. The Submuro family itself is one of which we know a good deal. They suggest that, as we might expect, there was a close relation between Eynsham and the neighbouring city of Oxford, for the Submuro of the charters is again nothing but a Latinisation of Underwall, a name which might very naturally arise in Oxford. And these Underwalls played a prominent part in civic life. We can trace, during the first half of the thirteenth century an Adam as several times bailiff, and a Thomas as successively bailiff, alderman, and finally mayor. Both appear to have been sons of a Walter.[4] At Eynsham a Walter is a witness between 1190 and 1228, and a younger Walter about 1260. But the Richard of our charters was probably the son of William, who witnesses, as De Muro, with Henry Banastre in 1180–90.[5] This is an inference from the fact that the *capitalis mansio* which had been his, and which was subsequently granted to Hugh Bacon, subject to a *servitium* to the crown, must be the same as the tenement of William Underwall, for which it was claimed in the *Hundred Rolls* that the abbot had failed to do suit. We may perhaps infer from the adjective *capitalis* that some of the Underwall land had been subinfeudated to inferior tenants. But it is rather a puzzle to guess why suit should be due to the crown for a single house on a manor, the whole of which was held of the Bishop of Lincoln. Conceivably there may have been a grant to a predecessor of the Underwalls during the short period for which the king held Eynsham immediately after the Conquest. Richard de Submuro's conveyance to the abbey in 1197–1208 did not dispose of the whole of his family estate. Nor, in spite of his anxiety for his soul was he on his death-bed. He lived and witnessed deeds at least to 1220. One other plot in Luttershulle he sold to

[1] S, 556; *Cal. Patent Rolls* (Edw. III), vi. 407; *Bodl. Oxon Charters*, 724.
[2] S, 107. [3] S, 216.
[4] Wood, *City of Oxford*, i. 317; ii. 529; iii. 4, *sqq.*; Salter, *Oseney Cartulary*, III, xii. *sqq.*
[5] S, 180.

Abbot Adam's brother, William of Oxford, from whom the abbey later acquired it.[1] But before 1258 he was dead, and had left a widow Isabella and a son and heir William, who already had a second wife Emma. We hear of land belonging to William below Hekehulle, in Sidelakesham, and above Wodecroft, and of a bit called the Hurst, which he sold to John Porter. But by 1258 William was in the hands of the Jews, and gradually the whole of the estate, which lay in South Leigh and Sutton as well as in Eynsham, passed to the abbey. His mother Isabella was entitled to a third of it as dower, but this she transferred to her son for a mark down and 3*s.* a year from him or his assigns, reserving only her life-interests in a house and garden which she occupied in Huthende and in a rent-charge of 6*d.* due from Adam le Franceis upon land in Tilgarsley. William then conveyed the whole, with his mother's reversion, to the abbey, not in perpetuity but for a term of forty years, during which he bound himself not to alienate to anyone else, Jew or Christian. At the end of the term the abbey were to take the standing crops (*vestura*) of the following autumn. In consideration of this lease, the abbey freed the estate *de Judaismo* by redeeming a mortgage of eighteen marks. They also undertook to pay Isabella's 3*s.* and some small dues to the prior and St. Andrew's light, and to give William and his wife an annual allowance of three-quarters of wheat and one quarter of barley. At his death this was to be continued to his wife, or alternatively she was to have her dower of a third. But if the abbey gave William a *servitium*, then Emma was only to be entitled to half the allowance of grain. Apparently, however, this arrangement was not successful in restoring William's shaky finances to equilibrium, for by a later deed he made a complete conveyance of his lands to the abbey, reserving only the house at Huthende for his mother's life and his own, and one other in which he dwelt at Tilgarsley with its croft and curtilage and a single acre of arable, which were to go to his heirs. For these he was to pay the abbey 3*s.* during his mother's life and 1*s.* thereafter. The consideration was now a corrody (*liberacio*) for his life. Presumably Emma was dead. Again he enumerates the small oblations which the abbey must take over ; 3*s.* 10*d.* to the prior on Palm Sunday, 10*d.* to St. Andrew's light at Easter, 1*d.* to the light before the cross in St. Leonard's Chapel at Martinmas, ½*d.* to Adam son of William at Easter. So ended the greatness of the Underwalls. The house at Huthende had reverted to the abbey by 1281.

[1] S, 240–41.

A John de Submuro, who might be a son of William, still dwelt in Eynsham at about the same time.[1]

What the abbey did with the land of William de Submuro we do not know. It may have been merged in the demesne, or it may be one of the freeholds of 1279, that of Henry de la Hulle, for example, or that of Augustinus Clericus, the origin of which the charters do not disclose. The earlier donation of Richard de Submuro has already been traced to Hugh, the son of William Bacon, and after him to Walter Bacon, who was presumably his son. The Bacons in their turn became prominent people in Eynsham. Hugh had already his *curia* about 1220 and the deed which names it as a boundary names also a *pons Hugonis*.[2] Walter is traceable from about 1260 to 1281. He had land in Mulmore, Walton furlong, Chaldewelle, Hemehurst and Langdale.[3] Richard and John Bacon, who witnessed the grant to Hugh, may have been his brothers. But Hugh had also a son John, who in 1261 surrendered to the abbey other land called Lintune near Hamstall and an acre at Lutteswelle "which is now called Stondych," both being property which he had recovered from them before the Justices in Eyre. The Lutteswelle is almost certainly the Chil Brook, over which there is now a bridge near Acre End, and I suspect that the change of name was due to the fact that here John's father Hugh Bacon had built the *pons Hugonis* of stone. No consideration is recited in the deed of surrender, but by one which immediately precedes it in the cartulary the abbey granted John the *servitium* of under-miller, and this by 1281 he had exchanged for a house, next door to St. Leonard's Chapel.[4] In these deeds he is called John son of Hugh Le Noble of Hamstall, and only an endorsement on one of them tells us that Bacon and Le Noble are the same family. An *alias* is common enough, and may have more than one explanation. Sometimes it connotes illegitimacy. But it is also possible that a villein sometimes changed his name on manumission. There was a Fellow of Merton in the fifteenth century, who dropped the name of Shakspere, *quia vile reputatum est*, and took that of Sawnder. He could not have known what a mistake he was making. On the other hand Le Noble is a more than adequate exchange for Bacon. It is, however, still as Bacon that we find John concerned in another holding of land, distinct from Lintune, but also in Hamstall. Here he and his wife Agnes had acquired land from William le

[1] S, 301, 312–14, 317, 338, 364, 384, 413.
[2] S, 419, 594. [3] S, 366, 467. [4] S, 328, 328A, 381–82.

Coupare of Hamstall and his wife Lucy, and this they exchanged with the abbey for a manse and a half a virgate. These had been held at one time by Henry, son of John de la Bertone, but he had surrendered all his land in Eynsham with its members of Tilgarsley and Hamstall. Part of the new Bacon holding may have been at Holewellehulle, where some land of John's is noted. But it was not long before the abbey got it all back again, together with certain rights which in the meantime had been granted to John, a *clericus* of Stanton Harcourt. Land-holding in Eynsham seems to have been rather unstable at the end of the thirteenth century. All these transfers seem to have taken place between 1268 and 1279, as neither Henry de la Bertone nor John Bacon is among the *liberi* of the *Hundred Rolls*.[1] Richard Bacon, who witnesses up to 1302, must be a younger man than the witness of 1228–39. He may have been a son of Walter. About 1287 he bought an acre from Peter Le Porter, to which a lawsuit afterwards showed that Peter had no claim.[2] John Le Noble, of a younger generation, acquired a tenement in Huthende in 1342, and about 1360 a meadow-right in Clayhuthe still belonged to the heirs of Bacon.[3] Another family, that of De le Hulle, is faintly traceable from 1279 to 1366, when a Johanna was living in Newland.[4]

The Avenels were people of consideration in Oxfordshire, and also in Bucks. William Avenel married Helewisa, daughter of Walkelin Waard, a holder of Domesday manors, and widow of a Hareng. Her sister Dionysia married Hugh de Chesney. Those Avenels, like the Chesneys, helped to endow the abbey. We do not know that they lived in Eynsham.[5] But from 1190 to 1220 or later an Avenellus is a very frequent witness to charters. By 1229 he had gone from a house bordering on Newland.[6] He gets no other personal name, but is occasionally described as *dispensator*. The *dispensator* or spencer was the officer who issued the provision of food for the refectory. Avenel had several sons. Four of them, John, Adam, Thomas and Elias, are named in a confirmation by the abbey of an exchange of land made with their father.[7] A house which John had held at some date before 1284 can be safely identified with his.[8] Adam witnesses up to 1268 at least. A fifth son was Robert, who with his wife Isabel transferred to the abbey seven acres of arable in Huthecroft, lying between the demesne and the brook Karsewelle, and seven acres of meadow to the east of

[1] S, 364, 409, 423–24, 491.
[2] S, 486. [3] S, 569, 607. [4] S, 607, 615.
[5] S. I, p. 413; cf. p. 64. [6] *Ox. Fines* (O.R.S.), 86.
[7] S, 242. [8] S, 474.

Bitterhale.[1] Robert's daughter Margaret married Henry Dorne, perhaps one of the Dornes of Wick Rissington, and from Henry and Margaret the abbey acquired a house that had been Robert's, with four acres and some rent-charges, and all Margaret's hereditary rights in Eynsham deriving from her grandfather Avenel. One of these rent-charges was due from Walter Avenel, who may have been a sixth son of the spenser. He was a servant of the abbey in 1250 and dwelt somewhat later in Newland.[2] The Avenels disappear from Eynsham records soon after the middle of the thirteenth century, but the grant from the Dornes to the abbey led to a curious dispute in 1292. The abbot complained in the Court of King's Bench that, after the assignment of her rights, Margaret had unjustly disseised him by conveying a house and half an acre to William Sely. Margaret was now dead, but William called upon her daughter Agnes to warrant him. A doubt arose whether Agnes was of age to be sued, but it was decided from her personal appearance that she was, and that the abbot might take the land and Agnes must recompense William Sely. Then it was suggested that the grant to the abbey was contrary to the statute *De Viris Religiosis* of 1279, which prohibited grants of land to religious corporations without the consent of the crown. It was, however, proved to the satisfaction of a jury that the grant was made before the passing of that statue in 1279, and so the abbot recovered his seisin.[3]

Avenellus the spenser and the *servitia* held or hoped for by William Underwall and John Bacon have shown the close connection between some of the Eynsham freeholders and the *ministeriales* of the abbey. There are several other examples. One is to be found in the family of Porter. We can trace a succession of actual abbey porters ; a Roger and then a Baldwin in the twelfth century ; a John or possibly two Johns, father and son, during the first half of the thirteenth ; a Stephen from 1241 onwards ; a Richard Le Taylur of Stanton appointed about 1264 ; a John of Iuetene appointed in 1281 ; a Richard de Faxton, succeeded in 1375 by a John Currour.[4] The early Johns are the most interesting, because in their line we can see the official description enduring as a family name, long after the *servitium* itself had ceased. By 1264 John, son of John, once porter of Eynsham, has surrendered to the abbey the house next to the abbey gate formerly held by himself and his father, and also a croft in Newland, and gets another

[1] S, 239. [2] S, 275, 355, 420. [3] S, 482.
[4] S, 62, 102, 112, 146, 260, 275, 360, 419, 448, 607, *etc.* ; II, xcvii. ; *Cal. Patent Rolls* (Ed. III), xvi, 204.

house in exchange. Naturally the house next the gate would be wanted for the new porter. But later than this it is still as John Porter that he witnesses, and as John Porter that the abbey converts for him a rent of 4*d.* on another house into one of a pound of cumin a year. And it is even more precisely as John Porter, son of John Porter, that he, with his wife Matilda, surrenders to the abbey, not only the house granted him on his retirement, but also a considerable amount of land, including as much as half a virgate at Tilgarsley, which he had accumulated from William Underwall and other vendors. I think that his mother, apparently also a Matilda, must have been an heiress, for amongst other things he resigns any claims to land left by her to his brother Peter.[1] We have found Peter Porter as a *liber* in the *Hundred Rolls*. In 1281 he was living in Newland.[2] But it was probably a younger Peter, the son and not the brother of the second John, who was sued in 1287 by his cousin Simon, son of John Horloke, for a house and two acres which he claimed as the heir of his grandmother, the elder Matilda. Peter asserted that part of those acres had been granted to his grandfather by the abbey, and called upon the abbot to warrant him, but the abbot said that his grant was of different acres, and so the jury found.[3] One can similarly trace a family of Marshals, deriving no doubt from a marshal of the abbey, and another which seems to be indifferently called in the abbey Latin De Ecclesia and De Lardario. Other names, such as Woodward, Cocus, De Coquina, De la Bertona, De Gardino, De Monasterio, point to similar origins. A considerable *liber* of 1279 was Augustinus Clericus, born, as we happen to know, about 1256.[4] There were of course many clerks in Eynsham, some of whom were only in minor orders and free to marry. Their sons sometimes took the name *Filius Clerici*, which is again only a Latinisation of Clarkson. Augustinus was a son of Richard the Clerk, and may have been godson of an earlier Augustinus, who was a *vicarius*, probably of St. Leonard's Chapel, and therefore a priest. His property passed about 1281 by inheritance, presumably through a sister, to Nicholas son of Richard of Hockele, also called Nicholas the Smith, who kept the rent-charge due from Peter Porter, and exchanged the land with the abbey for other land and a house in Newland next door to Peter's, where he could look comfortably after his rent-charge.[5] Another early family, that of Halewy, although not in the *Hundred Rolls*, is traceable from

[1] S, 258, 382–84, 386. [2] S, 467.
[3] S, 486. [4] *Cal. I.P.M.*, ii. 166. [5] S, 324, 466–67.

at least 1264 to 1366, and again in 1442, and probably also as Holway about 1569, and as Holloway in 1650 and in Eynsham to-day.[1]

V. THE BLACK DEATH AND ITS RESULTS.

The statute *De Viris Religiosis* of 1279 checked the alienation of land to the abbey. Another enactment of Edward I, the *Quia Emptores* of 1290, loosened the relation of freeholders to the abbey, by laying down that future purchasers should hold, not of the vendor, but of the vendor's lord, although of course rents and other dues could still be reserved to the abbot, and it was still in his manor court that freeholders and villeins would meet together, under the supervision of his steward, to consider matters arising out of the co-operative agriculture in the common fields. It was perhaps as a result of these legislative changes that comparatively few transfer deeds of the fourteenth century and still fewer of the fifteenth are recorded in the cartularies, and that the abbey grants tend to take the form of leases for one or more lives or for terms of years, rather than of conveyances on hereditary tenure.[2] Shortly after the abortive lawsuit of the villeins of 1346 came the disastrous pestilence of 1348–9 known as the Black Death, which much reduced the agricultural population and for a time profoundly affected manorial economy. Its incidence, indeed, was very variable, but it is calculated that in Witney, hard by Eynsham, the mortality reached the high level of two-thirds of the population.[3] In Eynsham itself we learn that all the *nativi* in the hamlet of Tilgarsley died, and that for lack of tenants to supply their places the abbot was obliged to take the holdings into his own land.[4] How the rest of the manor was affected we do not directly know. But the new conditions are in part reflected in a survey which was taken about 1360. In part only, since this is a survey not of the manor as a whole, but of the demesne, and it is only incidentally that references to the interests of the tenants occur in it. The document is rather disorderly.[5] Its nucleus consists of a statement as to the foundation of the abbey, and an estimate of its income from the home manor. There is the house itself, valued at nothing, owing to the cost of repairs. A large and well-planted

[1] S, 306, 397 and *passim*, 607, 615, II, pp. xvii, xviii; *Cal. P. Rolls* (Edw. III) vi. 407; *Harl. Roll* F. 14 (4).
[2] S, 549, 569, 570.
[3] *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*, v. 195.
[4] S, 628, 633. [5] S, 607.

garden, with fish-ponds (*vivariis*) recently made, brings in 40*s.* a year, and a large court on the west of the house, with granges, sheds for cattle and sheep, and storehouses, brings 40*s.* more. There are fourteen carucates of arable. Of these ten only are of good soil; they lie in the furlongs (*culturae*) called Twelve-acre, Southefelde, Lodemede, Loteshulle, Cattesbrayne, Huythecroft and Mullecroft, and each is worth 60*s.* The others, of poor soil, are in the fields (*campi*) called the Graungecroftes and are worth, including the profits of flocks and animals, here and in the Frith, 40*s.* A comparison of this large demesne of fourteen hides with that of only eight and a half hides in the *Hundred Rolls* of 1279 suggests that a good deal of arable, besides that in Tilgarsley, may have reverted to the lord during the Black Death. There are considerable sources of profit besides the arable. Two woods, the Frith and the Heyewode, with a great heath (*brueria*) between them, yield 100*s.* in house-wood and hedgewood. The fishery on the Thames is worth 73*s.* that on the Bladene 4*s.* Along the rivers lie meadows. They are Wyreshey, Wroghtehey, Longemede, Achey, Froggenhale, Stoweham, Benyngey, Landemede, Stubelfurlong, Longelete, Cleyhuthe, Byterhale, Claxhurst, Monkeshode, Sydelakesham, Cryspesham, Weymore, and the croft called Culvyrmede. They produce the large sum of £35. From them are distinguished three pastures, the Overeyt, the Nethereyt and the Calvecroft, worth £4. These we may presume to have been fed over throughout the year, and not mown for hay, like the meadows. Finally there are three mills on the Bladene, valued at £4 7*s.* 0*d.* Space is left for a total, which is not entered. But we can summarize as follows:—

	£	*s.*	*d.*
Arable	32	0	0
Grass Land	39	0	0
Miscellaneous	17	4	0
	£88	4	0

To this, of course, in a full account of income, would have to be added the rents of tenants and the profits from court fines, which are not here estimated.

The main survey is preceded and followed by a number of memoranda, which seem to be approximately of the same date, although there are some small differences of detail. One notes two additional furlongs called Lutteshulle and Kyngesdone and a meadow called Baremede towards the west of the manor, and

an unnamed furlong on the south of Caldecroft, towards a way called Stywardispathe. Lutteshulle, however, has already been included. Another gives a more detailed description of the meadows, with notes of the ownership and of the acreage belonging to the demesne. This omits Weymore and Culvyrmede, but adds Beterdeye, Trumpermede, Costloneit, Otehurst, which is called a pasture, but was certainly mown, and Langdale, where there was arable as well as meadow. It is supplemented by a third, which contains directions to the lord's bailiff and his subordinate the beadle, as to the management of the grass-land at different times of the year. Here, again, we find meadows, Partrichesmede, Lodemere, Mullemore and one near Twelveacre, which have not been mentioned before. Evidently the enumeration of the main survey was seriously defective. From these documents we learn that by far the greater number of the meadows, including all those bordering on the Thames, south-west of the road to the ferry, were parts of the demesne. Together they cover about 236 acres; the largest being Wyreshey (53 acres) and Wroghtehey (37 acres), in which we have seen that the boonworks of the freeholders were done. But while some of these "separate" meadows were reserved for the lord's use throughout the year, others were only laid up at Candlemas (Feb. 2), and after being mown once or twice were thrown open at Lammas (Aug. 1) or Michaelmas (Sept. 29), for the "common" grazing of the manor. The pasture of Overeyt was similarly "separate" from Candlemas to Midsummer. There are, however, certain meadows in the north-east and north of the manor, which are quite differently organised from the purely demesne meadows. Between the wharf stream and the Cassington road lie from south to north, first Clayhuythe, of which the eastern point, on the Thames itself, is at Corneeyt; then Longelete and then Stubbefurlong, which together constitute the Landemede. Here there is a minute and curious division of rights. Each meadow, but for an acre in Clayhuythe set apart for the beadle, is in three parcels. One, in the Landemede much the largest, is always the lord's. The other two are exchanged between him and a group of tenants in alternate years, and the tenants' parcel is split up into acre or half-acre fractions and distributed among them by lot. But in Clayhuythe the holder of the tenement of Apestede has a right to the first lot. One of the fractions in each case is the "chopperacre" of "diverse tenants," and was no doubt further subdivided in the same manner. North of the Cassington road, in the Bladon valley, are Beterdeye and Costloneit.

Each of these is also in three parcels. The lord has two, but one in each formerly belonged to the almoner, the sacrist and the " natives " of Tilgarsley, and had presumably reverted to the lord at the Black Death. The language is a little puzzling. There may once have been a chapel at Tilgarsley, but it is not likely that the hamlet had its own almoner and sacrist. Perhaps the abbey officers had plots earmarked for Tilgarsley uses. A group of tenants, the same in each case, has the third parcel ; among them are the heirs of Robert Wylles of Tilgarsley. Lots are not here specified in the survey, but Costloneit is probably the same as Cotsedneyde, where Walter Marshal acquired two half-acres of meadow, to be taken by lot, in 1268–81.[1] If so, it was probably originally appropriated, wholly or in part, to the *cotarii*. Both the bailiff and the beadle have some tiny plots, " by the lord's permission," in Beterdeye. Between Beterdeye and Eynsham town comes Langdale. This is exceptional, in that it is not wholly meadow. It must, I think, be identical with the Mullecroft, which appears in the list of arable *culturae*.[2] The ground lies in long strips, with arable in the middle of each and grass at either end. Narrow strips belonging to tenants are dispersed between broader ones belonging to the lord. Here again certain strips go with specified tenements. These are called Londeneis and Forner, but their tenants in 1360 have other names. In the Bladon valley, above Costloneit, is Mullemore, as to which the survey gives no details. Wyreshey, on the other side of the Bladon, is one of the purely demesne meadows. If we leave Langdale out of account, the mixed meadows add about 80 acres to the demesne hay land, making the total about 316 acres. Among the names of tenants who have rights in one meadow or another about 1360 are several which hark back to those of the thirteenth century. Here are a William atte Hulle, a Nicholas Colyns, perhaps really of the same family which yielded a Nicholas Goldine in 1279, a Henry Leoven, and the " heirs " of Bacon, Tywe and Halwy.

Of the remaining memoranda appended to the survey of 1360, one enumerates the small perquisites of the beadle and his assistant, and of the bailiff, now substituted for the reeve whom it was a grievance of the villeins that they had to find in 1346. A second records the duty of the tenants to pay suit at the portmote or the manor court, and the right of the abbey through its officers (*satellites*) to fine those who break the assize of bread and ale, or commit offences in the fields or separate

[1] S, 364. [2] Cf. p. 101.

meadows, or take away timber, bush or briar from the woods or heath. The third is the regulation for the boonworks of freeholders which has already been cited. This survey, with many others for manors of the abbey elsewhere, is preserved in the second cartulary of Eynsham, now at Christ Church. In it, too, is a list, dated in 1366, of the tenements in Newland, with their areas, the names of the occupiers and the rents they paid, which amounted to a total of £3 13*s.* 11¾*d.*[1] In this we again find Nicholas Colyns, who, though he lived in the borough, was not a burgess, but held *de antiqua tenura.*

I have not material for tracing in any detail the history of the manor during the long period of nearly two centuries between the survey of 1360 and the dissolution of the abbey in 1538. The *Harleian Rolls* in the British Museum contain many records of proceedings at the manor and borough courts, together with rentals and abbey accounts. The earliest roll for the manor court is of 1296, for the Newland court of 1307, and for the portmote of 1453. Dr. Salter has extracted much valuable information from these documents, but much probably still awaits the research of some future local historian.[2] It may be taken for granted, however, that in Eynsham, as elsewhere, these centuries saw the development of forces which considerably affected the manorial economy. The beginnings of some of these are traceable in the thirteenth century itself. Manumission continued, although there were still serfs in England during the reign of Elizabeth. They long survived even upon ecclesiastical manors, where piety ought to have been at its maximum. Glastonbury Abbey had many of them when it was dissolved. The most important change was that already noted, by which money rents gradually replaced the labour services of villeins. When holdings stood vacant after the Black Death, the lords were driven to employ hired men upon the much enlarged demesnes, and even when the population recovered itself, the great efficiency of this method ensured its continuance, in spite of the high cost of labour, which the attempt to stabilize wages by the Statute of Labourers in 1351, for a breach of which Walter le Sawer of Eynsham was pardoned in 1355, had not been wholly able to control.[3] Prices, too, had risen, and boonworks were not worth the twopence which a meal at the cost of the lord entailed. The fourteenth century saw a rapid commutation both of week-work and of boonwork for money rents. This in itself tended to blur

[1] S, 615.
[2] S, II, vii–xx., xl–xlviii., lxxiv–xcvii.
[3] *Cal. Patent Rolls* (Ed. iii), x. 156,

the distinction between free and villein tenure. And this was affected in another way. The theoretical disposal of villein land at the will of the lord had always been qualified in practice by his need for securing villein labour, and custom came to supply the place of right in determining the amount of service to be given and the hereditary succession of father by son in each holding. In course of time these customs were written down in manorial surveys, and the admissions of new tenants entered on court rolls. And ultimately, in the fifteenth century, the royal courts, first that of Chancery and then the Common Law courts, began to take cognisance of manorial customs, and to enforce them against the lord, where land could have been shown to have been anciently subject to them. Thus tenure at will passed into tenure by custom, and this again into tenure by copyhold, under which the villein's copy of the entry of his admission on the court roll served as a title-deed hardly less firm than a freehold conveyance. This is what Lord Justice Coke says in the seventeenth century[1]:

> But now copyholders stand upon a sure ground, now they weigh not their lord's displeasure, they shake not at every sudden blast of wind, they eat, drink and sleep securely; only having a special care of the main chance (viz.) to perform carefully what duties and services soever their Tenure doth exact, and Custome doth require: then let Lord frown, the copyholder cares not, knowing himself safe and not within any danger. For if the Lord's anger grow to expulsion the Law hath provided several weapons of remedy; for it is at his election either to sue a *Subpœna* or an action of trespass against the Lord. Time hath dealt very favourably with Copyholders in divers respects.

Moreover, when agricultural services were commuted for money rents, these too became part of the custom; which proved much to the advantage of copyholders in the sixteenth century, since their rents remained fixed, although the discovery of new silver mines had much lowered the value of money. It is true that the full advantage of the tenure only applied to ancient holdings, which custom had made hereditary, and that many later copyholds, like leaseholds, were granted for lives only, and were determinable by the lord, unless the tenant secured renewal before his interest was exhausted. One other development must be noticed. The high cost of labour and the growth of the English wool trade made sheep-breeding more profitable than corn growing, and much arable on the demesnes

[1] *Compleat Copyholder*, § 9.

was enclosed by hedges and converted into pasturage. A return of demesne rents for Tilgarsley in 1443 covers fifty-four parcels, consisting mainly of crofts and " parrocks," of which most were let to tenants, but a few, for that year, were in the lord's hand.[1] The names suggest in many cases the domestic crofts of extinct families of *nativi*. There are a Hertescroft and Strenyscrofts, and we found a William the Herte and a John Streen among the litigating villeins of 1345. There are also Morellescrofts.

