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Abstract

The present thesis is a study of a Middle English legal document defining the boundaries of Barmston in the East Riding of Yorkshire. The document was produced by four main scribes; in addition, a fifth scribe may have produced a few lines. The document is of considerable interest from the point of view of scribal practices and dialectal variation; three of them form a fairly coherent group, while the fourth one clearly stands out as different.

The document raises several questions about Middle English scribal variation and its social context; in particular, these concern the role of regional linguistic usage in Northern documents and the context of text production and literacy practices of which the document forms a part. In order to address these questions, the present study focuses on four different aspects of the Barmston document: the text as a historical document and as evidence for literacy practices, the palaeographic variation and the dialectal variation.

The document is of considerable interest as evidence for the development of literacy practices and literate modes. The fact that it was produced by four or five different scribes is in itself remarkable. The format and conventions of the text, as well as the traces of annotation present, are also of interest in what they suggest about literate modes and the use of documents: in particular, the text seems to be remarkably little suited for reference use.

The thesis is divided into two main parts. The first one places the text within its dialectal, historical and geographical context, and provides an overview of the landholding arrangements described in the document. It then carries out studies of the physical, palaeographical and dialectal characteristics of the document. The second part consists of an edition of the text, with notes on the editorial conventions a glossary and explanatory notes on the measurements and land units. In addition, a list of the names and places that appear in the document is provided as an appendix.
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1. Introduction

The present thesis is a study of a Middle English legal document defining the boundaries of Barmston in the East Riding of Yorkshire. The document was produced by four main scribes, and the length of their scribal stretches varies from 248 to 2489 words; in addition, a fifth scribe may have produced a few lines. The document is of considerable interest from the point of view of scribal practices and dialectal variation. While all the main scribes differ from each other palaeographically and dialectally, three of them form a fairly coherent group, while the fourth one clearly stands out as different; interestingly, the text copied by this scribe has also been recopied by another one, suggesting perhaps it has been considered problematic.

The document raises several questions about Middle English scribal variation and its social context; in particular, these concern the role of regional linguistic usage in Northern documents and the context of text production and literacy practices of which the document forms a part. In order to address these questions, the present study focuses on four different aspects of the Barmston document: the text as a historical document and as evidence for literacy practices, the palaeographic variation and the dialectal variation. A diplomatic edition of the entire text, with a glossary and name index, is provided.

The thesis builds upon the research tradition of A Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English (McIntosh, Samuels and Benskin, 1986: vol 1, p.45; henceforth LALME). The Atlas provides localisations for more than a thousand texts from the period ca 1300-1500, with a geographical range covering England and Wales, as well as, to some extent, Southern Scotland. The localisation of the texts was carried out using the so-called ‘fit-technique’, comparing the linguistic forms in the texts and placing them in relation to each other and to ‘anchor texts’, that is, texts that, in contrast to most other Middle English manuscripts, reveal their geographical provenance. The Barmston document was included as one of the anchor texts in LALME and the dialect of the document is found as a Linguistic Profile. There are, however, several grounds for why the document is worth another close examination.

The document is of considerable interest as evidence for the development of literacy practices and literate modes. The fact that it was produced by four or five different scribes is in itself remarkable. There seems to be no particular reason why the work load should have been divided between several scribes: the document is not of a huge length, nor is it likely that it was compiled over a long period of time. This might in itself raise questions about the local origins: is it reasonable to assume a relatively small village was able to produce such a range of available scribes? The format and conventions of the text, as well as the traces of
annotation present, are also of interest in what they suggest about literate modes and the use of documents: in particular, the text seems to be remarkably little suited for reference use.

The discussion about literacy context is closely connected to the palaeographical and dialectal study of the text. The Linguistic Profiles in LALME were not intended to give a thorough description or interpretation of the language used in the texts, but simply to provide the forms needed in order to localise texts. The Linguistic Profiles are based on the questionnaire. As the present text is highly repetitive and contains a limited vocabulary, it is important to cover the entire material, so as not to leave out crucial dialect information. In addition, there are no frequencies given in LALME, nor is there any differentiation between the different scribal stretches in the document, except in that one is excluded as not representing a local dialect (LALME I: 257). In order to gain a full understanding of the text, it is crucial to study the different scribal texts separately and to study both the distribution and the frequencies of linguistic variants within the text.

