

# The Perception of Profit before the Leasing of Demesnes\*

By DAVID POSTLES

ONE of the critical questions of the agrarian economy of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, is the performance of the seigneurial economy. From the late twelfth century, lords had begun to resume their demesnes in hand, to exploit them directly, rather than to continue to lease them to *firmarii*.<sup>1</sup> Direct exploitation persisted into the later fourteenth century, when there was a return in many cases to the leasing of demesnes.<sup>2</sup> The inducement to lords to engage in direct exploitation is therefore a central issue. Research into particular estates has attempted to face this issue. In many cases, however, the performance of the properties has had to be reconstructed. Reflections on 'profit' have necessarily comprised retrospective analyses — the historian's interpretation of 'profitability'.<sup>3</sup> For want of other information, this approach is entirely

valid. An equally helpful method may be to try to recognize the lords' own perceptions of how well their property was paying. As long ago as 1965, P D A Harvey wrote perceptively: 'But, however reached, the figures are of value as showing what the College itself considered to be its profit from Cuxham.'<sup>4</sup> He was referring to the memorandum of the profit of the manor entered on the foot of the face of the manorial accounts of Cuxham. Perhaps only a minority of lords — or their auditors — added these statements of profit to the manorial accounts.<sup>5</sup> The purpose of this paper is to assess these memoranda from a small number of lesser and medium-sized estates, to attempt to show the lords' perception of the profitability of their properties.

The principles behind these *proficua* calculations were cogently explained by Eric Stone some twenty years ago.<sup>6</sup> He revealed the two calculations which might be introduced: the *proficuum manerii* and the more sophisticated *proficuum ganagii (wainagii) et stauri*. This paper is basically concerned with the *proficuum manerii* and its variants. Some attempt will be made to assess the nature of the calculation, building on Stone's research; to review the data from the selected estates, within the context of the various properties; and finally to draw some further conclusions about attitudes to the calculations.

\* I am indebted to the British Academy for their assistance with a small research grant, which allowed me to undertake some of the research for this paper. For permission to use their archives, I am grateful to: The Queen's College, Oxford; the Warden and Fellows of Merton College, Oxford; the Dean and Chapter of Lichfield; His Grace, the Duke of Devonshire; Winchester College; Christ Church, Oxford; and the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey. Above all, I am grateful to their respective archivists for enabling my research, in particular: Dr JRL Highfield, Mr J Burgass, Mrs J Hampartumian, Mr N MacMichael, Mrs E Nixon, Mr J M Kaye, and the staff of the Bodleian Library. Without committing them to the inadequacies of the paper, I must record my gratitude for advice at various times from: Dr E King, Professor P D A Harvey, Dr J Z Titow, Miss B F Harvey, Dr C C Dyer, and Dr H S A Fox.

<sup>1</sup> P D A Harvey, 'The Pipe Rolls and the Adoption of Demesne Farming in England', *Econ Hist Rev*, 2nd ser, XXVII, 1974, pp 345-59.

<sup>2</sup> R A Lomas, 'The Priory of Durham and its Demesnes in the Fourteenth and fifteenth Centuries', *Econ Hist Rev*, 2nd ser, XXXI, 1978, pp 339-53, suggests this tendency was not absolute.

<sup>3</sup> For example, recently, M Mate, 'Profit and Productivity on the Estates of Isabella de Forz (1260-92)', *Econ Hist Rev*, 2nd ser, XXXIII, 1980, pp 326-34; and, in the past, for example, Frances Davenport, *The Economic Development of a Norfolk Manor*, 1967, pp 43-4.

<sup>4</sup> P D A Harvey, *A Medieval Oxfordshire Village*, Oxford, 1965, p 97.

<sup>5</sup> P D A Harvey, *Manorial Records of Cuxham, Oxfordshire*, Historical Manuscripts Commission, JP 23, 1976, pp 56-7.

<sup>6</sup> E Stone, 'Profit-and-Loss Accountancy at Norwich Cathedral Priory', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, XII, 1962, pp 25-48.

## I

The *proficuum manerii* was designed, in Dr Stone's phrase, to answer the question: 'how well is our property paying?' The objective was to assess the level of current profitability. The memorandum recording the statement would often be quite summary: *Proficuum manerii hoc anno xliiij.li. viij.s. iij.d.*<sup>7</sup> According to Professor Harvey, the memorandum is 'the last significant stage in the compilation of the manorial account', and 'perhaps the most interesting addition to account rolls at Stage 3'.<sup>8</sup> The memoranda collected together here derive from the estates of several lesser or medium-sized lordships: the estates of Merton College; God's House (Southampton); the Bishopric of Lichfield; Southwick Priory (Austin Canons); and Bolton Priory (Austin Canons). The memoranda are often very cryptic, and in many cases the brevity of the entries makes it impossible to re-work the nature of the calculation which lay behind the bare statement. It may be that the principles — as explained in the treatises from a few estates<sup>9</sup> — varied only little from one estate to the next, with the significant exception of whether or not the balance of the account was included in the calculation.<sup>10</sup>

Nevertheless, the memoranda do sometimes reveal something of the nature of the calculation. Principally, they divulge that productive investment would be added towards 'profit' or noted. For example, there is the reference to 40s for the new building at Gussage (God's House) in 1312-13, the costs of the new grange (1311-12) and new house (1313-14) at Werrore with Cosham (God's House), and the new grange at Hickley (God's House) in 1296-7. Similarly, at Hickley, marling was noted in 1295-6. In that same year, ditching contributed to profit on the grange of Bolton Priory at

Cononley. Improvements were also included to profit on the estates of Oseney Abbey, although not consistently. In this respect, the memoranda reflect that lords were conscious of the value of investment in their estates, even if the general level of investment was low.<sup>11</sup> Equally, foreign expenses were credited to profit or noted. In the Hickley memoranda, the value of hay and forage sent for the stock at Southampton in 1301-6, is consistently noted. Similarly, hay bought at Gussage in 1308-9 for the lord's horses, was valued towards profit. At Werrore with Cosham, the keep of members of the convent was recorded in two years (1313-14 and 1314-15). The rationale behind this action was presumably that the value of these commodities would otherwise have accrued to profit, had it not been consumed in an extraneous expense. Conversely, foreign receipts were deducted or noted, as the three quarters of wheat received at Cononley for seed from the tithes of Carlton in 1295-6. The great question mark about these aspects — investment, foreign expenses, foreign receipts — is how consistently they were applied.

The calculations of Bolton, Beaulieu and Oseney allow a more detailed insight into the principles behind the calculation. The main components of the calculation were the liveries of cash to the household and the value of grain and stock delivered to the household or to other manors on intermanorial livery.

A further calculation — of unknown provenance, but mid-fourteenth-century — is slightly more refined than Bolton (c1296), Oseney (c1280), and Beaulieu (c1269-70). The sophistication of this calculation rests in the inclusion of grain remaining in the granary and the issue of livestock during the year, and the deduction of arrears. The latter especially was not considered in many other calculations. The author of this formulary,

<sup>7</sup> Leicestershire Record Office DG9/1954 (Beaumanor, Leics.).

<sup>8</sup> Harvey, *Manorial Records* . . . Cuxham, pp 56-7.

<sup>9</sup> See Tables 1-4.

<sup>10</sup> E Stone, 'Profit-and-Loss Accountancy . . .', p 29.

<sup>11</sup> R H Hilton, 'Rent and Capital Formation in Feudal Society', repr. in *The English Peasantry in the Later Middle Ages*, Oxford, 1975, pp 174-214; J Z Titow, *English Rural Society, 1200-1350*, 1969, pp 49-50; M M Postan, 'Investment in Medieval Agriculture', *Journal of Economic History*, XXVII, 1967, pp 576-87.

however, recognized that there were other possibilities: *Tamen aliqui discreti habent alium modum extrahendi verum valorem manerii*. Indeed, the author suggested other methods, including checking the current account with the extent and with accounts of previous years, as well as rules of thumb (such as grain yielding to the fourth grain for break-even, and the necessity of making £10 profit on every carucate tilled in the paragraph *De valore terre regula*).

A less refined effort was made a century earlier on the estates of Eynsham Abbey, before the Beaulieu, Bolton and Oseney calculations. For the manors of Stoke, Charlbury and Mickleton, the Abbey noted the issue of grain each year between 1256 and 1259. A standard price was then applied to each grain: 4s per qtr. of wheat; 2s 6d per qtr. of mixtil; 2s per qtr. of barley; 1s 6d per qtr. of *tramesium*; 1s per qtr. of oats but only 8d per qtr. at Mickleton; and 2s per qtr. of beans. An average was then calculated from the four years to provide the annual figure for profit with some of the costs of collection deducted: *Summa denariorum iiii libre xv solidi et sic subtractis de illa summa xxiiii solidos [sic] pro conduccione et locacione hominum et carectarum et remanent lxxi solidi*.<sup>12</sup>

Undoubtedly, however, the Oseney, Beaulieu and Bolton calculations represented the most widespread form of the application. The significance of the basic tenets of the calculation was that they recognized the value of the supply of the household as much as the proceeds from the commercial sale of produce, an important consideration on many lesser and medium-sized estates.

