

Lost Rents, Vacant Holdings and the Contraction of Peasant Cultivation after the Black Death*

By JAN TITOW

Abstract

In the post-Black Death Winchester account rolls the information on lost rents and vacant holdings is unusually detailed. This enables us to see how the recorded totals were computed; the results are striking. Careful analysis of the information provided makes it clear that the recorded totals are not what they are said to be. In fact, they represent the balance between the lost rents *sensu stricto* and any income which was obtained from the vacant holdings in other ways. Furthermore, this paper argues that the money obtained from vacant holdings came from the peasants who, therefore, must have exploited them in some profitable way and, thus, such holdings cannot be automatically equated with unused land. Apart from telling its own story, the Winchester evidence may have a lesson for other estates as well: it provides a warning that reliance on the recorded totals alone could be greatly misleading, for the ostensible situation with regard to lost rents and vacant holdings on such estates could be as far removed from the actual reality as it is for the Winchester estates.

IN the account rolls of great estates the Black Death has left in its wake a long record of lost rents and vacant holdings. Both are clearly of considerable importance in the narrower context of landlords' economy, but the phenomenon of vacant holdings raises questions of much wider general significance since such holdings are commonly seen by historians as land abandoned by the peasantry, and their presence in manorial accounts is widely regarded as evidence of contracting peasant cultivation. However, the account rolls of the bishopric of Winchester¹ show that there is danger in accepting such evidence at its face value. Because of their habit, at least from the early fourteenth century onwards, of including a great deal of gratuitous explanations the Winchester accounts show, on careful analysis, that the recorded totals of lost rents and vacant holdings are neither a true reflection of the total value of lost

rents, nor a valid measure of the true extent of the peasants' withdrawal from agriculture.

It is crucial for the proper understanding of the discussion which follows to have a clear picture of how the relevant information is recorded in the manorial accounts. Whenever a holding fell vacant it was invariably described as being in the lord's hands (*in manu domini*), and its rent was lost to the landlord; this remained so until the holding was let again. The information on vacant holdings and lost rents is recorded in the section headed *Lost Rents* (*Defectus Redditus*) which, in the Winchester accounts, is placed at the beginning of each manor's account as follows:

Rent of Assize (<i>Redditus Assisus</i>)	£ s d
Acquittance of Rent	£ s d
Lost Rents (<i>Defectus Redditus</i>)	£ s d

Total of Acquittances and Lost Rents	£ s d
Rent Remaining	£ s d

On some estates, acquittances and lost

*I am most grateful to Professor Ian Kershaw for his generous encouragement and helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

¹Hampshire Record Office, Eccl. II/159270, 271, 272, and so on. Thereafter only the final reference number is quoted.

rents are placed among the expenses, others follow the Winchester practice, which seems to me the more logical. The Winchester accounts always list vacant holdings one by one but elsewhere the loss can be recorded as a total sum only, particularly on those estates which follow the practice of putting it in the expenses. In the Winchester accounts, prior to the Black Death, there is only one section for lost rents, which is quite unambiguous, and the holdings involved usually represent peasant land which had been incorporated into the demesne or the parks. From the Black Death onwards, the holdings which became vacant through the death of the incumbent in the plague, and which were not taken up by another tenant, are grouped on their own under the heading: *Loss of Rent due to Pestilence*, though holdings occasionally vacated for other reasons are also included in this section. After 1361/2, vacancies caused by the plague are usually listed in two separate sections as *Loss of Rent due to the First Pestilence* and *Loss of Rent due to the Second Pestilence*, though this distinction is ignored if the number of holdings lost in the second outbreak was insignificant. This arrangement is adhered to virtually for ever, with each current year being numbered consecutively from the year of the outbreak: for example, in the year 1399/1400 *Loss of Rent due to the First Pestilence* is said to be in its fifty-second year and *Loss of Rent due to the Second Pestilence* is said to be in its thirty-ninth year. In this paper any discussion of *Lost Rents* entries refers exclusively to the Winchester accounts and to the *Loss of Rent due to the Pestilence* sections only.

If the arguments in the rest of this paper are to be followed it is crucial to have a clear understanding of how the individual entries in the *Lost Rents* section are presented. Three variants are possible:

i) The totality of the rent from a named

holding is recorded as lost and the sum involved is stated.

ii) Only the stated part of the full value of the rent is recorded as lost because a specified sum of money, equal to the remainder of the rent, has been 'raised' (*levatur de exitu*) from the vacant holding.

iii) An explicit statement is made to the effect that no loss of rent is being recorded from a vacant holding because the full value of the lost rent was recovered from the income raised from it. If the income raised from the holding was greater than the full value of the rent, then the excess income was entered, as income over and above the rent, in a separate section in the account under the heading: *Issue of the Holdings in the Lord's Hands due to Pestilence* (*Exitus Terrarum in manu Domini per Pestilenciam*).²

It is imperative to notice that a crucial conceptual change has occurred between variant one on the one hand and variants two and three on the other. All three variants talk of *rents*, but variants two and three while talking of *rents* are actually concerned with *income*. In all these three instances the tenant was dead, the holdings were in the hands of the landlord, and *no rent at all* was coming from them. The fact that the customary rent was lost in its totality is as true of variant one as it is of variants two and three, the difference being that in the last two instances the *value* of

² This system of accounting persisted in the accounts of the bishopric of Winchester to the end of the pontificate of William of Wykeham. The first extant account of his successor Henry Beaufort, that for his second year 1405/6 (159409), abandoned it in favour of a more realistic method of recording the full value of lost rents in the *Lost Rents* section and the full value of any income raised from vacant holdings in the *Issue of Vacant Holdings* section. The difference can best be appreciated on a concrete example. At Marwell, the position in respect of one virgate, once of Peter atte Broke, was recorded as follows. Prior to 1405, *no loss* of the four shillings of rent from this holding was recorded in the *Lost Rents* section, because it had been raised from the holding. The *Issue of Vacant Holdings* section recorded an income of four shillings as the issue of the holding over and above the rent. After 1405, the *Lost Rents* section recorded the loss of four shillings of rent from the same holding, and the *Issue of Vacant Holdings* section recorded a 'raised' income of eight shillings. In each case the received income was four shillings but the latter method is free of the ambiguities of the earlier practice.

TABLE 1
Trends in lost rents, 1350-1383

Year	Recorded value of Defectus Redditus £ s d	Full value of lost rents of assize £ s d	Income raised from vacant holdings £ s d	Net change + / - £ s d
1350/1	103 18 2	187 6 8 ³ / ₄	96 19 3	-90 7 5 ³ / ₄
1355/6	42 4 0 ³ / ₄	100 6 10 ¹ / ₂	77 15 8	-22 11 2 ¹ / ₂
1364/5	40 12 0 ¹ / ₂	104 19 3 ¹ / ₂	91 8 10	-13 10 5
1382/3	31 19 4 ¹ / ₂	104 3 6 ¹ / ₂	116 2 6 ¹ / ₂	+11 9 2

the lost rent was recovered, in part or in full, in other ways, and the recorded figure is the *balance* between the value of the lost rent and the income raised from the holding, though even that may not be a full balance since any excess income is recorded elsewhere.