VI. EYNSHAM AFTER THE DISSOLUTION.

With the later fortunes of Eynsham I shall only deal so far as is necessary to explain the origin of certain documents which are useful in throwing light upon its early topography. In 1535 the income of the manor was returned for the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* as £47 2*s*. 0*d*. from " the demayne londs of the fearme " and £76 3*s*. 6½*d*. from " temporalltyes and rents of assize."[2] The abbey was surrendered to the crown on 4 December, 1538, and shortly thereafter the royal commissioner John London was negotiating with the " farmers " of Eynsham on behalf of Sir George Darcy.[3] Presumably, therefore, the monks had by this time ceased to cultivate the demesne or the greater part of it themselves, and had leased or " farmed " it out to others. The whole estate was granted by the crown to Darcy at a rent of £43 5*s*. 10*d*. on 4 April, 1539, and with it went a freehold close called le Fryth, which had passed into the hands of the Abbey of Abingdon.[4] This is no doubt the land granted to Nicholas of Leigh about 1150. We have observed that at later dates care was taken to safeguard Eynsham freeholds from alienation to rival ecclesiastical foundations. Darcy also bought the lead of the roofs, and with its removal must have begun the process of destruction which turned the monastic buildings into a quarry for Eynsham householders throughout several generations.[5] John Aubrey, in 1647, had been told by inhabitants of Cumnor that within their remembrance there was still " a world of painted Glasse, sc. Stories, Coates of Armes, etc. There were curious buildings, excellent carved wainscot, and wainescot-cielings gilded : a curious Chapelle ; " and he himself had seen two handsome towers standing at the west-end, which were on the ground when he wrote, about

[1] *Harleian Roll*, F 14 (3).
[2] *Valor* (R.O.), ii. 207.
[3] *Letters and Papers* (Hen. VIII), xiii. (2), 425, 478.
[4] *L.P.* xiv. (1), 417.
[5] *L.P.* xiv. (2), 72.

1684.[1] A similar record was made by Anthony Wood some little time after a visit on 16 September, 1657.[2]

> A.W. went to Einsham to see an old kinsman called Thomas Barncote. He was there wonderfully strucken with a veneration of the stately, yet much lamented, ruins of the abbey there, built before the Norman conquest. He saw then there two high towers at the west end of the church, and some of the north walls of the church standing. He spent some time with a melancholy delight in taking a prospect of the ruins of that place. All which, together with the entrance or the lodg, were soon after pul'd downe, and the stones sold to build houses in that towne and neare it. The place hath yet some ruins to shew, and to instruct the pensive beholder with an exemplary frailty.

Incidentally I may note that in 1630 Thomas Barncote was excommunicated for helping to bury another excommunicate by night "in a close called the park on the backsyde of Eynsham Abbey."[3] He dwelt at the Abbey end of Mill St. in 1650.

Wood made a drawing of the ruins which is still preserved, and was engraved by John Cole about 1690 and by Samuel Buck in 1729.[4] Thomas Hearne, in 1706, found nothing remaining but the outer gate on the west of the precinct and traces of fishponds, which had, according to "some of ye seniors" at Eynsham, been fifty-two in number, one for each week of the year.[5] Sir George Darcy did not hold his purchase long. On his surrender in 1543 it went to Sir Edward North, and on his in 1545 to Edward, Earl of Derby, who settled it, in 1562, upon his son Thomas and his grandson, who became in 1603 Sir Edward Stanley.[6] Sir Edward had other estates, and does not appear to have lived in Eynsham, but here, in charge of a tenant, was brought up his daughter Venetia Stanley. "But as private as that place was," says Aubrey, "it seemes her beautie could not lye hid. The young eagles had espied her, and she was sanguine and tractable, and of much suavity (which to abuse was greate pittie)."[7] Ultimately the adventurous lady married Sir Kenelm Digby, and became the subject of his verse and Ben Jonson's. In 1609 a consider-

[1] MS. note in copy (*Bodl. Ashm.* 1722) of Plot's *Oxfordshire* (1677).
[2] *Life and Times*, i. 228.
[3] *Bodl. MS. Top. Oxon*, c. 56, f. 29.
[4] *Bodl. Wood MS.*, E.1.
[5] *Collections* (O.H.S.), i. 244.
[6] *L.P.*, xiv. (1), 417; xviii. (1), 446, 540; xx. (2), 540; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, iii. 1, 3, 27; J. Seacome, *House of Stanley*, 52.
[7] *Brief Lives*, i. 229, where "Enstone" is an error.

able freehold estate in Eynsham was purchased by Corpus Christi College in Oxford, and in 1615 coloured maps of those parts of the manor in which the college lands lay were drawn for them by one Henry Wilcock. These still exist in the college muniment room, together with terriers for the lands, compiled in 1697 and 1788. Here too are similar maps of 1605 for other college lands in Hanborough, bordering upon Eynsham. The college surveyors probably came from elsewhere, and seem to have made errors in recording place-names from oral communication, but the maps are of high value for topographical reconstruction. About 1611 another property was bought by the City of Oxford, largely out of the proceeds of the sale of the old Augustinian friary as a site for Wadham College.[1] The vendor was Thomas Blackman, whose surname appears in the records of Eynsham from 1427 onwards. John Blakeman was rent-collector in that year and Richard bailiff of the old borough in 1438. In 1535 an earlier Thomas was entitled to a quit-rent from the abbey of 5*s*. The Blackmans of Eynsham appear as an armorial family, with a pedigree, in the heraldic *Visitation* of 1574.[2] A dispute between Sir Edward Stanley and William, Earl of Derby, was determined by a private Act of 1606–07, under which the manor was to revert to the earldom after Sir Edward's life, and the reversion was settled upon Charlotte de Tremouille, at her marriage in 1626 with Earl William's son James, who succeeded him in 1642.[3] A former settlement on Earl William's nieces had apparently been ended.[4] Sir Edward Stanley died in 1632 ; he was buried at Tong in Shropshire, but has a brass in Eynsham church, set there by his daughter Petronilla. The Derby estates were sequestrated under the Commonwealth, and Eynsham was given in 1649 to Henry Marten of Beckett in Berkshire, one of the " regicides."[5] To this event we doubtless owe a *Survey Book* or *Field Book* of the manor of Eynsham, compiled in 1650 by John Whiting of East Hendred, which is now in the Bodleian.[6] Unfortunately a map, which once accompanied it, is not there. But the record is an elaborate one, giving a complete list of tenants, with their names, the localities of their holdings, and the areas of these in acres, roods and perches. Three columns are

[1] Salter, *Oxford Council Acts* (1928), 205, 208, 209, 226, 231, 233, 235, 252, 287.
[2] S, II, xiii. *sqq.* ; *Harl. Soc.*, v. 193 ; *Valor Eccl.*, ii. 207.
[3] *Statutes of Realm*, iv. 2, 1133 ; Seacome, 175 ; Hearne, v. 352.
[4] *Cal. Hatfield MSS.*, xii. 571.
[5] Hearne, v. 352.
[6] *Gough MS. Oxon* 53.

provided for names, headed respectively, " Former Tenants," " Present Proprietors " and " Present Tenants," but the second and third are left blank, evidently for subsequent use, and the " Former Tenants " may be taken to be those existing at the date of the survey. A comparison with the Corpus maps of 1615 shows some changes during the interval. There are thirty leaseholders, forty-seven copyholders, and twenty-two freeholders, but some names appear in more than one category for different holdings. One man did not know whether he held by lease or copy. The book begins with a list of tenements in the town. To Newland St. are ascribed thirty, of which two are closes only. Gaps in the numbering suggest that there may also have been three vacant tenements. In the thirty are included five for Puck Lane and four for Lowe Lane. This may be an error for Love Lane, perhaps due to the fact that Simon Lowe was a tenant. A footpath to the west of the tenements is now Love Lane. Mill St. has forty-three holdings, Acre End Street twenty-six, and Thames St. eighteen. This last includes Carfolks and the Churchyard. A few tenants have more than one house, and a few houses are empty. Newland is all freehold, but for one close, which is copyhold. Elsewhere the tenures vary. The smallest area is six perches, the largest about two acres. Sometimes there is a " homestead." Then come accounts of the " common " meadows and the arable fields. Here the nominal acreage of the parcels is given, in addition to their actual measurements, and it is possible to calculate that, while a nominal acre of Eynsham arable was often more and often less than a measured acre, it was on an average about three-quarters of a measured acre. The common meadows are Shut-lock Ham, including Oatehurst and Trumpets Mead ; Clay-wyre, including Long-leigh, Stubfurlong, the Lot Furlong, and the Furlong shooting on the Lots ; and Mill-Mead, including the Furlong shooting on Cassington Hedge, Middle Furlong, and the Furlong on Catsbraine. There are three arable fields, South Field, Cundit Field and North Field. South Field is as large as the other two, taken together. Then comes an account of the demesne, followed by separate lists of leaseholders, copyholders and freeholders. Here the information already given is repeated, but in addition 75 parcels of pasture, variously described as " grounds," " closes " and " coppices," are recorded. The whereabouts of these is not precisely given. Some are said to become " common " at Lammas or Michaelmas, or for six weeks after Michaelmas, or with one of the arable fields, or

even to be " in " one of these, which probably means the same thing. And in a few cases a red ink note has been added to show that the plot is tithe free, as being former demesne, or " of the manor of Tilgarsley." Some of the names in the Tilgarsley list of 1443 recur. A few outlying grounds have houses on them, presumably the beginnings of the hamlet of Freeland, and there is one house on half an acre in Cundit Field. The book is completed by summary tables which bring into account the heath and some permanent common land, and by notes of the boundaries of the heath and on the Thames. The approximate total area is made up as follows :—

Pasture	2,040	acres.
Meadow	481	,,
Arable	1,138	,,
Heath	1,468	,,
Ways and Waste	115	,,
	5,242	,,

Evidently much land has been converted into pasture since 1360, and some indeed is pasture, which has since become arable again. The demesne has shrunk to 460 acres. It has one house in Acre End, the Alms Houses in Mill Street, an Abbey Court and a Farm Court. The rest is all grass land. There are 169 acres, common for six weeks after Michaelmas, at Twelve Acres, with eight more at The Claydens hard by. There are the Upper, Middle and Lower Parks, the Upper and Lower Monks Woods and Little Monks to the south of them, the " several " meadows of Rothie, Bungie and Long Mead on the Thames above the ferry, the Lammas meadows of Worsea and Bitterell, the Mead Close near the mill, and a number of hams, swathes and rimes, some of which, in the common meadows, were once the bailey's. Much of the old demesne seems to be represented by the large holding of Thomas Edgerley. He lives at the south end of Mill Street, where the Abbey Farm now is, and has 286 acres of arable, of which about 108 are " lying together " in South Field, 73 are Catsbrain " piece " in North Field, and 104 make four " parcels " in Conduit Field. These last were not strictly " in " the field, but went with it. Catsbrain, again, was divided by a way from North Field. Probably, however, each "piece" followed the rotation of crops in the field to which it was attached. Edgerley also has about forty-four acres of meadow, forming three " farme pieces " in Claywyre. An Egerley seems to have been

an officer of the abbey in 1535, and a Robert Eggerley was then steward of Thame Abbey. A monument of his family is in the church of Great Milton near Thame, where he leased the Lincoln manor of Romeyns. A John Egerley, also in 1535, was steward of King's College, later Christ Church, in Oxford.[1] The rest of the Eynsham arable is distributed over the three fields among sixty-five tenants. Usually it lies in nominal acre or half-acre strips ; occasionally a few contiguous strips form a small "piece." Only six leaseholders, three freeholders and five copyholders have as much as a nominal virgate. The largest holders are Mr. King with 119 nominal acres, Mrs. Hampshire and Mrs. Granger with 81 acres by lease, Mrs. Hampshire again with 45 acres by copy, Corpus with 73 acres, and Oxford City with 70 acres. Twenty-nine tenants have less than ten acres each. Most of the arable tenants hold in each of the three fields, but not in equal proportions. Most have a little of the common meadow land. Some have also pasture. There are also some large leaseholds, consisting of pasture only. Mr. Green has 176 acres, Mr. Swest 100 acres, Michael Craggs 109 acres at Freeland. About forty tenants have houses only.

In 1652 the Parliamentary Committee for compounding with Delinquents terminated the sequestration of the Countess of Derby's jointure, and by a complicated series of transactions her interest and Marten's were sold in 1653 to a group of Eynsham men, evidently for the benefit of Thomas Jordan, whose name heads the list.[2] We found an earlier Jordan at Huthende in 1360. Of the same family must have been another Thomas Jordan, a London actor and poet, who wrote verses to his cousin, Mr. Francis Jordan of Eynsham, as a dedication to his *Wit in a Wilderness of Promiscuous Poetry*, printed about 1660–66. In 1672 Merton College bought a freehold estate in the township. From the Jordans the manor passed to the Perrots of North Leigh in 1718 and from them to James Lacy, a patentee of Drury Lane Theatre, in 1763.[3] Willoughby Lacy sold it to Robert Langford, who was of Eynsham Hall, the park of which now occupies the Heyewode, when an Act for enclosing part of the Heath was passed in 1781.[4] An estate map of 1782 shows the township as it then stood, and may be compared with the fine map of Oxfordshire, published by

[1] *Valor Eccl.*, ii. 169, 173, 207, 214, 250 ; *Parochial Collections* (O.R.S.), 215. T. Ellis, *Great Milton* (1819).

[2] *Cal. of Committee*, ii. 1102 ; Hearne, v. 352.

[3] Information from Mrs. Cruickshank.

[4] 21 G. III, c. 37 (Bill in C.C.C. muniments).

Richard Davis in 1797, from a survey made in 1793 and 1794. James Duberley had apparently succeeded Langford by 1788. He was dead by 1796, when the steward of his trustees, Charles Terrill Morgan and Michael Jones, held what must have been almost the last session of the manor court, at which orders for the management of the common fields were made.[1] The fields were broken up under a second Enclosure Act of 1800. The lord of the manor was than the Rev. John Robinson.[2]

VII. THE BOUNDARIES AND WOODS.

I turn now to a consideration of the topography of medieval Eynsham, so far as one can discern it beneath the dust of Time. The boundaries, as set out in the Anglo-Saxon charter of 1005, appear to have been in the main preserved both by the ecclesiastical manor and to a quite recent date by the modern township. There is a possible divergence towards the south-west, and a certain one on the north-east. I quote the translation of one of the most learned students of such documents, the late W. H. Stevenson.[3]

> These are the boundaries of the land at Egnesham. First from the " rough lake " to Bugga's brook ; along the brook to Tilgar's ditch ; from the ditch to ward sty (i.e. path) ; from the sty to Winburh's " stock " ; from the stock to three oaks ; along the way to the boundary tree ; thence along the way to the port street ; from the street to the " swains " croft ; thence to heath-field to the old ditch ; thence right to the boundary brook ; along the brook into (the) Bladen ; along (the) Bladen into (the) Thames.

The Thames itself is, of course, assumed here as the south-east boundary. The description starts from the most southernly point of Eynsham up the river, and proceeds by west, north, and east. The " rough lake," which means no more than " overgrown watercourse," is that which falls into the Thames round the island just below Pinkhill Lock. From here the present boundary follows the water-course for about three-quarters of a mile in a northerly direction, until it reaches a junction with the Limb Brook, and then turns back at a very sharp angle up the Limb Brook itself for another three-quarters of a mile to the south-west, and finally, at a turn in the course of the stream, for over a mile to the west, during which it is

[1] *Bodl. MS. Top Oxon*, c. 70.
[2] 39 and 40 G. iii., c. 63 (County Council Offices).
[3] S, I, p. 24 ; cf. G. B. Grundy, *Saxon Oxfordshire* (O.R.S.), 33.

crossed by the Stanton Harcourt road. It is a very odd line, which leaves the Sutton meadows north of Pinkhill Farm as a long tongue-like projection running right into the heart of Eynsham up to a point less than a third of a mile from the road to the Thames. It is conceivable that the Saxon boundary ran more directly from the Thames to the turn in the Limb Brook. With the Limb Brook the Saxon Bugga's Brook may be safely identified. It is the only regular stream in this region of back-waters and ditches. It appears as Sutton Brook in 1615, but it rises in South Leigh, and its modern name is doubtless a corruption of Leigh ham Brook. Another Leyham-broke is recorded near North Leigh in 1298. The eponymous Bugga is lost in the mists of antiquity. So are Tilgar, to whom I shall return, and Winburh. The modern boundary leaves the Limb Brook at a right angle, runs to the north-east for two-fifths of a mile, then turns to the west by a sharper angle and passes through the hamlet of Hamstall, now Armstalls, which is partly in Eynsham, and partly in Sutton. Tilgar's ditch must have touched the Limb Brook, but whether the boundary here followed the line of the ditch or merely crossed it is not clear. I am inclined to think that it followed it. But that cannot be so, if Dr. Grundy, who has studied the charter in his *Saxon Oxfordshire*, is right in reading the next stage, not with Stevenson as *on weardstige*, but as *onweard stige*, and translating it "on up the path," since the only slight rise about here is that of two-fifths of a mile from the level of the brook. Mr. Kenneth Sisam, however, tells me that *onweard* has no such sense in Old English, and suggests " to (or along) the path to the watch place," or possibly " to the guard house (or beacon) enclosure." *Stige* has the double sense of " path " or more rarely " enclosure " or " building." There was a Steward's Bush Furlong not far away in 1615, and possibly but not certainly a Stywardispath of 1360 led to it.[1] But I think it would be fantastic to relate these names to the *stige*. They are more likely to owe their origin to the villein John Stiward of 1279. Perhaps therefore the *stige* may have been at Hamstall and Winburh's " stock " or " place," which also one might have thought represented by that hamlet, may have been further along the boundary. That now, after leaving Hamstall, takes a loop to the south, and then follows a somewhat irregular line first to the north and then to the west, where it crosses the Eynsham and Witney road. One can hardly locate the Three Oaks, but the western part of this area was woodland

[1] Cf. p. 102.

until the end of the eighteenth century. Dr. Grundy finds the way to the boundary tree in a track still discernible south of Salutation Farm, as the line begins to converge with the Witney road. The tree was doubtless at the crossing of the road, and the way to the port-street is represented by Wood Lane, which runs north between Eynsham Park and Coggs Wood, and then up Osney Hill to the Witney and Bladon road. This road, according to Dr. Grundy, represents an old ridgeway which linked at Sturdy's Castle with another running from the " port " of Oxford to the great Cotswold ridgeway at Chipping Norton. The modern road is straightened from the line of the Witney ridgeway, and the boundary is at first to the north-west and then to the south-east of it. There is a Shepherd's Hall public-house near the point where the modern extension of Cuckoo Lane emerges on the road. I do not know whether that can preserve the memory of the " swains " croft. Thence the boundary goes " to heath-field to the old ditch." Mr. O. G. S. Crawford has traced from the air a band in the grass east of Shepherd's Hall about 100 yards south of the road, which would come very near it.[1] This he thinks may be part of Grim's Ditch, probably a Romano-British defensive frontier against the Anglo-Saxons, which is also traceable between North Leigh and Cornbury and at Ditchley, and seems to have enclosed an inhabited limestone area of industrial value, lying between two others of wooded clay. Mr. Crawford suggests that the " old ditch " of the Eynsham charter may have been Grim's Ditch. But his interpretation of its words as indicating an old ditch " on a heath-field " is not quite the same as Mr. Stevenson's " to heath-field to the old ditch," which implies a ditch lying beyond the heath-field. And the heath-field must be the large stretch of open waste lying to the south of the ridgeway, between the Heyewode on the west and Church Hanborough and the Thrift on the east. It is located by a Heathfield Lane shown in a map of 1605, which still runs up from Church Hanborough to the hamlet of Freeland. The Eynsham boundary turns south about half a mile beyond Shepherd's Hall, crosses this heath-field, and passes down a ditch, already there in 1280, between the Thrift and Moseley Wood in Hanborough. This ought to be the " old ditch." Whether it can also be Grim's Ditch I do not know. Mr. Crawford is doubtful about the course of this beyond the point to which he could trace it, but thinks that it may have followed the ridgeway to Bladon bridge. If it went by the Thrift, it may

[1] *Antiquity* iv. 303.

have reached the Bladon, which is now the Evenlode, somewhat lower down. From a little beyond the Thrift the township boundary is taken up by the brook, known medievally as the Cauerswelle, which it follows to its juncture with the Evenlode. From this point the modern line, and also the medieval line, so far back as one can trace it, seem to diverge considerably from that of 1005. Instead of following the Evenlode to the Thames, the boundary crosses it, not once only but twice, taking into Eynsham the large meadow of Wyreshey on the east bank beyond Eynsham Mill, and then lower down leaving to Cassington a strip of from anything up to half a mile wide between the west bank and Cassington Ditch or Hedge. Dr. Grundy calls this " a minor channel of the Evenlode," but it is really no more than a boundary ditch, although it naturally takes some overflow water from the river in flood-time. But he also tells me that Anglo-Saxon bounds sometimes disregard meads, and perhaps some " intercommoning " between Eynsham and Cassington, upon which we shall come, may point to an indefinite frontier at an early date. Cassington, however, had certainly a mill on the Eynsham side of the Evenlode in 1181.[1]

The whole of the area within the limits described was held by the abbey as a single manor. But there is an internal distinction to be taken account of. From the beginning of the twelfth century we hear of a locality which is within Eynsham and yet in some sense distinct from it. This is Tilgarsley. There was arable land " in " or " at " it, and there were also, in early days, houses. Richard de Submuro had his at Tilgarsley, William de Submuro his " towards " Tilgarsley. John Porter grants one house in the " vill," here clearly the " township " rather than the borough, of Eynsham and another in the " vill " of Tilgarsley. On the other hand Walter Marshal surrenders all his rights in the " vill " and fields of Eynsham and Tilgarsley.[2] The *Hundred Rolls* of 1279 define the position more precisely. Tilgarsley is a " member " of Eynsham. That is a common term for an outlying hamlet, the inhabitants of which have their own agricultural organisation, but owe suit to a central manorial court, where they are perhaps represented by a separate tithing man. Tilgarsley, as already noted, was depopulated by the Black Death in 1348–9, but it is still described in 1369 as a " *hamlettus vocatus Tilgerdesle infra bundas villae de Egnesham.*"[3] During 1359–1383 it was the subject of a protracted lawsuit between the abbey and the crown in the court of Exchequer.[4] In 1357 Parliament had

[1] Cf. p. 64.
[2] S, 178, 313, 338, 364, 383.
[3] S, 661.
[4] S, 628–33.

granted to the king a relief of amounts conventionally regarded as representing alternative rates of a tenth on the annual value of land or a fifteenth on the value of chattels in every vill. The collectors of this tax had assessed the abbot at £4 14*s.* 9*d.* on chattels in the vill of Tilgarsley, and in default of payment had distrained on four oxen and kept them in a " park," which probably here means no more than an " enclosure," at that place. The abbot claimed that he had no property in Tilgarsley except spiritual dues, on which he was already assessed towards a tenth granted by the clergy. The collectors replied that £4 14*s.* 9*d.* had been the regular assessment on Tilgarsley since 1334, that no one except the abbot had dwelt in the vill since 1349, and that he was properly charged on the lands and tenements which came into his hands when all the tenants died in that year. The abbot admitted that these tenants were his villeins and held in bondage, and on this the court decided that he was liable to the payment. He appealed, however, to the King and Council, on the ground that Tilgarsley was part of the endowment of the abbey from before the Conquest, and that his profits from the land there were already included in the spiritualities on which he paid his clerical tenth. The Exchequer Court was directed to reconsider the case, and after long delays it was finally decided in 1383 that the abbot was in the right, and that no fifteenth should be claimed unless and until the land should again be occupied by tenants. Incidentally it appears that the corresponding charge on the tenant land in Eynsham proper was only £3 19*s.* 4*d.* and a comparison of this with the £4 14*s.* 9*d.* for Tilgarsley suggests that a large proportion of such arable as was not originally demesne must have lain in that hamlet.

Much of the northern part of Tilgarsley was wood and waste of the manor. The *silva* of *Domesday Book* and the " Heath " of the survey of 1650 and the Enclosure Act of 1781 are generic terms for the whole of this area. The survey of 1360 is more precise ; there are two woods, the Heyewode and the Frith, with a great heath (*brueria*) between them. In 1650 they amounted together to 1,468 acres. The Frith is estimated at 10 acres in 1306 and the Heyewode, then called Highwood, at 1,000 acres in 1545, which leaves about 450 acres for the heath. This was part of the old heath-field of 1005, which seems also to have extended into Hanborough. The Frith stood on the north-east boundary. The name means no more than " wood," and has been corrupted into Thrift. In 1280 there was a lawsuit between the abbot and Adam of Dunhalle in

Hanborough, terminated by an arbitration as a result of which Adam, who had trespassed on the Frith, acknowledged the abbot's ownership of a ditch which lay between it and his own wood of Moseley, and granted the abbot the right to take anything he pleased from that, with the exception of forty marked oaks, for the purpose of making a fence along the ditch.[1] This is, of course, the "old ditch" of the Saxon bounds. South of the Frith a map of 1605 shows a bit of Freelandes, which, however, lay also in part to the west of it. This almost certainly represents the hide of *terra de Frithe*, which the abbey granted to Nicholas of Leigh about 1150, and if so, it probably owes its name to the wood, rather than to the fact that it was a freehold. In view of the precautions taken later by the abbey to prevent Eynsham freeholds from alienation to any other religious body it must have much annoyed them that in some way Le Frith passed into the hands of the Abbey of Abingdon. It was, however, reannexed to the manor by the royal grants at the Dissolution. In 1650 Freeland had become a pasture of 109 acres, and the map of 1782 shows part of it as divided between the Vicarages of Kirklington and Stanton Harcourt. It has given a name to the hamlet of Freeland, the dwellings of which, however, lie to the north-west of it, on what was once part of the Heath. There were a few houses here in 1650, probably where Elm Farm now stands, but the main extension along the road to the north must date from after the Enclosure Acts. The township boundary can be in part checked by those of the Heath and of the Heyewode. The outer limit of the former is given in the survey of 1650. It was marked at many points by meerstones or crosses. The line starts at Pennticraft Close corner, where the ordnance map now shows Ash Plantations, and goes north by Ambrey, later by a confusion Handborough, Close and to a cross under Ambrey Close hedge. There it turns west, and passes first another cross; then Meerstone Hill, which must be on the present road to South Leigh, although that does not drop much below the level of the Witney Road; then South Leigh Lane's End, now a foot-path near Whitehouse Farm; and then Swench Hill. All this part of the Heath is south of the Witney Road. But at Swench Hill the boundary crosses the road, and continues westward to another meerstone on Swench Hill where South Leigh and Coggs meet. Here is now Hill Farm. Then comes a turn to the north, by Coggs Coppice Bottom, up the hill marching with Coggs, down to Woodley's Coppice, up

[1] S, 410, 444.

Osney Hill and so to Dr. Grundy's "ridgeway." This northwards stretch is now Wood Lane. On the ridgeway the line of the Heath goes by the way to North Leigh to a cross, then to an elm under North Leigh Townside, and then along the Townside, where it leaves the Highway, to another cross parting North Leigh and Hanborough. This point is where the modern extension of Cuckoo Lane emerges upon the Witney and Hanborough road to the west of Shepherd's Hall. The final stage is only given in the survey as going to Richard Weller's Breach Corner, but this description must be rather abbreviated, as the present boundary continues for some way to the east and crosses the Freeland lane, before it turns south towards the Breach and the Thrift.