Two further problems should be considered before moving on to address the data. The first problem concerns the

terminology, and relates to the use of the terms *valor* and *proficuum* (*profectus*). During the fourteenth, and especially in the late fourteenth, century, some baronial and episcopal estates introduced the calculation called the *valor*. This *valor* occurred in two forms: a *valor* for each manor appended at the foot of each manorial account; a central *valor* for the entire estate, compiled from the individual returns. Professor Davies, in an important article, suggested that these later *valores* were related closely to the decision to lease demesnes, in contrast with earlier profit calculations which had been produced for demesnes being directly exploited. The later *valores* thus comprised liveries of cash, mainly rents and farm (*firma*), whilst the *proficuum* was concerned with wider agricultural activity. Theoretically, the *proficuum* was concerned with current profitability; by the time of the *valor* a decision had been made irrevocably in favour of leasing.

The difference, however, was not quite so absolute. Some of the calculations of the early fourteenth century were called *valeur* or *valor*. The first Merton memoranda occur as *valet manerium*, and some of the God's House statements appear initially as *manerium valet*. On the Lichfield accounts, the statement is interchangeably *valet hoc anno* and *proficuum* in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The Stubbington accounts in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries have consistently *valet (hoc anno) manerium*, and in 1351-2, when the demesne was still in hand, *valor*. On the estates of Westminster Abbey, the term *valor* was used in the early fourteenth century for manors where the demesne was still in hand, as well as in the later fourteenth century for demesnes then at farm. At Hickley, moreover, the term *valet* was used when the profit calculation was re-introduced transiently in 1383-4, the demesne being then still in hand, although it had previously been leased. Other *valores* which were introduced in the later fourteenth century, applied to demesnes still in

<sup>12</sup> H E Salter (ed), *The Cartulary of the Abbey of Eynsham*, I, Oxford Historical Society, XLIX, 1906-7, pp 8-9; Salter, *The Cartulary of Oseney Abbey*, VI, Oxford Historical Society, CI, 1936, pp 184-207; Dom S F Hockey, *The Account Book of Beaulieu Abbey*, Camden Society, 4th series, 16, 1975, *passim*; D Oschinsky (ed), *Walter of Henley and Other Treatises on Estate Management and Accountancy*, Oxford, 1971, pp 470-1 (*Valor manerii*); for Bolton Priory, see Appendix 4.

hand in the 'Indian Summer' of the 1380s and 1390s. The *Valor* of the Worcester episcopal estates was initiated in 1391, when some demesnes (eg Bibury) were still in hand, and the *valor* included separate elements for grain, stock, wool, and 'the manor', similar to the Clare *valor* of sixty years previously. Ramsey Abbey embarked on a similar exercise as some demesnes recovered in the 1380s. The manor of Elvethall, which was held by Durham Cathedral Priory, was maintained in hand through to the sixteenth century, as a home farm for which a *clarus valor* was calculated between 1443 and 1514. One of the most remarkable examples of *valores* being employed for demesnes still in hand, was the Catesby *status maneriorum* of 1385-6, deriving from a small lay estate.<sup>13</sup>

A general tendency can therefore be observed. In the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, a profit calculation would probably be designated *proficuum* or *profectus*, but the terms *valor* or *valet* would also be used. This is not unusual since the same terms (*valet* especially) had been used in other contexts previously, for example in Domesday Book, and even instead of a *summa* in some extents of manors. By contrast, most calculations in the later fourteenth century would fall under the rubric of *valor*—whether the demesnes were still in hand or, more often now, placed at farm. The change of emphasis in the use of the terms had coincided with a shift in the economic climate. By this time, the climate had altered so radically that many *valores*

simply comprised cash liveries from manors now leased, although some still related to demesnes in hand. The increase in the use of *valores* in the 1380s and 1390s—the 'Indian Summer'—may have reflected a genuine effort of lords to assess again their policy towards leasing or direct exploitation at this critical juncture.

Some lords had attempted to address this important question at an earlier time, by comparing the manorial account with the extent of the manor to assess the level of profit. In this case, the extent would represent the expected return on the property and its husbandry *vis-à-vis* the actual amount achieved by re-working the account. Certain examples of this method have been discovered on the estates of the Bishopric of Worcester in the 1290s, and the Abbey of St Alban's in the fourteenth century. The officials of the Bishop of Ely may also have employed the concept, as the balance of one of the accounts for Wisbech Barton is qualified: *Item debet ut Gaigneria respondeat ad extentam Liiij. li. ix.s. vij.d.* This alternative may have been more widespread than is yet known, but the *proficuum manerii* was undoubtedly the most favoured method, and it is to this calculation that the paper returns.<sup>14</sup>

## II

The estates selected here for comparison are not the larger Benedictine houses, but rather a collection of medium-sized and lesser estates. Several of the larger Benedictine houses are known to have introduced a *proficuum* calculation: Canterbury Cathedral Priory, Norwich Cathedral Priory, Crowland Abbey, the Abbot of Westminster for

<sup>13</sup> R R Davies, 'Baronial Accounts, Incomes and Arrears in the later Middle Ages', *Econ Hist Rev*, 2nd ser., XXI, 1968, pp 211-29; C D Ross & T B Pugh, 'Materials for the Study of Baronial Incomes in the Fifteenth Century', *Econ Hist Rev*, 2nd ser., VI, 1953, pp 185-94; C C Dyer, *Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society*, Cambridge, 1980, pp 147, 162, and 178-9; R A Lomas, 'A Northern Farm at the End of the Middle Ages', *Northern History*, XVIII, 1982, p 49; for Westminster Abbey, for example, Westminster Abbey Muniments 15339 (*Valor manerii* for Launton, Oxon., 1330-1, the demesne being in hand), 20277-20278 (*Valor rectorie* and *Valor manerii* of Oakham, co. Rutland, 1358-60, Oakham including the rectorial glebe, but the demesne being at farm); Jean Birrell, 'The *Status Maneriorum* of John Catesby, 1385 and 1386', in R Bearman (ed), *Miscellany I*, Dugdale Society, XXXI, 1977, pp 15-28. Dr C C Dyer kindly informed me of the last item.

<sup>14</sup> M Hollings (ed), *The Red Book of Worcester*, Worcs Historical Society, 1934-50, Part 2, *passim*; Stone, 'Profit-and-Loss Accountancy . . .', pp 34 and 46; Cambridge University Library Ely Diocesan Records D8/1/4 (Wisbech Barton, 1319-20); D Oschinsky, *Walter of Henley*, pp 312-13 (Walter, c21).

the abbatial *mensa*, the monks of Westminster, the Abbey of Bury St Edmund's, for example.<sup>15</sup> (See Table 4.) Although significant and interesting, these great religious houses are not entirely representative. The very fact that lords of smaller estates had adopted the calculation is equally important, suggesting a far wider use of the *proficuum manerii*. Merton College introduced the calculation virtually from the foundation of the College, in the 1270s. God's House had established the statement by the time of the first extant manorial accounts from its estates, in 1293–4. Oseney Abbey had a centrally enrolled calculation by c1280, although the earliest extant accounts for its estates only slightly antedate the central account. Bolton Priory had a calculation by 1295–6, the accounts in the Bolton *compotus* volume surviving from 1286. The Beaulieu memoranda, occurring in the account-book, survive for c1269–70, as also the Stubbington ones survive from c1268, although the earliest extant Stubbington accounts antedate the calculation by some twenty years. Some tentative points emerge: firstly, the increase of interest in the 1280s and 1290s, at a time when direct demesne exploitation had reached a mature level, such that even the lords of lesser estates realized a need to assess more precisely the performance of their properties; secondly, the central enrolment of some of the accounts with their *proficuum* date — Bolton (although enrolment of the accounts preceded the *proficuum*), the Merton *kalendarium* (inconsistently), the Oseney centrally enrolled account, the Beaulieu account-book, and the first account for Southampton on which are collected

together the *proficua* for all the properties of God's House.

To place the *proficuum* data in context, the estates and their varied manors and granges will be summarily described. Whereas the estates of the large Benedictine houses comprised a high proportion of large 'classical' manors, the composition of the estates selected here varied greatly, including medium-sized 'classical' manors, small manors and granges. The use of each manor or grange also varied: there was a high level of sales of produce from some, whilst others acted more as suppliers of the household. The *proficuum manerii* was applied to all of them, regardless of their function. Despite these diverse functions and nature, the general picture was 'profitability', but with varying levels and ranges.