It will be seen from this that we must distinguish clearly – as the documents do not – between two overlapping concepts: rents *sensu stricto*, and income obtained from the same holdings in other ways. When the figures recorded in the Winchester accounts are rearranged to take this distinction into account it becomes clear that the loss of rent from vacant holdings was greater than the recorded totals indicate, while the loss of income to the landlord from the same holdings³ was much smaller; in fact, on some manors, cash income from vacant holdings was substantially greater than the cash previously obtained from them as rent. As time went on, this trend tended to be more pronounced as Table 1 illustrates.⁴

There is one other pair of overlapping concepts which can easily be confused but which must be clearly distinguished, though this is the fault of historians rather than of the documents themselves: the distinction between vacant holdings and land lying idle. If it can be shown that vacant holdings were producing revenue for the landlord, then, they cannot be regarded as land withdrawn from agricul-

ture (either in its arable or its pastoral aspect). If it can further be shown that the revenue raised from them had *not* been produced by the landlord himself, then it must follow that it had been produced by the peasants, and that the land represented by vacant holdings producing such revenue must have been, in some way, profitably exploited by them, in which case, such land cannot be regarded as land abandoned by the peasantry. It is the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that the latter was, indeed, the case. Re-examining the Winchester data with this problem in mind yields interesting results. However, before I proceed with this argument let us examine the scale of the problem.

The outbreak of plague in 1348/9 produced a large number of vacancies on all Winchester manors but many of them were ephemeral. By about 1355 the position stabilized; however, there is a striking difference in the number of vacant holdings between manor and manor. On some manors, most of the holdings vacated through the death of the incumbent were taken up almost at once creating no permanent, or semi-permanent, residue of vacant holdings; on other manors, a more or less permanent core of such holdings was created. For example, populous manors such as Waltham, Meon or Taunton had very few long-term vacancies, while Downton, Ivinghoe or Witney had a large number of them. Such differences, incidentally, *must not* be regarded as a measure of different

³ This ignores additional loss of income such as loss of entry fines and the value of labour services.

⁴ See Appendices 1-4 for full details.

levels of mortality on different manors. The wording of entry fines and the evidence of heriots show conclusively that manors such as Waltham, Meon or Taunton had very high levels of mortality; if anything, the presence of such vacancies seems to be a measure of the reluctance of the local peasantry to take up customary holdings on traditional basis.

The second outbreak of plague in 1361/2 added only marginally to the vacant holdings already there, though it does seem to have imparted a greater degree of permanency to them and may have caused temporary problems on some manors.⁵ Looking ahead into the century confirms the impression of little significant change; individual manors do show some movement up and down but, broadly speaking, the overall position remained largely unchanged. For example, if one looks at the 1381/2 account, manors without vacancies in 1365 remained without them. A few manors reduced their number slightly: Adderbury, for example, lost all its seven vacancies in 1372 (the original four plus three surrenders in 1369) by adopting the practice of farming them out. Only four manors increased their vacancies significantly: Sutton from thirteen in 1365 to twenty-five, Wargrave from forty-six in 1365 to seventy-six, Wycombe from thirty in 1365 to forty-six, and Ivinghoe from twelve in 1365 to thirty-two. Such changes were achieved not through a sudden rush of mortalities in any particular year but through a progressive erosion of rent-of-assize tenancies through a mixture of deaths and surrenders, the latter often accompanied by an explicit explanation that the tenant had given them up because of his *inopia*, or *impotencia*. The overall position with regard to vacant holdings on the Winchester estates in the second half of the fourteenth century has been summarized in Table 2.⁶

As already indicated, for the equation of

TABLE 2
Trends in vacant holdings, 1350-1383

Year	Number of vacant holdings		Estimated	
	standard	irregular	total	acreage
1350/1	618	335 + *	953 +	12,742
1355/6	348	133 +	481 +	7092
1364/5	400	109 +	509 +	8156
1382/3	452	115 +	567 +	8609

* An unspecified but substantial number of vacant assarts at Witney must be added to this total. Their cumulative acreage is known.

vacant holdings with the abandonment of peasant cultivation to be valid, it must be shown that the income obtained from such holdings was produced by the landlord himself. Can it be shown to have been so? Income obtained from vacant holdings in the Winchester account rolls is invariably described as income 'raised' from them (*levatur de exitu*). The first, purely instinctive reaction is to take that phrase at its face value and to assume that what is involved here is the produce of these holdings, and that it was produced, and disposed of, by the landlord himself. This impression is strengthened by statements recorded against some vacant holdings to the effect that no offsetting income could be raised because there was nothing from which it could be raised (*nichil potest inde levare*), or that this was so for lack of purchasers (*pro defectu emptorum*). The fact that there is hardly ever any mention of any intermediaries between the landlord and the 'raising' of the income from the vacant holdings⁷ also tends to strengthen this impression. Nevertheless, on reflection, the notion that the landlord was directly involved in producing such income must be rejected. In the documents the term *exitus* is a rather nebulous concept. This is why I am reluctant to render it as 'produce', since this could introduce an a priori bias in favour of sale of produce into the discussion. In the account rolls the word *exitus* can be used to indicate any-

⁵ For example, 159372, Witney (1362/3), *Exitus Manerii: de exitu 41 virgatarum terre in manu domini ultra certum redditum nichil hoc anno*.

⁶ See Appendices 1-4 for full details.

⁷ A notable exception to this rule is discussed on p 105 below.

thing saleable and to include not only produce in the strict sense of the word but also sales of rights (for example, permission to graze animals on landlord's land) and the like; some modern studies translate it as 'issue' but in this context such rendering seems to be evasive, though I have retained it for the sectional headings.

There are only three possible ways in which vacant holdings could have produced revenue:

- i) Asset-stripping: namely, the sale of trees, hedges, old timber from dilapidated buildings, and the like.
- ii) Pastoral activity: namely, using the holdings as rough grazing land.
- iii) Sale of produce grown on the land: of crops grown in the fields, or the produce of gardens or orchards of the cottages, or messuages, attached to the standard holdings, or held on their own.

The first possibility applies only to the landlord and not to the peasants, the other two are open to both. In theory it would have been quite possible for the landlord to exploit the vacant holdings directly and record the income, obtained from the produce sold, in the *Lost Rents* section as a sum deducted from the value of the lost rent, or, in the *Issue of Vacant Holdings* section whenever there was an excess of income over rent. In practice, we can say with complete assurance that such was not the case. Goods sold off the vacant holdings seem to be regarded in the documents as a special case and they are invariably (so far as I can see) recorded one by one either in the *Issue of the Manor* section, or in the *Issue of Vacant Holdings* section, as a separate entity from the 'income raised', even when they emanate from the same holdings. In any case such instances of asset-stripping cannot possibly account for the large sums regularly raised from vacant holdings though they can be substantial when they occasion-

ally occur.⁸ It is also possible for holdings, when they first fell vacant, to have done so with their crops still standing; I have not come across such entries in connection with vacant holdings but only in connection with holdings seized by the landlord; however, when that happens the documents usually refer to such crops as *vestura tenementi X* and record them separately.