The greater part of the bounds of Heyewode, then already Hyewode and Hiwode, are given in a document of 27 May, 1449, as determined by certain marks (*metae*, *limites*, *bundae*) of old made and recognised as parting it from North Leigh, and also by the common processional way followed year after year from beyond the memory of man by the abbot, convent, vicar and parishioners of Eynsham upon Rogation days.[1] They run from "a certain place called Tilgarsley," by Coggs wood, Osney Wood, and the vill of North Leigh to "a certain place called Blowynd." The line from Coggs wood to North Leigh is that of the manor boundary itself. It is not clear whether, between Tilgarsley hamlet and Coggs wood, the Heyewode took in the bit south of the Eynsham and Witney road, which the survey of 1650 treats as Heath in the wider sense. Blowynd must be on the edge of the heath-field proper. I see no reason why the name should not mean what it appears to mean. We are on high ground, not far from the ridgeway. The Hanborough map of 1605 shows a plot called Blowens, and hard by are two plots called Breach. These are in Hanborough itself, but border on Eynsham, just where a Powes Lane, now reduced through most of its course to a foot-path, runs into the street of Freeland. Here is now a Little Blenheim. I do not know the origin of the name. Can it be a corruption of Blowynd? In any case there was in 1650 a ground called Blowens in Eynsham itself, and a Blowmans Close, held by Richard Weller, who also held one of three grounds called the Breach. We have found Weller's Breach Corner as a bound of the Heath, and may fairly take the Eynsham Blowynd to have been not far from the Hanborough one.

Blowynd brings us to the difficult question of the relation

[1] S, 609.

of Eynsham to the royal forest of Wychwood, which covered a large stretch of land to the north of it. This was a favourite hunting ground of medieval kings from their neighbouring manor of Woodstock, or perhaps in early days from Eynsham itself. It was in 1100–07 that Henry I exempted the men of Eynsham from *stabilitas*, which seems to mean the duty of setting up stands from which to shoot deer, when his household was lodged there.[1] Medieval kings regarded the chase of the greater game, and in particular of deer, as a special appanage of royalty, and much land, both on their own demesne and on that of others, was subjected to special forest laws, designed for the protection of "venison" and of the "vert" which harboured it. Justiciars controlled the two groups of forests to the north and the south of the Trent, and under them each forest formed the bailiwick of a warden or an hereditary forester in fee, with a body of foresters as his agents. Wychwood was the bailiwick from 1130 to 1362 of a family of Langley to which several successive Thomases belonged.[2] These executive officers were assisted and to some extent controlled by local knights, chosen by the sheriff in the county court. They sat as verderers to deal with minor trespasses and refer more serious cases to royal Justices in Eyre, and took part as regarders in a periodical inspection (*regarda*) of their forest. They served also, with the foresters and a jury, on important inquisitions held by the justiciar or his lieutenant under a royal mandate. The lord of a manor, who had woods within a forest, was much restricted in his use of them. He might perhaps secure a special grant of custody, leaving him directly responsible to the justiciar, and if so he appointed his own woodwards, who were, however, sworn to observe fealty to the crown in respect of the venison and vert. Failing this, he could only make his clearings (*assarta*) or even take his cuttings of wood (*estoveria*) for the buildings (*housbote*), hedgings (*heybote*) and firings (*fyrbote*) of himself and his tenants, subject to the permission of the foresters. Even his pasturage of beasts seems to have been limited. In 1185 the abbot paid a fine for turning out pigs beyond measure, and in 1190 he was pardoned for assarts and waste of timber.[3] This may not have been at Eynsham itself, since the abbot also had woods at Charlbury, in the heart of Wychwood, and at Woodeaton in the forest of Shotover. The Eynsham woods were not originally within Wychwood. But Henry II and his sons made great additions to the forest

[1] S, 698. [2] V. J. Watney, *Cornbury*, 12.
[3] *Pipe Roll Soc.*, xxxiv. 108; i. (N.S.), 12, 13.

areas. No doubt the foresters, who had no salaries, but depended upon fees and amercements, out of which they had to make up an annual rent to the crown, were always on the look out to extend their jurisdiction. Afforestation was one of the grievances put forward by the barons in the *Magna Charta* of 1215, and this was followed in 1217 by a *Carta Forestae* which decreed the deforestation of all land taken in since the coronation of Henry II in 1154. Inquisitions were held to determine the limits fixed by the charter, but although this was confirmed when Henry III became of age about 1223, he afterwards refused to be bound by it. In 1229 the abbot purported to allow estovers by view of his own foresters, but in the following year these were made subject to the view of those of the crown, by a limited grant of custody which he obtained after paying a fine for past waste.[1] Possibly Eynsham was not concerned in this grant, since the waste specified was in the neighbourhood of Charlbury. Later in the reign the forest administration was tightened, and again became a subject of dispute between the king and his barons. Apparently the grant of 1230 had proved inadequate, for in 1270 the abbot made suit for a new one. An inquisition was held, and the jury reported that, if the abbot were given further custody, it would be to the king's hurt. There would be destructive clearings and the harbourage for deer would be spoilt. Moreover Thomas de Langley would lose his emoluments and would be unable to pay his rent to the king.[2] There was some disafforestation shortly after the accession of Edward I in 1272, but the purpresture and assart ascribed to the abbot by the *Hundred Roll* of 1275 must have been in forest land. The purpresture may be a Coumede in Eynsham wood held about 1284 by William of St. Owen and formerly by Walter of the New Forest, who had been wont to receive annually from the abbey an oak and other materials for enclosing it, and to pay in return one honest loaf and four flagons of ale at Christmas and four capons at Easter. St. Owen then passed his interest to the abbot of Oseney.[3] The *Hundred Roll* of 1279 shows that, although the Frith was then outside the forest, the Heyewode was within it. In 1297, however, Edward confirmed the *Carta Forestae*, and fresh inquisitions led to a good deal of disafforestation. A perambulation of Wychwood in 1298 now gives a very minute description of its bounds.[4] These, so far

[1] *Ox. Fines* 86 ; *Pipe Roll Soc.* (N.S.), iv. 257.
[2] S, 759.
[3] *Bodl. Oxon Charter* 349 ; Salter, *Oseney Cartulary*, iv. 111.
[4] S, 649.

as they concern us, ran from Bladon bridge down the Bladon to the pool of a mill called Eynsham mill, there by a watercourse (*sickettum*) called Cauerswelle Brook to a long ford, thence by the same watercourse to a meadow called Cauersshulle, and so between the Frith and the wood called Mousele. After that the line went by the house of Walter le Wyneter in Hanborough and the grange of Robert le Eyr to Blowynd and the sheepcote (*bercaria*) and croft of the Abbot of Oseney, and then passed away towards the Bladon again near Stonesfield. The Hanborough map of 1605 has a drawing of a curious little structure near Blowens, which may indicate a survival of the sheepcote. The earlier part of the perambulation exactly agrees with the northern limit of Eynsham itself, along the boundary brook of 1005, here called the Cauerswelle, and the " old ditch " ; and as the further part keeps away through Hanborough to the north, perhaps just touching Eynsham again at Blowynd, it is clear that both the Frith and the Heyewode are excluded from the forest. The perambulation was confirmed by an inquisition of 1300, and the jury added a note that the Eynsham wood had been afforested since 1154, so that the abbot had lost his right of cutting without the consent of the foresters.[1] But if the Heyewode was now disafforested, it was not for long, for in 1306 Edward, having obtained a dispensation from the Pope to disregard his confirmation of 1297, revoked it by an *Ordinacio Forestae*. The abbot once more applied for a grant of custody, and on this occasion was successful in persuading a jury that it would not be to the king's hurt.[2] The Frith, it was noted, was a league from the covert of the forest, and only rarely a resort of wild animals. In the following year, therefore, the abbot, for a fine of 100 marks, received his grant, with the reservation of the right of the foresters to attach offenders against the venison.[3] It ceased, however, to be of value in 1327, when further baronial pressure obliged Edward III to accept the settlement of 1297. Even this is not quite the end of the story, since the disafforested lands remained subject to some minor provisions of the forest law for the sanctity of deer that might stray into them. They were known as " purlieus " of the forest ; a Purwell Farm, not in Eynsham but in Cassington, preserves the name. About 1351 the Thomas de Langley of the day is said to have enlarged the limits of the purlieus and claimed that the fields of the

[1] *Archaeologia*, xxxvii. 437.
[2] S, 760.
[3] *Cal. Patent Rolls* (Edw. I), iv. 493.

hamlet of Tilgarsley fell within them.[1] He seems to have made himself very unpopular in Eynsham. In 1350 men of the town were tried for an outbreak when he came with other royal justices to hold a sessions. They chased him into a chamber in the abbey, with threats to burn him unless he handed over all accusations and indictments against them, and behaved "like madmen and men possessed by an evil spirit, usurping to themselves power above the royal power."[2] The history of forest administration in the fifteenth century is not very well known, but the record of a verderers' court, known as a swainmoot, in 1449 shows that the Heyewode was then once more within Wychwood.[3] A survey of 1552, which indicates very summarily a limit between Eynsham Mill and Grimes Mead to the south of Witney, presumably also includes the Eynsham woods, but they were disentangled from Wychwood at latest by 1622, when the area of the forest was much restricted, and nothing left to it south of the Evenlode.[4]

The occupation of the abbot's woodwards had already given a name to Eynsham villein families by 1279. Their oversight of the claims of the tenants to *housbote*, *heybote* and *fyrbote* is traceable in a curious survival of 1677.[5] Every Whitmonday, says Plot, the inhabitants of Eynsham might cut as much timber as could be drawn by men's hands into the abbey yard—

> Whence if they could draw it out again, notwithstanding all the impediments could be given to the Cart by the servants of the abbey (and since that by the family of the Lord) it was their own, and went in part at least to the reparation of their Church; and by this, as some will have it, they hold both their Lammas and Michaelmas Commons.

But when Plot wrote, the custom had become "inconvenient," and "the chiefest of the Parish" were contemplating its discontinuance. After the Black Death, at least, the estovers of timber, together with the rights of cutting furze and fern, and of running swine in the wood and cattle on the heath, no doubt became available for the tenants of Eynsham proper. A portion was reserved for a common pasture by the Enclosure Act of 1781. Swine probably ran also in the arable fields after harvest, but a grant of 1229 specifically excludes them from

[1] S, 661.
[2] *Cal Patent Rolls* (Edw. III), viii. 594.
[3] S, 609.
[4] V. J. Watney, *Cornbury*, 220.
[5] R. Plot, *Nat. Hist. of Oxfordshire*, 202.

the abbot's park.[1] There was a limitation on the number allowed to each tenant, and the abbey took, under the name of "pannage," a payment of $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ for each sow and $1d.$ for each porker. These perquisites were collected at a special court, known as the Powkebridge court, on St. Martin's Day.[2] On the heath itself there had probably been some clearings for arable at an early date. The field-name Breach, which occurs both in Tilgarsley and in Hanborough, is evidence of this, for a breach is a piece of ground broken up for the plough. And in fact we find the abbot selling to Robert le Eyr in 1264–68 an acre of arable in the *brueria*, bordering on the way to Hanborough.[3] That by 1275 he had assarted a large piece of fifteen acres in this neighbourhood, we have already seen. There were attempts to dig for coal on Furse Heath at some date before 1718, but in the main this area remained waste until 1781.[4] I have noted its outer limit with those of the Heyewode and of the township itself in 1449 and 1650. The inner limit of the part south of Witney road seems to have been the hedge of Ambrey Close. That of the much larger part north of the Witney road probably followed the present way, called Bowles Road in 1802, from Barnard Gate to Bowles Farm, where it met Cuckoo Lane, and then turned north to Breach Corner, along the line of the existing lane to Freeland. The Bowles Road seems to be now merged in Cuckoo Lane, but the rectilinear planning of a branch to North Leigh, which also shares the name, and of Tanner's Hill, which joins it, suggests that these were laid out after the enclosure of 1781. The total area of the Heath, together with the Old Coppice, which may be the Thrift, is given in the survey of 1650 as 1,468 acres and in the Enclosure Bill of 1781 as 1,482 acres. The Heyewode is, of course, here included.

VIII. THE NEIGHBOURS OF EYNSHAM.

Something must be said of the neighbours of Eynsham. By land they are, from west to east, first Stanton Harcourt, with its hamlets of South Leigh, Sutton, part of Hamstall, and Pincle, now Pinkhill; then Coggs, North Leigh, Hanborough and Cassington, with its hamlets of Somerford and Worton. Stanton Harcourt, in *Domesday Book*, is part of the vast estates of Odo de Bayeux. These were confiscated in 1088, and Henry I assigned Stanton to the maintenance of Adeliza of

[1] *Ox. Fines*, 86.
[2] S, II, xlvi; cf. p. 85.
[3] S, 450.
[4] *Parochial Colls.* (O.R.S.), 140.

Louvain, whom he married in 1121. She gave a hide to Eynsham Abbey, and other parts to Reading Abbey, the Templars, William de Hareflucta, and her kinswoman Melisent, who married first Robert Marmion and then Richard de Camville. The abbey surrendered its hide to the king, who returned it in exchange for land in Hanborough for a *vivarium*, presumably the menagerie which he is said to have in fact established in Woodstock Park. On the death of Richard de Camville in 1191 his daughter Isabel became the ward of Richard 1, and with her land the royal bailiff, Richard Ruffus, seized the hide belonging to Eynsham, which the abbey was never able to recover.[1] Much land in Stanton Harcourt went with Isabel on her marriage to Robert Harcourt. Two hides, however, were given by the king to Henry de la Wade.[2] These passed to a son Henry, whom we found also holding Eynsham land of the abbey in 1279, and to a grandson John, who sold them in 1303 to Roger de Mortimer, afterwards Earl of March, the lover of Queen Isabella.[3] On his execution under her son Edward III in 1330, his Stanton land was probably granted to the Harcourts, who appear to have been in sole possession of the township from at least 1346 to the present day. The Wades had held, not by the normal tenure of knight service, but by serjeanty or household service. As to the precise nature of their service, there is some discrepancy. Several thirteenth century records describe it as that of bearing a gerfalcon for the king, but others as that of strewing fodder for the king's beasts and making hay in the park of Woodstock. Probably the tenures of the Wades and Harcourts have been confused. A notice of 1241 may give the true facts. Here Wade has the falcon serjeanty. But Harcourt, while holding part of his land as a third of a knight's fee, holds another part by a fodder serjeanty.[4] The falcon serjeanty would be appropriate for the Wades, since a Richard de la Wade had been an actual royal falconer in 1181.[5] Moreover, it was the Woodstock service which continued with the Harcourts. It was acknowledged in 1389, and recorded in Woodstock surveys of 1550 and 1650. Every summer the lord of Stanton Harcourt had to mow and carry the meadows known as Stanton, South Leigh and Rosamond's in the park. And in the winter, when the snow lay on the ground, he had, if summoned by the winding

[1] S, 584, 725. [2] *Hundred Rolls*, ii. 855.

[3] *Feudal Aids*, iv. 163; *Harl. Soc.*, lxxxii. 218; lxxxiv. 129.

[4] *Red Book of Exchequer*, ii. 456; *Book of Fees*, 102, 253, 344, 587; *Cal. I.P.M.*, i. 111; ii. 376; iii. 75.

[5] W. Farrer, *Honours and Knight's Fees*, iii. 10.

of a horn at his manor-house gate, to find four browsers to cut brushwood for the deer, in reprisal for which each browser was entitled to take a nightly billet of wood the length of his axe-halve, such as he could carry to his lodging on the edge of his axe. The service was still enforceable, although in practice commuted for a money payment, when Woodstock was granted to the first Duke of Marlborough in 1705.[1]

But I am wandering too far from Eynsham. Coggs was also Odo of Bayeux's at the time of the *Domesday*, but was held of him by Wadardus, the grandfather of the Helewisa Waard who married William Avenel. On the distribution of Odo's estates, it became the head of the barony of the Arsic family, and when that died out for lack of male heirs about 1230 passed in moieties, through marriages and purchase, to the Giffards of Twyford and the Greys of Rotherfield, and after the Greys to the Lovells of Minster Lovell. North Leigh was Roger d'Ivri's in 1086, and with other Ivri property became part of the Honour of St. Valery about 1112. This Honour passed by marriage to Robert, Earl of Dreux, and on his treason under John escheated to the crown. Henry III gave it about 1229 to his brother Richard Earl of Cornwall. It reverted to the crown on the death in 1300 of Richard's son Edmund, was held by Piers Gaveston, as Earl of Cornwall, from 1307 to 1312, and then again reverted. North Leigh, however, had been subinfeudated by Thomas de St. Valery to the Abbey of Netley in Hants, and the Abbey still held it at the dissolution. With Hanborough and Cassington Eynsham had more important relations than with Coggs or North Leigh. At *Domesday* Hanborough was held by Gislebert de Gand. Later it was resumed by the crown and became a member of the great royal manor or honour, which had its centre at Woodstock. Under the crown parts were held, from the thirteenth century at least, by the Abbey of Oseney and the families of Dunhalle and St. Owen. Members of these often appear as witnesses to Eynsham deeds. The dispute between Adam de Dunhalle and the abbey as to a boundary ditch has already been noted.[2] The name survives in Downhills Farm at Hanborough. William de St. Owen was bailiff of Woodstock in 1242–50. Robert le Eyr, another Eynsham witness, who was bailiff in 1284, also had a grange in Hanborough, as well as a plot in Eynsham itself, but his main holding appears to have been in Bladon. Between the men of Hanborough and Eynsham there was a

[1] E. W. Harcourt, *H. Papers*, i. 18; E. Marshall, *Woodstock*, 39, 208, 250.
[2] Cf. p. 50.

long-standing dispute, the records of which extend over a couple of centuries.[1] In concerned "intercommoning," or the right of one township to run beasts over the waste, or sometimes the uncropped fields or meadows, of another. It was not an unusual custom, especially when, as in this case, the townships were divided by a stretch of waste, the boundary on which may not, in the beginning, have been precisely defined. So far as the records go, however, we learn that in 1154–89 the abbot granted Hanborough a licence during his pleasure to run porkers in the Heyewode, in return for which each tenant was to do two autumn boonworks without food in the fields of Eynsham, and to bring a hen at Christmas and ten eggs at Easter. About 1230 a dispute arose. It was complicated by a claim that the abbot had raised the level of his mill-pool so as to damage the meadows of Hanborough, which as we have seen, was still a grievance in 1275. But the Hanborough men also asserted that he had unjustly withheld from them traditional rights, as regards not only porkers, but also the cutting of fern and of pasture on the abbey lands. The king, in the interests of his tenants, ordered the sheriff to submit the matter to a jury. So far as the mill-pool was concerned, the jury found that the claim was justified, and fixed the damages at 40*s*. But they declared that there was no right of intercommoning between the fields of Eynsham and Hanborough, and that, although the agreement of 1154–89, which they recited, gave the right to run porkers, it did not extend to the cutting of fern on the heath. It was, however, in the common pasture of Eynsham and Hanborough that the abbot was reported in 1275 to have made an assart, and in the fields of Eynsham and Hanborough that about 1284 tenements lay for which the abbot received 5*s*. a year, when William of St. Owen, who had them from Walter of the New Forest, passed them to the abbot of Oseney.[2] The issue of 1230 was re-opened in 1369, when the King's Bench had before them a case in which the abbot claimed damages for a trespass by Robert Blowynd and eleven other Hanborough men on 27 June, 1356. They had entered his ground, he said, in arms, accompanied by their chaplain, and brought with them a number of horses, cattle, sheep and pigs, by which his growing wheat, barley, winter-wheat, beans, peas, oats and grass had been consumed and trampled upon during several days to a value of £1,000. The defendants, in reply, denied any trespass. They were the

[1] S, 659–62.
[2] *Bodl. Oxon Charter* 349 ; Salter, *Oseney Cartulary*, iv. 111.

king's tenants of his manor of Hanborough. The place of the alleged trespass was the hamlet of Tilgarsley within the limits of the township of Eynsham, and therein tenants of Hanborough had common, with beasts of all kinds, over the wastes and pastures throughout the year, over the arable fields between harvest and sowing or when fallow, as they ought to be every third year, and over the meadows between the haymaking and the Feast of the Purification. This had been their right from time beyond memory, and their only entry upon standing crops had been in fields which the abbot had sown, although in due course they ought to have been fallow. The abbot, in his rejoinder, controverts this. The fields ought to be sown for three years and lie fallow in the fourth. And he repudiates the claim to immemorial intercommoning. It has only been made, he declares, since 1351, under colour of the Wychwood perambulation of that year, whereby Tilgarsley was brought within the bounds of the forest. The record of pleadings is followed in the cartulary by notes of evidence from three men born in Tilgarsley, three born in Eynsham, and two monks, who all testified that rights of commoning by Hanborough or other Woodstock tenants in Eynsham were limited to the heath of Tilgarsley and the Heyewode. The court adjourned the suit, in order to obtain the views of the crown, and the cartulary records no more of it. But a survey of the honour of Woodstock, as late as 1706, notes that the tenants share with those of the manor of Eynsham in all their common grounds and Michaelmas grounds.[1] It cannot have been very usual in the fourteenth century to crop arable for three years out of four. Were the abbey trying an agricultural experiment on land which had fallen into demesne through the Black Death ?

The manorial history of Cassington and its northern hamlet Worton is complicated, and I can only deal with so much of it as bears upon Eynsham. There were three main lordships and much subinfeudation among mesne lords. In *Domesday* Wadardus holds two and a half hides and Ilbertus six hides, of Odo of Bayeux. Worton had been once the land of William Fitzosbert Earl of Lincoln, but now five hides are held by Roger D'Ivri and under him by Robert D'Oili. It was claimed later by the Abbey of Oseney that Robert, with the consent of Roger, had endowed out of Worton the College of St. George in Oxford, and that this land passed with the college itself to Oseney soon after its foundation by a younger Robert D'Oili about 1130. The charters for the college are forgeries, but

[1] E. Marshall, *Woodstock*, 253.

there is no doubt that Oseney did in fact hold two and a half hides in Worton to its dissolution.[1] The rest of the township was held as three knights' fees, of three distinct Honours. The land of D'Ivri became, like North Leigh, part of the Honour of St. Valery. That of Wadardus passed to the Fee of Arsic, and followed the descent of Coggs to the Greys. That of Ilbert de Lacy became part of the Honour of Pontefract, and remained with successive Earls of Lincoln of the Lacy house until 1311, when an heiress took it to Thomas, Earl of Lancaster.

The chief mesne lords during the twelfth century were the Clintons, who seem to have held, on different tenures, of both the Arsic and the Pontefract Honours. The history of the family is rather obscure, and a pedigree by Dugdale certainly does not give all its members.[2] The church of Cassington was built by Geoffrey de Clinton or Glympton, a royal Chamberlain, who endowed it with a virgate and gave the advowson to Eynsham Abbey. If this was the Chamberlain of Henry I, who also built Kenilworth Castle, the date would be as early as 1123.[3] It was probably his son Geoffrey, although some think it was the same man, who at some date before 1153, being also a royal Chamberlain, married Agnes the daughter of Roger, Earl of Warwick.[4] And it was no doubt this second Geoffrey, whose wife Agnes witnessed a charter, probably before 1152, by which he confirmed the grant of a second virgate given to the church by his uncle William for the restoration of a fallen tower.[5] Perhaps one may infer that William had been his guardian. Now appears a Jordan de Clinton, for whom Dugdale finds no place, but who witnessed Eynsham deeds as early as 1170 and as late as 1186, and from him, with the help of the records for his manors of Aston Clinton in Bucks and Orton in Oxfordshire, can be traced a line of three successive Williams Clinton, the last two of whom also bore the name of William de Paris.[6] Jordan died in 1188–89, and his son William in 1194–95. William's widow Isabella outbid another claimant for the wardship of the heir, and received a royal allowance during the minority out of the escheated lands for the upbringing of her children.[7] During 1200–04 she brought a suit against the abbot of Eynsham on

[1] Salter, *Oseney Cartulary*, iv. 1–57 ; *Feudal Aids*, iv. 163 ; *Valor Eccl.*, ii. 217.

[2] *Baronage*, i. 529.

[3] S, 19, 20.

[4] *Ancestor*, xi. 153.

[5] S, 101.

[6] *V. H. Bucks*, ii. 312 ; *Book of Fees*, 20, 344, 1154, 1358.

[7] *Pipe Roll*, 1 Rich. I (R.O.), 110 ; *Pipe Roll Soc.* (N.S.), iii. 127 ; v. 15, 16, 208 ; vi. 35, 43 ; vii. 192, 202 ; viii. 39, 40 ; ix. 15, 194 ; x. 223–24 ; *Rot. de Oblatis* (R.O.), 61, 173.

behalf of her son for the advowson of Eynsham. The abbot produced the charter of the second Geoffrey, and Isabella replied that he had no power to grant away the right, which he only held as guardian of his *nepos* Jordan. It is not clear why the charter of the first Geoffrey, which is explicit on the point, was not cited, but in any case the claim of Isabella was rejected on the ground that the abbot's right had already been acknowledged by the Bishop of Lincoln.[1] *Nepos* is sometimes a vaguely used term, but it seems probable that Jordan was an actual nephew, rather than a cousin, of the second Geoffrey. And the later history of the Cassington land suggests that the first Geoffrey had held both the Arsic and the Pontefract fee, and that on his death these were divided between two sons. The Arsic fee, of which both the vicarage virgates were in fact held, and which also included the hamlet of Somerford, went to the second Geoffrey, and ultimately to his grand-daughter Agnes, wife of Warinus de Brakenham, as co-heiress to a childless brother. The Pontefract fee went to Jordan and his line.[2] But from 1212 at least these seem also to have had an inferior mesne tenure of the Arsic fee from their kinsmen. In 1242 the Brakenhams conveyed their lordship to William de Cantelupe, and from him it had passed, apparently through William Maudit, to Sir William Montacute by 1255. In this year the last William de Paris died childless. In 1252 he had sold Aston Clinton to Montacute, who had also acquired his interest in the Arsic fee and so much as was left to him of the Pontefract fee, of which, however, three-quarters had already been alienated.[3] So ended the rule of the Clintons in Cassington. They were not quite extinct, for in 1275 John and Hawise Clinton still had a freehold of two virgates, which they sold to John d'O or d'Ewe, of an Oxford civic family.[4] In 1269 Montacute exchanged his Cassington manor for other lands in Somerset with Sir Philip Basset and his wife Ela de Longespée for the terms of their lives.[5] Ela was the daughter of William, Earl of Salisbury, a natural son of Henry II by Rosamund Clifford, and the widow of Thomas de Newburgh, Earl of Warwick. Basset died in 1271 and Ela in 1297. The Cassington manor then reverted to the Montacutes, who became Earls of Salisbury in 1337, and they held it to 1428, after which a widow, the grand-daughter of the poet Chaucer, took it to William de la Pole,

[1] S, 585, 592; *Cal. Curiae Regis Rolls*, ii. 1, 228; iii. 173, 241.
[2] *B. Fees*, 449, 822.
[3] *Red Book of Exchequer*, ii. 616; *B. Fees*, 822, 1295; *Ox. Fines*, 67, 237, 241; *Cal. I.P.M.*, i. 95.
[4] *Ox. Fines*, 206.
[5] *Ox. Fines*, 244; *Cal. I.P.M.* i. 272; *Hundred Rolls*, ii. 854.