The estates of Merton College have been the subject of considerable research.<sup>16</sup> Analysis is concentrated here on several important manors: Cuxham, Holywell, Ibstone, Cheddington, and Malden. Holywell was a rectorial manor on the perimeter of the borough of Oxford, described in one schedule as *in manerio de Haliwelle in suburbio Oxon*. This manor also included the smaller property at Wolvercote, from which tithe receipts were important, and for which separate accounts were rendered from c1332. The manor of Holywell supported no sheep, but it was intensively cultivated with the purchase of large quantities of manure.<sup>17</sup> The garden was also intensively cultivated, particularly

<sup>15</sup> Stone, 'Profit-and-Loss Accountancy . . .', *passim* (Norwich and Canterbury Cathedral Priors); Frances Page, *The Estates of Crowland Abbey*, Cambridge, 1934, pp 240, 249 and 256; B F Harvey, *Documents Illustrating the Rule of Walter de Wenlok, Abbot of Westminster, 1283–1307*, Camden Society, 4th series, 2, 1965, p 242n; Bodleian Library MS Suffolk Roll 21, m 7 face (*Proficuum* of the manor of Mildenhall, Abbey of Bury St Edmunds); J A Raftis, *The Estates of Ramsey Abbey*, Toronto, 1957, pp 262–3.

<sup>16</sup> Mrs E C Lowry, 'The Administration of the Estates of Merton College in the Fourteenth Century', University of Oxford DPhil thesis, 1933, being Bodleian Library MS DPhil c 70, relates mainly to the College's manor of Gamlingay, co. Cambs.; Harvey, *Medieval Oxfordshire Village*, for Cuxham; C Howell, *Land, Family and Inheritance in Transition: Kibworth Harcourt, 1280–1700*, Cambridge, 1983; T H Aston also describes the estates in J L Catto (ed), *The History of the University of Oxford, The Early Oxford Schools*, Oxford, 1984.

<sup>17</sup> M(erton College) M(uniments) 4493 (inventory or schedule of stock, 1331); MM 4484, 4495 and 4497 have very detailed accounts of extensive manuring and planting in the garden, but most of the Holywell accounts have similar expenses.

the raising of madder and hemp. Despite its proximity to the College, Holywell was not exploited as a home farm. Large quantities of grain were sold, even carted as far as Wallingford and Reading, possibly for trans-shipment to London. The following figures from sample years reflect the extent of the sale of grain:

TABLE I  
Grain Sales from Holywell

|                  | Issues           | Sales           |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| <i>1296-7</i>    |                  |                 |
| wheat            | 142 qtrs. 6 bs.  | 114 qtrs. 6 bs. |
| rye              | 21 qtrs. 1 bs.   | 2 qtrs. 2 bs.   |
| barley           | 200 qtrs. 2½ bs. | 88 qtrs. 5 bs.  |
| legumes          | 38 qtrs. 7 bs.   | 21 qtrs. 1 bs.  |
| <i>1299-1300</i> |                  |                 |
| wheat            | 85½ qtrs.        | 23 qtrs.        |
| barley           | 108 qtrs.        | 50 qtrs.        |
| legumes          | 27 qtrs. 5 bs.   | 10 qtrs. 1 bs.  |

The cash receipt from sales of grain in 1296-7 comprised £25 os 3½d for wheat, £13 2s 8½d for barley, and £2 16s 0½d for beans and peas. In 1300-1, the sale of grain amounted to £32 17s 8¾d. The main deficiency continued to be oats, which were not produced on the manor until 1300-1. Consequently, 22 qtrs. 1 bs. of oats were purchased in 1296-7, 35 qtrs. in 1299-1300, with a further 30 qtrs. 3 bs. received by inter-manorial livery in 1299-1300, offsetting some of the sales of grain. In 1300-1, the demesne issue only accounted for 7 qtrs. of the total grange issue of 27 qtrs. 6 bs. 3 pecks, and the account included: *Minute expense. Et dati ij garcionibus querentibus auenam apud Cukesham ij d.* In 1299-1300, the account revealed a similar story: *Et dati vij hominibus querentibus Auene [sic] apud Farendon' cum vij Equis viij d. ob. et ibidem pernoctauerunt.*<sup>18</sup> The manor, despite the deficiency of oats, was exploited by Merton as a commercial unit, with a

relatively high level of investment, particularly in manuring. Its proximity to a local urban market may have influenced the decision to manage it in this way, although grain was also sold farther afield. The range of profit for the manor consequently fluctuated between £21 and £49, perhaps second only to Cuxham amongst the College's manors.

The demesne under seed at Ibstone, in Buckinghamshire, varied from 192½ acres to 240 acres between 1279/80 and 1300/1. Production of grain was concentrated on oats, mixtil and wheat, with the oats and mixtil being virtually all consumed on the manor. The wheat was produced for sale, as in 1284-5, when 33 qtrs. from the demesne issue of 44 qtrs. was sold. In 1279-80, 49½ qtrs. ½ bs. had been sold from the total issue of 70 qtrs. ½ bs., although only 8 qtrs. of mixtil (total issue 78 qtrs. 2½ bs.) and 11½ qtrs. oats (total issue 134 qtrs.) had been sold. Ibstone thus comprised a medium-sized demesne, not intensively exploited for the market, but producing some quantities of wheat for sale. The level of *proficuum* ranged accordingly from £8 to £13.

The demesne of the College's manor of Cheddington in Buckinghamshire fluctuated between 120 and 163½ sown acres between 1297-8 and 1304-5, the principal crops being wheat, dredge and legumes, although by 1311 pure barley began to replace dredge. Only small quantities of oats were produced. Considerable amounts of wheat and dredge/barley were sown: in 1311-12, 33 qtrs. wheat and 56 qtrs. 5 bs. barley; in 1313-14, 42½ qtrs. wheat and 73 qtrs. 7 bs. barley. Sample figures for receipts from sales are given below (Table 2), although the receipt from the sales of grain plummeted to only £8 7s 7¾d in 1315-16. As the table reveals, sales of wool also contributed highly to receipts. Cheddington was therefore a medium-sized demesne, smaller than Ibstone, but with a range of profit of £9 to £27 compared with the range of £8-£13 at Ibstone.

<sup>18</sup> MM 4476-4477.

TABLE 2  
Sales of Produce at Cheddington

|         | Grain |     |     | Wool |    |    |
|---------|-------|-----|-----|------|----|----|
| 1302-3  | £10   | 5s  | 5¾d | £1   | 4s | od |
| 1304-5  | £22   | 16s | 0½d | £4   | 8s | 8d |
| 1310-11 | £15   | 17s | 2¼d | £3   | 4s | od |
| 1311-12 | £19   | 3s  | 4½d | £4   | 3s | 3d |
| 1313-14 | £23   | 5s  | 9d  | £4   | 5s | od |
| 1314-15 | £16   | os  | 9¼d | £4   | os | od |

Malden, situated in Surrey, was the most remote of the College's demesnes; it was the largest in the Surrey group of manors which included also Farleigh and Leatherhead, studied by Miss Briggs.<sup>19</sup> Malden was a further medium-sized demesne, with a range of profit from £1 to £29, similar to Cheddington, but with a lower bottom range.

The estates of God's House (the Hospital of St Julian) were more disparate, comprising the large 'classical' manor of Gussage, the grange at Hickley, the small manor of Werrore with Cosham, and the property at Southampton. Of these properties, Gussage (Dorset) was the largest agricultural concern. The sown acreage at the end of the thirteenth century varied from 208 to 259½ acres, producing wheat, barley and oats as the principal crops, of which wheat and barley were largely sold. In the late thirteenth century, between 39 per cent and 66 per cent of the gross issue of wheat was sold; the proportion of barley which was sold attained 64 per cent of the gross issue in 1293-4, although none was sold when the yield fell in 1295-6. Occasionally, the sale of oats was also high. Consequently, the sale of grain accounted for as much as 77 per cent of receipts in 1295-6, 72 per cent in 1293-4, 56 per cent in 1294-5, and 47 per cent in 1297-8. Gussage, having much in common with the large 'classical' manor, had an equivalent range of profit, extending from £24 to £48.

Hickley, by contrast, had a grange-type economy. Its sown acreage in the later

thirteenth century probably reached about 130 acres, and was still a carucate in 1362. The composition of crop production altered radically in the early fourteenth century. In the same way, although the grange had functioned initially in the early 1290s as an appendage of Southampton, it later became more an independent unit, although still relying on foreign receipts of cash in many years from Southampton. From 1311, the grange developed its own flock, rather than simply being a transhumance pasture for the Southampton flock. Sales of grain were not important, except in uncharacteristic wind-fall years: £7 8s 3½d in 1299-1300, £28 3s 7½d in 1300-1, £2 14s 7½d in 1302-3. Discounting four years of loss, the *proficuum* ranged from £1 to £16.<sup>20</sup>

Although a manorial type of property, with some customary tenants, Werrore with Cosham (Isle of Wight) was hardly a more impressive concern. The accounts do not state the acreage sown, but some impression of the size of the demesne can be obtained from the figures for the demesne issue of grain. The manor also supported a small flock of sheep, but a very low level. The range of profit was higher than at Hickley, with minimum and maximum of £5 and £31.