As for pastoral activity, there are numerous entries on various manors to the effect that a vacant holding had produced no income to offset the loss of rent because the landlord used it to graze his animals on, or that the income raised was no bigger for the same reason.⁹ Perhaps the most striking example of this comes from the account for the manor of Ivinghoe for the year 1364/5 in which all the vacant standard holdings returned a full loss of rent because, on the instruction of the lord steward, a flock of 250 sheep was distributed among them to graze on the land.¹⁰ This situation continued until 1369, the year in which the manorial flock of sheep was greatly reduced by an animal epidemic (*in communi morina*), and the manor then reverted to its usual practice of 'raising' an income from the vacant holdings.¹¹ Such

⁸ For example, 159360, Downton (1350/1), *Exitus Terrarum per Pestilenciam*: contains 21 entries *de veteri merento 1 domus [2 dom. twice] in tenemento X* totalling £5 15s 6d. This is, of course, an extreme case due to the sudden influx of vacant holdings in the wake of the greatest outbreak of the plague ever. Normally there are only occasional entries, if at all.

⁹ For example, 159375, Cheriton (1364/5), *Defectus per Primam Pestilenciam*: in defectu redditus 1 virgate terre Nicholai Lynche 5s quia nichil levatur de exitu eo quod reservatur pro agnis domini. 159389, Mardon (1382/3), *Defectus Redditus per Pestilenciam*: in defectu redditus ferlingate terre native et 3 acranum terre purpresture que quondam fuerunt Johannis Knight in Northistendene eo quod depasc. cum multonibus domini 3s 5d. 159375, Twyford (1364/5), *Defectus per Primam Pestilenciam*: in defectu redditus 54 acranum terre purpresture que fuerunt Johannis Sterye per annum 27s propter quem decasum Dominus levavit 1 faldam multonum ibidem pasc. 159389, Culham in Wargrave (1382/3), *Defectus Redditus*: in defectu redditus 1 placie et dimidie virgate terre native quondam Cecilie Neel vocatur hynelond in manus domini existencium pro defectu emptorum et pastura eiusdem depasc. cum averiis domini et prata falcant, ad opus domini.

¹⁰ 159375, Ivinghoe, *Defectus Redditus per Pestilenciam*: in defectu redditus 1 messuagii et dimidie virgate terre native quondam Jacobi Fourhous in manu domini per annum 25 6d et dominus habet 250 multones de nova ordinatione emptos in pastura tenementi predicti et in aliis tenementis infrascriptis per ordinationem Seneschalli loco redditu eorundem tenementorum hoc anno primo.

¹¹ 159385.

activity by the landlord is thus cited to explain why there had been no income to offset the loss of rent, so it cannot explain the presence of such income. There are only two exceptions to this rule but they clearly represent a change in accounting practices rather than a real change in the actual situation. The account for 1355/6 for the manor of Crawley abandons the normal practice of recording full loss of rent for holdings grazed by the landlord's animals and for a single holding only, that of one messuage, one virgate and twenty-two acres of purpresture previously held by Robert Wodecok, records it as *no loss of rent* because it was raised 'as in pasture sold for the lord's sheep' with a corresponding entry for the purchase of that pasture in the expenditure section of the account to balance the books.¹² This continued until 1378¹³ when the manor reverted to the old accounting practice. The second instance comes from the manor of Fareham, again in respect of one holding only. The account for the year 1356/7 records no loss of rent from three crofts of purpresture, containing in all fifteen acres, previously held by John Scot, because it was raised 'as in pasture sold for the lord's beasts'.¹⁴ As at Crawley there was a corresponding entry in the expenditure section of the account but, unlike Crawley, Fareham did not subsequently revert to the previous, and normal, practice in respect of this holding. For the sake of consistency I have re-recorded these entries in the tables and appendices, whenever appropriate, in

the usual way, adding the full value of lost rent to the *Lost Rents* total and subtracting it from the calculation of the income recovered from the vacant holdings.

In so far as arable cultivation is concerned we can say with equal assurance that it was not the landlord's effort which raised the income recorded as offsetting the loss of rent. At least three separate lines of argument converge to support this contention: the way itself in which income from vacant holdings was habitually recorded, the striking regularity of such income, and the occasional presence (very rare it must be admitted) of an explicit intermediary between a vacant holding and the *exitus* received from it by the landlord.

To record income from the landlord's own arable exploitation of the vacant holdings as income 'raised' from them would run contrary to well established accounting practices in use on the Winchester estates for recording grain produced by the landlord himself. Prior to 1349, whenever the landlord took into his own cultivation any of the peasant holdings this was accounted for in the *Issue of the Grange* section, incorporated into the demesne acreage and produce, and the grain sold was included with the rest of demesne grain in the *Sales of Grain* section of the account.¹⁵ There is no

¹² 159366, Crawley, *Defectus per Pestilenciam*: de 215 redditus 1 messuagii 1 virgate terre et 22 acrarum purpresture que fuerunt Roberti Wodecote nichil quia levantur de exitu ut in pastura vendita pro bidentibus domini hoc anno. Custus Bercarie: in pastura de terra de Wodecote emptia pro bidentibus domini 215 hoc anno pro defectu pasture et propter siccitatem in estate.

¹³ 159385.

¹⁴ 159367, Fareham, *Defectus per Pestilenciam*: de 125 7d ob. de redditu 3 croftiarum purpresture continentium 15 acras in decenna de Pokesole que fuerunt Johannis [Scot] adhuc remanentium in manus domini per obitum eiusdem in pestilencia nichil hoc anno quia levantur de exitu ut in pastura vendita pro averiis domini. Custus Domorum et Necessarye: in pastura emptia in 3 croftis purpresture Johannis Scot existentibus in manus domini hoc anno pro averiis domini 125 7d ob.

¹⁵ For example, 159364, Hambledon (1353/4), *Defectus per Pestilenciam*: in defectu 1 messuagii et 10 acrarum terre ... que fuerunt Rogeri Coupere 20d quia seminatur cum dominico et pastura in gardino depasc. cum vitulis domini. Ibidem: in defectu 1 messuagii et 10 acrarum terre in Hamledona que fuerunt Matilde le Frind 20d quia melior pars seminatur cum dominico. [Exitus Grangie includes sowing in terra nativa in manus domini exist. without specifying the holdings involved]. 159360, Taunton, Holwey (1350/1), *Defectus per Pestilenciam*: in defectu redditus 10 acrarum et dimidie terre in la Wynard ... que fuerunt Willelmi Bacon rem. in manus domini ... 155 9d quia seminatur in dominico nichil inde levatur. [Exitus Grangie under Oats lists parva Wynard que nuper fuerit Willelmi Bacon et continet 11 acras]. 159402, Ivinghoe (1395/6) *Defectus Redditi Per Pestilenciam*: in defectu redditus 1 messuagii et 1 virgate terre native quondam Willelmi Havecombe in manus domini existentium per annum 55 pro defectu emptorum et quia terra eiusdem seminabatur ad opus domini. 159379, Waltham in Wargrave (1369/70), *Defectus Redditi de defectu redditus 10d ob. 1 akerlond(i) quondam Agnetis Webbe existentis in manus domini per mortem eiusdem in pestilencia nichil quia levantur de exitu et de eo quod ulterius est respondet inferius in exitu manerii. Exitus Manerii: et de 25 1d ob. de exitu 1 akerlond(i) quondam Agnetis Webbe existentis in manus domini ultra certum redditum preter 2 acras seminat as cum bladis domini. Exitus Grangie, Frumentum: item in semine 2 acrarum sicut jacent in camp(o) de tenemento quondam Agnetis Webbe.*

reason to believe that such long-established practice would have been altered had the vacant holdings been incorporated into the landlord's production; clearly, they were not, and that is why any income raised from them was accounted for in a different way. The inescapable conclusion is that the income used to offset the lost rents came from the peasants and was raised by their own effort. It was not the product of the landlord's own cultivation but money levied on those who were, in some way, exploiting these holdings, with the landlord merely taking his cut from the profits of their labour.