Duke of Suffolk.[1] The three-quarters of the Pontefract fee alienated by the Clintons before the sale to Montacute was held in 1243 by William FitzPeter, of a family whose members generally appear in deeds under patronymics, but whose name appears to have been Rampayne.[2] A considerable part was held of them in 1279 by the nunnery of Godstow, who had gradually acquired it from various sources.[3]

The St. Valery fee, which apparently lay only partly in Worton and partly in Cassington proper, was "farmed" or leased from the chief lord in the thirteenth century by members of the family of Brun and Fritwell, between whom there was some kind of partnership.[4] But here too there were inferior mesne lords. One of these in the twelfth century must have been William Avenel, the husband of Helewisa, daughter of a Walchelin Waard, who appears in *Domesday* as holding of Roger D'Ivri in Thrupp. William and Helewisa had a daughter Avice, who married Richard de Vernon, and clearly brought with her, not only Haddon in Derbyshire, but also land in Cassington and Thrupp. Isabel de Vernon married in 1181 William de Brai of Shenstone in Staffordshire, and with her Richard and Avice gave the hide of Burgeleia or Burgesia in Cassington, to which they afterwards added, to make up a full half knight's fee, another virgate, with a mill on the Eynsham side of the river Bladon.[5] About 1245 this same half fee, together with some land in Thrupp, was held of Sir Richard Verney or Vernon by William Bagot, and sold by him to Peter of Ashridge, with the exception of the mill, which the Earl of Cornwall, as chief lord, took into his own hands.[6] From Peter of Ashridge the land passed to Godstow, who in 1279 held it of Brun and Fritwell. The other half fee was then similarly held of them by Edmund Pady, again of an Oxford civic family.[7] His father Philip had it from John son of Amice of Woodstock, whose sale of a villein of the Morel family to Richard Blund I have already noted.[8] By 1197 Amice had given another, with his cotland, to the church of Cassington.[9]

Now appears, for the first time, Michael de Meldon, a clerk from Meldon in Devonshire. He bought a hide from Henry

[1] *Feudal Aids*, iv. 163, 177, 195; *Cal. I.P.M.*, v. 156; vi. 141; viii. 513; x. 147.

[2] *B. Fees*, 822; *Cal. I.P.M.*, v. 156; *Godstow English Register* (E.E.T.S.), 328, 336, 340, 342, 346; S, 102.

[3] *H. Rolls*, ii. 854; *Godstow*, passim.

[4] *B. Fees*, 822; *H. Rolls*, ii. 854; *Godstow*, 341, 367.

[5] W. Salt Soc., *Great Coucher*, xvii. 241; *Cal. Rutland MSS.*, iv. 24.

[6] *Godstow*, 383–86.

[7] *H. Rolls*, ii. 854.

[8] *Ox. Fines*, 159.

[9] S, 136.

Pady in 1284, and another 250 acres, once held in part by John d'O, in 1586.[1] Presumably this gave him the whole of the Pady estate, since in 1300 he held a half fee in Worton directly from the Honour of St. Valery, and Godstow similarly held the other half in Cassington.[2] The intermediate lordship of Brun and Fritwell had evidently been eliminated. By 1295 Meldon had also acquired an interest in the Pontefract fee, and the next twenty years saw a series of complicated transactions, in which sometimes Meldon seems to be holding of Godstow, and sometimes Godstow of Meldon, while here too the intermediate lordship disappears.[3] Michael Meldon paid a feudal aid in 1316. A similar payment in 1346 is by William Meldon, presumably his son, to whom in 1350 Godstow gave a forty years lease of a messuage and three hides of land, part of which, called Estcroft, he already held of them.[4] By 1414 the Meldon manor had passed to Roger Cheyne of Drayton Beauchamp in Bucks, who died in that year and is described on his brass in Cassington church as *quondam armiger domini regis*. His younger son Thomas succeeded him. In 1446 he acquired Chesham Bois in Bucks by marriage with a daughter of Sir John Chesham and probably died soon after.[5]

I return to the relations between Cassington and Eynsham. On 25 June, 1295, royal justices sat with a jury at Oxford to hear a complaint by the abbot that inhabitants of Cassington had done injury to his property by diverting the flow of water to his mill.[6] The alleged wrong is curiously dated as having arisen since the first crossing of Henry III to Gascony, which was as far back as 1242. But the present defendants were the Countess of Warwick, the Abbess of Godstow, Richard the vicar of Cassington, Simon the clerk and his wife Joan, John Blund, Michael Meldon, John of Fairford the chaplain, John Morel and four others. The last six of these were evidently men of Michael Meldon. The jury held that some of the defendants were guiltless, but not so Michael Meldon and his men. The abbots, from time immemorial, had been wont to go, with their own timber and turfs, carried on their own boat, to the edge of their mill-pool and there repair it, wherever an overflow of water had broken it down. The present abbot had done this, and then, at the bidding of Meldon, his men had

[1] *Ox. Fines*, 215, 224, 226; *Cal. I.P.M.*, iii. 26.
[2] *Cal. I.P.M.*, iii. 467, 479; *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (Edw II), i. 46.
[3] *Godstow*, 415, 417, 428–30.
[4] *Feudal Aids*, iv. 163, 177; *Godstow*, 431, 432.
[5] *Feudal Aids*, iv. 195; *Bucks Records*, i. 294.
[6] S, 504–6.

destroyed the bank, and the abbot had lost the profits of his mill for want of water. The court amerced them and gave the abbot 60*s*. costs. On the other hand he was amerced in respect of his false claim against the Countess and the rest. Meldon then had apparently land well up the Bladon, in the north-western part of Cassington. Another trouble arose in 1328.[1] Just as the men of Hanborough had rights of intercommoning upon the heath of Eynsham, so had those of Cassington in the neighbouring meadows of Eynsham, when these were thrown open for pasture after the hay-cutting. But the exact extent of these rights was uncertain and on 7 August, 1328, there was a conference in Mullemore meadow to determine them. On one side came the abbot, on the other Elizabeth Lady Montacute, *Seignouresse* of Cassington, presumably in right of dower, William Meldon, and the Abbess of Godstow. The chief officials of the abbey and the learned counsel of the parties were in attendance. A jury of six Eynsham and six Cassington men was chosen. It was admitted that there had been intercommoning from time immemorial over an area between Somerford and the ditch of Hythecroft and between the Thames and the floodgates of Eynsham Mill. The point at issue was as to the date at which it should begin. Cassington claimed to enter Wyreshey, Landmede, Mullemore and Mullecroft on the Nativity of St. John Baptist (June 24). They had done so, and the abbot had turned their cattle out. The jury decided that they had overstated their claim. Wyreshey and Landmede they might enter when the hay was cut, sending their beasts "horn by horn"; that is, I take it, in equal numbers with those of Eynsham. But Mullemore and Cattesbrayn they must keep out of until the neighbouring corn in Cattesbrayn and Mullecroft was harvested, or, if the land was fallow, until Lammas Day (1 August). In Hythecroft itself they had no rights. The record of this settlement is followed in the Eynsham cartulary by one of a complaint from the abbot to the king against his tenants of Cassington, who in a year in which mowing was made impossible by floods (*par decretyn de ewe*) had, none the less, entered the meadows and done damage to the extent of over fifty marks.[2] This is undated; it may be later than 1348, when the last Lacy who held the Honour of Pontefract died. There is another echo of the settlement in the demesne survey of 1360, where the abbey officials are instructed to keep Mullemore several until the Cattesbrayn harvest is over, but

[1] S, 656. [2] S, 657.

when the neighbouring meadow is mown, only to drive away the men of Cassington, without arresting them. Wyreshey is also to be several until haytime, unless the abbot sends his cattle in earlier, in which case the men of Cassington may do the same.[1]

Across the Thames, Eynsham's only neighbour was the rival abbey of Abingdon, which held Cumnor with its hamlet of Swinford. On the river Eynsham had a fishery, and a lease of this in 1302 gives a list of islands, on most of which a weir for catching fish was installed.[2] They follow the downward course of the river. One is at Godycroftshamme, one next the weir of William of Puntle (Pinkhill), one below the Wodewere, one on the south of Halkwere, two next the weir of John the Fisher, one at Forthwere, two below Forthwere, one in the middle of the passage, one at Bolwere, one called Wythegeneham (Wytham) and three in Standlake next the Landmede. The Standlake, I take it, was not in the main river, but in the tributary formed by the confluence of the Limb Brook and Chil Brook streams, which seems to have been widened to take the landing-place for barges, known as the Hythe and later as Orchard End and the Wharf. It is Bitterall Wharf in 1650. A second and shorter list of river boundaries in 1650 represents an agreement as to the respective rights of Eynsham and Swinford arrived at between the abbey and Edmund Dunch of Little Wittenham, to whose family Swinford had passed in 1563.[3] They are the south-east corner of Rothie Mead, Strond Wyre, Lilly Wyre, Merten Ham, the Shire Lake against the Ferry, Bole Wyre, and Mrs. Hampshire's Neight. The flow of the river has of course been much altered by the introduction of locks, and many of the islands have been submerged, but Merten Ham is now Merry Down Ham in Long Meadow. The *passagium* or ferry of Swinford was the subject of an elaborate treaty between the two abbeys on 21 April, 1299.[4] Eynsham acknowledge that the right in it belongs to Abingdon, and grant them a free landing for passengers by barges and boats, both small and large, provided no unnecessary harm is done to meadows or pastures. They must not, however, dig or work on Eynsham land without special license. For their use of the soil outside the king's highway they are to pay 12*d.* a year. Further the abbot and monks of Eynsham, their servants and domestics (*manupasti*) are to have free passage, on horse or foot, with their goods and animals. But if the abbot himself

[1] S, 607.
[2] S, 541.
[3] *V. H. Berks*, iv. 401.
[4] S, 508.

crossed, he shall give the ferryman two breads, commonly called peysloves, and two pitchers of second-best beer, and so too for an abbey cart ; and if the cellarer or steward crosses, then one peyslof, and one pitcher of beer. The rent of 12*d.* was still payable in 1539. When the Cumnor bounds were beaten in 1759, it was the custom for the ferryman to bring the vicar of the parish the sum of 6*s.* 8*d.* in a basin of water, from which the vicar sprinkled the young people who came within his reach, no doubt, whether he knew it or not, as a rain charm. The vicar and parishioners then crossed the river and took hold of the twigs or reeds on the Eynsham side, thereby asserting their claim to the whole width of the passage. After this the Gospel of the Ascension was read.[1]

IX. THE EYNSHAM HIGHWAYS.

The king's highway (*via regalis*) of 1299 is the road which still leads from the ferry to the town of Eynsham, a long half-mile to the north-west. It is " the common-street which leads to the crossing of Thames water " in 1284 ; " Temese-stret " in 1414.[2] It mounts the gravel ridge which borders the river valley, passing the site of the abbey garden and park to the south. The abbot had already a *parcus* in 1229.[3] At the top of the ridge the houses begin. This part of Eynsham was Huthende in the middle ages ; it was still Thames Street in 1518, and is now High Street.[4] It is linked with Newland, the Nova Terra of 1213, by a way to the north, which was Puck Lane in 1615 and 1650, but is now Queen Street. The name Puck Lane has been transferred, in the form Pug Lane, to a narrow lane, which strikes out of Queen Street to the west and then turns north, thus dividing Newland from the older part of Eynsham. This in 1650 was apparently Love Lane, now a mere passage joining Pug Lane to the market place. I return to the road from the ferry, which itself continues through the market-place, and is then crossed by another way, which runs from above the top of Newland on the north to the abbey gate on the south. This, on the northern part of it was medievally " the quarter (*vicus*) called the Mullhende."[5] In 1650 it was all Mill Street ; the southern part is now Abbey Street. The point of intersection was called Carfolks in 1650, probably after Carfax in Oxford. The market-place seems to have extended to this point in 1650. There has been much

[1] *Bibl. Top. Brit.*, iv. (2) 23.
[2] S, 474, 476 ; *C.C.C. Bursary Transcripts*, 404.
[3] *Ox. Fines*, 86. [4] S, II, xviii. [5] S, 570.

later building in the western part of it, including an eighteenth century school-house. If anything stood there originally, it was the so-called "ancient manor-house," now a shop and a bank, to the owner of which, up to a recent date, the lord of the manor paid a quit-rent of 5*s*., in return for which he was entitled to a lodging when he visited Eynsham. The survey of 1650 is not very clear here, but I think that the house may be that called the Green Dragon. The name looks like that of an inn, but conceivably the quit-rent was by origin that of the same amount which the abbey was paying to Thomas Blakeman in 1535. The position of the building suggests that a court-house for the borough may once have stood there. To the west of Carfolks comes the main street of Eynsham, which is all Acre End Street in the 1650 survey, although it seems to have been partly Eynsham St. and partly Acre End in 1518.[1]

From the Berkshire side of the ferry Eynsham had access to Abingdon through Cumnor, and also to Oxford by a horse road which crossed the ridge of the Wytham hills, and descended to Botley, probably by Tilbury Farm, but possibly through the lane between Botley and Wytham village. This, according to Dr. Grundy, was part of a system of ancient ridgeways, which had served as trade-routes from prehistoric dates.[2]. Such a ridgeway must, as Dr. Grundy says, have continued westwards through Oxfordshire after passing the ferry, but its line cannot now be traced. One would expect it to get as soon as possible out of the river valley, which could only be at Eynsham itself, and then perhaps to make for higher ground still, such as the other ridgeway or *portstraet* between Witney and Bladon. If so, it must have diverged from the line of the ferry road, perhaps at Mill St., since the present link between Acre End and the Eynsham and Witney road did not exist at all in medieval times, or indeed until centuries later. Acre End was certainly continued by the lane which still passes down to a bridge over the Chil Brook. In 1261 this stream was the Lutteswelle, "which is now called Stondych." Perhaps, therefore, it already had a bridge, which may be also a *pons Hugonis* of about 1220.[3] In 1650 the bridge had given a name to two Chilbridge furlongs. Thereafter the lane goes by the brook for a little way, and then, leaving a footpath to continue its direct line towards Twelve Acre Farm, turns south towards Hamstall. It is called the way leading to Hamstall in 1281.[4] It now in fact comes to an end in a divergence to Armstalls

[1] S, II, xviii.
[2] *Saxon Oxfordshire* (O.R.S.), 99.
[3] S, 328a, 419. [4] S, 467.

farm, but it seems clear from Richard Davis's map of 1797 that it once crossed the Eynsham boundary and joined a lane leading from South Leigh to Sutton. It is called Sutton Way in 1782. Part of it seems to be Lintbrow Lane in 1650; a Linton Furlong is hard by.

Medieval travellers from Witney to Eynsham would follow the course of the existing road, passing from Swench Hill through the lower corner of the Heath and by Tilgarsley. As they approached Eynsham, they would come to a point on the right, now marked by Derrymerrys Barn, on a close of the same name. In 1615 it is Diamorris Close, and the map shows a considerable set-back in the road, which is still, in spite of the widening of the road, discernible. But the 1650 survey gives Davy-Mary Close, and I have little doubt that the original name was Ave Maria Close, and that in the set-back stood, in pre-Reformation days, a shrine of the Virgin. As a parallel to the corruption, I may cite a Green Pixy wood known to me in Cornwall, which, according to a local hind, it is not safe to enter after dark, without crossing your fingers and saying "'Ave Merry!" Shortly afterwards the old road diverged from the present cut to Acre End, took a line still preserved by a foot-path to Sparacre Lane, which in 1615 was Town End, and joined the north end of Mill Street by the water-tower on the site of the old pound, which was already here in 1601.[1] This track the map of 1615 calls Honye crosse way, and in it, near the west end, marks a Hony crosse. But in the survey of 1650 we get Hawme Cross, and in Corpus terriers of 1697 and 1788 Howling Cross, as the name of a furlong in Conduit Field. Howland Cross is mentioned as a locality in 1802, and a neighbouring pasture is still Howland Close. It is fairly clear that the college surveyor of 1615 got the name wrong, and that we have really to do with a Howling Cross, at which mourners from Tilgarsley rested their dead, when they came to Eynsham for burial. Weeping crosses of similar significance are known at Banbury, Buckingham, and elsewhere, and they have got into literature. There is an old proverb :—

He that goes out with often losse,
At length comes back by Weeping Crosse.

John Florio, translating Montaigne's *Essays* in 1603, has :—

> Few men have wedded their sweet hearts, their paramours or mistresses, but have come home by Weeping Crosse, and ere long repented their bargaine.[2]

[1] C.C.C. *Bursary Transcripts*, 608.
[2] Bk., iii. cl. 5.

And in a song book (1600) of Robert Jones comes :—

Let him not vaunt that gains my loss,
For when that he and Time hath proved her,
She may him bring to Weeping Cross.
I say no more, because I loved her.

It is possible that medieval communication between Eynsham and Oxford was through Cassington, Yarnton and Wolvercote, rather than by the horse road over Wytham. The "great street towards the bridge of Cassington" is named in the charter of 1215 for Newland, which was laid out on either side of it. In 1366 it is called a *via regia*.[1] Both this road and that to the ferry came into question in an interesting lawsuit of 1362, which however was primarily concerned with the relation of the abbot's manorial court to the old Hundred Court at Wootton.[2] The abbot brought a complaint in the King's Bench that on 13 December, 1361, Thomas Warner took certain plough-beasts of his, to wit twenty-four oxen, in Mulmore, drove them to Wootton, and there unjustly detained them, damaging him in £100. Thomas Warner admits the capture, but claims that it was within his right as bailiff of Wootton. A view of frank-pledge, he says, is held at Eynsham twice a year, after Easter and Michaelmas, by the sheriff of Oxfordshire and the bailiff. The abbot has to feed them and their horses for a day and a night and to pay a fee of 8*s*. If a defect is not presented but concealed, it is to be presented at the great view of Wootton at Old Woodstock by twelve free jurors of the hundred from within and without Eynsham. The bailiff is to hold this view, and the person responsible for the defect is to be amerced and punished. This has been the practice from time immemorial. It had been presented at a view of Wootton in January 1361 that the abbot and his predecessors had been immemorially bound to make a passage for foot and horse at Swynefordehythe in Eynsham, and that the passage was broken and ruinous, so that men could not get to the view at Eynsham, with the result that the defect was not presented but concealed. There was therefore an amercement on the abbot, which was assessed at 50*s*. At the next view of Wootton on 25 April, 1361, it was presented that the defect had not been amended, and further that, whereas the abbot was bound to make and repair a bridge and causeway between Eynsham and the mill of Cassington, these too were broken and destroyed, so that men could not pass. Additional fines were then inflicted, and it was for the sums due that the oxen were taken by way of restraint.

[1] S, 44A, 615. [2] S, 653–55.

In rejoinder, the abbot denied any obligation to maintain the passage, bridge and causeway in question. And he claimed that the view of Eynsham was one to be held by his own steward, although it was true that if the sheriff and the bailiff of Wootton chose to attend, he had, once in the year only, to feed them and pay 8*s*. It was however his own view, and here only, and not at Wootton, could defects arising within Eynsham be presented. Both parties now put themselves on their country, and on 27 November, 1363, a writ was issued for the calling of a jury by twelve knights or freemen, worth not less than 100*s*. a year, from the vicinity of Eynsham. They were summoned on 13 February, 1364, but we have not their verdict. It is, however, pretty clear that on the point of jurisdiction the abbot was in the right, since he had had a definite grant of the view of frankpledge, as already noted, in 1313.[1] It will be observed that, while his plea repudiates in general terms any responsibility for maintaining the ways, it does not specifically record the transference of the ferry to Abingdon in 1299. The bridge in question would not be that over the Evenlode, which stood in Cassington itself, just below the mill, and not in Eynsham. It may have been a Bow Bridge, shown at the Eynsham end of the road in the map of 1615, or an unnamed one, also there shown, over a water-course called the Flam, or one not shown over the boundary ditch between the townships. The map does not show Mead Lane, which strikes southwards, to join the ferry road and the Wharf. It no doubt gave access to the Lanmede, but I find no notice of it before 1708. In 1782 it is Bitteralls Lane, from another mead on the opposite side of it. But the northern arm of the present Mead Lane is in fact part of the old road to Cassington, the course of which was altered at the Enclosure of 1802, so that it now runs in a straight line through what was once the Upper Meadow, and crosses the Cassington boundary, some 250 yards farther north than its predecessor, to a new bridge.

The habits of kings and nobles in the middle ages were migratory, and it is believed that as a result the roads were in a better condition than in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when they became deplorable. The neighbourhood of Oxford, however, was to some extent protected by Mileway Acts, begun in Elizabethan days, which imposed the duty of upkeep upon townships within a circuit of five miles.[2] An

[1] Cf. p. 18.
[2] L. L. Shadwell, *Enactments in Parliament*, (O.H.S.), i. 195.

annual sum of £1 10*s.* 0*d.* was still payable by Eynsham for the maintenance of Botley causeway in 1767. But in the eighteenth century the whole system was revolutionised by the establishment under innumerable local Acts of Road Trusts with powers for widening and repair, and the right to meet expenses by charging tolls at gates and turnpikes. And when a coaching road from Oxford through Eynsham to the west came into existence, it was not the Cassington line which was chosen, but that of the old horse road over the Wytham hill. The Oxford and Witney Trust was set up by an Act of 1751, the operation of which was amended and continued by others of 1767, 1768 and 1778.[1] Its powers extended over the Horse Road from Staple Hall in Witney to the west end of Botley causeway. I find an agreement, as early as 1 June, 1752, between the trustees and Thomas Keen of Hanborough, mason, to make the road between Barnard Gate and Goodenough's turnpike on the west side of Eynsham town and to keep it in repair for a year. He is to have £60 a mile for construction and £3 for repair. The road is to be eight feet in width, ditched, and with "set-offs" for carts to pass each other. The surface is to have a foot's depth of stones.[2] But the powers of the Trust ended at Botley, and at the Oxford end there seems to have been considerable delay. Tenders were issued for widening Botley causeway and making a carriageway to Eynsham in 1755, but it is doubtful whether anything was then done.[3] One recognises the familiar methods of the Oxford Corporation. In 1766 the New Road in Oxford was made to replace the inconvenient way round the Castle.[4] And in 1767 came an Act setting up a Trust for repairing the road from the west end of Thames St. in Oxford over the causeway to the turnpike at Fifield; that is the road up Cumnor Hill, as we now know it.[5] This Act recites the raising of a county, university and city subscription of £600 for the purpose of widening the causeway to thirty feet and its bridges to twenty feet. It assigns the Eynsham contribution under the Mileway Acts to the new trustees, and in view of the increased traffic expected through Botley provides that they shall pay the older body half the causeway tolls, on condition of the removal of all turnpikes between the north end of the causeway and the north-west of the town of Eynsham. The same year of 1767 saw an

[1] 24 *G. ii*, c. 28 (*Bodl. Fol.θ*673); 7 *G. iii*, c. 66 (Shadwell, ii. 88); 8 *G. iii*, c. 34; 18 *G. iii*, c. 81.

[2] *Bodl. Oxon Charter*, 2473.

[3] *Ox. Journal* (29 Nov., 1755).

[4] H. Hurst, *Ox. Topography* (O.H.S.), 79.

[5] 7 *G. iii*, c. 66.

act for the building of a bridge at Swinford, and another in 1768 provided for repairing and widening the road from the ancient Horse Road there through Cumnor to the Mayor's Stone in Abingdon.[1] Finally the *Oxford Journal* records that on 4 August, 1769, the Stroud Water coach went for the first time along the new turnpike to Witney and over "Lord Abingdon's magnificent new bridge." The bridge is depicted in Samuel Ireland's *Picturesque Views on the River Thames* (1792), with a three-storey building on the Wytham side which Ireland says was meant for an inn but never yet occupied. This has now been reduced in height and turned into cottages. A toll for foot-passengers was abandoned by Lord Abingdon in 1835 on the marriage of his eldest son.[2] The new road had its drawbacks. The Oxford shambles of Butcher Row down the middle of Queen St. were not removed until 1773.[3] And the Seven Bridge Road was long the haunt of highwaymen. In 1783 an association was formed to combat them. In true English fashion, the promoters held a dinner, after which they were relieved of their purses on their return home.[4] One may suspect that the transit of the old trackway over the Wytham heights was also favourable ground for such incidents of eighteenth century travel. But it is not until 1810 that the *Oxford Journal* records an agreement for the lower road now in use, "avoiding the present Hill and going through a country not only perfectly level, but affording the most picturesque and delightful prospect."[5] Up on Wytham the old road, which has never seen a motor-car, still runs, broad and level once you have climbed the steep hill from Swinford, beneath a canopy of overhanging beeches. It is clear from the reference to a gate at the north-west end of Eynsham in 1767, which is doubtless the Goodenough's turnpike of 1752, that at first the coach road went from Eynsham to Witney along Howling Cross Way. The present way from Acre End did not then exist. It first appears in the map of 1782. Here it is drawn, with two angles in it, along the full length of one arable strip and across others, and joins the Witney road a little east of Cuckoo Lane. Perhaps it was then only a plan, and some adjustment of the holdings was to accompany it. But it must have been made soon after, although with only one angle, which is dangerous enough now.

[1] 7 *G. iii*, c. 63; 8 *G. iii*, c. 61.
[2] *Symonds MS.*, vii. 526.
[3] 11 *G. iii*, c. 19 (Shadwell, ii. 102); *Ox. Journal* (16 Oct., 1773).
[4] J. R. Green, *Oxford Studies*, 193; C. G. Harper, *Oxf., Gloucester and Milford Haven Road*, i. 214.
[5] *O.J.* (20 Jan., 1810).

The road map in David Paterson's *British Itinerary* of 1785 shows it, but still takes the coach road by the north of Mill street. So does the later edition of 1796, but the map there is probably an unaltered reproduction. On the other hand Richard Davis's map of 1797 makes the Acre End road the coach road, and although John Cary's *New Itinerary* of 1798 has no map, it notes the Swan Inn, presumably as a baiting-place, and this implies by its situation the use of Acre End. That the *Oxford Journal*, both in 1785 and in 1801, puts a Newland Gate on the road proves nothing, since there is a Newland outside Witney as well as that in Eynsham.