Southampton was a totally different kind of operation. The demesne was not particularly large, producing in 1305-6, for example, 32 qtrs. 2 bs. of wheat, 6 qtrs. 7 bs. of rye, 27 qtrs. 6 bs. of barley, 2 qtrs. of beans, 3 qtrs. 6 bs. of peas, 6½ bs. of vetches, 6 qtrs. 2 bs. of dredge, and 13 qtrs. 6 bs. of oats. The yields in 1311-12 were comparable: 35½ qtrs. of wheat, 10 qtrs. 3 bs. of curall, 5 qtrs. 3 bs. of rye, 38 qtrs. of barley, 9 qtrs. 6 bs. of beans, 12 qtrs. of peas, 1 qtr. of vetch, 7 qtrs. 7 bs. of dredge, and 15 qtrs. 7 bs. of oats. More important for the

<sup>19</sup> HM Briggs (ed), *Surrey Manorial Accounts*, Surrey Record Society, XV, 1935.

<sup>20</sup> Eg Bodleian Library Queen's College Rolls 181 and 182: *De exitu stauri non respondet hic quia irrotulatur in compoto Hamton*; *De stauri non respondet hic quia in compoto Hampton*. In the same accounts, the foreign receipts from Southampton were £28 6s 6d in a total receipt of £30 0s 6d and more than £32 in a total receipt of £34 plus. Queen's Roll 230 is a *status manerii* describing the demesne in tillage as one carucate (1362).

economy of Southampton, however, was the high level of receipts from rents, usually in excess of £40. With these rents as its nucleus, the *proficuum* attained the range of £43 to £65, exceeding the level at the large 'classical' manor at Gussage.

The estate of God's House thus comprised very diverse properties, even though it was small and compact geographically. Much the same is true for the estate of the Bishop of Lichfield, where the manors were of varying size and composition. Cannock, Rugeley, and Lichfield had no demesne in hand, Lichfield, moreover, being a borough. The sown acreage at Chadshunt amounted to 293 acres; at Itchington in various years about 221, 233 and 330 acres; at Stanton a mere 77 acres. The sale of grain from Chadshunt realized £36 1s 7½d in 1306-7; from Stanton only £7 13s 10d in 1314-15; from Berkswich £3 16s 0d in 1312-13; and from Wirksworth £29 15s 2½d in 1304-5 (but conversely the purchase of grain, mainly 62 qtrs. 1½ bs. of oats, cost £14 2s 7½d there). The immense sheep flock on the Peak manor of Wirksworth yielded 999 fleeces, whilst Berkswich produced 294 fleeces. The episcopal estate thus comprised a wide variety of types of property, from the very large manors of Wirksworth and Chadshunt, to the small demesnes of Berkswich and Stanton, where the income from sales of produce was minimal in comparison with the large revenue at Wirksworth and Chadshunt. Further contrast was provided by the manors of Lichfield, Cannock and Rugeley, where there was no demesne agriculture. The *proficuum* figures varied as greatly. Unfortunately, the sporadic survival of the Lichfield accounts prevents any analysis of the changes of the *proficuum* over a period of years on any one manor. There survives only one account for each of Berkswich, Wirksworth, Chadshunt, Cannock and Stanton; two accounts for each of Lichfield, Rugeley and Turvin; and three for Itchington.

The estate of Bolton Priory has been admirably described by Kershaw.<sup>21</sup> Bolton relied mainly on granges, mostly with smallish demesnes, marked by a strong concentration on the production of oats, and, from the end of the thirteenth century, large sheep flocks. The exceptionally large granges were the home farm at Bolton, and Kildwick and Holmpton. The *proficuum* from the majority of the granges never exceeded £10, but the level at Bolton ranged from £28 to £175, Kildwick £7 to £34, and Holmpton £16 to £34. Receipts from tithes may have been an important element in some of the *proficua*.

Receipts from tithes were certainly contributory to the profit of Stubbington (Hampshire), a grange of Southwick Priory. The sown acreage of the demesne at Stubbington exceeded 150 acres in 1319-20 (152½ acres) and 1330-1 (151 acres), but was usually below this level. Substantial quantities of grain were delivered to Southwick, Stubbington acting somewhat as a home farm. Such a brief résumé of the estates which form the basis of this study, has necessarily been cursory, but will hopefully provide the context for the comments below on the figures of the *proficua*, and also help to relate the size and range of profit to the size and nature of the properties.

### III

TABLE 3  
The Range of Profit

| (Figures are rounded) |                                      |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Holywell              | £21 to £49                           |
| Ibstone               | £8 to £13                            |
| Cheddington           | £9 to £27                            |
| Malden under          | £1 to £29                            |
| Gussage               | £24 to £48                           |
| Hickley               | £1 to £16 (excluding losses)         |
| Werrore               | £5 to £31                            |
| Southampton           | £43 to £65                           |
| Bolton                | £28 to £175                          |
| Kildwick              | £7 to £34                            |
| Holmpton              | £16 to £34                           |
| Stubbington           | £69 to £119 (but only £13 in 1351-2) |

<sup>21</sup> I Kershaw, *Bolton Priory*, Oxford, 1973.

The statements of the *proficua* present a certain number of problems. The genuineness of some of the figures raises some doubts. The Lichfield figures, for example, are often rounded figures. On the other hand, figures from the other estates are not rounded, which suggests that a very real calculation had been made.

The Lichfield calculations were also undertaken for manors where the demesne was not in hand or where there was no demesne, such as Lichfield, Cannock and Rugeley. Westminster Abbey similarly produced its memoranda for manors where the demesne was at farm as well as for demesnes in hand. By contrast, Merton College does not seem to have been concerned to assess profit where there was no demesne in hand. The College's manor of Barkby had no demesne, the reeve accounting continuously from 1285-6 simply for the *redditus assise*, fines and perquisites, and expenses. None of his accounts contains a memorandum of the *proficuum*.<sup>22</sup> In the light of later *valores*, produced for estates after the leasing of demesnes, the College's attitude might seem less committed. Given the simplicity of the accounts of the reeve of Barkby, however, the Warden and Fellows may have needed no further refinement to assess the performance of the property.

The commitment of the College to the *proficuum manerii*, however, was probably less than wholehearted. The ambivalence is demonstrated by the infrequency with which the statement is recorded on the original accounts. These accounts include the memoranda most diligently in the decade 1295-1305, but before and after these years, the memoranda appear only inconsistently. Mrs Lowry, moreover, found only three statements in the accounts for the College's manor of Gamlinghay in Cambridgeshire. Denholm-Young revealed the same inconsistency on the Bigod accounts, only some thirty-five of some three hundred containing

*proficua*.<sup>23</sup> The accounts from manors of God's House record the *proficuum* consistently from 1293-4, but a decision seems to have been taken c1318-19 to discontinue the calculation.<sup>24</sup> The demesnes, however, continued to be kept in hand, although Hickley was probably farmed for a short period in the late 1360s and Gussage in the 1380s.<sup>25</sup> The transience of the *proficuum* is illustrated well by its use by Oseney Abbey. Abbot William de Sutton (1267-84) was responsible for a centrally enrolled account of c1280, which abstracted and engrossed the manorial and obedientiar accounts, including the *proficua* of the manors. Only one original manorial account thereafter contains a *proficuum*, that for Forest Hill in 1302-3 recording a profit of £4 16s 6d. Nothing further is heard of the *proficuum* except for a self-styled *proficuum* on a very much later account for Watlington: *Proficuum. Item petit Allocationes de viij carectis straminis liberatis domino Nicholao de la Bech*.<sup>26</sup>

The possibility of loss on the transactions of the manor occurs in the memoranda from some manors. Several of the granges of Beaulieu Abbey performed poorly to record a loss in 1269-70. In the early fourteenth century, the demesnes of Darley Abbey were recording a total loss of £60.<sup>27</sup> Hickley recorded losses in four years. The losses may have been associated with the susceptibility of some grange-type properties, where the absence of customary labour incurred higher costs of production, combined with the susceptibility of husbandry and no stable

<sup>23</sup> Lowry, thesis, pp 164-6; N Denholm-Young, *Seigniorial Administration in England*, Oxford, 1937, pp 120-30.

<sup>24</sup> The *responsio* on fleeces and dairy produce was also discontinued simultaneously. For the *responsio*, see J S Drew, 'Manorial Accounts of St Swithun's Priory, Winchester', *English Historical Review*, LXII, 1947, pp 20-41.

<sup>25</sup> Bodleian Library Queen's Rolls 35-38.

<sup>26</sup> H E Salter (ed), *The Cartulary of Oseney Abbey*, VI, Oxford Historical Society, CI, 1936, pp 184-207; D Postles, 'The Manorial Accounts of Oseney Abbey', *Archives*, XIV, 1979, pp 75-80; Bodleian Library d d Christ Church Oseney Roll 23 (Forest Hill); Bodleian Library d d Christ Church Oseney Roll 63 (Watlington).