A strong support for this view comes from the recorded figures themselves, particularly those recorded as income raised over and above the value of the rent. On some manors with vacant holdings the landlord had great difficulty in raising sufficient income to cover the lost rents, yet alone to produce excess income, but on a large number of manors a substantial number of vacant holdings was regularly producing income in excess of the lost rents. For the purpose of this study I have concentrated attention primarily on the period 1350 to 1370¹⁶ though, on most manors with excess income, the latter begins to appear regularly only from about 1354 onwards and continues beyond 1370. Examination of payments from individual holdings in the *Issue of Vacant Holdings* section of the accounts, on manors with a substantial number of vacant holdings producing income in excess of the value of their rents, reveals that such payments often remained constant from year to year. If *exitus* really did represent produce grown and sold by the landlord himself one would expect the recorded payments to fluctuate from holding to holding and year to year. Thus, uniform returns for the same holdings from year to year must indicate a *charge* and not a sale; since the landlord

would clearly not have imposed charges upon himself these payments must have come from the peasants. But since, by definition, no charges could be imposed on holdings for which no one was responsible somebody must have in fact been responsible for them, even though this is not immediately apparent from the wording of the relevant entries themselves.

If the above argument is correct, then the most explicit confirmation of the view that the phrase *levatur de exitu* represents a charge levied on whoever took on a vacant holding comes from the manor of Witney. Excess income over and above the customary value of rents is there recorded as one total in the *Issue of the Manor* section of the account in the form: '(so many shillings) as issue of (so many) virgates ... in the hands of the lord, over and above their rent ...', with the number of shillings corresponding exactly to the number of virgates; from 1365 onwards it is often explicitly stated that the rate was 12d per virgate.¹⁷ On other manors the regular pattern of payments is disclosed only by scrutinizing payments from individual holdings over a period of time. At Cheriton, for example, between 1356 and 1370,¹⁸ the same sums of money were obtained from each holding with monotonous regularity with only an occasional change in the rate of payment from a few holdings.¹⁹ A similar situation obtained on the two other manors of the same bailiwick with a regular presence of excess income: Alresford and Sutton.

However, if fixed payments must represent a *charge*, the reverse is not necessarily true; fluctuating value of excess income could indicate no more than the landlord's ability to charge different sums in different circumstances from those who took them

¹⁷ For example, 159383, Witney (1372/3), *Exitus Manerii: 29s de exitu 29 virgatarum terre ... in manus domini existencium ultra certum redditum et tuthingpeny earundem superius et inferius capt. hoc anno videlicet de qualibet virgata terre 12d ...*

¹⁸ Accounts 159366 to 159379.

¹⁹ See Appendix 5.

¹⁶ Accounts 159359 to 159379.

on. We must also beware of relying on the annual totals alone since fluctuating annual totals of excess income on individual manors, *on their own*, can be misleading; they often conceal a great deal of regularity in payments from individual holdings. Downton, a manor with the longest and most persistent listings of vacant holdings, illustrates this point rather well. Close scrutiny of individual entries in the *Issue of Vacant Holdings* section, over a period of years, reveals the same rates of excess income being returned year after year. The same general argument applies also to manors where no excess income was recorded but where many holdings regularly 'raised' the exact value of their rents, since this too is tantamount to a fixed charge.

Figures from the manor of Wargrave²⁰ can also be used to illustrate the same point, and the example is worth quoting because the manor also provides a couple of those rare pieces of additional information relevant to this argument. Appendix 6 reveals the position between 1356 and 1370. Excess income received there from standard holdings shows considerable fluctuations in the total amount for the manor, but examination of individual entries for each year discloses what can only be called 'variable regularity' in individual payments, implying a negotiated 'charge' levied on somebody utilizing the land rather than the sale of produce from it by the landlord himself. This is confirmed by two pieces of incidental information in the account for 1369/70,²¹ which explain the low value of the *exitus* recorded against two of the listed holdings by actually mentioning a payer and explaining that he had abandoned the holding in the course of the year and 'no one could be found to take on the land'. The phrase used here is *illam terram conducere voluit*; a deliberate

choice of a verb, it would seem, to distinguish the transaction from a lease (*traditur ad firmam*) on the one hand, and the traditional customary renting (*pro eam finivit*) on the other. More significantly, both entries explicitly state that the payer held the holding *ad firmam*, the phrase in this instance implying, I think, exactly what the word literally means: a 'firm' (that is, a fixed) payment.

Such instances of the regularity of the sums recorded as the *exitus* of the vacant holdings are not isolated cases. All the manors with long-term vacancies, and the presence of excess income, display some degree of regularity in excess payments; what varies is their position on the scale of regularity, sometimes near the Witney and Cheriton end of it, sometimes nearer the Wargrave end of it.

Another glimpse of what can hide behind the ubiquitous phrase *levatur de exitu* is offered by one entry each from the manors of Sutton and Alresford, both in the same bailiwick. The account for Sutton for 1354/5 records excess income from vacant holdings as a single total only, as follows: '21 shillings as issue of certain lands in the hands of the lord in recompense for the labour services due from them'.²² The next account, for 1355/6, has a separate section for excess income and lists eight holdings individually whose total adds up to the same 21 shillings, but without any additional comment.²³ The 1355/6 account for Alresford²⁴ repeats the same statement which appeared in the account for Sutton in the previous year. Clearly, what we have here is a payment, from whoever took on the land, perceived by the landlord as a compensation for the loss of labour services. That the payment is not recorded as commutation of services

²⁰ The tabulated figures are those for the village of Wargrave itself and not for the composite manor as a whole.

²¹ 159379; see Appendix 6.

²² 159365, Sutton, *Exitus Manerii*: de 21s de exitu quantundem terrarum in manu domini existentium in recompens(ationem) operum de eisdem debitum sic concess. per Ballivum hoc anno.

²³ 159366, Sutton, *Exitus Manerii*.

²⁴ 159366, Alresford, *Exitus Manerii*.

tends to emphasize the fact that no proper tenancy was regarded as having been established in respect of the holdings in question.

Finally, the last, and in a way the most explicit, confirmation that the money raised from the vacant holdings apparently by the landlord himself was in fact a payment made by the peasants comes from the manor of Twyford/Marwell.²⁵ On that manor, income from vacant holdings over and above the rent was at first recorded in the *Issue of the Manor* section of the account and described by the usual phrase as so many shillings and pence 'as issue of the holding previously of X (*de exitu tenementi quondam X*)'. However, from 1372 onwards, income over and above the value of the rent began to be recorded in a separate paragraph of its own, under the usual heading: *Issue of Vacant Holdings*, but with a significantly altered phrasing for the individual entries. Each entry is recorded as a payment from a named payer paid 'as issue of the holding previously of X', with an additional explanation that the holding was handed over (*dimissum*) to the payer until someone came forward to pay a fine for it and to hold it according to ancient custom.²⁶ We have here, for the first time, a regular and explicit interposition of an intermediary between the landlord receiving revenue from a vacant holding, and the holding producing it. Subsequent accounts show clearly that many of the peasants at Twyford/Marwell who made payments for vacant holdings, recorded as 'issue' of such holdings, did so year in year out and at the same rate. Effectively, this was a tenancy of a sort but the arrangement

seems not to have been formally recognized as such.