Some other early ways must be noted. A *via regia* to Hanborough in 1264–68 went by the *brueria*.[1] It began, I think, with the present Cuckoo Lane, from the Witney Road, half a mile from Town End. The lane is shown in the map of 1615, but not named. But there are several Cuckoo Closes in the survey of 1650, and there are several by the lane in 1782. Two tracks from points further west along the Witney road converge upon the lane about three-quarters of a mile from its opening. They are shown in the map of 1782. One is the lane to Meanes Close in 1615. A little beyond their emergence, on the east of the lane, is a spot now haunted by gipsies. This is Kington Green, and a brook flowing through it was in 1650 Kingston's Gutter. Here the old way to Hanborough diverged from Cuckoo Lane to the east over the Gutter. It is shown in the maps of 1782 and 1797, and is still traceable, although much overgrown, It had a cross-link with Cuckoo Lane near the Bowles, after which it ran on the western side of Vincent's Wood to Elm Farm, whence it followed the northerly line of the present road through Freeland. It would take the monks by the heath-field to Hanborough, and also to another important estate of the abbey at Charlbury. Heke Hulle is several times named as a spot of high ground in early deeds.[2] A way went up it, as now, in 1615 from Town End to the east of Howling Cross Way. A continuation of it, apparently called Colletts Lane in 1650, passed through Turners Green, and then diverged to the west and fell into the Hanborough road just described. This link is now lost. A foot-path, which crosses a ford below Turners Green and reaches Elm Farm by the east side of Vincent's Wood, may be a later substitute for it. Mill Street is continued northwards in 1615 as Milne Lane and then Woodstock Way. This was the *via de Bladene* in 1268–81.[3] On it, at the foot of Torres Grave meere,

[1] S, 450. [2] S, 226, 317, 364. [3] S, 366.

was in 1615 Stonende Bridge. A second bridge, over the Cauerswelle on the Hanborough boundary, seems to be a Cherebrugge of 1268–81.[1] In 1570 it was Tolcon Bridge, and in 1782 Token Bridge, perhaps from a signpost. The mill itself may have originally been reached by a continuation of the way down Torres Grave meere by Stonend Bridge. Possibly this is what is called Wudeman Muleweye in 1241–64, although the name is not very intelligible.[2] The existing causeway, which starts more to the south, is in the map of 1782, but is treated in the Enclosure award of 1802 as an allotment under the name of Rod Ham. Nearly opposite began a second Hanborough way, still a foot-path leading directly to Hanborough church. It is, no doubt, on this way that Up Joan opens a gate for passers by. She is presumably the Old Mother Culpepper, of a family which came to Hanborough in the sixteenth century, who still walks.[3]

From the south end of Mill Street, now called Abbey Street, started a way to Sutton and Stanton Harcourt, distinct from that through Hamstall. Its original course was diverted, under the authority of a royal patent in 1217, by the same Abbot Adam who laid out the borough of Newland.[4] The old road, according to the patent, went on the east of the house of Herveus, and between the *curia* and the barton of the abbey. It was, therefore a fairly straight continuation of Abbey Street downhill to the Chil Brook. The new road was to go farther away from the abbey buildings, passing round the west side of the courtyard of Herveus, and then dropping down beyond the stream between that courtyard and the barton, and taking in both the barton itself and the courtyard of Walter Clarkson. It was to join the old road at one end before the door of Reginald Pictor, and at the other before the gate of the cemetery of the great church, between the barton and the courtyard of John Porter. We can trace in the cartulary the steps taken to carry out this specification. From Herveus the abbey acquired his manse, courtyard and croft beyond the torrent towards Stanton, giving him in exchange another manse and croft, once held by Henry Banastre.[5] From Ralph, the son of Walter Clarkson, they acquired his messuage, garden and croft next the abbot's barton, and a place which extended in length from a new bridge to the angle of the barton wall on the north, and in width from the new street to the barton.[6] There were

[1] S, 366.
[2] S, 317.
[3] *Folk Lore*, xxiv. 84.
[4] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (Hen. III), i. 78.
[5] S, 216.
[6] S, 224.

some consequential changes on the west side of the new street. The transfer from Herveus included his arable and pasture between it and the Calvecroft. Robert Halthein granted the arable Heycroft, the side of which was divided by the new street from the spring called Holewelle, while its end abutted on the *hospitale*.[1] Here it was contemplated the abbot might build a grange. This was, however, in fact built on another plot already acquired from Walter Clarkson, and confirmed in his son Ralph's deed. Stephen of Fritwell was granted an arable acre in the new street, north of the arable of Robert Marescallus, as a burgage, and the abbot undertook to build him a house upon it. Robert's land is described somewhat later as "towards Sutton." Still later his son Walter was granted arable in Holewellehulle, between that of John Bacon and that of William the son of Margery.[2] The line of the new street is, I think, represented, first by the way which goes from the end of Abbey Street between the house of the Abbey Farm and its yard, the Farm Court of 1650, on the site of the old barton, and then, from the point where that emerges, by Station Road to Chilmore Bridge. The purchases made it possible to throw all the ground to the south and east of this into the precincts of the abbey itself. The Holewelle may be identified with a spring just to the south of the present Abbey Farm barn, and from it issues a stream, hardly now to be called a torrent, which probably once went straight into the Chil Brook, but seems to have been blocked at that end, and turned eastwards to feed the abbey fish-ponds. In 1650 Edgerley's Farm appears to be the most southerly house on the west side of what is now Abbey Street. Opposite the Farm in 1650 was the Abbey Court, which I take to be the cemetery of 1217. But the *curia* of 1217, as the other uses of the word in the patent suggest, was probably the large court for cattle, attached to the agricultural buildings, which is described in the survey of 1360. The *hospitale*, on which land to the west of the new street abutted, probably lay between that and Acre End. I take it to have been, not a distinct religious foundation, and not an alms-house, but the *hospitium* or guest-house of the abbey, detached, as at Glastonbury, from the precinct itself. It would come just about where the Swan and Railway inns now stand. The link with the road to Stanton Harcourt, which now divides them, must be of later date. The "new" grange is represented by the house and mill which preserve the name, a little further to the

[1] S, 209. [2] S, 186, 242, 364.

west in Acre End. The " new " street itself is probably the Holewellehulle of the grant to Walter Marshall. But it was still being called the New Bridge road when the railway came and turned it into Station Road. There were apparently no houses in it in 1650. Possibly Stephen of Fritwell's was never built. His widow resigned dower over land only in 1231.[1] The house of Reginald Pictor probably disappeared.

The lines of the old and new roads must have converged a little beyond the " new " Chilmore bridge. But there has been another alteration in the course towards Sutton, which was made nearly six centuries after the first. Part of the medieval way is shown in a map of 1615 as a track across the arable South Field running south-west from " Deadmanes burial " over one furlong, then more to the west between two others, and then turning south at a right angle, down the side of a Belgrave Acre, to the Limb Brook. This agrees with the map of 1782, which gives the whole course, following a sinuous line which divides a large arable piece into a " Long Farm " on the north and a " Short Farm " on the south. The Enclosure award of 1802 provides for the continuance of the way from Cowleaze Lane, which still leads into the pastures from a little below Chilmore Bridge, to " an Ancient Gateway into the parish of Stanton Harcourt." This was, no doubt, at Bell Bridge on the Limb Brook. The name Belgrave Acre is probably an error, due to the fact that Corpus, which held it, also held a tenement called Belgraves.[2] In the college terriers of 1697 and 1788 it is Bell Acre. Unless there was a bell on the " Ancient Gateway," the proceeds of the acre may once have gone to the maintenance of the chapel bell. The present rectilinear road from the station to Bell Bridge must have replaced the medieval one at a late date. It first appears as an afterthought ruled in pencil on the map of 1782. It runs further to the north-west than the old line, with a maximum divergence of about fifty yards, and the site of " Deadmanes buriall " is well on the river side of it.

X. SOME EYNSHAM TENEMENTS.

It is possible that the earliest inhabitations of Eynsham tenants were in the Mullhende, which lay next the common arable fields. It is called a *vicus* in 1342, when Richard Bourmain succeeded Robert de Elmyndone in a tenement there.[3] In the middle of the old borough, I can locate John

[1] S, 716. [2] Cf. p. 81. [3] S. 570.

Le Noble at a house, once Henry Le Stede's, next the Chapel of St. Leonard, with Gilbert Doget on the other side of him.[1] This was in 1268–81 and in 1317–30 Robert le Bedel is similarly placed, with William de Canigge as his neighbour.[2] The chapel itself, now the parish church, is first mentioned in 1264–68. It had a light before the cross, to which certain tenants were bound to make contributions on St. Martin's Day.[3] In 1337 a house was assigned to the vicar between that of Richard the Miller of Fawler and that once of Walter Gaylone.[4] It may have been on the site of the present vicarage, which was in Mill Street by 1650. John Porter and his father John lived next the abbey gate before 1264 and John Etone, possibly the same as the porter John of Iuetene, was there in 1268–81.[5] The gate long survived at the south end of Abbey Street. In 1290 it was found by an inquisition that it would not be to the hurt of the crown, if the abbot enclosed the way between the abbey and the almonry and made another competent way of the same length and breath outside the abbey.[6] One cannot be sure where the almonry stood. In 1650 there was an alms-house to the north of Edgerley's farm. But this point is almost opposite the abbey gate, and no special way to it could be necessary. In Huthende we can trace several houses; that of Avenel before 1229 and his son John after him, which stood next Newland, on the east side of Puck Lane; those once of Henry de Baggingdene and Robert Navigator, granted to Henry the fisher of Sumerford in 1241–64; that once of Isabella de Submuro, granted to Simon, son of Walter the fisher of Eynesham, in 1268–81; those of Henry, Louekyn, and Robert le Rower, adjacent to each other, of which Louekyn's passed in 1342 to John le Noble; that once of Walter the clerk, which Robert Jordan held in 1360.[7]

Of one tenement, in which are merged two earlier ones, some fuller account is possible. This is the house, now known as The Elms, at the top of the hill from the ferry. It belongs to Corpus Christi College, among whose muniments some early title deeds are preserved. The history begins with a family of Belegraves. The first member of them upon record is a Walter Belegrave, who seems to have had a hereditary right in the abbey fishery on the Thames.[8] I have just noted his son Simon in

[1] S, 381. [2] S, 549. [3] S, 338, 383.
[4] S, 457. [5] S, 258, 366; cf. p. 32.
[6] *Symonds MS.* (*penes* Oxf. County Council), vi. 338, from Exeter College muniments.
[7] S, 312–13, 315, 338, 413, 474, 569, 607; *Ox. Fines*, 86.
[8] S, 472.

Huthende. But he had an elder son Robert, who in 1268–81 surrendered the fishery to the abbey. About the same time Robert had some land in a furlong called Coleworthe. Shortly afterwards some considerable trouble seems to have arisen between him and the abbot. On 13 April, 1284, he surrendered a virgate of land, a house, a water-mill, and four strips (*seliones*) of land within the abbey garden, and made a very full renunciation of all right and claim in any lands and tenements held by the abbey, and in ways, paths, meadows, feeding grounds, pastures, waters, marshes, mills, fishponds and dovecots. In return he received on the same day a grant during the lives of himself and his wife Joan of a corrody consisting of a white and a black loaf, a gallon and a half of superior beer, a dish from the kitchen and a pottage, under a proviso that the corrody should be void, if ever he disquieted or disturbed the abbey in other respects, or if his widow did so by claiming a dowry or otherwise. Nor were his affairs yet quite settled. On 3 May, before the same witnesses, three other deeds were signed. By one the fishery was restored to him under a life-grant at a rent of 40*s*., without right of alienation, and with the duty of guarding the abbey meadows next the Thames. By another he resigned a house next the Thames, one end of which was on the ferry road and the other on the abbey garden. By the Thames is probably here meant the Hythe, rather than the main stream. The consideration is to be the grant of another house in exchange. And the third deed is the abbey grant of this house, which was on the other side of the ferry road, between that and the house once of John Avenel. To this I shall return. The deed also confirms Belegrave in his existing freehold of a half virgate of land, at a rent of 5*s*. subject to suit of court and boonworks and the right of pre-emption to the abbey on alienation.[1] One would like to know what all the fuss of 1284 was about. Belegrave, it will be observed, had a virgate and a half, of which he only kept the half. The land must have been acquired after 1279, since there is no Belegrave among the freeholders in the *Hundred Rolls* of that year. The only freeholder who then had just a virgate and a half was Augustinus Clericus. He was dead by 30 November, 1281, when Nicholas Faber of Hockele, as his heir, gave all his rights to the abbey.[2] Was Belegrave in a position to make some claim to a prior interest, on which a compromise was arrived at in 1284 ? Robert was dead by 1302, when a new life-grant of the fishery, from which I have

[1] S, 364, 406, 471–76. [2] S, 466.

already taken a list of the Thames islands, was made to his son William at a reduced rent of 33*s.* 4*d.*[1] William was concerned with his son John and others in an assault upon Sir John Lovel at Eynsham in 1344.[2] But it is a Richard le Fischere, who in 1330 witnesses a grant from Matilda, widow of William Puntle, of a house in Sutton to her son-in-law John Belegrave of Eynsham and his wife Alice. This house John's son Henry transferred to John Foly of Puncle in 1346.[3] Richard le Fischere may be a brother rather than a son of William Belegrave. If, as likely, he is a Richard Belegrave of 1366, he dwelt, not in the ferry road, but in Newland.[4] And I suspect that the direct line of Robert Belegrave died out with Henry. The survey of 1360 ascribes one plot of meadow land to "the heirs of Belegrave" and another to Walter Moricen "of the inheritance of Belegrave." This Walter, also called Morice, has meadow plots of his own, as well as one which he shares with John Wodestoke. A Walter Morce, born in Eynsham, was a witness in the Tilgarsley dispute of 1352, and in 1365 certain felonies and trespasses by him, in company with other men of Eynsham, were the subject of a royal enquiry.[5] Probably he married a daughter of Henry Belegrave.

Of the house in the ferry road we hear nothing more until the fifteenth century, when the Corpus title-deeds begin. In 1414 Hugh Glover bought one part of a tenement in Eynsham from Agnes widow of Walter Morris and another from Henry Porter through William Herberger. It stood in Thames St. between the tenements late of William del Fermereye and William Belegrave. In 1433 William Glover, probably the son of Hugh, bought the third part, with John Lewis and John Bocher, from Johanna widow of Thomas Warner. On the same day John Lewis, John Stowe and Robert Croxford bought one part from Robert Wodestoke and three parts from Johanna Warner, which she had jointly with her husband from Richard Chapman and John Bocher, of a second tenement, described as a toft, close and dovecot called Belgraves in Thames St. And this also William Glover acquired in 1440 from Lewis and Croxford. It is further located in the conveyance to him as being on the north side of a spring called Modyeswell.[1] This is clearly the house granted to Robert Belegrave in 1284, and next door is Walter Morris, probably a descendant of the man who may

[1] S, 541.
[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (Ed. iii), vi. 407.
[3] *Bodl. Oxon. Charters* 716, 717.
[4] S, 615.
[5] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (Edw. iii), xiii, 144.
[6] *C.C.C. Bursary Transcripts*, 402–08, 418–22.

have married Robert's great-grand-daughter. Morce, Moricen, Morice, Morris ; it is all one in medieval orthography. Of the other names one can make little ; some of them probably only represent syndicates or trustees through whom sales were effected. That of Robert Wodestoke recalls the joint tenure of meadow by Walter Morice and John Wodestoke in 1360. Conceivably John Wodestoke married another daughter of William Belegrave. But the reference to Modyeswell is interesting, since it suggests a possible predecessor of Robert Belegrave in John son of William Mody, who granted houses to the abbey in 1268–81.[1] The actual Belegrave house had clearly been pulled down by 1433. Here, as often in early documents, a " toft " is the site where a house once stood. From 1440 the Glover purchases form a single holding. They passed from William's son Richard and his wife Philippa to Henry Busby *alias* Fyckette in 1503 and from Busby to John Eggecombe, William, Archbishop of Canterbury and Richard Gibbes in 1504.[2] Trustees again, no doubt, but why Archbishop Warham was concerned with the affairs of a small freeholder in Eynsham I do not know. Eggecombe, however, sold in 1505 to Richard Barry of Eynsham, glover, his wife Agnes and his son John, and in the hands of the Barry family the property seems to have remained for some time.[3] I take it that it was they who built, on the vacant toft, the present house, which is drawn, quite recognisably with its projecting porch, as an inset in one of the Corpus maps. They became people of some importance, probably through the glove trade, which prospered in Oxfordshire during the sixteenth century. John Barry was the collector of Eynsham rents in 1518.[4] In 1541 he bought from Leonard Chamberlain the manor of Hampton Gay, on the Cherwell near Woodstock, and here he was succeeded by his son Lawrence in 1546 and his grandson Vincent in 1575.[5] The next deed concerning Belgraves is of 1595.[6] By this William Seacole sells to Edmund Reynolds messuages known as the old and the new building, late in the tenure of Thomas Peniston, esquire, and bounded by Hye Crofte on the north and east, and by the street from the ferry, the tenement of Peter Townsend, and Puck Lane. Townsend's tenement, that of Del Fermereye in 1414, must have been at the angle of the ferry road and Puck Lane, and that of Belegrave must have run

[1] S, 415.
[2] *B. Transcripts*, 456, 468, 472.
[3] *B. Transcripts*, 470.
[4] S, II, xviii.
[5] *Cal. Ancient Deeds*, vi. 480 ; *Bodl. MS. Top. Oxon*, c. 328 ; *Harl. Soc.*, v. 198, 326.
[6] *B. Transcripts*, 542.

through to Puck Lane behind it. With the messuages conveyed now went six acres of arable. Seacole himself had bought from Thomas Cheyney esquire and his wife Elizabeth, and from Andrew Reade, who may have been a trustee for Elizabeth, and from William Buttle, William Hyecroft and Robert Yate. I take it that these three sold him the arable and the Cheyneys the houses. He gives warranty against any claim by Richard Ruffin, late of Eynsham, or his daughter, Cheyney's wife. The Penistons were a Bampton family, and the Thomas of the deed, presumably only a temporary occupier on lease, seems to have been one who died in 1557.[1] But how did the Eynsham tenement get to Thomas Cheyney, who was not one of the Cheyne family at Cassington, but of a branch from that of Kent, which had settled at West Woodhay in Berkshire?[2] Doubtless from Elizabeth's father Richard Ruffin, to whom it must have passed from the Barrys, possibly by way of mortgage. Richard was feoffee for a family settlement of Hampton Gay in 1547.[3] The name Ruffin is found at Cumnor, Hinksey and Fulscott, and elsewhere in Berkshire. In 1585 John Ruffin of Fulscott took a mortgage of land in Eynsham from Thomas and Elizabeth Cheyney, and later his son John brought an action against them to recover money lent by his father.[4] But Richard Ruffin was already of Eynsham in 1560, when he took a lease of the manor of Swinford in Cumnor.[5] In the same year he acquired a tenement in Newland from Laurence Barry, and became guardian to John Seacole, the son of Agnes Ruffin, from whom Seacole inherited a Perch Close. Richard died in 1562–3.[6] In 1581 John Seacole conveyed Perch Close, earlier known as Hopwilles, to his brother William, and this also William probably sold to Edmund Reynolds. At any rate it went with Belgraves and its six acres and various other lands and closes in Eynsham, acquired from several vendors, when Edmund Reynolds and Henry Jackson sold these to feoffees for Corpus on 24 July, 1609. A licence was obtained from Sir Edward Stanley, as lord of the manor, for a transfer from the feoffees to the college, with a proviso for the exclusion of any land granted to Richard Barry by the abbey.[7] This probably relates to a Berry's close near the wharf which appears in the

[1] *Harl. Soc.* v. 153.
[2] *Harl. Soc.*, lvii. 102.
[3] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (Edw. vi), i. 164.
[4] *Cal. Anc. Deeds*, vi. 533; *L. I. Chancery Proc. Eliz.* (R.O.), ii. 431.
[5] *V. H. Berks*, iv. 401.
[6] *Court Rolls.*
[7] *B. Transcripts*, 482, 500, 582, 590.

survey of 1650. Reynolds long continued to farm the college land in Eynsham.

The limits of Newland can be determined with some precision. Dr. Salter cites the charter of 1215 as assigning to it a furlong (220 yards) from north to south, and describes it from the map of 1782 as forming "a rectangular projection into the fields, measuring one furlong from north to south and two furlongs from east to west."[1] I do not think that this is quite exact. What the charter gives is 20 perches or half a furlong on the north of the Cassington road, and on the south all the demesne land between the old borough and the road. When the copyhold manor of Newland, as it was then called, was sold in 1862, it extended over the greater part of Newland St. and Queen Street, and along Queen Street it certainly ran back for much more than half a furlong. This is clear from a singularly minute survey of 1366, which gives in order each tenement, with the name of the owner, the frontage and lateral measurement, the area down to a fraction of a barley-corn, and the rent down to a fraction of a farthing.[2] Various notes of orientation and of relation to the Hythecroft on the west and to a *via regia* make it possible to plot the whole. The *via regia*, however, must sometimes be Newland St. and sometimes Queen St. On the west side of Queen Street face four tenements, having a total frontage of 95 yards, which with 115 yards taken up by the side of the tenement at the western angle of Newland Street and Queen St. cover the distance from that angle to the boundary of the old borough at Pug Lane. From the same angle westwards along the south side of Newland St. are six tenements, with a frontage of 145 yards, again reaching the old borough at Love Lane. On the north of Newland St. are ten tenements with a frontage of 230 yards. The third from the west is the *aula*, now the White Hart, which was the court-house for Newland up to recent times. Between the eighth and ninth is interposed a tenement of Nicholas Colyns, which was *de antiqua tenura*, that is, not a Newland burgage at all, but a freehold or copyhold of the agricultural manor. As this is not measured, the eastern limit remains a little vague, but probably it was that of the existing houses, other than the detached Chesneys. The tale now crosses again to the south side of Newland St. Here, at the south-east angle of Queen St. is no house, but a "place" in the lord's hand, with a frontage of twenty-seven yards, and to the east of it a croft of about three and three-quarter acres, nearly square, but widening a little

[1] S, II, xli. [2] S, 615.

at the east end, where it is in part planted with trees. The side of the " place " on Queen St. is 115 yards. Beyond it, on the east of Queen St. come five tenements, with a total frontage of ninety-three yards. These plots, taken together, bring us to a point opposite the opening of Pug Lane. Here, no doubt, began the holding of Avenel in Huthende, which in 1229 was bounded by strips (*butta*) of arable, then not built on, in Newland.[1] The last of the five tenements was called Goseford, and here presumably a stream, still traceable to the east, crossed the road. As this was then Puck Lane, it may be the spot at which the Powkebridge court for pannage payments was held in the fifteenth century. In all the survey gives twenty-seven tenements, of which a few had been divided by the building on them of subordinate cottages. The total area is about eighteen and a half acres, and the total rental £3 13*s.* 11¾*d.*, not far from the 4*s.* an acre prescribed in 1215, probably for rather smaller agricultural acres than those measured in 1366. The plots are of very unequal width. In length they are mostly within a perch or two of the typical 20 perches. But there is more variation on the south-west, owing to the irregular outline of the old borough, and here we get a range from 17 to 27 perches. For the same reason the 17 perch plot is tri-angular, with a frontage of 10½ perches and a backside of no more than half a perch. In 1650 the number of tenements is not much altered. There are still five on the east side of Puck Lane. The Newland tenures were practically all freehold in 1650. But in 1862 Newland is described as a copyhold manor.[2] Dr. Salter finds cases in the court rolls, which suggest that, when holdings got back into the hands of the abbey and were regranted, copyhold was substituted for burgage tenure.[3] But clearly we must put the main change at a later date, when the distinction between a freehold and a copyhold of inheritance had become little more than one of technical procedure in conveyancing.

A good many thirteenth century tenants of Newland are upon record, but the only link between their names and those of the fourteenth is through the family of Sclatter, who yield a Roger in 1294 and 1315 and a William in 1366.[4] Something more, however, is to be said of the " place " at the eastern angle of Newland Street and Queen St. and the croft beyond it. The croft is, I think, clearly that next to abbey land which John

[1] *Ox. Fines*, 86.
[2] *Sale Particulars* (*Bodl. G. A. Oxon*, b, 85*a*, No. 30).
[3] S, II, xliii.
[4] S, 615, 729 ; *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (Edw. ii), ii. 402.

Porter surrendered to the abbey in 1241–64. It had formerly belonged to Reginald Clement, who is traceable as attorney for the abbey in 1235 and 1238 and witnesses a deed in 1241.[1] In 1366 William Jakkes had it and Richard Dame Eleyne had preceded him. In a less detailed list of Newland tenants, which follows that of 1366 in the cartulary, but may be of earlier origin, the occupant is Dominus Johannes Pateshulle.[2] The two lists must be of near date, as most of the names are the same ; and this would point to the later rather than the earlier of two Johns of a well-known legal family of Pateshulle, who died in 1290 and 1349 respectively. In 1650 Mr. Green had the croft, but it was still called Porter's Close. A second entry, which gives "Mrs." Green and "Potters" Close, is probably an error. I think there was only one Mr. Green, who gets no Christian name in the survey. If so, he had both copyholds and freeholds, one of which was the Green Dragon, and also leased several closes, including Berry's Close and Charterhold Close, which had become Chatterholt by 1782, on the south side of the Cassington road, at the foot of the hill below Newland, and not far from Porter's Close itself. Tombstones in Eynsham churchyard once recorded the burial in 1615 of a John Green, born at Tamworth in Warwickshire, and of another John, who died on 1 January, 1653, and left a widow Elizabeth. These are doubtless the holders of Porter's Close in the survey.[3] But the elder John already had land in Newland in 1590, which he had acquired from Henry Edmunds.[4] Porters Close was still pasture in 1650, but on it, at some later date, was built the house known as The Gables. Of the early history of this, nothing seems to be known. I think it must be the house conveyed by Thomas Browne of Eynsham on 10 April, 1708, to George Knapp for the uses of John Bartholomew and his wife Hester, in discharge of the portion of Hester, who was Knapp's step-daughter. It is described in the deed as a messuage in Newland, with a malthouse, barn, backside, orchard and garden.[5] By 1802 it had passed to John Collier,of whom James Swann, then living in Eynsham, may have been tenant in 1807.[6] The Swanns were papermakers at Wolvercote, and furnished the paper on which William Cobbett's *Weekly Political Register* was printed. Correspondence between them and Cobbett is preserved, and by Cobbett was planted the

[1] S, 227A, 258, 611, 719. [2] S, 615.
[3] *Par. Colls.* (O.R.S.), 143.
[4] *Cal. Chancery Proc.* (Eliz.), iii. 314.
[5] *Bodl. Oxon Charter* 693.
[6] *Bodl. MS. Eng. Hist.*, c. 33, f. 18.

large Acacia in the garden of the Gables. It has been stated in the street of Eynsham that this tree is mentioned in *Domesday Book*. Evidently William Cobbett has been misheard as William Conqueror—an amusing example of the growth of oral legend. The Gables was once copyhold, but was redeemed by the Swanns who purchased it about 1820. It may have been treated for convenience as all belonging to the copyhold manor of Newland, but much of its land, which extends to Charterhold, lies too far east to have been part of the original borough, and must have been an addition to Porters Close. In 1863 this is called Swann's Close, and also, then and later, Malthouse Close. The malthouse stands on the " place " at the angle of Newland St. and Queen St., which was in the hands of the lord in 1366. No tenant is assigned to it in 1650.

My own tenement, the Hythe Croft, which is next the Gables on the south, had a somewhat similar history. Tanner's Lane, which leads to it, with part of its garden, must have been taken from the two northern tenements on the east side of Puck Lane. The house itself was built on the site of an old cottage, probably representing one of these tenements, which had rights in the common fields. This is shown in the map of 1782, where it stands, with most of the existing ground, to the east of the borough of Newland, in what had been the Hythecroft. The present house, probably built soon after 1782, was once called Highworth or Highcroft Lodge, by a corruption which I have eliminated. There was once a tannery here. On 16 August, 1713, Thomas Day, tanner, bought from William Quartermaine of Eynsham two pieces of ground known as the Nursery and the Lime Pits. The former is described as between Porter's Close, still retaining its old name, and the ground called Highcroft, and the latter as having the Nursery on the west and Charterhold on the east of it.[1] There were Days in Eynsham as early as 1560.[2] A William Quarterman was a tenant in 1615, but, rather curiously, the name does not appear in 1650. James Quarterman was, however, one of the purchasers of the manor from Lady Derby in 1653, and may be the Jacob Quarterman whom the registers show as churchwarden in 1665. He or another James left £10 to the poor of Eynsham. A James and a John are traceable about 1687, and many women of the name were being married in 1724–86. In 1813 the holding was extended by the purchase from John

[1] *Bodl. Oxon Charter* 694.
[2] *Court Rolls.*

Collier of parts of the southern and south-eastern angles of Porter's Close. The deed of 1713 conveys a freehold, but in the nineteenth century the whole property, like the Gables, was treated as copyhold of the manor of Newland, forming two holdings, one of which represented the house and tannery, and the other the intake from Porter's or Malthouse Close. In 1832 the Days sold to the Druces, and when they sold in 1897 the property was enfranchised.[1]

XI. THE MEADOWS.

The grass land is naturally that part of Eynsham which has undergone least change since medieval days. It lies along the Thames, along the Limb Brook and the Chil Brook, across the angle between the Thames and the Bladon or Evenlode, and along the Bladon valley towards the north. Strictly speaking, a meadow is hay-land, only grazed when the crop has been cut, and a pasture is grazed throughout the year. But the terms are loosely used, and the allocation may have varied from time to time. Nor is the nomenclature always quite clear ; the smaller plots are sometimes treated as divisions of larger ones. I give the acres, where possible, as they stand in the survey of 1650 ; those in the list of 1360 probably represent a looser estimate.