<sup>27</sup> Dom S F Hockey, *The Account Book of Beaulieu Abbey*, Camden Society, 4th series, 16, 1975, pp 113, 120, 136, 145, 151, 157 and 163; Stone, 'Profit-and-Loss Accountancy . . .', p 42, for losses on wainage; RR Darlington, *The Cartulary of Darley Abbey*, I, Kendal, 1945, p 34.

<sup>22</sup> MM 6483-6548: manorial accounts of Barkby, 1285-1486.

income from rents of assize. As a result, a large foreign receipt of cash would be necessary to bail out the grange. For example, Hickley produced a loss in 1295-6 and 1296-7, when foreign receipts from Southampton amounted to £28 6s 6d and more than £32 respectively.

The disparate nature of the data makes it difficult to assess trends over time. Kershaw remarked upon the dramatic inflation of the profit of the properties of Bolton Priory in 1309 and 1315-16. Bolton employed the current actual price of grain in its calculation rather than a notional price. Consequently, three years of dearth, poor yields, and the high price of grain, resulted in high profit. Since virtually all the grain was required for internal consumption, Kershaw concluded that 'as realistic estimates the profit calculations are therefore meaningless in these cases'.<sup>28</sup> A slightly different perception, perhaps that of the canons, is that, had the demesne been leased, the canons would have been obliged to spend that amount of cash on the open market to purchase grain for its consumption. In which case, the figures for profit still represented the value of the manors and the demesnes to the house. The profit accurately reflected the importance of the supply of the household. Indeed, had the demesnes been farmed out at a fixed farm, and the price of grain been enhanced so dramatically, the canons would have been well out of pocket by having to purchase their grain. In some sense, therefore, the canons may have concluded from this lesson the advantages at that time of keeping with direct exploitation.

The effect of the years 1315-17 is also demonstrated by the *proficua* at Southampton, Cuxham and Hickley. Profit was inflated also at Cheddington, Gussage and Werrore with Cosham in 1308-11. Years of higher profits occurred at Malden in 1301-5 and 1322-3; Cheddington 1337-8 and

1343-5; Gussage 1293-4 and 1295-6; Werrore 1298-9; Hickley 1299-1302 and 1307-8. The fluctuations may have been generated internally on some manors. At Hickley, for example, the level of sales of grain was affected by grain lying unthreshed in one year and sold in the following. There seems to be a general correlation, however, between the levels of profit and the levels of prices and dearth, although the effect would have been influenced by which type of grain predominated on each property.<sup>29</sup> The difficulties of 1315-17, however, may have persuaded God's House to abandon the calculation of profit and simply renew its commitment for direct demesne exploitation.

The manor of Ibstone may be illuminating in this respect, since it may reflect a harder relationship between the *proficuum* and the leasing of demesnes. The memorandum recorded that in 1299-1300, no profit was made. In the following year (1300-1), the recorded profit was £7 17s 11<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>d. From 1303-4, the manor was placed at farm, with the *firmarii* continuing to submit accounts to Merton. The first *firmarius*, William de Mersham, the former serjeant (*serviens*), paid a farm of £10; his successor from 1313, Master William de Alburwyk, held the manor for an increased farm of £10 13s 4d. The *firmarii*, however, deducted their expenses from the full farm, with the result that the final farm to the College approximated to the *proficuum* in several previous years. For example, the actual farm after deductions in 1319-20, represented by the balance of the account of the *firmarius*, was £7 5s 7d.<sup>30</sup> The manor may also have been placed at farm in 1286-7 and 1293-4, and certainly the stock in the account for 1293-4 is described as received *de firmariis*. Then, as in 1303, the College may have based its assessment of the farm of the manor on its experience of the *proficuum*. Indeed,

<sup>28</sup> Kershaw, *Bolton Priory*, p 46, and *idem*, 'The Great Famine and Agrarian Crisis in England, 1315-1322', in R H Hilton (ed), *Peasants, Knights and Heretics*, Cambridge, 1976, pp 85-132.

<sup>29</sup> H E Hallam, 'The Climate of Eastern England 1250-1350', *Ag Hist Rev*, 32, 1984, pp 124-32, esp. pp 131-2.

<sup>30</sup> MM 5077, m 7.

Kershaw has suggested that Bolton Priory may also have related the farm of leased properties, to the recent profit calculation.<sup>31</sup> These examples, however, seem to be fairly isolated. In most other instances where the *proficuum* was calculated, no experiment was made with the leasing of properties.

The role of rents of assize in the calculation deserves some mention. Holmes remarked that the general stability of the Clare *valores* between 1329-30 and 1338-9, was largely imparted by the large element of rents, which comprised 35 to 50 per cent of the constituents of the calculation.<sup>32</sup> A suspicion must remain, however, that the profit founded on rents of assize was misleading, because of the persistence of arrears of rent. Southampton is an excellent example. Here, the major contribution of rents ensured a consistent level of the profit. Even so, the arrears of rent at Southampton attained £59 13s 2<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>d in 1303-4, had been £55 9s 10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>d in 1302-3, and expanded to £68 5s 4<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>d in

1305-6. The extent of arrears was still £44 14s 11d in 1311-12, virtually the equivalent of the annual rental. There is no evidence that God's House took arrears into account in calculating profit, and this weakness continued to detract from *valores* in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries on many estates.

#### IV

The overall impression of the statements of profit is that, in the perception of the lords, even the smallest demesne or grange was of some value in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, although losses were also recorded on some types of property. This profitability extended to manors which produced simply for internal consumption as well as those properties which operated for the supply of the market. The attempts by lords to assess profit thus fully recognized the contribution of the supply of the household. The profitability of manors, however, fluctuated widely in the course of a few years, and the range of profit was often

<sup>31</sup> MM 5062; Kershaw, *Bolton Priory*, p 46-7.

<sup>32</sup> G A Holmes, *The Estates of the Higher Nobility in Fourteenth-Century England*, Cambridge, 1957, pp 89, 108-9 and 143-7, the quotation from p 189.

TABLE 4  
The Adoption of Profit Calculations on Some Estates

|                                |                          |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Canterbury Cathedral Priory    | From c1225               |
| St Mary's Abbey, Winchester    | From c1233-4             |
| Westminster Abbey (conventual) | From 1267-8              |
| Norwich Cathedral Priory       | From c1268               |
| Southwick Priory               | From c1268               |
| Beaulieu Abbey                 | c1269-70                 |
| Beaumanor, Leics               | 1277-8                   |
| Bigod estates                  | Late thirteenth century  |
| Oseney Abbey                   | c1280                    |
| Merton College                 | From 1281-2              |
| Westminster Abbey (abbatial)   | By 1292                  |
| God's House, Southampton       | From 1293-4              |
| Bolton Priory                  | From 1295-6              |
| Lichfield episcopal estate     | From 1304-5              |
| Abbey of Bury St Edmund        | By 1323                  |
| Clare estates                  | 1329-30 and 1338-9       |
| Darley Abbey                   | Early fourteenth century |

References will be found in the text, except the following:

Westminster Abbey (conventual) — Westminster Abbey

Muniments 15286;

St Mary's Abbey, Winchester — P D A Harvey, *Manorial Records of Cuxham*, p 15.

very wide. The element of rent might provide a stabilizing influence, but could be an ambivalence given the often high level of arrears. The commitment to the calculation also looks suspect on some estates. The zenith of its use may have been limited to the 1290s and first two decades of the fourteenth century. The attempt to monitor current

profitability may have been no more than an intellectual exercise, of a transient nature. Managers, however, are always trying to refine their systems of analysis, even if some of their methods do not last the test of time. Certainly, the adoption of the calculation of the *proficuum manerii* extended beyond the largest estates.