If the interpretation is correct, that the *exitus* of vacant holdings represents money paid to the landlord rather than income raised from the sale of produce grown by himself, we must ask the question of *how* the peasants came to exploit the holdings which are persistently described as being 'in the hands of the lord', and in what way did they obtain an income from such land. We are in the position to give a firm answer to the first of these questions. But before we proceed with the argument any further, let us recapitulate briefly what we know about vacant holdings and of the payments described as income 'raised' from them. To do so we must turn to the section in which income raised over and above the value of rents was recorded, for it is here that a few available clues as to their nature are to be found. The very fact that these payments are grouped on their own indicates clearly that they are intentionally contrasted to the two traditional, and hitherto the *only*, ways in which occupation of land was formally achieved and recognized: traditional customary tenure (exemplified by the payment of rent of assize and an entry fine) and leasing. These holdings have become vacant because the previous tenant having died (occasionally having relinquished them), and the usual proclamations in the manorial court having been made, nobody came forward to claim them. Since nobody has formally assumed responsibility for them they were technically vacant and they remained 'in the lord's hands' waiting for someone to come forward and formally accept responsibility for them. *As holdings*, they belonged to no one and in that sense they were truly vacant. But does this necessarily mean that the land itself lay idle and unused? Clearly not! If money was being paid for it, the land must have been subjected to some form of exploitation to raise the money in the first instance, and whoever used it must

²⁵ Up to 1348 Twyford and Marwell are accounted for as a single manor and all items of information are presented as a single joint total for both, from 1348 onwards two separate accounts are drawn up, one for Twyford and one for Marwell.

²⁶ For example, 159383, Marwell (1372/3), *Exitus Tenementorum in manu Domini per Pestilenciam: Et de 4s de Stephano Smyth de exitu terre quondam Ricardi atte Moore ultra certum redditum sic sibi dimisse quosque aliquis venerit ad finiendum et tenendum secundum antiquam consuetudinem.*

have had the landlord's permission to do so. Since such transactions did not go through the manorial court, paid no entry fines, and were not subject to lease agreements, they must have been, in their very essence, in the nature of *ad hoc* arrangements carrying with them no rights, no permanence and no certainty of any kind; they must have conveyed no more than the permission to use the land in some unspecified way for the time being.

What can we learn about the uses to which such vacant holdings were put by the peasants who took them on? Not much, unfortunately, since there are virtually no explicit comments to that effect. If the landlord could graze his animals on some of the vacant holdings so could have the peasants. It seems quite possible that some of the small payments, particularly those in respects of vacant assarts, represent an extension of animal husbandry on the part of the peasantry; after all, such an extension did occur on the part of the landlords in this period and the peasants could have done likewise. However, I think it highly unlikely that the vast majority of the often quite substantial payments for standard holdings could have been the consequence of a more extensive pastoral activity on the part of the peasantry; the sums involved are far too often quite out of proportion to the usual payments for rough grazing. It is also worth pointing out in this context that it is the standard holdings, above all, which were producing income over and above the rent value. The land constituting these holdings lay in the arable fields of the village and it was almost certainly used primarily, if not exclusively, to grow crops. Payment for such land is not, of course, a guarantee that it was cultivated in its totality, so the presence of a large number of vacant holdings producing revenue could still involve some contraction of peasant cultivation from its pre-1349 level, but it must not necessarily be seen as an indication, least

of all as a measure, of the abandonment of peasant cultivation in the wake of the Black Death. Some contraction of peasant cultivation there may have been since some vacant holdings produced no income at all and do not appear to have been used in any way, but I am very much against the assumption that any contraction of peasant cultivation was on anything like the same scale as the phenomenon of vacant holdings. It is, of course, the 'standard' holdings – holdings whose land must be assumed to have been arable land almost by definition – which are particularly relevant to this argument, and the fact that cash income accrued to the landlord in respect of the vast majority of them must indicate a degree of cultivation. What we are witnessing here is primarily a tenurial crisis, not an agrarian crisis. It is tempting to speculate why was it that peasants on so many manors were no longer willing to take up holdings on traditional basis and, conversely, why on some manors they appear to have been quite happy to do so, but that problem is part and parcel of the much wider issue of changing tenurial patterns after the Black Death, and it must be discussed fully in that context – I intend to do so elsewhere.

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion has shown conclusively that for the Winchester estates the recorded totals of lost rents and vacant holdings cannot be taken as stated; that the so-called 'vacant' holdings were often vacant only in the tenurial sense and must not be equated with land which ceased to be profitably exploited in one way or another; and that the recorded value of lost rents represents at best the balance between the value of lost rents *sensu stricto* and income 'raised' from such holdings, the latter often being considerably in excess of the value of the rent itself. Some years ago I copied into a table the totals of lost rents for all the manors of the bishopric for all the years between 1349 and 1472 (the date of the

last manors being farmed out) but I have since destroyed it for such unprocessed figures should be regarded as meaningless.

This paper makes no claims in respect of other estates except one: that whenever the information on lost rents and vacant holdings is presented in its most basic form there can no longer be any certainty that the recorded totals can be accepted at their face value and no certainty that the conclusions drawn from them are necessarily valid, since the reality of the situation on such estates could be as far removed from the impression ostensibly given by the recorded figures as it is on many manors of the bishopric of Winchester.

As for the contrast in the bishopric of Winchester between manors with and manors without vacant holdings, perhaps that too is a false dichotomy. If the view is valid that the problem of vacant holdings is essentially a tenurial one, then the contrast between such manors, *in so far as the exploitation of land is concerned*, could be more apparent than real. For is it too far-fetched to suggest that the manors without vacant holdings might too have had long lists of them but for some feature of their tenurial structure which had made peasants on such manors less reluctant to take up vacated holdings on the old basis?

APPENDICES

NOTES TO APPENDICES 1-4

Holdings

For the purpose of these appendices a holding is defined as the totality of land recorded as a separate entry under a single tenant. In theory, they can range from a fraction of an acre to a large conglomerate, but in practice they are hardly ever bigger than two virgates and some acres of assart.

Regular holdings: virgates, cotlonds, akerlonds, mondaylonds and their regular subdivisions.

Irregular holdings: assarts (regardless of size), crofts, cottages, tofts, curtilages, messuages, bits and pieces.

At Witney a very substantial acreage of lost assarts was recorded in 1349, though it was dwindling progressively as time went on. That total has never been itemized and thus the total number of irregular holdings, and the overall total, entered in the appendices is substantially less than it should have been. On some manors with very long lists of vacant holdings year after year (notably Downton) cross-checking between the *Defectus Redditus* section and the *Exitus Terrarum* section, and between different years, discloses frequent omissions particularly among the 'negative' entries in the *Defectus Redditus* section. Such omissions have been restored whenever spotted.

Mills throughout have been excluded and anything else which is not in the nature of a peasant holding.