The range down the Thames begins with Wroughthey (29 acres), later Rothie. This was one of the meadows in which boon-work was done by freeholders. It is cut off by a water-course, with a bridge on it, from Achey or Acheley, which divides it from the intrusive triangle of Pinkhill. Further down the river comes Benengey (18 acres) later Bungey, bounded on the north by Merten Ham ; then Longmede, and then Froggenhale. By 1650 this last seems to have been merged in Long Meadow (45 acres), but in 1360 the division ran from Foulespole, probably the rough swampy place just beyond the apex of the Pinkhill triangle, to Bulput, somewhere on the river bank between Merten Ham and the ferry. The southern end of Long Meadow is now called Long Ledmere. From Foulespole the Limb Brook becomes the western border of this area down to its confluence with the Chil Brook, close to the ferry road. Along the edge of this road is a narrow strip, cut off from the other meadows by a ditch. This was regarded as part of Overeyt in 1360, but is distinguished in 1650 as " the Neight near the ferry " and in 1782 as Little Eight. Across the

[1] Hythe Croft title deeds.

ferry road, in the space between that, the Hythe and the Thames, and divided from each other by a watercourse, are the greater part of Overeyt to the west and Nethereyt to the east. All these Thames meadows remained demesne in 1650, except the larger Overeyt, then "the common Neight" (18 acres), and Nethereyt, then "the several Neight" (9 acres), both of which were leased. The same names recur in 1782.

North of the Chil Brook come the abbey park and garden, and south of them Munkeshode, now Monk's Wood (45 acres), divided in 1650 into Upper, Lower and Little, and still held as demesne. Between the Chil Brook and the Limb Brook, at the angle of their confluence in the Wharf, is Stoweham or Stonyham (4 acres). West of this is Claxhurst, now Lockarts, merged by 1782 in the very large Cowleyes (120 acres). This first appears in 1650. Probably it is omitted from the list of 1360, because it was already, as in 1796, a common and not a demesne pasture. Its earlier name may have been Hemehurst, like that of a neighbouring arable furlong, which was corrupted to Haymarch and Haymarsh and even, in the map of 1615, Hyemate. To the west again comes, along the north bank of the Limb Brook, Otehurst (28 acres); and then, in an order of which I cannot be quite sure, Barefootes Ham, presumably at a fordable point on the Limb Brook, Sidelakesham, later Shut-lock Ham (22 acres), Trumpermede, later Trumpets Mead (14 acres), and Crispesham, later Coopers Ham (3 acres). The whole group is treated as Shut-lock Ham Furlong in 1650, and apparently as Oat Hurst in 1782. In Sidelakesham was in 1650 a Bailey's Ham, and an order of 1360 prescribes that the bailiff should have a piece here, as the reeve (*praepositus*) was wont to have. Probably, therefore, this is the Refham of 1268–81.[1] A plot of three acres, further up the Limb Brook, is Fox Leas. By 1650 the meadows of this group had all been detached from the demesne, but one parcel in Shut-lock Ham was on lease.

North of the Chil Brook, before it reaches the Stanton Harcourt road, and not far from Acre End, is the Calvecroft, named in 1213–28, which is no doubt the same as the later Cowcroft (8 acres).[2] Above it the brook passes between arable fields, and beside it come some more meadows, which I cannot precisely locate. They seem to be Wethemore or Weymore and Ludemere, both named in the thirteenth century, Baremede, Partrichesmede and an unnamed meadow near Twelveacre.[3]

[1] S, 383.
[2] S, 216, 467, 607.
[3] S, 178, 220, 240, 366, 419, 607.

The Cowcroft and Partrichesmede were tenant land in 1650, but the other names seem to have dropped out of use.

The common meadows in the east and north-east of the township are divided, like the arable, into furlongs. There are two of them, one to the south, the other to the north, of the Cassington road. The southern meadow is called Clay-Wyre Mead in 1650. It is divided into an eastern and a western section by a dyke, called the Flam, the course of which has now been somewhat altered by hedging. The eastern section contains four furlongs, demarcated from each other by stones, and bounded on the east by Cassington. They are, from south to north, Clay-wyre or Claye weere, Longe Lighte or Longleigh, Stubfurlong, and the Lot Meadow, which is divided into the Great Lots and the Little Lots. In the survey of 1360 Longelete and Stubbefurlong together form the Landemede. In the thirteenth century it was Lanmede.[1] The term probably also covers the later Lot Meadow, but Clayhuythe is distinct. Two large pieces which were demesne in 1360, are traceable as part of Edgerley's farm in 1650. There are half a dozen smaller leasehold parcels; the rest is freehold and copyhold. The western section, between the Flam and Mead Lane, does not appear at all in 1360, presumably because it contained no demesne. In 1650 it is the Furlong shooting on the Lots, and only one of its parcels is on lease. The whole area is the Lower Meadow in 1782, but this term seems also to cover Biterhale on the west of Mead Lane, which was, however, all demesne (36 acres) in 1650 and as far back as 1442, when it was regarded as belonging to Tilgarsley.[2]

Mullemore, a name found as early as 1229, seems to cover all the grass-land in the Evenlode valley, between the Cassington road on the south, Cassington Hedge on the east, the river itself and Mill Lane on the north and a dyke which still divides it from arable land on the west.[3] But by the seventeenth century a small part at the northern end had been made into closes, and this process may have begun as early as 1360, if a Culvyrmede of that date is the same as a later Dove House Close, which stood next the river. The rest is again divided by a continuation of the Flam into an eastern and western section, of which the latter, much the larger of the two, is not covered by the survey of 1360. The northern part of the eastern section was then Costloneit; by 1650 it has become the Furlong on Cassington Hedge. The southern part is Bedredeie

[1] S, 224. [2] *Harl. Roll.*, F. 14 (4).
[3] *Ox. Fines* (O.R.S.), 86; S, 317, 420, 467, 656.

in 1360 and Bitter Dale in 1615. But afterwards there seems to have been some adjustment of holdings, to facilitate a further enclosure, and this part, which was certainly Cuckoo Pens in 1782, is probably also one of several Cuckoo Closes, not precisely located, in 1650. Of the western section the northern part is in 1650 the Furlong shooting on Catsbrain, and the southern part Middle Furlong, with a Church Way running up its western side from the Cassington road. Why a Church Way I do not know ; it cannot have taken anyone to church. Possibly it led to the parcels in the eastern section, acquired by the lord from the almoner and sacrist before 1360. In 1650 it belonged to the town. But by 1788 the nomenclature has been changed ; the southern part is now the Furlong on Catsbrain, and the northern part Twenty Penny Furlong. The whole meadow, so far as unenclosed, is Milne Meadow in 1615. Mill Mead in 1650, the Upper Meadow in 1782. The eastern section has still a good deal of leasehold in 1650, but there is very little in the western section.

An interesting feature of the Eynsham meadows is the chopper-acre. The term is not found in the *Oxford Dictionary*, but is clearly derived from " chop " in the sense of " exchange." In the system to which it belongs we may trace an attempt of the purely human desire for equity to redress the wantonness of nature, in neglecting to make the grass grow with equal luxuriance in every spot. The survey of 1360 discloses in the Lower Meadow six parcels of from four to eight nominal acres which are arranged in pairs. The parcels of each pair are exchanged between the lord and a group of tenants in alternate years. The parcels falling to the tenants are divided among them, but one fraction in each case is further divided among a sub-group. It is to these fractions that the name chopper-acre is given in 1360. When we next come upon a description of chopper-acres in 1615 the sense has altered a little. Not only a subdivided fraction but any holding subject to rotation may be called a chopper-acre. The arrangements are much less uniform than in 1360. Corpus, whose holdings came to it by a series of transactions from more than once source, has an interest in no less than ten chopper-acres, together with one in the Lower Meadow, which is not so called. This is in the Lots. Here the college has always one-fourth of a parcel, but " it shifteth every year." In the same meadow it has one-eighth of a chopper-acre in Stubfurlong every other year, one-eighth of another in Claye weere every year, and two-eighths of another, also in Claye weere, alternately with two-eighths

of one in Longe Light. In the Upper Meadow the College has similarly two-eighths of a chopper-acre called Widdowes Ham, alternately with two-eighths of one in Bitter Dale, and by yet another variation alternately three-fifths and one-fifth of a third, to which, when it is only one-fifth, is added as make-weight one-third of a fourth. All these are in the eastern section of the meadow. Finally, Corpus has every year two-eighths of a chopper-acre in Shutlockesham and two-eighths of another in Foxleas. The College maps, of course, only see the chopper-acres from the angle of a single tenant. It is unfortunate that the full survey of 1650 does not fill out the picture. It does not, however, use the term chopper-acre at all, although it shows the Little Lots as held in thirds, and the Great Lots in quarters, of which Corpus has one, and in listing the tenants of Longleigh brackets the holders of five numbered parcels, and puts four tenants under a sixth number. There seems to have been some adjustment between 1615 and 1650, by which Corpus surrendered its chopper-acre in Bitter Dale, perhaps to enable that to be enclosed as the Cuckoo Pens, and received compensation elsewhere. But I think we must also infer that the surveyor of 1650 disregarded chopper-acres, and credited each tenant with the actual parcels which he happened to be holding in that year. For it is clear from later records that the system of alternation remained in existence to some extent up to the enclosure of 1802. The Corpus terrier of 1697 is rather summary, but it notes two chopper-acres in the Upper Meadow and two in the Lower, together with an exchange between Claye weere and Oathurst, which probably here covers Shutlockesham. The map of 1782 notes "changeable Acres" against the name of the Lower Meadow. The terrier of 1788 is explicit again. There had evidently been some further adjustment since 1650. But Corpus was still interchanging two pieces on the Isis, which would be in Claye weere ; exchanging a piece, apparently in the Lot Meadow, for one near the Cheese Cake ; and exchanging a piece in Long Lite, together with a "Twopenny Bit" on the Worsey Brook, which must be Widow's Ham, together with Watkins Ham next the Cuckoo Pens, both in the Upper Meadow, for an acre in Oathurst.

In 1360 the Lower Meadow tenants who take part in exchanges divide their parcels by lot, and presumably, although it is not stated, the chopper-acres were then similarly subdivided. In the Upper Meadow the Costloneit of 1360 seems to be the same as the Cotsetneyde, where lots were used

in the thirteenth century. How long this further striving after equity prevailed in Eynsham we do not know. There is nothing of it in 1615 or 1650 except the name of the Lot Meadow, with its subdivision into Great and Little Lots. But on other Oxfordshire manors methods of apportioning mowing rights in common grass-land by lot were operative even in the nineteenth century. At Aston and Cote in Bampton the meadow was divided into 16 " layings out," corresponding to the 16 hides in the manor, and each laying out into four " sets," corresponding to the four virgates of the hide. These were indicated by stones. Each virgater possessed his " mark," on which was cut, either one or more straight lines called " overthwarts," or some more elaborate symbol, such as a frying-pan, heron's foot, bow or cross. When the grass was ready, the grass-stewards summoned the tenants. The marks for the four virgates of each hide were put into a hat and drawn by a boy, and the sets of the laying-out belonging to that hide were allocated in accordance with the drawing. Each tenant, as he received his set, cut his mark on it with his scythe. The process was repeated for each laying out in turn.[1] At Yarnton in 1809 the principle was much the same. Here the great meadows of Pixey, Oxhey and West Mead were shared by the townships of Yarnton, Water Eaton and Begbroke. Certain enclosures, marked by white stones and called Tydels, belonged to the rectories of Yarnton and Begbroke. The rest was allocated with the help of thirteen marks, which in this case bore the names of families to whom tenements had once belonged, and were drawn from a bag by the meadsman. Oxhey was divided into thirty-nine lots and drawn thrice, West Mead into sixty-eight and drawn five times, Pixey into twenty-six and drawn twice. Each tenement, therefore, got two plots. When the drawing was finished, runners marked treadways between the lots by shuffling their feet along from fixed stakes.[2] There was a lot system at Cassington also, but all we know of it is that the priority was determined by the length of drawn haystalks.[3]

North of Mullemore, across the Evenlode, stood the large demesne meadow (43 acres) of Wyreshey, later Worsey, and on the river itself the abbey mill. This dated from Domesday. By 1229 it had somehow been alienated to Peter de Staninge and Margaret de Baskervile, but was then recovered, subject to a lease for life of the attached house, with three little crofts

[1] *Archaeologia*, xxxiii. 269.
[2] Stapleton, *Three Ox. Parishes* (O.H.S.), 307.
[3] *Godstow Register* (E.E.T.S.), li.

running along the river bank up to the Hanborough boundary on the Cauerswelle, and of certain rights in Mullemore and elsewhere.[1] Then and in 1360 there were actually three mills. The mill-pool, as we have seen, gave rise to trouble with neighbours, both in Hanborough and in Cassington. Probably the Eynsham tenants in villeinage were obliged to use the lord's mill, but freeholders might have their own. In 1268 William son of Ranulf Sewi conveyed to the abbey a hide and three mills which his grandfather Humphrey Huthewulf had held.[2] A mill also formed part of the property surrendered by Robert Belegrave in 1284. Miller's Closes on the upper course of the Chil Brook in 1650 and 1782 suggest that a mill once stood there. The Evenlode mill, with a Mead Close which represents the three crofts of 1229, was still part of the demesne in 1650.

XII. THE COMMON FIELDS.

The early deeds located arable by the locality on which it abutted or by the furlong in which it stood, and not by the field of which that furlong formed part. The demesne survey of 1360 names the fields called the Graungecrofts and the Southefielde, which seems here to indicate only a single *cultura* in that field. During the thirteenth century a two-course system of agriculture, by which fields were cropped and left fallow in alternate years, was giving way to a three-course system, under which a year of fallow succeeded two years of cropping. It is possible, therefore, that in early times there were only two common fields in Eynsham proper. But we have seen that in 1356 the abbey was experimenting with a four-course system at Tilgarsley, and it may reasonably be inferred that by this date the three-course system was well established. In the seventeenth century three fields, the North Field, Conduit Field and South Field, spread out fan-wise, to the north-west, west and south-west of the town. The furlongs are given in the survey of 1650 and with the help of the maps and terriers it is possible to form an idea of their relative positions. It can only be roughly approximate up to 1782, because the Corpus maps of 1615, which are the most detailed, leave blank certain areas in which the College had no holdings, and because the furlongs themselves seem to have been redivided from time to time, and were of very different sizes and shapes and very irregularly dove-tailed into each

[1] *Ox. Fines*, 86. [2] S, 368.

other. In South Field especially, much licence of conjecture is necessary. The nomenclature seems to have varied much at different periods, and often a description takes the place of a definite name. A furlong may be named from a bush standing on the strip of a tenant or former tenant, or from some contiguous locality outside the field. Or it may be merely said to be "abutting" or "shooting" upon such a locality, or upon the headland of a neighbouring furlong to which the length of its strips extends. On the other hand it will be seen that some very old names endured up to late dates. In the thirteenth century, an arable holding has often a bit of adjacent meadow going with it, but this arrangement seems to disappear after 1360.

I will tabulate the furlong names, following for convenience the order of the 1782 map, in which they are numbered, and abbreviating to "On" the phases "Shooting on" and "Abutting on."

North Field, roughly triangular, lay between Heke Hill way and its continuation as Collett Lane on the south-west, Osney Leas and other pastures and the Cauerswelle brook on the north, the upper Mill Moor Meadows, and nearer the town the Woodstock way, on the east. The further course of this way to the north is through the field itself and on the west of it diverges the way to Hanborough Church. Torres Grave meere crosses the field from east to west, and a small slade runs a little way down from Collett's Lane. A bit at the town end of the last furlong had been converted into four pasture closes by the seventeenth century. The name Spade Acres suggests that it had once been tilled by hand. It may have become arable again by 1782. Hillands, arable in the middle ages, as its name shows, was again arable in 1782. But it was pasture in 1650.

The furlong names are[1]:—

I. 1782, Hillands.

II. 1782, On Osney Lays &c.: 1615, unnamed, but Parker Peece and Osney Leaes shown: 1650, On Osney Leyes: 1697, 1788, Parkers Piece.

III. 1782, Token Bridge: 1615, unnamed: 1650, (*a*) On Hanborough Way; (*b*) On Woodstock Way: 1697, Above Mill Moor F.: 1788, Stoken Burge.

IV. 1782, Mill Moors: 1615, Beyond Stonend Bridge: 1650, On Lower Millmoor: 1697, On Millmoor: 1788, Millmoors (part).

[1] The numbers follow those in the map of 1782 (*ad finem*).

V. 1782, Hollow: 1615, (*a*) Above White Pittes; (*b*) Crabtree: 1650, North Middle: 1697, 1788, Hollow F. Bottom.

VI. 1782, White-Pitts: 1615, Couleworthe Slade: 1650, White Pits: 1697, By Collet Hedge: 1788, Collett.

VII. 1782, Mill Moors: 1615, Woodstocke Waye: 1650, On Upper Millmoor: 1697, On Millmoor: 1788, Millmoors (part).

VIII. 1782, Red-Lands: 1615, (*a*) On Jordens Withies; (*b*) Redlandes: 1650, Noble F and Redlands: 1697, (*a*) On Withies; (*b*) Redlands: 1788, Redland.

IX. 1782, Gossard: 1615, By Milne Lane: 1650, Gosard: 1697, 1788, Gozzard.

X. 1782, Gom-Bush: 1615, (*a*) Black Bushe; (*b*) unnamed: 1650, (*a*) Middle; (*b*) Dasie: 1697, Shrubb: 1788, Gomms Bush.

XI. 1782, Ache-Hill: 1615, Eake Hill: 1650, On Blackman's Bush (part): 1697, Sparrow Acre (part): 1788, Sparacre (part).

XII. 1782, Middle: 1615, Gravell Pittes: 1650, Lower: 1697, Gravell Pitts: 1788, unnamed.

XIII. 1782, On Long Wales: 1615, At Hollyes Tounes Ende: 1650, On Blackman's Bush (part): 1697, Sparrow Acre (part): 1788, Sparacre (part).

XIV. 1782, Spar Acre: 1615, Spar and Sparre Acre (closes): 1650, On Blackman's Bush (part, with Spade Acres): 1697, Sparrow Acre (part): 1788, Sparacre (part).

There was early arable "in Middel forlong," "under Colewurthe," "between the Wawes" (all 1268–81), "abutting on Mullemore" (1241–64 and 1268–81), and "at the Mulmore" (1281).[1] Jordans were at Eynsham from 1315 and Blakemans from 1427.[2]

Conduit Field lay between the Mill Street tenements on the east, those of Acre End and then the upper Sutton Way and the Chil Brook, over which were two gates, on the south, a rather irregular boundary from the Chil Brook to the Witney road and then up the path in a line with Torres Grave meere on the west, and Heke Hill Way on the north-east. It was crossed from north to south by the continuation of the Torres Grave path and a little to the east of that in its lower course,

[1] S, 317, 364, 366, 420, 467.
[2] *Cal. Pat. Rolls.* (Ed. ii), ii. 402; cf. pp. 26, 42.

by a greensward track called the Withyslade, and from east to west by Howling Cross Way. In its south-east corner stood by 1615 the Conduit House, from which a channel fed the abbey and the town along Conduit Lane, which still passes the edge of the vicarage garden. By 1650 a house had been built on half an acre in the field. The map of 1615 shows an intriguing little building occupying an isolated enclosure in the way between the field and Acre End. This seems too small for half an acre. I should have taken the building for a pound, but the pound was in Mill Street. Is it a lock-up for offenders ?

The furlong names are :—

XV. 1782, Ache-Hill : 1615, Eake Hill : 1650, Upper Eake Hill.

XVI. 1782, Ache-Hill : 1615, Long Wales : 1650, Eake Hill.

XVII. 1782, Long Wales : 1615, Shorte Wales : 1650, Wales : 1697, 1788, Short Wales.

XVIII. 1782, Short Wales : 1615, Setters Bushe (part) : 1650, On Hawme Cross Way (part) : 1697, 1788, Howling Cross (part).

XIX. 1782, Conduit Corner : 1615, (*a*) Conduite ; (*b*) Setters Bushe (part) : 1650, (*a*) Cundit ; (*b*) On Hawme Cross-Way (part) : (*c*) On Baily's Headland : 1697, 1788, (*a*) Howling Cross (part) ; (*b*) Conduit (part).

XX. 1782, Stump Stile : 1615, Ruffines Bush : 1650, Bush : 1697, On the Three Bushes : 1788, Stump Stile, on the Skrub.

XXI. 1782, Clay-Pit : 1615, (*a*) At Neales Townes Ende ; (*b*) Chelbredyate : 1650, Chilbridge : 1697, 1788, Conduit (part).

XXII. 1782, To Three Bushes : 1650, On Mr. Brown's Headland.

XXIII. 1782, Withy Slade : 1615, unnamed : 1650, On the Slade : 1697, On Wythy Slade.

XXIV. 1782, Long-Lud Moor : 1615, Ludmore : 1650, Great Ludmoor : 1697, Long Ludmore : 1788, Ludmoor.

XXV. 1782, Short Lud-Moor : 1650, Little Ludmoor.

Here we can perhaps place old arable "at Ludemere" (1197–1208), "next Lodemere" (1241–64), "abutting on Ludemere" (1268–81), "abutting on Wethemore" (1213–28), "towards la Weymora" (1220), "in Waltona" (1241–64), "above

Waltone forlong" (1281).[1] Old arable "under Hyohull" (1213–28, for Hychull ?), "in the furlung under Hekehulle" (1241–64), "above thekehulle" (1268–81), "under Yethulle" (1268–81) is more likely to be here than in North Field.[2] Ruffines Bush preserves the name of a sixteenth century tenant.

South Field lay mainly between the Chil Brook on the north-east, the meadows along the Limb Brook on the south-east, the township boundary on the south-west, and the upper way to Sutton on the north-west. At two points, however, it extended beyond that way. Southfield Barn, on the modern Stanton Harcourt road, preserves the name. The old lower way to Sutton ran through it. Most of the middle part of the field was occupied by a demesne piece, of which more hereafter. Parallel to this, on the north-west, ran a greensward track, the Cow Croft Slade, which apparently met another, the Lark Slade, coming down from the upper Sutton way. Oat Hurst, or bits of it, and bits of Foxleys, as shown in the map of 1782, may then still have been meadow, as they certainly were earlier.

The furlong names are :—

XXVI. 1782, Deadland Fs : 1615, Dead landes : 1650, Deadland (*a*) On the Way ; (*b*) On Reeke Close ; (*c*) Middle ; (*d*) On Twelve Acres.

XXVII. 1782, Chilbridge : 1615, Chelbreade : 1650, (*a*) Chilbridoe (for Chilbridge ?) ; (*b*) Cow Cross : 1697, 1788, Chilbridge.

XXVIII. 1782, Sutton-Way : 1615, Twelve Acre (part) : 1650, 1697, 1788, New-field (part).

XXIX. 1782, New-Field : 1615, Twelve Acre (part) : 1650, 1697, 1788, New-field (part).

XXX. 1782, Peat-Pits : 1615, Calke Crofte Slade : 1650, West of Cow-Cross-Slade : 1697, Cowcroft Slade : 1788, Cowcraft.

XXXI. 1782, Hollow : 1615, unnamed : 1650, North from Bush F. : 1697, 1788, At the Bottom of New Field F.

XXXII. 1782, Cow-croft Slade : 1601, On Grant's Cowcroft : 1615, On Calke Crofte Slade : 1650, East of Cow-Cross-Slade : 1788, Leaping Cowcraft Ditch.

[1] S, 178, 220, 240, 366, 419, 467.
[2] S, 226, 317, 364, 420.

XXXIII. 1782, To Cowcroft Slade : 1615, On Farm Peece : 1650, By the Greenway : 1788, Next the Greensward Baulk.

XXXIV. 1782, Round Hill : 1615, On Barow Hill : 1650, (*a*) Round Hill ; (*b*) North of Round Hill : 1788, On the F next the Greensward Baulk.

XXXV. 1782, To Larkslade : 1615, (*a*) Elder Stump ; (*b*) Stewerde Bushe : 1650, Bush : 1697, land near Parrots pond : 1788, Cross Field below Linthorn.

XXXVI. 1782, A Gravelly Piece : 1615, unnamed : 1650, (*a*) On Citie's Headland ; (*b*) On South of Eglestone's Piece.

XXXVII. 1782, A Gravelly Piece : 1615, unnamed : 1650, On Farm Piece and Wise's Headland.

XXXVIII. 1782, Lark Slade : 1615, Into Larke Dale : 1650, (*a*) Hampstall (part) ; (*b*) On Larkslade : 1697, 1788, Larkslade.

XXXIX. 1782, Linton : 1615, Linthorne : 1650, (*a*) Linthorn and Linthorne F. ; (*b*) Hampstall (part) : 1788, Hampstall.

XL. 1782, Foxleys : 1615, ffoxleaes : 1650, (*a*) Foxlie ; (*b*) Lot at Foxly.

XLI. 1782, On Sutton Way : 1615, unnamed : 1650, On Sutton Way : 1697, Deadmans Burial : 1788, Goswell.

XLII. 1782, Golding : 1615, On Sutton Brooke, with Belgrave Acre : 1650, On Sutton Brook : 1697, Sutton Brook, with Bell Acre : 1788, Golden, with Bell Acre.

XLIII. 1782, Oat Hurst.

XLIV. 1782, To Oathurst : 1615, (*a*) On Shutlockes Ham ; (*b*) On Owters : 1650, Haymarch (part) : 1697, Hambush (part) : 1788, Haymarch (part).

XLV. 1782, Hay-Marsh : 1615, Hye-mate : 1650, Haymarch (part) : 1697, Hambush (part) : 1788, Haymarch (part).

There was old arable " at Hemehurst " (1281), " in " or " abutting on Sidelakesham " (1213–28, 1241–64, 1268–81), " towards Sulthone " (1241–64) and " at Gosewelle " (1268–81).[1] It is curious to find the last name disappearing for so long, and emerging in 1788. Perrot was a tenant in 1650. Land " in Lintone " (1241–64) may have been either here, or across the Sutton Way, where also a map of 1615 marks a " Linthorne," distinct from the furlong.[2]

[1] S, 220, 242, 314, 328A, 364, 420, 467. [2] S, 242.