# APPENDIX I

## Merton College Manors

| <i>Ibstone</i><br><i>MM5053-5089</i> |    |    |                  | <i>Holywell</i><br><i>MM4466-4507</i> |    |    |     | <i>Malden</i><br><i>MM4633-4662</i> |     |    |    | <i>Cheddington</i><br><i>MM5529-5599</i> |    |    |     |
|--------------------------------------|----|----|------------------|---------------------------------------|----|----|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|----|----|------------------------------------------|----|----|-----|
|                                      | £  | s  | d                |                                       | £  | s  | d   |                                     | £   | s  | d  |                                          | £  | s  | d   |
| 1279-80 <sup>i</sup>                 | 8  | 17 | 10½              | 1296-7                                | 44 | 18 | 7¾  | 1281                                | 20  | 0  | 0  | 1298-9                                   | 10 | 17 | 10¾ |
| 1296-7                               | 12 | 0  | 9¾               | 1297-8                                | 20 | 17 | 7½  | 1296-7                              | 12  | 5  | 6  | 1300-1                                   | 13 | 9  | 2½  |
| 1297-8 <sup>ii</sup>                 | 7  | 13 | 1¼               | 1298-9                                | 45 | 15 | 1½  | 1300-1                              |     | 16 | 4  | 1302-3                                   | 9  | 3  | 5   |
| 1298-9 <sup>ii</sup>                 | 9  | 13 | 4¾               | 1299-1300                             | 34 | 2  | 10½ | 1301-2                              | 24  | 17 | 10 | 1304-5                                   | 13 | 15 | 6¾  |
| 1299-1300                            | 0  | 0  | 0 <sup>iii</sup> | 1300-1                                | 28 | 0  | 0   | 1302-3                              | 29  | 2  | 3¼ | 1310-11 <sup>vi</sup>                    | 27 | 6  | 8   |
| 1300-1                               | 7  | 17 | 11¾              | 1303-4                                | 40 | 11 | 1¾  | 1303-4                              | 28  | 17 | 9½ | 1314-15                                  | 18 | 3  | 5½  |
|                                      |    |    |                  | 1304-5 <sup>iv</sup>                  | 48 | 14 | 2½  | 1304-5                              | 28  | 6  | 6¼ | 1321-2                                   | 11 | 12 | 0½  |
|                                      |    |    |                  |                                       |    |    |     | 1316-17                             | 15  | 11 | 7½ | 1323-4                                   | 18 | 18 | 4¾  |
|                                      |    |    |                  |                                       |    |    |     | 1320-1                              | ?30 | 7  | 0  | 1336-7                                   | 8  | 17 | 4   |
|                                      |    |    |                  |                                       |    |    |     | 1322-3                              | ?45 | 8  | 6¼ | 1337-8                                   | 21 | 9  | 9   |
|                                      |    |    |                  |                                       |    |    |     |                                     |     |    |    | 1343-4                                   | 24 | 12 | 8   |
|                                      |    |    |                  |                                       |    |    |     |                                     |     |    |    | 1344-5 <sup>vii</sup>                    | 20 | 0  | 0   |

\*For Cuxham, P D A Harvey, *A Medieval Oxfordshire Village*, Oxford, 1965, p 95, Table IX.

i *Et valet manerium de Ybeston' de claro cum redditu assise et consuetudinibus* . . . In subsequent years, the term is *profectus*.

ii Separate *profectus* for the mill in these years.

iii *Memorandum quod nichil de profectu isto anno set a nobis capet lx.s. preter certum redditum illius manerii*.

iv Term is *profectus* throughout, but *profectus ecclesie* (ie the rectory manor) in 1300-1. There are no statements in 1287-8, 1295-6, and in the extant accounts from 1308 to 1346.

v *Valet manerium* in 1281-2, but *profectus* thereafter. No statements in 1271-2, 1278-80, 1285-7, 1292-3, 1298-1300, 1308-9, 1311-12, 1313-14, 1317-18, 1321-2, 1329-30, 1334-5. Figures in 1320-1 and 1322-3 are cancelled.

vi *Profectus huius anni in hoc rotulo et rotulo annexo [sic] xij marcas xxj.d.* (ie two years).

vii No statement in 1297-8, 1311-13, 1315-16, 1317-21, 1322-3, 1325-6, 1328-9, 1332-5, 1339-40, 1341-3, 1345-6, 1347-8, 1349-50 and subsequent years.

# APPENDIX 2

## God's House Manors

| Southampton<br>R265-284 |    |    |    | Gussage<br>R1-39      |    |    |    | Werrore/Cosham<br>R236-256 |    |    |     | Hickley<br>R181-230   |     |    |                    |
|-------------------------|----|----|----|-----------------------|----|----|----|----------------------------|----|----|-----|-----------------------|-----|----|--------------------|
| £                       | s  | d  |    | £                     | s  | d  |    | £                          | s  | d  |     | £                     | s   | d  |                    |
| 1296-7                  | 42 | 16 | 5  | 1293-4                | 45 | 16 | 0¼ | 1293-4 <sup>vi</sup>       | 4  | 17 | 9   | 1295-6                | -14 | 3  | 4½ <sup>viii</sup> |
| 1300-1                  | 46 | 9  | 4½ | 1294-5                | 36 | 9  | 3¼ | 1294-5 <sup>vi</sup>       | 10 | 7  | 10  | 1296-7 <sup>i</sup>   | -3  | 14 | 4 <sup>viii</sup>  |
| 1305-6 <sup>ii</sup>    | 54 | 6  | 10 | 1295-6                | 47 | 5  | 9¾ | 1295-6                     | 9  | 7  | 2   | 1299-1300             | 8   | 7  | 6                  |
| 1306-7                  | 58 | 11 | 11 | 1296-7 <sup>i</sup>   | 34 | 0  | 11 | 1296-7 <sup>i</sup>        | 10 | 0  | 0   | 1300-1                | 8   | 4  | 0¾                 |
| 1311-12                 | 56 | 2  | 4  | 1297-8                | 30 | 3  | 8¾ | 1297-8                     | 8  | 16 | 10½ | 1301-2                | 13  | 3  | 4                  |
| 1314-15                 | 65 | 10 | 0  | 1299-1300             | 29 | 1  | 8½ | 1298-9                     | 24 | 3  | 2   | 1302-3                | 2   | 6  | 2                  |
| 1317-18 <sup>iii</sup>  | 62 | 0  | 0  | 1300-1                | 29 | 15 | 5¼ | 1301-2                     | 12 | 13 | 6¼  | 1303-4                | 5   | 12 | 9                  |
|                         |    |    |    | 1305-6                | 32 | 5  | 5½ | 1302-3                     | 12 | 2  | 11  | 1304-5                | 1   | 4  | 1                  |
|                         |    |    |    | 1308-9                | 47 | 16 | 6  | 1303-4                     | 10 | 19 | 0   | 1305-6                | 1   | 7  | 2                  |
|                         |    |    |    | 1309-10               | 43 | 10 | 0  | 1309-10                    | 16 | 13 | 4   | 1306-7                | 2   | 1  | 2½                 |
|                         |    |    |    | 1310-11               | 47 | 4  | 8  | 1310-11                    | 31 | 3  | 0   | 1307-8                | 11  | 8  | 8¾                 |
|                         |    |    |    | 1311-12               | 33 | 16 | 8  | 1311-12                    | 11 | 18 | 3   | 1308-9                | 2   | 15 | 6                  |
|                         |    |    |    | 1312-13 <sup>iv</sup> | 30 | 0  | 0  | 1312-13                    | 5  | 2  | 0   | 1309-10               | 4   | 0  | 7                  |
|                         |    |    |    | 1312-13 <sup>iv</sup> | 33 | 15 | 3  | 1313-14                    | 13 | 4  | 3   | 1310-11               | -1  | 11 | 0 <sup>viii</sup>  |
|                         |    |    |    | 1318-19 <sup>v</sup>  | 24 | 0  | 0  | 1314-15                    | 12 | 10 | 2   | 1311-12               | -1  | 14 | 4 <sup>viii</sup>  |
|                         |    |    |    |                       |    |    |    | 1315-16 <sup>vii</sup>     | 15 | 0  | 0   | 1312-13               | 4   | 2  | 0                  |
|                         |    |    |    |                       |    |    |    | t Edw II                   | 21 | 11 | 2   | 1313-14               | 2   | 13 | 3                  |
|                         |    |    |    |                       |    |    |    |                            |    |    |     | 1315-16               | 15  | 12 | 4                  |
|                         |    |    |    |                       |    |    |    |                            |    |    |     | 1316-17               | 1   | 16 | 0                  |
|                         |    |    |    |                       |    |    |    |                            |    |    |     | 1317-18 <sup>ix</sup> | 2   | 6  | 8                  |

R: Bodleian Library Queen's College Rolls.

i The Southampton account for this year includes statements for all the manors of the House, giving the profit from the whole estate as £83 3s 0d: *Et sic valent de claro iiij<sup>xx</sup> iij. li. iij. s.*

ii A separate figure is given for the wainage for this year: *Et sic valet Waynagium Ciiij. s. vj. d.*

iii No statements in 1298-1300, 1302-5, 1308-9 and after 1317-18.

iv Two accounts dated 6-7 Edw II.

v No statements in 1304-5, 1307-8 and after 1318-19.

vi In 1293-5 *Manerium valet*, but *proficuum* thereafter.

vii No accounts extant in 1316-18; no statement in 1318-19 and thereafter.

viii Losses in 1295-7: *Waynagium consumsit*; and in 1310-12 *Manerium consumit*.

ix No statement in 1298-9 and after 1317-18, but in 1383-4 *Valet hoc anno xliij. s. j. d.*