Estimated acreage

For most manors the size of standard holdings is known and appears to be constant, but on some

manors the size of virgates is variable. This is particularly true of composite manors such as Downton and Wargrave (but not Taunton). The problem manors are: Sutton, where a 32-acre virgate and a 40-acre virgate seem to have been present. The rest of the manors in the Sutton bailiwick appear to have had only a 32-acre virgate so all virgates at Sutton have been converted on the same basis. Crawley seems to have had two virgate sizes: 30 and 32 acres; these have been converted throughout by multiplying by 32. The position at Farnham is uncertain but a 32-acre virgate seems to have been in use. Brightwell seems to have used a 20-acre and a 24-acre virgate but Harwell, its neighbour in the same bailiwick, seems to have used only a 20-acre virgate and so the same multiplier has been adopted for Brightwell also. Wycombe has 20-acre and 24-acre virgates: the latter figure has been adopted for all conversions. At Ivinghoe virgates of 16, 18, 20 and 24 acres are recorded, according to locality and type (those of assart origin appear to have been the largest); a multiplier of 20 has been adopted throughout, rather arbitrarily. At Wargrave a 24-acre virgate seems to have been the most common though a 20-acre virgate can also be found; the former has been adopted throughout. Downton presents the greatest difficulty in this respect; virgates of 16, 18, 20, 24 and 32 acres are recorded there. There are some grounds to think that a 32-acre virgate is more common among the vacant holdings so that measurement has been used throughout, albeit, rather arbitrarily. Irregular holdings, too, can present

a problem, particularly crofts, where usually the only guide to their size is the value of their rent. On manors with standard rate per acre (Witney at 6d an acre of assart) there is no problem but elsewhere arbitrary decisions had to be made.

Recorded loss of rent

The sums in this column are the totals given at the end of the *Defectus Redditus* section; recorded figures have been altered only when a clerical error has been spotted in the documents themselves, and at Crawley and Fareham, when appropriate, as explained in the text, otherwise they have been left as they stand.

Full value of lost rents

The full rent value of vacant holdings is recorded on most manors but on some manors 'negative'

entries omit to give it. Practically the only serious offender is Downton, but even there the number of holdings whose rent is uncertain is relatively small; the decision in their case is arbitrary but the same values have been used throughout. Any arbitrariness in calculating the full value of lost rents automatically affects the figures in the remaining four columns which are thus, to the same extent, estimates only.

Lost rents as the percentage of pre-1349 rents

The figures entered in this column compare the full value of lost rents with the *actual* rents in 1348; that is, the total *nominal* rent less the pre-1349 *defectus*.

APPENDIX I
Lost rents and vacant holdings, 1350/I (159360)

Manors	Numbers of vacant holdings			Estimated acreage	Income recorded defectus £ s d	Full value of lost rent £ s d			lost rent as % of 1348 total	income raised £ s d			net change +/- £ s d			% of lost rent recovered
	standard	irregular	total			£	s	d		£	s	d	£	s	d	
Fareham	6	1	7	127	23	2 3/4		29 11 3/4	4.9	6	9		-23		2 3/4	22.5
Bitterne	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	0
Waltham	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	0
Twynford/Marwell	33	15	48	620	8 10 10 1/2	1 6		10 6 7 1/2	20.4	35	9		-8	10	10 1/2	17.3
Stoke	0	2	2	1	2	0		11 10	0.7	11	2		-1		6	0
Meon	5	1	6	70	4	6		16 6	15.9	5	6		-11		0	94.4
Meon Church	4	0	4	70	30	0		59 3 1/2	8.4	35	0		-24		3 1/2	33.3
Hambleton	18	10	28	242 1/4	5 5 11	2 10 1/2		7 2 10 1/2	18.7	36	11 1/2		-5	5	11	59.0
Alresford	15	2	17	505 1/4	24	6		48 8 3/4	42.6	24	2 3/4		-24		6	49.7
Beauworth	11	6	17	246	77 11	12		6 0 3	20.8	42	4		-3	17	11	35.2
Cheriton	26	4	30	657	32	0		6 15 6	13.4	5	3 6		-32		0	76.4
Sutton	36	4	40	615	12	6		17 6	11.3	5	0		-12		6	28.6
Wield	6	1	7	99	9	6		30 0	10.7	20	6		-9		6	68.3
Crawley	3	0	3	72	5	1 11		5 11 8	13.9	11	3		-5	0	5	10.1
Mardon	11	3	14	344	40	6 1/2		44 0 1/2	12.7	3	6		-40		6 1/2	7.9
Bentley	1	8	9	42	7 15	9 1/4		8 4 11 1/4	6.8	9	2		-7	15	9 1/2	5.6
Farnham	16	16	32	443	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	0
Esher	0	0	0	0	88	9 3/4		7 18 8 1/4	33.0	69	10 1/2		-4	8	9 3/4	44.0
Burghclere	28	19	47	629 1/2	5	2 0 1/2		5 6 7 1/2	26.1	4	7		-5	2	0 1/2	4.3
High Clere	6	17	23	364 1/4	3	8		6 0	2.5	2	4		-3		8	38.9
Echinswell	5	3	8	46	36	11		39 10	25.5	22	11		-16		11	57.5
Ashmansworth	11	3	14	203 1/2	51	6		82 10	10.1	31	4		-51		6	37.8
Woodhay	4	10	14	184 1/4	5	12 9 3/4		9 9 3 3/4	36.0	76	6		-5	12	9 3/4	40.4
Overton	33	2	35	599	5	18 8 1/2		7 19 2 1/2	74.1	40	6		-5	18	8 1/2	25.4
N. Waltham	30	0	30	525 1/2	7 1/2	7 1/2		0	0.2	0	0		-7 1/2		0	0
Brightwell	0	1	1	1	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	0
Harwell	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	0
Morton	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	0
Wycombe	33	6	39	419	49	4		7 4 4 1/4	17.6	95	0 1/4		-49		4	65.8
Ivinghoe	22	3	25	334	62	0 1/2		5 4 3 1/2	20.2	48	3		-56		0 1/2	46.3
Wargrave	49	39	88	1009	53	1 1/4		6 10 5	15.2	93	5 3/4		-36		11 1/4	71.7
Adderbury	3	0	3	66	16	0		40 0	7.9	24	0		-16		0	60.0
Witney	47	0+	47+	1639	19	10 3		28 2 3	43.1	8	12		-19	10	3	30.6
Downton	50	11	61	926 3/4	22	3 3/4		10 18 8 1/4	16.2	18	9 4 1/2		+7	10	8 1/4	168.9
Bishopstone	15	0	15	232	4	4		6 8 1	51.8	6	7 9		-23		10	99.7
Knayle	11	8	19	194 3/4	32	9		67 0	23.5	43	2		+7		0	64.4
Fonhill	11	1	12	150	5	0		25 0	25.3	32	0		-5	6	8 1/2	128.0
Taunton	69	139	208	1065	6	19 3 1/2		22 2 3 1/4	10.2	16	15 6 1/4		-5		0	75.9
Rimpton	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0				0	0
Total	618	335+	953+	12,742 1/2	103	18 2		187 6 8 3/4	13.9	96	19 3		-90	7	5 3/4	51.8

APPENDIX 2
Lost rents and vacant holdings, 1355/6 (159366)