XIII. THE DEMESNE.

The amount of the demesne arable, as we have seen, varied much at different periods. In 1279 there were eight and a half hides, and the partial extent of a few years earlier suggests that of these six were in Tilgarsley. In 1360 there were fourteen. In 1650 Edgerley's farm contained 286 measured acres and there were 316 other leased acres in the three fields. These would together represent about six and a half hides. And in tracing the history of the demesne, one must further consider how far it consisted of strips intermixed with those of the tenants and how far of separate large "pieces," admitting of more scientific husbandry. As to this, the early evidence is largely negative. The thirteenth century deeds, which commonly locate plots by naming the ownership of adjacent plots, rarely cite the ownership of the lord. I have only noticed two exceptions. Ralph Clarkson conveyed to the abbey an acre next Le Berwe towards Stanton which was a headland (*forera*) of the abbot's own *cultura*.[1] Robert Avenel similarly conveyed seven acres in Hythecroft between the abbot's demesne and the brook Karsewelle.[2] This is not the boundary brook but a smaller one of the same name, which still runs through Hythecroft. Occasionally also, a plot of the almoner becomes a landmark, but the almoner's land was probably not counted as demesne. The great increase in demesne between 1279 and 1360 was, no doubt, mainly due to the falling into the lord's hands of villeinage land left vacant through the Black Death. But conveyances of freehold land to the abbey continued after 1279 and some of that may not have been disposed of by fresh grants by 1360. Ten of the fourteen hides then in demesne lay in *culturae* called Twelve-acre, Southefelde, Lodemede, Loteshulle, Cattesbrayne, Huythecroft and Mullecroft, and four in the Graungecroftes. Lodemede is probably a mistake for Lodemere, itself a corruption of Ludemere. There was arable, as well as meadow, there in the thirteenth century.[3] Loteshulle, called elsewhere in the survey Lutteshulle and earlier Luttershulle, is, I think, the later Litchfield, to the west and south of the Acre End houses. The term *cultura* is generally taken to mean furlong, but obviously, if most of the ten hides lay in seven furlongs, these must have been much larger units than the furlongs of 1650, of which the largest held 77 and 53 nominal acres, and only nine so much as a virgate of 30 acres. It will be observed that the name of one *cultura* is Southfield, which

[1] S, 259. [2] S, 239. [3] S, 178, 240, 366.

was also that of a field, in which the big farm had a "piece" of 108 acres in 1650. The areas or parts of the areas called in 1650 the Conduit Field and North Field must obviously have been already under cultivation in 1360. Probably, like Southfield, they shared the names of the demesne *culturae* in them, Lodemere and Cattesbrayne. Hythecroft was remote from the three fields, on the east side of the town, and Twelve-acre and the Graungecrofts were in Tilgarsley. In 1328 Mullecroft is named as arable bordering upon Mullemore. It is almost certainly to be identified with the area of arable with grass at each end of the strips, which is described in another part of the 1360 survey as Langdale. This was *sub* Cattesbrayne, and next the fosse of Mullemore. In it there was certainly some intermingling of demesne and tenant-land. The lord had large strips amounting to 27 acres, and ten tenants, including two *nativi*, shared no more than three acres between them. The name goes back to the first quarter of the thirteenth century.[1] Langdale is called a *cultura* and a furlong in 1281. Land there is "super le Hurst." The almoner has some of it. In 1650 and thereafter Langdale seems to be merged in Catsbrain, of which I think it forms the east part, and to be all arable demesne. Notes to the survey of 1360 add to its list of *culturae* two small furlongs. One is at Kyngesdone, probably near the later Kingston's Gutter, off Cuckoo Lane. The other was next Caldecroft on the south and abutted on a way called Stywardispathe. This can be located on the south of the town between the Chil Brook and the Stanton Harcourt road. Caldecroft must be a mistake, perhaps influenced by Chaldewelle, which is one of several names given to the Chil Brook,[2] for Calvecroft, which appears elsewhere in the survey as a pasture. Later it became Cowcroft. Both lord and tenants held land in this neighbourhood during the thirteenth century. I have noted several examples in connection with the laying out of the *nova strata* in 1217, including some arable and pasture between that and the Calvecroft which the abbey bought from Herveus. There was still tenant land at Calvecroft in 1281.[3] Close by must also have been the Berwe towards Stanton, next which Ralph Clarkson had a headland of the abbot's furlong. Walter Marescallus also held arable at "le Berewes," and the locality is further defined in a confirmation by the abbey to William Underwall in 1213–28 of arable and meadow south of the stream running through the middle of "la Barre."[4] A *berwe* is a grove, and the stream must

[1] S, 220, 366, 467.
[2] S, 467.
[3] S, 467.
[4] S, 221, 364.

again be the Chil Brook. Underwall's land would lie in Southfield. The small furlong to the north of the Chil Brook and south of Calvecroft may have been called Chilmore, a name which only survives as that of the bridge which was "new" in 1217. Stywardispathe, on which it abutted, might be the Stanton Harcourt road itself, but I think it is more likely that it was a continuation of the slade called Cowcroft in 1650, giving access from the town between Cowcroft and Chilmore to Southfield. The slade led in 1650 to a Steward's Bush furlong. By this date the arable of Chilmore seems to have been absorbed by Cow Croft, which joins Litchfield at the slade. Here is still a foot bridge into Southfield. Litchfield itself ran from Cowcroft round the backs of the houses on the south side of Acre End, and probably down to the upper bridge over the Chil Brook on the way to Hampstall and Sutton. Here William of Oxford gave the abbey the arable and meadow of Lutteshulle in 1241–64, and here too may have been the arable at Lutteswelle, "now called Stondych," which they had in 1261 from John Bacon, whose father perhaps built the bridge.[1] The Lutteswelle was no doubt once more the many-named Chil Brook, and gave its name to the neighbouring slope. In Cattesbrayne I find no record of any early holding. We are not dealing with very large furlongs. The *cultura* in Cattesbrayne, if equivalent to the Catsbrain of 1650 without Mullecroft, would only give the lord about two virgates; Mullecroft, Lutteshulle and Hythecroft about a virgate each; Chilmore very little. Probably both Cattesbrayne and Hythecroft were once larger before Newland was cut out of them. But if Southfield, in 1360 as in 1650, added between a hide and a hide and a half, we are coming fairly near to the two hides and a half, which we took to be the extent of demesne in Eynsham proper about 1279. My impression is that, while in early days demesne and tenant acres may have been throughout intermixed, as we find them to some extent in Mullecroft, a good deal of progress had already been made by 1360 with a gradual concentration of demesne in "several" pieces.

For eleven and a half hides of demesne in 1360 we have therefore to look to Tilgarsley, where in 1270, before the Black Death, there were six, with four in villeinage, and an unspecified amount of freehold, certainly including a hide at Freeland. But what was the line of demarcation between Tilgarsley and Eynsham? The intercommoning of Hanborough with Tilgarsley shows that it stood in the northern part of the township.

[1] S, 328A.

One naturally expects to find it in some relation to the Tilgar's ditch of the Anglo-Saxon bounds. The Corpus Estate map of 1615 shows a "Torres grave meere," which starts from Stonende bridge on the Bladon road, and runs across the North Field in a direction slightly south of west to the highest point of the Heke Hill lane. This spot is Tar's Grave in the map of 1782 and is now known locally as "Jack Tar's grave," and there is an ætiological myth of a travelling sailor who hanged himself. There is now no indication of a grave beyond a triangle of rough grass, but a little drawing in the map suggests that large stones once stood in it. I hope that the site may some day be excavated. There may have been stone elsewhere on the Meere. Stonende Bridge looks like it. Near the grave, in Conduit Field, was a Walton furlong, but that is an ambiguous name, and is sometimes taken to indicate the survival of "Welsh" or British inhabitants. Nor are the walls of the town houses far away. Torre can hardly be the god Thor, who in his rare appearances so far south is generally Thunor. Thor, however, might be a personal name. There is no "tor," in the sense of a rock, here. Dr. Allen Mawer, who had also seen the name in the form Thorgravesmere, thought "mere of thorn grove" a possible interpretation. There are certainly plenty of thorns on the meere. I have rarely seen such sheets of hawthorn blossom as they yielded in 1934. *Domesday Book* has a Toresmere, now Tusmore, in north Oxfordshire, near Bicester, from which probably came a R. de Toresmere, appointed by the abbey to the vicarage of Cassington in 1278; but Tusmore is only very roughly in line with the meere.[1] It is perhaps temerarious to suggest that "Torres" or "Torres grave" may be a corruption of "Tilgar's," but there is little limit to the oral transmutation of local names. And the surveyor of 1615 was a stranger, who certainly heard other names wrongly. In any case, the meere itself, apart from its name, requires explanation. It is a ditch far deeper than could serve any agricultural purpose in the North Field. A footpath by its side comes up from the Evenlode, continues in the same direction to the Witney Road, and once, according to Richard Davis's map of 1797, continued to the Chil Brook, where its line is picked up by the old upper road to Sutton. This now ends at a divergence to Hamstall Farm, but, again according to Davis, the main track once went straight on, to cross the Eynsham boundary at a point which may very well be that of Tilgar's ditch, as given in 1005. Still further, on

[1] S, 425.

much the same line, is Tar Wood in South Leigh, the origin of which name I do not know. I incline, then, to conjecture that, whatever Torres grave may be, its meere is a fragment of an old Tilgar's ditch, which once parted Tilgarsley from Eynsham. The Tilgarsley homesteads were doubtless at Barnard's Gate. Here Davis has the name on the north side of the Witney road. Other maps follow him; in Smith's of 1808 Tilgarsley has become Till Guzzle. Probably Hamstall was reckoned as part of Tilgarsley. It is not called a *villa*, but one deed of 1281–1307 speaks of "the manor of Eynsham with its members of Tilgarsle and Hamstalle."[1] Part of the hamlet, however, lay in Sutton.

No doubt the falling into hand of the Tilgarsley villeinage holdings, and the consequent disappearance of Tilgarsley as an independent agricultural unit, entailed a considerable reconstruction of the manorial economy. But only a partial light can be thrown upon the processes by which, during the course of three centuries, this reached the stage at which we find it in 1650. The two main factors were clearly the conversion of arable into closes of pasture, and the substitution, apparently by 1535, of leased farms for direct cultivation by the lord. In 1356, not long after the Black Death, an experiment was being made with a four-year system of tillage in fields towards Hanborough. These are probably the Graungecroftes of 1360. They were poor soil, and it may well have been found better to turn them into pasture. In 1650 they are represented in part by Grange Closes and a Grange Coppice, perhaps now Castle's Copse, aggregating about two hides of grassland. The map of 1782, in which are Grains Closes, locates these north of the Witney road and east of Barnard Gate. A grange at Tilgarsley, supplementing that in Eynsham itself, would be natural enough. Barnard Gate may itself be by origin Barnyard Gate. For the rest of the Graungecrofts we may perhaps look to the Bowles, immediately on the north, and to pastures still further north, towards Freeland and Hanborough, where the names Hillands and Oldlands carry a reminiscence of arable. For 1443 we have a list of fifty-four demesne crofts, paddocks, meads and pastures in Tilgarsley. Most are leased, others in the lord's hand, but apparently only for the time being.[2] A few of the names recur in 1650. Some are evidently derived from those of tenant families, traceable in the thirteenth century or the villein

[1] S, 491.
[2] *Harl. Roll*, F. 14 (3). Another for 1442, F. 14 (4), adds a few names.

protest of 1345. Such are Hertescroft, Strenyscroftys, Morellescroftes, Bellegravecroftes, Avenelford. The smaller ones, at low rentals, may be the homestead crofts of the houses in Tilgarsley deserted after the Black Death. Some other names are a little surprising. Here are Betyrhale, Betterdye, Crypesham, Brokescroft, Nethereyt, Partryshōōh Mead, and Bannynggescroft, which looks like Benyngey. These are all on the Eynsham side of my conjectured meere between Eynsham and Tilgarsley, and seem at first sight to throw doubt on that conjecture. Moreover, we know that Tilgarsley tenants had held meadowland in Beterdeye and Costloneit before 1360. But I think that such a criticism would overleap itself. Betyrhale, on the east of the town, and Nethereyt, down by the ferry, cannot on any possible theory have been strictly "in" Tilgarsley. I suggest that hay land would, from its position, be scarce in the hamlet, and that parcels in the ampler meadows of Eynsham had been at some time granted to amend its holdings.

I take it that the break-up of Tilgarsley also entailed the addition sooner or later of some of its arable to the three common fields of Eynsham. All three, as we find them in 1650, extend beyond the meere. Southfield has the four furlongs grouped as Deadland. In 1442–43 these seem to have been pasture, and the name is given as Dedlond and Dedelane. I regard Deadland as a strong point for my theory, for what can it mean but the land of families now dead? Near it were Newfield, the Claydens and Twelve Acres. These were all pasture, demesne or leased in 1650. But Newfield must at some time, in view of its name, have been tried for arable. North Field was apparently enlarged by two hides of Tilgarsley land beyond the meere, and this may have made possible an adjustment of strips by which tenant land was eliminated from Mullecroft. This by 1650 has been incorporated in Catsbrain, and this name, if it was ever that of the whole North Field, has been limited to the arable bordering Newland, and forming a "piece" of Edgerley's farm, attached for agricultural purposes to North Field, but divided from it by Mill Lane. Similarly, in South Field, the farm has a single "piece," which here is not on the outskirts of the field, but in the middle of it. Conduit Field is a more difficult problem. Here the farm of 1650 had four "pieces," but the survey does not name them. Lodemere gives its name to two furlongs north of the meere, and west of them is a Great Ludmore of 1615, which is Farm Ludmoor in 1782.

This is no doubt one of the " pieces." The Ache Hill furlong of the field seems also to be duplicated in 1782 by another Ache Hill plot beyond the meere. It may be the Kyngesdone of 1360. A third " piece " is probably Loteshulle or Litchfield, where the map of 1615 shows " Farm groundes." I can only conjecture that the fourth, although so far away that it could only be conventionally treated as part of the field, is Hythecroft, which has a similar note in 1615. If I am right, we have, towards the eleven and a half hides of Tilgarsley demesne in 1360, four hides in the Graungecrofts, two in the additions to Catsbrain or North Field, perhaps one in the additions to Lodemere or Conduit Field and its two northern " pieces." And for the rest we must look to Twelveacre, which by 1360 must have far exceeded the limits suggested by its name, and become a generic term for the whole of the arable, including the Deadland, which lay between the Witney Road, Hamstall, and the Upper Sutton Way.

A few early localities and many of 1443 and 1650 elude me. Leuiton (1213–28) may be a mistake for Linton near Hamstall, and Mikelforlong (1241–64) for Middle furlong in North Field, although " Mikel " in the sense of " large " would be intelligible enough.[1] Ketericheshurst (1241–64) is perhaps the Hurst in Langdale.[2] Wodecroft (1241–64, 1268–81) abutted on Ludemere and on Sortegrove, and Sortegrove (1241–69) may be the same as Scorthegrene (1268–81).[3] Strandputtes (1268–81) might be any furlong on the edge of a stream.[4] Chaldewelle (1281) may be a furlong bearing an old name of the Chil Brook, either in Conduit Field or in South Field.[5] Brerifurlong (1268–81) might be any of the " Bush " furlongs, perhaps that called the Skrub in 1788.[6] W(u)delongemannecroft (1268–81) is distinct from Wodecroft, but I cannot place either it or Wakwed (1268–81).[7] Wowndewell (1443) is probably once more the Chil Brook, which is remarkably sinuous in the upper part of its course. In 1241 Reynold the forester, dwelling at the hermitage at Eynsham, was accused of partnership with robbers.[8] About the same time Hugo Heremita had land in North Field.[9] There is a Hermitage in Eynsham now, but that is a name of modern fancy. Possibly the hermitage of 1241 was on the site at Hamstall now called the Nunnery. Folk memory is likely to be vague about the distinctions

[1] S, 226, 242.
[2] S, 240, 241.
[3] S, 301, 366, 383, 420.
[4] S, 364.
[5] S, 467.
[6] S, 364.
[7] S, 366.
[8] *Cal. Liberate Rolls* (Hen. iii), ii. 46.
[9] S, 317.

between religious foundations, and an abbey manor would be an odd place for a nunnery. But a hermitage at Hamstall would be a very convenient spot from which to raid the Witney road. I regret that I do not know where the abbot's gallows stood.

APPENDIX.

The spelling and presumably the pronunciation of the town name have gradually shortened. The earliest text (900–930) of the *O.E. Chronicle* has Egones hâm, and a copy (14th c.) of an O.E. will (979–1015) Igeneshamme. Quadrisyllabic forms, Eghenesham, Eigenesham, Egenesham, Evenesham, survive in 12th c. documents written outside the town. The Eglesham of *D.B.* (1086) recurs at Lincoln (1090) and an Eglessam at Hanborough (1100–07). But Abbot Aelfric (c. 1006) already has Egnesham, and this, apart from headings added later, appears to be the official form in the abbey cartularies of the 13th c. and 14th c., even when copying earlier deeds and the O.E. charter of 1005 itself. It is on an abbey seal of the early 13th c., although another, of uncertain date, has a curious Einelsa[m]. Occasional variants in the cartularies are Eygnesham, Eignesham, Eisnesham, Einesham and Enesham. Outside documents yield in the 12th c. Enesham, Eignesham and Einegham, and in the 13th c. Eynesham, Heynesham, Einesham, Heinesham, Aynesham, Ainesham, Enysham and Eylnesham. In the abbey use of the 15th c. and 16th c. Egnesham is passing into Eynesham. It does not occur at all in a series of 15th c. receipts from Oxford University to the abbey. Here Eynesham is the commonest trisyllabic form, varied by Eynysham, Enesham, Eneysham, Enysham, Enisham, Enysam, Enensham, Enensam, Enseham. Meanwhile dissyllabic forms begin to emerge, with Egnsham (1306, 1413) in outside documents and Eynsham (1390) in an abbey account. The Oxford scribes have Eynsham, which replaces Eynesham as the commonest form in the latter half of the 15th c. and also Einsham and Ensham. In the 16th c. and thereafter the dissyllabic forms become normal. A Guinsham of 1518 may be an error. The Oxford Visitations of 1566 and 1574 have Eynsham, Eynsam, Ensam, but also Egnesham and Egnosham, and a court roll of 1568 "Eynsham alias Evinsham." The latest trisyllabic forms which I have noted are Evensham (1602) and Aubrey's Enesham (*c.* 1652). The Corpus maps

(1615) have Einsham, the Gough MS. (1650) Ensham. The latter was the normal form in the 18th c., but more recently Eynsham has re-established itself.

FIELD AND OTHER LOCAL NAMES.

Common elements in local names are :—*brede*, *breade*, " breadth " ; *but*, (*a*) " arable ridge," (*b*) " small enclosure " ; *croft*, " enclosure, arable or pasture, often near a house " ; *dale*, (*a*) " small valley," (*b*) " share of land " ; *den*, (*a*) " woodland swine pasture," (*b*) " valley " ; *don*, " hill," " slope " (often confused with *den*) ; *ea*, *ei*, *ey*, with diminutive *eit*, *eyt*, *eyde*, *eight*, " island, water-meadow " ; *ham*, (*a*) " enclosure," " home," (*b*) " meadow in river-bend " ; *hale*, " corner " ; *hey*, (*a*) " hay " (perhaps confused with *ey*), (*b*) " hedge," (*c*) " high " ; *hulle*, " hill " ; *hurst*, " wooded hill," " hill," " wood " ; *hythe*, " haven," " landing-place on river " ; *lake*, " slow stream," " backwater " ; *land*, " arable," " strip in arable " ; *lea*, *ley*, (*a*) woodland, (*b*) clearing, (*c*) open ground ; *lease*, " meadow," " pasture " (confused with plural of *lea*) ; *meere*, " boundary " ; *mere*, " pool " ; *mor*, " swampy ground " (confused with *mere*) ; *slade*, " valley," " greensward among arable " ; *stan*, " stone," " place marked by stone " ; *stall*, " place," *esp.* " place for cattle " ; *stede*, " place " ; *strand*, (*a*) " shore," (*b*) " stream " ; *ton*, (*a*) " enclosure," (*b*) " holding " ; *welle*, (*a*) " spring," (*b*) " stream " ; *were*, " weir "; *worth*, " enclosure " ; *yate*, " gate," " gap."

In the following list a good many names mean what they seem to mean. I have glossed a few, and for help with some of the more difficult my thanks are due to Professor H. C. Wyld of Oxford, and Professor E. Ekwall of Lund. I indicate A(rable), M(eadow), P(asture), the last two of which are not always distinguishable ; also C(lose), F(urlong), T(enement), and f.n. for probable derivation from a family name recorded in Eynsham.

Abbey Court, 1650.

Achey, Acheley, 1360 ; Rushy, mod. *M*—" oak island or clearing."

Acre End, 1518, mod.

Almery C., 1545 ; Ambery C., 1569 ; Ambrey C., 1650 ; Amborow C., 17th *c.* ; Handborough C. and Green, 1782 ; Ambury Green, 1802 ; Arnbury C. and Green, 1832. *P*—" the Almoner's."

Apestede, 1360. *T*—" aspen place."

Ash Plantations, mod.

Aula, 1650. *T*—now King's Head Inn.
Avenelford, 1443. *M*—f.n. cf. p. 31.

Bailey's Ham, 1615. *M*—" bailiff's," = Refham.
Barefootes Ham, 1615. *M*—by a ford ?
Baremede, 1360 ; Bear Meadow, 1858. *M*.
Barn C., 1650, 1802 ; Lord's Barn, *mod. P*.
Barnard Yate, 1752 ; Barnard Gate, 1781 ; Barnet Gate, 1862. — " Barnyard " ? or, if " Barnet " old, " place cleared by burning " (O.E. *bœrnet*) ?
Barow Hill, 1615. *A* = Round Hill.
Barre, 1213–28 ; Berwe, 1241–64 ; Berewes, 1268–81. — " grove."
Bedredeie, 1213–28 ; Beterdeye, 1360 ; Betterdye, 1443 ; Bitter Dale, 1615. *M*—" Beaduræd's island " (Wyld), or from O.E. *bedgerid*, " ants' nest," or O.E. *beterian*, " amend " (Ekwall).
Belgrave Acre, 1615 ; Bell Acre, 1697, 1788 ; Bell Bridge, mod. *A*—cf. p. 78.
Belgraves, 1433. *T*—cf. p. 81.
Bellegrave croftes, 1443. *P*—f.n. cf. p. 79.
Benengey, Benyngey, 1360 ; Bannyngges croft, 1443 ; Bungie, 1650 ; Bungess, 1782. *M*—possibly from O.E. *bean* " buckbean," or *ben*, prayer (Ekwall) ; cf. p. 26.
Berry's, Berry C., 1650, 1782. *P*—f.n. *Barry* ; cf. p. 83.
Beterhale, 1228–39 (transcribed in 14th c. or 15th c.), Bitterhale, 1241–64 ; Biterhale, 1360 ; Betyrhale, Betyrale, Beterale, 1443 ; Byterolls, 1565 ; Bitterell, Bitterall wharfe, 1650 ; Bitterolls, 1656 ; Bitirol, 1697 ; Bitteralls, 1708, 1782 ; Bitterill, c. 1709 ; Bitterell, 1796 ; Bitterhill, 1896. *M*—hale, " corner," but the spellings leave the first vowel uncertain. Beter might be from O.E. *bētan*, " amend," possibly = " tiller " (Ekwall)—if the ground was ever arable. The locality would suit the bittern, but the known forms in Bi- are later.
Bitteralls Lane, 1782. = Mead Lane.
Black Bush, 1615. *A*.
Blackmans Bush, 1615. *A*—f.n. cf. p. 42.
Bladene, 1005, 1268–81, 1298. Township and river—probably Celtic name, but sense unknown = Evenlode.
Blindwell Coppice, 1650, 1781. *P*.

Blowynd, 1298, 1449; Blowend, 1300; Blowens, 1650, 1775; Blowmans C., 1650; Blowings, 1802; Little Blenheim ? mod. *P*—from a windmill ?

Boldecroftes, 1442. *P*.

Bolwere, 1302; Bole Wyre, Bowlwyre, 1650—"bowl-shaped weir" ?

Bow Bridge, 1615.

Bowls, 1650, *c*. 1782; Bowls Road, 1880; Bowles Farm, mod. *P*—from tree boles, or "reddish clay," or "a smelting-place" ?

Brech, 1389; Breach, 1650. *P*—"ground broken for plough."

Brerifurlong, 1268–81. *A*—"briary."

Brodecroft, 1443; Broad Cs., 1650, 1782.

Brokescroft, 1443; Brockes C. Brokes well, elsewhere "brockes wells," 1615. *P*—broc, "brook," more likely than f.n. Brook (1650).

Bryant C., 1650, Briants C., 1782.

Buggan Broc, 1005. =Limb Brook.

Bulput (on river), 1360. — "bull's promontory" or "bowl-shaped fish trap"; cf. Bolwere (lower on river).

Burgeys croft, 1443. *P*.

Bush F, 1650; Beach House allotment ? 1858. *A* = Steward's Bush.

Calvecroft, 1213–28, 1281, 1360; Caldecroft, 1360; Calke Croft Slade, 1615. *P*—cf. p. 101.

Carfolks, 1650. — cf. p. 68.

Cassington Hedge F., 1650; Cassington Ditch, 1788. *M*.

Castle Coppice, c. 1782.

Cattesbrayne, Catsbrain, 1328, 1360, 1615, 1650, 1782. *A*—"rough stony clay."

Cauershulle, 1298. *M*.

Cauerswelle Broke, 1298. — "cress stream."

Chaldewelle, 1281. —"cold stream" =Chil Brook.

Charescroft, 1443; Charles's Green ? 1802. *P*—f.n. Chare, Chere (1562–70).

Charterhold, 1650, 1708, 1713; Chatter Holt, 1782. *P*—"held by deed."

Cheese Cake, 1788. *M*.

Chelbreade, Chelbredyate Fs, Far and Near Chelbred Yate, 1615; Chilbridge F, 1650, 1697, 1782, 1788. *A*—brede "breadth"; yate, "gate."

Cherebrugge, 1268–81. —" turning (bascule) bridge ? " (Ekwall, Wyld).
Chil Brook, mod.
Chilmore Bridge, mod. Cf. p. 102.
Church Way, 1650. Cf. p. 91.
Chymney C., 1563.
Claxhurst, 1360: Lockarts, mod. *P*—" Clac's clump " (O.E. pers. n) ?
Claydens, Cladins, 1650; Claddins, 1802. *P*—" clayey woodland pasture."
Clayhuythe, 1360; Claye weere, 1615; Clay-wyre, 1650; Claywire, 1697, 1708. *M*—" landing " and " weir " on river.
Clay-Pit F., 1782. *A*.
Coggs Coppice Bottom, 1650; Coggs Clump, *mod.*
Cokewell, 1443. *P*.
Cokkescroft, 1443. *P*—f.n. (1443).
Colew(u)rthe, 1268–81; Coulworth Cs and Couleworth Slade F., 1615; Collatts, Collett Lane, 1650; F. by Collet Hedge, 1697; Collets F., 1782; Collett F., 1788; Great Collet, 1802. *A*. *P*.—from charcoal burning ?
Colyers croftes, 1443. *P* = Colew(u)rthe ?
Common Gate, 1802.
Conduit Field and House, 1615; Cundit, 1650; Conduit Corner, 1782; Conduit Lane, mod. *A*.
Cooke's C., 1679. *P* = Rames C.
Cookoo, Cuckoo Cs. 1650, 1782; Cuckoo Pens, Cuckoo Lane, 1782. *P*.
Corne Eyt, 1360. —" crane (heron) islet " ?
Costloneit, Costloteit, 1360. *M*. Probably = Cotsetneyde, by error, perhaps influenced by use of lots; cf. pp. 37, 92.
Cotsedneyde, 1268–81. *M*—" cotset's (cottager's) islet " ?
Coumede, 1280–90.
Cowcroft, 1601; Cawcroft, Cow-Cross Slade, 1650; Cow-Croft Slade, 1782. *P*— = Calvecroft.
Cowleasus, 1565; Cowelease, 1571; Cowleyes, 1650; Cowleaze Common, 1782; Cowley's Common, 1796; Cowlease Lane, 1802. *P*.
Crabtree F., 1615. *A*.
Cryspeham, Cryspisham, 1360; Crypesham, 1443; Coopers Ham, 1796. *M*—" curly," from shape of strips, or f.n. Cryps (1345).
Culvyrmede, 1360. *M*—culver, " pigeon " = Dove House Close ?