## APPENDIX 3

**Lichfield Episcopal Manors. *Proficua* Statements**


---

|            |         |                                                                                                  |     |      |        |
|------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|--------|
| Berkswich  | 1312-13 | Valet hoc anno ix li. xs.                                                                        | £ 9 | 10s. | od.    |
| Wirksworth | 1304-5  | Proficuum istius manerii hoc anno xiiij li. xvs.                                                 | £13 | 15s. | od.    |
| Chadshunt  | 1306-7  | Valet hoc anno Liiij li.                                                                         | £54 | 0s.  | od.    |
| Itchington | 1309-10 | Valet hoc anno xxij li. xs.                                                                      | £22 | 10s. | od.    |
| Itchington | 1310-11 | Valet hoc anno xxxvj li.                                                                         | £36 | 0s.  | od.    |
| Itchington | 1305-6  | Valet hoc anno xxx li.                                                                           | £30 | 0s.  | od.    |
| Cannock    | 1308-9  | Valet hoc anno xvij li. vjs. iiij d. per Ricardum prepositum                                     | £16 | 6s.  | 4d.    |
| Lichfield  | 1308-9  | Valethoc anno Lxxviiij li. vs. xd. ob.                                                           | £78 | 5s   | 10½d.* |
| Lichfield  | 1312-13 | Valet hoc anno Lxviiij li. xiijs. iiij d.                                                        | £68 | 13s. | 4d.*   |
| Rugeley    | 1310-11 | Valet hoc anno xviiij li. cum lxvjs. de minera ferri unde<br>respondetur in compoto de Longedon' | £18 | 0s.  | od.    |
| Rugeley    | 1313-14 | Valet hoc anno cum incremento reddituum annorum<br>precedentium xvij li.                         | £17 | 0s.  | od.    |
| Stanton    | 1314-15 | Summa valoris vij li. xs.                                                                        | £ 7 | 10s. | od.    |
| Turvin     | 1304-5  | Proficuum istius manerii ix li.                                                                  | £ 9 | 0s.  | od.    |
| Turvin     | 1308-9  | Valet xij li. iijs. iiij d.                                                                      | £12 | 3s.  | 4d.    |

---

Source: Lichfield Joint Record Office D & C Muniments N1-N28.

\*Cf. Jane Isaac, 'Two Medieval Accounts for the Town of Lichfield', *Transactions of the South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society*, XVII (1975-6), pp 59-67.

## APPENDIX 4

**Bolton Priory Clarum de maneriis**  
(Source: Chatsworth MS. 73A)

|                      | Cononley                                        | Rither                                          | How                                            | Ingthorpe                                         | Malham                              | Riddings                            |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1295-6               | 2-13-5                                          | 3-7-11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>              |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1296-7               | 4-2-4                                           | 5-8-11 <sup>2</sup>                             |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1297-8               | 2-12-9                                          |                                                 | 0 <sup>3</sup>                                 | 0 <sup>4</sup>                                    | 4-19-0                              | 3-10-10                             |
| 1298-9               | 5-4-0                                           |                                                 | 4-14-4                                         | 0 <sup>5</sup>                                    | 4-16-3                              | 6-18-4                              |
| 1299-1300            | 0 <sup>7</sup>                                  |                                                 | 3-0-7                                          | 3-8-7                                             | 6-2-7                               | 5-18-0                              |
| 1300-1 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1301-2 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1302-3 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1303-4 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1304-5 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1305-6               |                                                 | 8-0-8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>               | 2-1-7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>              | 3-14-6                                            | 3-19-9                              | 6-8-9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>   |
| 1306-7               |                                                 | 6-9-5                                           | 2-7-7                                          |                                                   | 5-13-8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>  | 5-12-11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> |
| 1307-8               |                                                 | 3-3-3                                           | 17-1                                           |                                                   | 5-10-1 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>  | 6-19-1                              |
| 1308-9               |                                                 | 8-18-2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>              | 11-5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> <sup>10</sup> | 2-18-4                                            | 7-11-5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>  | 9-9-4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>   |
| 1309-10              |                                                 | 12-9-4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>              | 6-12-0                                         | 1-12-9 <sup>12</sup>                              | 8-17-8                              | 14-6-11                             |
| 1310-11              |                                                 | 7-2-2                                           | 4-17-10                                        | 2-5-4 <sup>15</sup>                               | 4-19-2 <sup>16</sup>                | 5-14-2                              |
| 1311-12              |                                                 | 7-5-8 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub> <sup>20</sup> | 3-4-4                                          | 3-8-10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> <sup>21</sup>  | 4-3-0 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>   | 4-17-1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>  |
| 1312-13              |                                                 | 1-1-1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub> <sup>26</sup> | 18-0                                           | 0 <sup>27</sup>                                   | 3-5-6                               | 1-6-0 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>   |
| 1313-14              |                                                 | 4-14-6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>              | 3 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>                  | 0 <sup>33</sup>                                   | 1-12-0                              | 18-10                               |
| 1314-15              |                                                 | 3-18-11                                         | 3-16-7                                         | 8-1 <sup>37</sup>                                 | 2-7-5                               | 1-4-11                              |
| 1315-16              | 0 <sup>39</sup>                                 | 10-0-0 <sup>40</sup>                            | 5-8                                            | 0 <sup>41</sup>                                   | 12-2-5                              | 1-8-6 <sup>42</sup>                 |
| 1316-17              | 8-6-0 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> <sup>44</sup> | 10-0-0 <sup>45</sup>                            | 8-19-0 <sup>46</sup>                           | 13-12-8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> <sup>47</sup> | 19-3-7                              | 4-16-4                              |
| 1317-18              | 0                                               | 10-0-0 <sup>52</sup>                            | 0                                              | 0 <sup>53</sup>                                   | 2-11-8                              | 10-0-4                              |
| 1318-19 <sup>8</sup> |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1320-1 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1321-2               |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   | 14-12-5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> |                                     |
| 1322-3               |                                                 | 6-0-0 <sup>55</sup>                             |                                                |                                                   | 12-6-1                              |                                     |
| 1323-4 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |
| 1324-5 <sup>8</sup>  |                                                 |                                                 |                                                |                                                   |                                     |                                     |

<sup>1</sup> preter fenum in expensis equorum.<sup>2</sup> preter fenum.<sup>3</sup> How respondit de nichilo [sic] hoc anno.<sup>4</sup> Unkethorp nichil reddidit domi hoc anno quia totum clarum ibidem deputatur ad manerium instaurandum.<sup>5</sup> Unkethorp. Unkethorp nichil Respondit de claro hoc anno.<sup>6</sup> Kildewik. De claro de Kildewik non fit mencio hoc anno quia non fuit in manu prioris.<sup>7</sup> Conedley. De Conedley nichil hoc anno quia terre dominice dimittuntur ad firmam.<sup>8</sup> No *clarum* statement this year.<sup>9</sup> Et sciendum quod semen omnimodi bladi non subtractur.<sup>10</sup> resumit hoc anno.<sup>11</sup> De manerio de Halton ignoratur hoc anno quia compotus inde rite[?] non potuit fieri pro morte fratris I. conuersi.<sup>12</sup> preter sustentacionem omnium.<sup>13</sup> preter sustentacionem omnium.<sup>14</sup> in parte.<sup>15</sup> feno [sic] pro bidentibus.<sup>16</sup> dum taxat excepto.<sup>17</sup> Kyldewyk' nichil hoc anno quia bladam fuit domino Rogero.<sup>18</sup> Angrum respondit de claro cum Boulton ut supra quia per carucatores de Boulton fuit aratum et seminatum.<sup>19</sup> Holmeton. Respondit de claro in parte xxij. li. vj. s. viij. d. Et non plus hoc anno quia residuum in edificiis ibidem.<sup>20</sup> cum Lxj. s. vij. d. ob. de arreragiis Thome forestarii ibidem. Et non plus quia non vendebantur nisi ix acras dim. prati et residuum ad manerium in feno ad vendendum.<sup>21</sup> preter sustentacionem omnium.<sup>22</sup> preter sustentacionem omnium.<sup>23</sup> preter sustentacionem diversorum animalium.<sup>24</sup> Et non plus quia pars frumenti remanet in garbis.<sup>25</sup> With Bolton.<sup>26</sup> excepto feno.<sup>27</sup> Unckethorp respondit de claro de nichil hoc anno.<sup>28</sup> Halton respondit de claro de nichil propter mortem conuersi.<sup>29</sup> Kyldewyk respondit de claro de nichil preter de feno et cariagio forinseco.<sup>30</sup> preter cariagium.<sup>31</sup> With Bolton.