Manors	Numbers of vacant holdings		Estimated acreage	Income		lost rent as % of 1348 total	full value of lost rent		income raised	net change +/-		% of lost rent recovered
	standard	irregular		recorded defectus	total		£	s d		£	s d	
Fareham	0	1	15	14	0 1/2	2.3	14	0 1/2	9	-13	3 1/2	5.3
Bitterne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Waltham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Twyford/Marwell	28	14	551	35	4	17.4	8	15 4 1/2	7 2 8 1/2	-32	8	81.4
Stoke	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meon	4	2	92	6	6	0.7	12	4	22 4	+10	0	181.1
Meon Church	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hambleton	12	4	192	21	2	5.6	39	8	18 6	-21	2	46.6
Alresford	10	1	260	12	7	8.4	64	1	51 6	-12	7	80.4
Beauworth	3	4	44 1/2	0	0	9.7	11	0 3/4	11 0 3/4	0	0	100.0
Cheriton	17	0	349	6	6	10.5	61	0	81 6	+20	6	133.6
Sutton	10	3	140 1/2	4	0	3.7	37	6	54 6	+17	0	145.3
Wield	5	0	66	0	0	12.0	18	6	18 6	0	0	100.0
Crawley	4	0	56	21	0	10.8	30	4	9 4	-21	0	30.8
Mardon	12	1	350 1/2	49	9	9.6	77	7	34 2	-43	5	44.0
Bentley	0	5	9	13	1 1/2	4.7	16	1 1/2	3 0	-13	1 1/2	18.6
Farnham	5	3	161	28	3 1/2	1.8	43	0	14 8 1/2	-28	3 1/2	34.2
Esher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burghclere	11	11	196	18	5	10.2	49	4	37 0	-12	4	75.0
High Clere	1	12	113 1/2	35	7	10.7	43	8	8 1	-35	7	18.5
Eccinswell	1	3	11	5	5	1.0	2	6	2 1	-5	0	83.3
Ashmansworth	7	2	111	5	11	17.6	27	6	22 1	-5	5	80.3
Woodhay	1	2	54	7	8	4.5	36	10	33 7	-3	3	91.2
Overton	25	0	360	50	8 1/4	23.7	6	4 5 1/4	73 9	-50	8 1/4	59.3
N. Waltham	24	0	370 1/2	58	11 1/2	55.7	5	19 8 1/2	60 9	-58	11 1/2	50.7
Brightwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wycombe	27	8	354 3/4	69	8 3/4	15.3	6	4 11	68 4 1/4	-56	6 3/4	54.7
Ivinghoe	13	0	234	26	8	15.5	4	0 2	56 0	-24	2	69.9
Wargrave	31	23	668 1/2	9	9 3/4	8.9	76	2 3/4	7 7 9 3/4	+71	7	194.0
Adderbury	2	0	39	15	10 9 3/4	1.6	8	0	8 0	0	0	100.0
Wimsey	34	0+	1351 1/4	0	0	35.3	23	0 3 3/4	7 9 6	-15	10 9 3/4	32.5
Downton	28	5	448	0	0	6.6	4	9 0 3/4	12 4 10 3/4	+7	15	275.0
Bishopstone	11	0	153	0	0	16.8	41	6	74 2	+32	8	178.7
Knole	13	4	170	2	2	11.0	31	4	51 8 1/2	+20	4 1/2	165.0
Fonthill	6	1	90	0	0	15.2	15	0	20 6	+5	6	136.7
Taunton	3	24	121	40	11 1/4	1.8	75	9 1/4	34 10	-40	11 1/4	46.0
Rimpton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	348	133+	7092	42	4 0 3/4	7.5	100	6 10 1/2	77 15 8	-22	11 2 1/2	77.5

APPENDIX 3
Lost rents and vacant holdings, 1364/5 (159375)

Manors	Numbers of vacant holdings			Estimated acreage	Income		lost rent as % of 1348 total	income raised			net change + / -		% of lost rent recovered
	standard	irregular	total		recorded defects	full value of lost rent		£	s	d	£	s	d
Fareham	0	1	1	15	12	7 1/2	2.0	0	0	0	-12	7 1/2	0
Bitterne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Waltham	1	1	2	12	6	4 6	0.3	5	9	0	+1	3	127.8
Twyford/Marwell	31	17	48	564	70	9	20.1	6	15	6	-67	5	66.8
Stoke	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Meon	4	1	5	80	6	7 6	0.4	7	0	0	-6	0	93.3
Meon Church	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hambleton	16	5	21	269	9	8	6.5	36	1	0	-9	8	78.9
Alresford	16	2	18	359	8	0	11.0	91	9	0	+8	0	109.6
Beauworth	4	3	7	45 1/2	6	6	11.7	15	4 3/4	0	+2	0	114.9
Cheriton	21	0	21	499	6	6	16.5	5	8	0	+12	6	113.1
Sutton	12	1	13	148	4	2	3.8	49	4	0	+10	10	128.1
Wield	3	1	4	38	1	0	5.8	16	8	0	+7	8	185.2
Crawley	4	0	4	86	21	0	10.6	8	10	0	-21	0	29.6
Mardon	20	1	21	490	53	1	13.1	56	7	0	-48	7	53.8
Bentley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farnham	3	1	4	130	37	4	1.9	8	0	0	-37	4	17.6
Esher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burghclere	11	8	19	141 1/2	10	4	8.7	38	3	0	-3	8	91.3
High Clere	4	12	16	235	32	7	16.8	36	0	0	-32	7	52.3
Ecchinswell	2	1	3	55 1/2	3	3	6.3	14	10 1/2	0	-3	2	98.3
Ashmansworth	6	2	8	102	3	2	17.8	24	8 3/4	0	-3	2	88.6
Woodhay	1	3	4	28	12	2	2.5	8	0	0	-12	2	39.7
Overton	24	2	26	478	36	2 1/4	28.5	5	13	9	-36	0 1/4	75.9
N. Waltham	28	0	28	562 1/2	54	7	75.5	5	7	8 1/2	-54	7	66.4
Brightwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morton	0	1	1	1/2	6	6	0.6	0	0	0	-6	0	0
Wycombe	25	5	30	377	4	3 1/2	13.8	33	11 1/2	0	-79	1 1/2	30.0
Ivinghoe	11	1	12	151	43	0 1/2	8.9	2	11 1/2	0	-43	0 1/2	6.4
Wargrave	33	13	46	643 1/2	6	8 3/4	6.8	12	14	1 3/4	+9	15	434.7
Adderbury	4	0	4	81	12	17	3.7	18	6	0	0	0	100.0
Winey	46	10 +	56 +	1417 1/2	7	3	34.2	10	13	6	-11	12	47.9
Downton	38	14	52	766 1/2	43	4	11.7	13	16	8 1/4	+65	18	175.0
Bishopstone	11	0	11	104	0	0	12.3	52	6	0	+22	0	172.1
Knolly	11	1	12	140	0	0	8.2	49	10 1/4	0	+26	5 1/2	213.1
Fonhill	10	2	12	137	3	5	25.8	44	7	0	+19	1	174.8
Taunton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rimpton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	400	109 +	509 +	8156	40	12	7.8	91	8	10 1/2	-13	10	87.1

APPENDIX 4
Lost rents and vacant holdings, 1382/3 (159389).