Dasie F., 1650. *A.*
Deadmanes buriall, 1615, 1697. Cf. pp. 1, 78.
Dedlond, 1442; Dedelane croftes, 1443; Dead Land Lane, 1564; Deadelandes F., 1615; Deadland, 1650; Deadland Fs., 1782. *A.* Cf. p. 105.
Derbyescroft, 1443. *P.*
Devalls Coppice, 1802—f.n. (1650).
Diamorris C., 1615; Davy-Mary C., 1650; Derry Merry Cs., 1782; Derry Merry Green, 1802. *P*—"*Ave Maria*" ?; cf. p. 70; but Mery f.n. (1470).
Dielis C., 1650; Dilley's C., 1802. *P*—"Dial" common in Surrey names, but meaning unknown.
Docerscroft, 1443. *P*—docer, "basket," or f.n. ?
Doddes uppe croftes, 1443. *P.*
Dove House C., 1650, 1782. *M* =Culvyrmede ?

Ealdan Dic, 1005. Cf. p. 48.
Elm C., 1650, 1782.
Elm Farm (Freeland) mod.
Elms, mod. Cf. p. 79.
Enstone C., 1802.
Evenlode, mod. =Bladene.
Eynsham St. 1518.

Fallerscroft, 1443; Fallowe C., 1615. *P.*
Ferry Lane, 1570.
Firsecroft, 1443; Furzy C., 1650, 1782. *P.*
Flam, 1615. Cf. p. .
Fordsham Lane, 1802. —at Barefootes Ham ?
Forner, 1360. *T.*
Forthwere, 1302. —"weir near a ford."
Foulespole, 1360.
Foxleaes, 1615; Foxly, Foxlie, 1650; Foxleys, 1782. *M. A.*
Foxooles, 1443. *P.*
Free-landes, 1615; Freeland, 1650. *P.*
Frethe, Frithe, le, 1268–81, 1279, 1280, 1298, 1360, 1543; Thrests ? 1650; Thrift, mod.—"wood."
Frithe, c. 1150; la Frache, 1279. *A*— =Freeland ?
Froggenhale, 1360. *M.*
Furse Heath, 1718. =Haethfield.

Gilbert's Catsbrain, 1782—f.n. (1565).

Glovers C., 1565—f.n. (1461).
Godycrofteshamme, 1302—perhaps in Sutton.
Golding F., 1782; Golden F. 1788. *A*—from a flower, the corn-marigold ? or f.n. Goldine (1279).
Gombush F., 1782; Gomm's Bush F., 1788. *A*—f.n. Gomme (1629).
Gosard, Gossard, Gozzard F., 1650–1788. *A*—"goose-herd," or (?) "gorse."
Goseford, 1366. *T*—"haunted by geese."
Gosewelle, 1268–81; Goswell F., 1788. *A*.
Grants C., 1615. *P* = Cowcroft.
Graungecroftes, 1360 (*A*); Graunge C. 1545 (app. wood); Grange Cs. and Coppice, 1650 (*P*); Grains Cs., 1782.
Gravel Pittes F., 1615, *c.* 1709. *A*.
Gravelly pieces, 1782; Gravy Piece, 1896. *A*.
Green Dragon, 1650. *T*.
Greenway, F. by the, 1650; Greensward Baulk, F. next the, 1788. *A*.

Haethfield, 1005; Heathfield Lane, mod.—cf. p. 48.
Halkwere, 1302. —"weir at corner."
Hamstalle, 1261, 1281, 1782; Hampstall, 1650; Armstalls, mod.—"home place"; cf. p. 104.
Hanborough Brook, 1601, 1615. = Cauerswelle.
Hemehurst, 1281; Haymarsh F., 1601, 1782; Hye-mate F., 1615; Haymarch F., 1650, 1788; Hambush F., 1697. *A*—"border clump"? Cf. p. 89.
Hermitage, 1241. Cf. p. 106.
Hertescroft, 1443. *P*—f.n. (1345).
Heycroft, 1213–28. *A*—hey, "hedge."
Heyewode, 1230 ? 1360; Heyewode, Hyewode, 1369; Hyewode, Hywode, Hiwode, 1449; Highwood, 1545. —hey, "high"?
Hillands, 1650, 1782. *P*.
Hills, 1650, 1782. *P*.
Hob Jonys, 1570; Hobirons, 1650; Hop Jones, 1782; Hopjoys, 1802. *P*.
Holewelle, *c.* 1217; Holewellehulle, 1268–81. Cf. p. 77.
Hollow F., 1697, 1782, 1788. *A*.
Hollyes Townes End, 1615.
Hony Crosse, 1615; Hawme Cross, 1650; Howling Crosse, 1697, 1788; Howland Cross, 1802. Cf. p. 70.
Hopwilles, Hobwillies, 1483; Hobwilles, 1485. *P*—"spring in small valley (hope)," = Perch Close.
Hospitale, c. 1217. Cf. p. 77.

Huthecroft, Huythecroft, 1241–64, 1328, 1360, 1366; Hye Crofte 1595; Highe Crofte Farm, 1615; Highcroft, 1713, 1782. *A.*
Huthende, 1241–64, 1258, 1264–8, 1268–81, 1342, 1360.
Hyohull (error for Hychull ?) 1213–28; Hekehulle, 1241–64; Thekehulle, 1268–81; Eake Hill, 1615, 1650; Ache Hill, 1782—perhaps from a bird, O.E. *hice* (Ekwall). Can it be the hickwall or green woodpecker ?

Isis, 1788.

Jordan's Lane—f.n. (cf. p. 45) = Market St., Swan Lane.
Jordenes Withies F., 1615, 1697, 1788. *A.*
Judd's Lane, 1802.

Karsewelle, 1241–64. —" cress stream."
Keterichesshurst, Kitterichehurst, 1241–64. *A*—" kite-stream " clump (Ekwall) or " Cuthrice's clump" (Wyld).
Kyngesdone, 1360; Kingson Green and Kingston's Gutter, 1650; Kingstone Grove, 1679; Kington Green, 1802. *P*—influenced by f.n. Kingson (1650).

Lammas C., 1650. *P.*
Langcot, Lanket mead, 1802. —" tongue of ground " ?
Langdale, 1213–28, 1268–81, 1360. *A*, *P*—" long ground, held in shares " ?
Langemede, 1281; Longmede, 1360, 1650, 1700; Long Meadow, 1782, mod. *M.*
Lanmede, 1213–28; Landmede, 1268–81, 1302, 1328, 1360. *M*—" by the lane " ?
Larkdale 1615; Lark Slade, 1782. *A.*
Leuiton, 1213–28. *A* = Linton ?
Lilly Wyre, 1650.
Limb Brook, mod.—" Leigh ham " ? Cf. p. 47.
Lime Pits, 1713.
Lintbrow Lane, 1650.
Lintune, 1241–64; Linthorne F., 1615, 1650, 1678; Linton F., 1782. *A*—lin, " flax."
Little Croft, 1650, 1672. *P.*
Lodge Bottom, 1781.
Londoneis, 1360. *T.*
Long Farm, 1782.

Long Ford (*longum vadum*), 1298.
Long Ledmere, mod. *M*—lade, " watercourse " ?
Longe Croft, 1615, 1672 ; Longer Croft, 1650. *P*.
Longelete, 1360 ; Long Lighte, 1615 ; Longleigh, 1650 ; Long Lite, 1788. *M*—leat, " watercourse " ?
Lot Meadow, 1615 ; Lot F. (Great and Little Lots), 1650. *M*.
Love Lane, 1650.
Lower F., 1650. *A*.
Lower Meadow, *c*. 1709, 1782. *M*.
Ludemere, 1197–1208, 1268–81 ; Lodemere, 1241–64, 1360 ; Lodemede, 1360 ; F. on Great Ludmore, 1601 ; Ludmore F. and Great Ludmore, 1615 ; Great and Little Ludmoor Fs, 1650 ; Long Ludmoor F, 1697, 1782 ; Short and Farm Ludmoor, 1782, Ludmoor F, 1788. *M*, *A*—" Luda's marsh."
Luttershulle, 1241–64 ; Lutteshulle, Loteshulle, 1360 ; Lieche fielde, 1615 ; Litchfield, 1782. *A*.
Lutteswelle, 1261. —" clear (O.E. *hlutor*) stream," = Chil Brook.

Maddeleyscroftes, 1443. *P*.
Maerbroc, 1005. =Cauerswelle.
Malthouse C. 1863. =Porter's C.
Market St., mod. =Jordan's Lane.
Mead C. 1650. *M*.
Mead Lane, 1708, 1796. =Bitteralls Lane.
Meerstone Hill, 1650.
Menecroft, 1443 : Mean C. 1615, 1650, 1782. *P*— " common (O.E. *mæne*) " ?
Merten Ham, 1650 ; Merry Down Ham, 1802. —" enclosure by pool," or from f.n. Mery (1503).
Middelfurlong, 1268–81 ; Middle Furlong, 1650, 1782. *A*, *M*.
Mikelfurlong, 1241–64. *A*—mikel, " great," if not error for " middel."
Mill Lane, 1601 ; Milne Lane, 1615. Cf. Wudemanne Muleweye.
Millers C., 1650. *P*.
Modyeswell, 1440. —f.n. (1268–81).
Morellescrofts, 1443. *P*—f.n. (13th—15th c.).
Morterpitts C., 1650 ; Morterfits, 1672 ; Mortar Pitts, 1782.
Mullecroftes, 1328, 1360. *A* =Langdale ? Cf. p. 101.

Mullemore, Mulemore, Mulmore, Mulnemore, 1229, 1241–64, 1268–81, 1281, 1328, 1360, 1362; Mill Meadow, 1601; Milne Meadow, Milne Moore C., 1615; Mill Mead, Mill Moors, Upper and Lower Mill Moor F, 1650; Mill Moors, 1782. *M.* *P.*
Mullhende, 1342; Mill St., 1518, mod.
Munkeshode, 1360; Monks Wood, 1650, 1782. *P*—shode, "dividing ridge," on Chil Brook.

Neales C., Neales Town End, 1615; Meals C., 1782. *P*—f.n. (1274).
Nethereyt, 1360; Nethereych, 1443; Several Neight, 1650; Several Eight, 1782; Lower Ayott, 1802. *P.*
Newfield, 1650, 1858; New Field Farm, 1782; Newfield Cottages, mod. *P.*
Newnehams, 1443. *P*—f.n. (1443).
Noble F., 1650. *A.*
North Field, 1596, 1615, 1650. *A.*
Nova Strata, *c.* 1217, 1219; New Bridge Road, 19th c.—=Station Road; cf. p. 76.
Novus Burgus, 1215–28, 1294; *Novum Burgagium*, 1268–81; *Nova Terra*, 1309, 1366; Newland St. 1650, 1782, mod. Cf. p. 8.
Nursery, 1713.

Old Coppice, 1650, 1781. *P*— =Frith ?
Oldeland, 1545, 1650, Oldlands, *c.* 1782. *P.*
Orchard End, 1503. =the Wharf.
Oseneyslond, 1389; Osney Leaes, Lays, 1615, 1650, 1782. *M.*
Osney Hill, 1650.
Otehurst, 1360; Owters, 1615; Oathurst, 1650, 1782, 1796; Oakhurst, 1672; Oaters, 1781; Oathouse, *mod.* *M.*
Overeyt, 1360; Common Neight and "the neight near the ferry," 1650; Common Eight and Little Eight, 1782; The Neat, 1796. *P*—"upper islet" or "shore (O.E. *ofer*) islet."
Ownhalles C., 1650; Ovenalls, 1782. *P.*
Owtwood, 1545. =Heyewode ?
Oxenpenie, 1443. *P*—from fee for pasturage.

Park, 1229, 1615, 1650.

Parker, Parkers Piece, 1615, 1697, 1782, 1788. *A*—f.n. (1601).
Partrichesmede, 1360; Partryshōoh mede, 1443; Partridge Mead, 1650; Partlow's Copse ? *c.* 1782, mod. *P.*
Patonscroft, 1443. *P.*
Pearts C., 1517, 1534; Perchez C., 1560; Perch C., 1615, 1650, 1782. *P*—bought from Pierte f. (1483); = Hopwilles, and probably Waterperces Croftes.
Peat Pits F., 1782, 1788, 1858. *A.*
Penycroft C., Pennticraft C., 1650; Penti-croft, 1782; Pentecrofts, Pinkcroft, 1802. *P*— =Oxenpenie, not from Pentecross f. (1650), who were not the tenants ?
Perrot's Pond, 1697—f.n. (1650).
Pinkle Gate, 1802; Pinkhill in Stanton Harcourt, mod.—"Pinca's lea."
Pons Hugonis, *c.* 1220. Cf. p. 30.
Poor's C., *c.* 1709.
Porters C., 1650, 1713, 1832; Potters C. 1650—cf. p. 85.
Portstraet, 1005. Cf. p. 48.
Poukebrugge, 1406, Powkebrugge, 1417; Powkebrege, 1438; Puckebrigge, *c.* 1466; Poukebrige, 1470. —"spirit," "demon."
Pound, 1601; Pound Gate, 1802.
Powes Lane, 1605.
Priors, 1802.
Puck Lane, 1615; Pug Lane, mod. =Queen St.
Pulleserscrofts, 1443. *P.*

Ram C., 1650, 1782, Rames C., 1679. *P* =Cookes C.
Redlands F, 1615, 1650, 1782. *A.*
Reeke C., 1650. *P.*—a rick in it ?
Refham, 1268–81. *M*—"the reeve's," =Bailey's Ham.
Robartreneescroft, 1443. *P.*—Robert Renne held Eynsham land in Marsh Baldon (1445).
Rod Ham, 1802.
Round Hill F, 1650. *A* =Barrow Hill.
Ruffines Bush F, 1615. *A*—f.n. (16th c.); cf. p. 83.
Rush Mil moore, 1615. *P.*

Saint Leonard's Chapel, 1264–68, 1268–81, 1317–30.
Sandhulle, 1275. *P.*
Setters Bush F., 1615. *A.*

Sheephouse C., 1650 ; Shepherd's C., 1782.
Shire Lake, " against the Ferry," 1650.
Short Farm, 1782.
Shrub F., 1697.
Sidelakesham, 1213–28, 1241–64 ; Sudelakesham, 1268–81 ; Sedelakesham, Sydelakesham, 1360 ; Shutlakes Ham, 1565 ; Shutlockes Ham, 1615 ; Shut-lock Ham, 1650. *M*—" ham on side of watercourse " ?
Skrub, 1788.
Sortegroue, 1241–64, 1268–81 ; Scorthgrene (error for greue ?) 1268–81. —" short grove "?
Southefelde, 1360, 1601, 1615, 1650 ; Southfield Barn, mod. *A*.
Southleigh Lane End, 1650.
Sparrow Acre, 1601, 1697, *c.* 1709 ; Spade Acres, 1615, 1650 ; Spare, Sparre, Spar Acre C, 1615 ; Spar Acre, 1782 ; Sparacre, 1788. *A*, P.—" land tilled by spade," or f.n. Sparrowe (1570) ?
Standlake, 302. —at the stone wharf ?
Steward's Bush F., 1615. *A*—cf. pp. 47, 102.
Stockmans C., 1782. *P*—f.n. (1443).
Stondych, 1261. =Chil Brook ; cf. p. 30.
Stone End Bridge, 1615.
Stonyham, Stoweham, 1360. *M*.
Strandputtes, 1268–81. *A*.
Strenyscroftes, 1443. *P*—f.n. (1345).
Strond Wyre, 1650.
Stubbefurlong, 1360, 1615, 1650 ; Stubelfurlong, 1360. *M*.
Stump Stile F., 1782, 1788 ; Stump Still Piece, n.d. *A*.
Stywardispath, 1360. Cf. p. 47.
Sutton Brooke, 1615, 1650, 1697. =Limb Brook.
Sutton Way F., 1782.
Swan Lane, 1847. =Market St.
Swana Croft, 1005. Cf. p. 48.
Swann's Close, 1863. =Porter's C.
Swench Hill, 1650. —" swink, labour."
Swynefordhythe, 1362.

Tanners Hill, mod.
Tanners Lane, mod. Cf. p. 87.
Temesestret, 1414 ; Temes Lane, 1615 ; Thames St. 1518.
Three Bushes, 1782. *A*.
Thrim Acon, 1005.
Tilgares Dic, 1005.

Tilgaresle, Tylgaresle, 1197–1208, 1200, 1258, 1260–81, 1328; Tilgarsle, Tylgarsle, 1264–68, 1281–1307, 1317–30, 1359, 1369, 1378; Tilgardesle, Tilgardesleke, 1279; Tylgaresley, Tylgarslee, Tylgarsley, 1359; Tilgerdesle, Tilsgarsley, 1369; Tilgersleye, 1378; Tylgaresleye, Tylgarsleye, 1383; Tylgarsle, 1443; Tylgarsley, 1449, 1471; Tuggersleye, 1543; Tiggersley, 1545; Tylgartesley, 1552; Tilgarsley, 1650, 1797; Tilgarsly, 1800; Till Guzzle, 1808. —"Tilgar's clearing."

Tolcon Bridge, 1570; Token Bridge, 1782; Token Bridge Gate, 1802; Stoken Burge, 1788. —from a sign-post? =Cherebrugge?

Toln Acre, 1802. Cf. p. 17.

Torres grave meere, 1615; Tars Grave, 1782. Cf. p. 119.

Toune C., 1615. *P.*

Townes Ende, 1615.

Trumpermede, 1360; Trumpet, Trumpets Mead, 1650, 1672, 1802. *M*—possibly f.n., or from a local name for some bird (the bittern), or from trumpery, "valueless, weedy (dial)"?

Turners Croftes, 1443; Turners C., 1650; Turners Green, 1782. *P.*

Twelueacre, 1360; Twelve Acre Farm, 1604; Twelve Acre C., 1615; Twelve Acres, 1619, 1650, 1782; Twelve Acre Farm, mod. *A. P.*

Twenty Penny F., 1788. *M.*

Tybbyns croftes, 1443; Tiffins, 1650, mod. *P.*

Upper Meadow, 1782. *M.*

Vinsons, 1650; Vincents, 1782; Vincents Wood, mod. *P.*

Wakwed, 1268–81. *A.*

Waltona, 1241–64; Waltone forlong, 1281; Wales F., 1650; Long and Short Wales Fs., 1602, 1615, 1697, 1782, 1788. *A*—"holding of *Weala*" (Welsh, British), and so serfs, or "holding near a wall."

Waresaye, 1229; Wyreshey, Wyreshy, 1228–39 (transcribed 14th c.); Wyrsei, *c.* 1260 (tr. 14th c.); Wireshy, Wirisheye, 1268–81; Wyrssei, 1281; Wyresheye, 1284, 1328; Wyreshy, Wyreshey, Wyrresey, 1360; Worsey, 1615, 1800; Worsea, 1650; Wersey, 1782. *M*—"Wighere's island," or from *wir*, "bogmyrtle"? (Ekwall), or Wir, 'winding,' a British river name.

Water C., 1650. *P.*
Waterperces Crofts, 1443. *P* = Perch Close ?
Watkins Ham, 1788. *M*—f.n. (1615).
Wattes blacke, 1615 ; Wale Black, 1650 ; Watt's Blake, 1782 ; Watts' Lake C., 1802 ; What's Blake, 1841. *P*—held by Thomas Blackman (1615).
Waymbut, 1650. *P*—error for Waynbut, " wagon-enclosure " ?
Weardstige, 1005.
Westmede, 1442. *M.*
Wethemore, 1213–28 ; Weymore, *c.* 1220, 1360 ; Waymore, 1443 ; Withers Leys, 1802. *M*—" withy marsh."
Wharf, 1782 ; Wharf Stream, 1796.
White horne C., 1615 ; White Thorn C., 1650 ; Whitall's C., 1782. *P*—f.n. Whithorn (1466).
White Pits F., 1650, 1782. *A.*
Whyteknaysterscroft, 1443. *P.*
Widowes Ham, 1615. *M.*
Winburgh Stoc, 1005.
Withy Slade F., 1697, 1782.
Wodecroft, 1241–64 ; W(u)decroft, 1268–81. *A* ?
Wodewere, 1302.
Wood Lane, mod.
Woodleys Coppice, 1650 ; Woodlease, 1781 ; Woodless, 1802 ; Wortley, 1862. *P*—in Heyewode.
Wowndewell, 1443. *P*—at " twisting stream " (Chil Brook) ?
Wrouthey, Wrouȝthey, 1228–39 (transcribed 14th c.) ; Wrotey, *c.* 1260 (tr. 14th c.) ; Wrouthy, Wroutheye, 1268–81 ; Wrotheye, 1284 ; Wroghechey, Wroghethey, Wroghehey, 1360 ; Rothie, 1650 ; Wrothey's Meadow, 1782 ; Wrothy, 1832. *M*—" island of debate," O.E. *wroht* (Ekwall), or " crooked enclosure," O.E. *wróh-tēag*," (Wyld).
W(u)delongemannecroft, 1268–81. *A.*
Wudemanne Muleweye, 1241–64.
Wytecroft, 1443. *P.*
Wyteparokke, 1443. *P*—parrock, " paddock."

Yethulle, 1268–81. —error for Hekehulle ?

GENERAL INDEX.

THE
OXFORDSHIRE RECORD SOCIETY.

(Founded in 1919 for printing documents relating to the History of the County.)

President.

THE EARL OF MACCLESFIELD,
Vice-Chairman of the Oxfordshire County Council.

Vice-Presidents.

His Grace the Duke of Marlborough
The Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Oxford, D.D.
The Right Hon. The Lord Camoys
The Right Hon. The Lord Sankey
The Right Hon. The Lord Saye and Sele
The Right Hon. The Lord Tweedsmuir, G.C.M.G., C.H.
The Right Hon. The Lord Wyfold
The Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher, P.C., M.A., F.S.A.
V. H. Smith, Esq., *Lord Lieutenant of Oxfordshire*
The Right Rev. Bishop Shaw, D.D.
The President of Trinity College
Rev. F. N. Davis, B.A., B.Litt.
W. M. Goodenough, Esq.,
Chairman, Oxfordshire County Council.
A. G. Little, D.Litt., F.B.A.
T. Loveday, L.L.D.
A. E. Preston, F.S.A., J.P.

The Council, 1936-1937.

Rev. H. E. Salter, D.Litt., M.A., F.B.A., *Fellow of Magdalen College* (Chairman).
G. F. H. Berkeley, Esq., F.R.Hist.S.
Rev. C. C. Brookes, M.A.
Miss C. Violet Butler, M.A., *Society of Oxford Home Students*
Miss Coate, M.A., F.R.Hist.S., *Tutor, Lady Margaret Hall*
C. F. Corbould-Ellis, Esq., J.P.
T. Cottrell-Dormer, Esq., J.P.
Canon Dams, M.A., *Rector of Henley-on-Thames*
L. G. Dillon, Esq., F.S.A., J.P.
Strickland Gibson, Esq., M.A., *Keeper of the University Archives*
Miss Rose Graham, D.Litt., M.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S., *General Editor, Canterbury and York Society*
Canon Jenkins, D.D., F.S.A., *Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History*
S. D. Kitson, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., F.R.I.B.A.
L. G. Wickham-Legg, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S., *Fellow of New College*, (Editorial Committee)
R. Lennard, Esq., M.A., F.R.Hist.S., *Fellow of Wadham College*, (Editorial Committee)
F. M. Powicke, Esq., M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *Regius Professor of Modern History*, (Editorial Committee)
Rev. A. J. Whyte, D.Litt., M.A.

Hon. Treasurer.

CYRIL W. HURST, ESQ.,
22, Oxford Road, Banbury, Oxon.

Hon. Secretary.

I. G. PHILIP, ESQ., B.A., (Editorial Committee),
12, Bradmore Road, Oxford.

IN PREPARATION.

The following are in course of preparation :—

Chartulary of the Preceptory of Sandford-on-Thames. Edited by Mrs. Leys, M.A., F.R.Hist.S., St. Hilda's College.

Oxfordshire Wills. Edited by J. H. R. Weaver, M.A., F.S.A., Fellow of Trinity College.

Henley Corporation Documents. Edited by Miss P. M. Briers, B.Litt.

OTHER PROPOSED PUBLICATIONS INCLUDE.

Feet of Fines, Oxfordshire (Part II).
Hearth Tax returns, Oxfordshire, 17th century.
Lists of Apprentices, Oxfordshire, 18th century.


ENSHAM
Common-Fields
1782
TWELVE ACRES FARM.
HANDBOROUGH CLOSE.
GRAINS CLOSES.
PENTI CROFT.
Handborough Green
Millers Closes
Meals Closes
Shepherds Closes
Broad Close
Perch Closes
Watts Blake
Stockmans Close
Elm Closes
Cherry Merry Closes
Whitalls Close
CUCKOO LANE
CUCKOO CLOSES.
Ram Closes.
VINCENTS.
OVENALLS.
Turners
Shepherds Close
Briants Closes.
Hop Jones
COLLETS.
Furzy Close
ACHE-HILL
Ache Hill
FARM LUDMOOR.
FURLONG Shooting on OSNEY LAYS &c.
N.o II
N.o V HOLLOW FURLONG.
N.o VI WHITE PITTS FURLONG
N.o III TOKEN BRIDGE FUR.
N.o IV MILL MOORS FUR.
N.o X GOMBUSH FUL.
N.o VIII RED LANDS F.
N.o VII MILL MOORS F.
Mill Moors
Ensham Mill.
Dovehouse Close
WERSEY-MEADOW.
EVENLODE RIVER.
CATSBRAIN.
N.o LXXXIII UPPER MEADOW
Cuckoo Pens
N.o XXIV LONG LUD MOOR F.
N.o XXV Short Lud-Moor Fur.
N.o XXVI DEADLAND FURLONGS.
N.o XXVII CHILBRIDGE F.
N.o XXI CLAY-PIT FURLONG
N.o XIX CONDUIT CORNER
N.o XIV SPAR ACRE
ENSHAM TOWN.
Newland Street
Mill Street
Thames Street
The Church
ABBEY FARM.
LITCHFIELD.
HIGH CROFT.
Mortar Pitts
Gilberts Catsbrain
Chatter Holt
BITTERALLS CLOSES.
Road to Cassington
N.o LXXXII LOWER MEADOW.
Changeable Furlongs
Newfield Farm
HAMSTALL FARM.
N.o XXIX NEW-FIELD FUR.
N.o XXVIII SUTTON-WAY FUR.
N.o XXX PEAT-PITS FUR.
N.o XXXII COW-CROFT SLADE
N.o XXXIII Shoot.g to Cowcroft Slade
N.o XXXIX LINTON FURLONG.
N.o XXXV Shoot.g to Larkslade
N.o XXXI HOLLOW FUR
N.o XXXIV ROUND HILL FURL.
N.o XL. FOXLEYS.
GRAVELLY PIECES
LONG FARM.
SHORT FARM.
Road from Sutton and Stanton Harcourt
N.o XLV HAY-MARSH FUR
N.o XLI Shoot.g on Sutton Way
N.o XLIV F. SHOOTING to OATHURST.
N.o XLII GOLDING FURLONG.
N.o XLIII OAT HURST.
Cowleaze Common
Long Meadow
Monks Wood
The Park
The Orchard
The Parks
Berry Close
THE WHARF
Common Eight
Several Eight
little Eight
ENSHAM BRIDGE.
ISIS.
Burgess