APPENDIX 4 — *continued*  
**Bolton Priory Clarum de maneriis**  
 (Source: Chatsworth MS. 73A)

| <i>Stead</i> | <i>Halton</i>         | <i>Kildwick</i>        | <i>Bolton</i>         | <i>Angrum</i>        | <i>Holmpton</i>       | <i>Appletreewick</i> |
|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 4-19-9       |                       |                        |                       |                      |                       |                      |
| 5-4-10       | 12-10-0               | 0 <sup>6</sup>         |                       |                      |                       |                      |
| 3-13-4       |                       | 3-4-11½                |                       |                      |                       |                      |
| 2-11-3       | 18-14-1½              |                        | 42-13-1½              | 6-12-0               |                       |                      |
| 2-16-8       | 12-18-7               |                        | 61-15-6               | 7-11-1½              |                       |                      |
| 3-0-1        | 16-0-6                |                        | 117-3-5½ <sup>9</sup> | 4-16-0               |                       |                      |
| 4-16-9       | ? <sup>11</sup>       |                        | 78-17-2               | 14-17-8              |                       |                      |
| 6-14-5½      | 1-0-0 <sup>13</sup>   |                        | 164-2-1               | 4-4-1                | 34-10-0 <sup>14</sup> |                      |
| 4-15-4       | 19-8-0                | 0 <sup>17</sup>        | 67-4-10               | — <sup>18</sup>      | 23-6-8 <sup>19</sup>  |                      |
| 3-2-11       | 17-15-8 <sup>22</sup> | 7-2-2 <sup>23</sup>    | 28-8-9¼ <sup>24</sup> | — <sup>25</sup>      | 16-13-4               | 2-14-8               |
| 1-7-0        | 0 <sup>28</sup>       | 0 <sup>29</sup>        | 88-0-3 <sup>30</sup>  | — <sup>31</sup>      | — <sup>32</sup>       | 1-9-4½               |
| 2-0-11       | 3-5-0                 | 0 <sup>34</sup>        | 67-17-3               | — <sup>35</sup>      | — <sup>36</sup>       | 5-2-2                |
| 13-0         | 2-11-5½ <sup>38</sup> | 7-9-2                  | 62-10-4               | 11-18-3              | 31-17-11½             | 3-11-10              |
| 4-15-2       | 4-5-0                 | 33-19-10               | 175-4-11              | 2-15-5 <sup>43</sup> | 19-15-10              | 10-9-4               |
| 4-15-3       | ? <sup>48</sup>       | 22-4-9½                | 130-18-8½             | — <sup>49</sup>      | — <sup>50</sup>       | 9-10-0 <sup>51</sup> |
| 1-19-4       | 0                     | 20-4-11½ <sup>54</sup> | 109-17-0              | 0                    | 32-11-2               | 5-14-2               |
|              |                       | 8-11-9½                | 77-16-8               |                      |                       |                      |
| 55           |                       | 9-0-0                  | 96-6-11¾              |                      |                       |                      |

<sup>32</sup> MS. blank.<sup>33</sup> Unckethorp Respondit de nichil hoc anno.<sup>34</sup> Kyldwyk de nichil preter fenum.<sup>35</sup> With Bolton.<sup>36</sup> MS. blank.<sup>37</sup> Unckethorp Respondit de claro de nichil set resumpsit viij.s. j.d.<sup>38</sup> Halton Respondit de claro de nichil set resumpsit Lj.s. v.d. ob.<sup>39</sup> Condeley respondit de claro de nichil hoc anno.<sup>40</sup> Ryth' respondit de claro per conuencionem de x.li.<sup>41</sup> Unckethorp respondit de claro de nichil hoc anno.<sup>42</sup> Ryddyngs respondit de claro de nichil set resurnit xxviij.s. vj.d.<sup>43</sup> Angrum respondit de claro de nichil set resurnit Lv.s. v.d.<sup>44</sup> Condeley respondit de claro de nichil set resumpsit in blado et denariis viij.li. vj.s. ob.<sup>45</sup> Ryth' respondit de claro per conuencionem de x.li.<sup>46</sup> But some grain sent to Halton and Angrum.<sup>47</sup> Unckethorp respondit de claro de nichil set resumpsit xij.li. xij.s. viij.d. ob.<sup>48</sup> Halton respondit de claro de nichil set resumpsit in denariis blado liberacione et roba seruientis . . . (figure illegible).<sup>49</sup> MS. blank.<sup>50</sup> MS. blank.<sup>51</sup> respondit de claro per conuencionem ix.li. x.s.<sup>52</sup> ex conuencione.<sup>53</sup> nichil set multum resumpsit.<sup>54</sup> preter vij.li. xvij.d. solutos pro factura unius noue grangie.<sup>55</sup> Rither and Stead conjointly £6.

NB. From 1305-6, the Priory began to give a *Summa* of the profit of all granges, as follows:

1305-6 £94 13s. 10½d; 1306-7 left blank; 1308-9 left blank; 1309-10 left blank; 1310-11 £139 13s 6d; 1312-13 left blank; 1313-14 £85 11s 0d In 1310-11, 1311-12, 1312-13, 1313-14, 1316-17, the statement is qualified by the following:

De semine vero nec de conduccione nec de valore terre non fit mencio (fos. 237v, 264v, 297v, 325v, 394v).

APPENDIX 4 — *continued*

Source: Chatsworth MS 73A, fos. 27r, 31v-32r

The *Clarum* for 1295-6 and 1296-7 for Cononley and Rither is elaborated in some detail, and reflects the principles of the calculation.

- 1295-6. (Cononley) Memorandum quod manerium de Conedley Respondit hoc anno de xiiij quarteriis auene precium quarterii ijs. vjd. Et de Ls. in denariis. Et de vjs. jd. in fossis factis in diuersis locis. De quibus subtrauntur xxxvs. pro iij quarteriis dim. frumenti receptis de decima de Carleton ad semen. Et sic respondit manerium hoc anno de claro de Liijs. vd.  
(Rither) Memorandum quod manerium de Conodley [sic] respondit hoc anno de xij quarteriis dim. auene precium quarterii xxd. Et de xlvij. jd. ob. in denariis liberatis.  
Summa Lxvijs. xjd. ob. Preter fenum in expensis equorum.
- 1296-7. Clarum de maneriis.  
Rither. Memorandum quod manerium de Rithert respondit hoc anno de claro De xj quarteriis frumenti precium quarterii iij. vij. jd. Et de vj bus. siliginis precium bus. vjd. Et de viij quarteriis auene precium quarterii xxd. Et de xxxixs. xjd. in denariis.  
Summa de claro Cviijs. xjd. preter fenum.  
Conodley. Manerium de Conodley respondit hoc anno de claro De vj quarteriis frumenti precium quarterii iij. vij. jd. Et de iij quarteriis dim. siliginis precium quarterii iij. iij. jd. Et de xij quarteriis auene precium quarterii xvij. jd. Et de xx plaustratis feni precium plaustrate vjd. Et de xvijs. iij. jd. in denariis liberatis.  
Summa iij li. ijs. iij. jd.

Until 1299-1300, the *Clarum* included a full list of the constituents and deductions. From 1300-5, there is no *Clarum* section. When the *Clarum* reappears in 1305-6, it is a simple statement, omitting the constituents, such as:

Manerium de Boulton Respondit de Claro hoc anno de xlij li. xiijs. jd. ob. (fo. 125r).

The single exception is Holmpton from 1314-17 (fos. 354v, 374v, 394r). The *Clarum* was omitted completely in 1318-19, 1320-1, 1323-4 and 1324-5.

## APPENDIX 5

## Stubbington Figures.

## Manor of Southwick Priory

Source: Winchester College Muniments

15376-15387

|        |                                                                                                                                                                                       |         |                                                                                                  |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1268   | Valet hoc anno manerium in omnimodis exitibus deductis necessariis expensis iij <sup>xx</sup> iij libras vij s jd qua. Cum tota decima infra pontem.                                  | ?1281   | Et valet in hoc anno iij <sup>xx</sup> xiiij li. ixd. ob.                                        |
| 1268-9 | Et valet hoc anno manerium deductis expensis necessariis in omnimodis expensis cum tota Decima infra Portesbrig' C libras vs viij. ob.                                                | 1287-8  | Valet hoc anno manerium de Stubinton' deductis expensis necessariis Lxviij libras xvij. ixd. ob. |
| 1270   | Et valet hoc anno manerium deductis omnimodis expensis necessariis cum omnimodis Exitibus* C et vij libras ij sol. iij. ob.<br>*expensis necessariis cancelled, Exitibus superscript. | 1319-20 | Et valet manerium hoc anno Lxxix li. vs. jd.                                                     |
|        |                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1330-1  | Et valet manerium hoc anno Cxix li. vs.                                                          |
|        |                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1344-5  | Et valet manerium hoc anno Lxxij li. viijs. Ideo minus pro defectu bladi hoc anno.               |
|        |                                                                                                                                                                                       | 1351-2  | Valor hoc anno xx marce. Ideo minus causa pestilencie.                                           |
|        |                                                                                                                                                                                       | c1405   | Valor huius manerii hoc anno cum decimis personatus. Lxxix. li. xij. s. vij. d.                  |

(This broken series of accounts runs from c1247 to the early fifteenth century. The survival of the earliest accounts, c1247 to 1268, is quite fair, but the *valor* does

not appear on the accounts until 1268. The series thereafter is very sporadic.)