Manors	Numbers of vacant holdings			Estimated acreage	Income			lost rent as % of 1348 total	full value of lost rent			income raised			net change + / - £ s d	% of lost rent recovered
	standard	irregular	total		recorded defectus £ s d	£ s d			£ s d							
						£	s		d	£	s	d	£	s		
Fareham	4	1	5	95	12 7 1/2	22	2	3.6	12 10 1/2		-9	3 1/2	58.1			
Bitterne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Waltham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Twyford/Marwell	37	18	55	58 1/2	43 11	10	12 7	21.0	11 5 5		+12	10	106.0			
Stoke	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Meon	1	0	1	10	0	2	5	0.1	2 5			0	100.0			
Meon Church	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Hambleton	12	5	17	172	1 10	34	0	4.8	53 8		+19	8	157.8			
Alresford	18	1	19	319	0	4	2 9	10.8	6 4 9		+42	0	150.8			
Beauworth	6	2	8	81 1/2	0	18	10 3/4	16.5	27 0 3/4		+8	2	143.2			
Cheriton	29	0	29	530	9 6	4	9 0	15.4	5 11 10		+22	10	125.7			
Sutton	24	1	25	455	2 6	5	0 0	9.9	9 9 4 1/4		+4	9 4 1/4	189.4			
Wield	0	1	1	2	1 0	1	0	0.6	0	0		-1	0			
Crawley	8	0	8	108	21 0	40	4	14.4	27 7		-12	9	68.4			
Mardon	17	2	19	306 1/2	50 8	78	2	9.7	36 11		-41	3	47.2			
Bentley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Farnham	0	1	1	6	1 10	1	10	0.1	0	0	-1	10	0			
Esher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Burghclere	9	7	16	118 1/2	11 1	31	11	6.6	29 2		-2	9	91.4			
High Clere	10	7	17	376 1/2	28 3	4	6 3	21.1	58 0		-28	3	67.2			
Ecchinswell	0	1	1	0	3	3		0.1	0			-3	0			
Ashmansworth	4	1	5	63	2 2	17	2 1/4	11.0	15 0 1/4		-2	2	87.4			
Woodhay	2	4	6	108 1/2	8 4	48	1	5.9	42 9		-5	4	88.9			
Overton	25	0	25	498	24 0	7	6 11	27.9	6 5 11		-21	0	85.7			
N. Waltham	28	0	28	493 1/2	4 2	7	3 2	66.6	6 19 0		-4	2	97.1			
Brightwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Harwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Morton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Wycombe	28	18	46	526	4 6 5 1/2	7	12 10	18.7	5 10 4		-42	6	72.2			
Ivinghoe	26	6	32	481	40 2	5	16 10	22.7	5 14 0		-2	10	97.6			
Wargrave	58	18	76	1134	11 7 1/4	5	8 5 3/4	12.7	12 4 6 1/2		+6	16 0 3/4	225.4			
Adderbury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Winney	42	10+	52+	1286 3/4	10 0 0 1/4	19	1 1 3/4	20.2	10 16 7 1/2		-8	4 6 1/4	56.8			
Downton	33	10	43	479 1/2	78 0	64	10 2	6.7	12 18 1		+28	7 11	286.2			
Bishopstone	8	0	8	88	0	25	6	10.3	5 5 8		+30	2	218.3			
Knayle	15	1	16	190	0	26	2	9.2	4 0 6 3/4		+54	4 3/4	307.9			
Fonhill	8	0	8	96	0	25	6	25.8	21 0		-4	6	82.4			
Taunton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Rampton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Total	452	115+	567+	8609 3/4	31 19 4 1/2	104	3 6 1/2	7.7	116 2 6 1/2		+11	8 4	111.5			

APPENDIX 5
Cheriton: excess income from vacant holidays^a

Holding of (quondam)	1355/6 (366) ^b	1357 (367)	1358 (368)	1359 (369)	1360 (370)	1361 (371)	1362 (372)	1363 (373)	1364 (374)	1365 (375)	1366 (452)	1367 (377)	1368 (376)	1369 (378)	1370 (379)
	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d	s d
Johannis le White	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 0	2 0	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6
Elene Tyre	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0
Petri atte Mede	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6
Ricardi Talney	4 6	4 6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5 0
Hugonis le Reue	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6
Henrici atte Thorne	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Henrici Gangyr	3 0	3 0	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6
Thome le Bonde	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	12	12	12	18	12
Roberti Walys	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6	2 6
Rogeri Kyneman	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
Hugonis Emery	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 6
	+ 3	9 ^c													
Total	30 9	27 0	22 0	22 0	19 0	19 0	19 0	19 0	19 0	19 0	17 0	17 0	17 0	17 6	24 6

^a *Exitus per Pestilenciam: exitus quantum terrarum in manu domini existentium ultra redditum et servicia.*

^b The last three meaningful digits of the reference number, 159366.

^c *Oneratio.*

APPENDIX 6
Wargrave: excess income from vacant holidays^a

Holding of (quondam)	1355/6 (306) ^b £ s d	1357 (307) £ s d	1358 (308) £ s d	1359 (309) £ s d	1360 (310) £ s d	1361 (311) £ s d	1362 (312) £ s d	1363 (313) £ s d	1364 (314) £ s d	1365 (315) £ s d	1366 (452) £ s d	1367 (377) £ s d	1368 (376) £ s d	1369 (378) £ s d	1370 (379) £ s d
Johannis Chamberlain	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis West	8	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis Yonge	22 3/4	22 3/4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Christine Sule	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nicholas Bost	14	—	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Ade Leverich	3 0	3 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Christine Henrys	10	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Willemi Holeweye	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis Bithewode	5 4	5 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dionisie Freuche	3 0	3 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis Kepe	7 0	7 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Edithe Wynter	2 0	2 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Willemi Herberd	11 3 1/2	11 3 1/2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Thome Touy	4 0	4 0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Isabelle Sebrond	11	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Philipp Gille	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alicie Colt	18	18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis atte Dene	3 2	3 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis Swon	7 5	7 5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alicie Miles	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis Blake	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis Bythewode	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Walteri Fulery	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Johannis Wordle	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Agnetis atte Moure	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	61 5 1/4	60 3 1/4	51 11 1/2	61 1 1/2	52 5 1/2	4 5 5	78 0 1/2	4 8 0 1/2	4 8 0 1/2	7 8 1/2	7 10 7	10 6 1/2	7 10 6 1/2	7 10 6 1/2	14 6 1/2

^a Exitus Manerii: exitus diversorum tenementorum in manu domini existentium ultra certum redditum comend.

^b The last three meaningful digits of the reference number, 159366.

^c Et non plus hoc anno quia pars dicit Willemi ad opus rem(anet) eo quod illis qui dictam terram ten(uit) ad firmam illam reliq(uit) et nullus alius eam conducere voluit.

^d Pro 2 tenuris, from now onwards.

^e Et eo minus quia pastura eiusdem tenementi depasc(ebatur) cum hogastris domini.

^f Et non plus hoc anno quia Willemus Smyth qui illam terram ten(uit) ad firmam amplius tenere noluit set omnino dereliquit et nullus alius eam conducere voluit ideo depasc(ebatur) cum hogastris et multonibus domini.

^g From now on included with his other holding above.

^h Individual items add up to £8 6s 8d.

ⁱ Et non plus hoc anno quia recognitio Domini Regis persolut(ur) tam pro illis terris et tenementis in manu domini existentibus quam pro aliis tenementis de exitu comendae hoc anno.

^j With five additional holdings omitted from this appendix.