The Barmston document is, above all, interesting because of the different scribal contributions and the linguistic and palaeographic differences between them. A major research question is to what extent, and on what grounds, it is reasonable to assume that the text represents the local written dialect of Barmston and its surroundings. Another, closely related question is how the text relates to the ongoing, and interconnected, processes of language standardisation and the development of literate modes in the late fifteenth century.

Legal documents commonly provide exact dates and references to places, and the Barmston survey is no exception. They also tend to be relatively short texts, varying in length from a few lines to a large sheet of parchment. The Barmston text is, however, remarkably long for a legal document, counting eleven large-size pages. In addition, the language of the document is exceedingly monotonous. The length and the repetitive nature of the document provides an excellent opportunity for studying the palaeography, language and linguistic variation found both between the different scribes as well as within each of the scribes’ texts. In addition, the text written by the fourth scribe is repeated by the fifth, which provides an opportunity to study in detail the differences and similarities between the two texts.

Documentary text were in general included as anchor texts in LALME (I: 40, 42) on two grounds: firstly, that they stated clearly where the document had been drawn up, and, secondly, that they contained a local language that agreed with this location. Even though the document states that it concerns Barmston at a given date and year, this does not necessarily

---

1 For modifications of this general rule, see LALME I: 40-42.
imply that the document is written by scribes from the same area: “If a document presents itself as ‘written’ or ‘made’ at a certain place, then, forgery apart, the local origins of the final copy are assured.” As the Barmston survey does not present itself as written in Barmston, and merely states that the bounding of Barmston took place at the given date, there is a possibility that the document was not produced there, or that the scribes did not come from this area. Ultimately, however, the question of precise local origins is likely to be unsolvable, and is in any case less interesting than the more general question of how the dialectal varieties contained in the text relate to the overall sociolinguistic context of late fifteenth-century Yorkshire.

The present thesis forms part of the Middle English Grammar Project (henceforth MEG). MEG is a long-term research project, ongoing at the Universities of Stavanger and Glasgow, which continues on the LALME research on Late Medieval English, with a particular focus on the context of texts. The aim of the project is to study linguistic variation found in Middle English both in terms of geographic and other patterns; apart from studying individual texts, the aim is to collect approximately one thousand texts or text samples of different genres and text types into an electronic corpus (The Middle English Grammar Corpus or MEG-C; Stenroos et al. 2008-). The present thesis contributes both a transcription of the entire Barmston document (to be included in version 2010.1 of MEG-C) and a detailed study of the text as part of the ongoing Survey of Northern Counties.

In addition, it is hoped that the thesis will contribute to the study of a text type that has been little studied earlier, and through this to our knowledge of late-medieval literacy practices. The research that has been done on boundary documents from the Middle English period is limited, in contrast to the Anglo-Saxon boundary clauses, which have been very thoroughly studied. One of the reasons for this is that the latter were some of the first English documentary texts written in the vernacular. The study of late Middle English manuscripts has been much focused on literary and religious, and more recently, to some extent, scientific, manuscripts, while the study of legal documents has been to a large extent limited to the study of London records as the starting point of standardisation (a notable exception here is the work of Michael Benskin, see e.g. Benskin 1977, 1989, 1992).

The thesis is divided into two main parts. The first one places the text within its dialectal, historical and geographical context, and provides an overview of the landholding arrangements described in the document. It then carries out studies of the physical,
palaeographical and dialectal characteristics of the document\textsuperscript{2}. The second part consists of an edition of the text, with notes on the editorial conventions a glossary and explanatory notes on the measurements and land units. In addition, a list of the names and places that appear in the document is provided as an appendix.

\textsuperscript{2} I would like to thank Merja Stenroos for her help with the description of long vowels in the Orthography section.
2. Description of the document

The document containing the fifteenth-century bounding of Barmston is kept at the East Riding Local Archives in Beverley, and forms part of a collection labelled ‘Chichester-Constable Family and Estate Records, 11th Century – 20th Century’. The document, which has the shelfmark DDCC / 3/19 is a survey of the open fields of Barmston in the wapentake of Holderness, East Riding of Yorkshire. It lists strips of land held by the various landholders of the village and describes their boundaries. The document consists of six large folios and contains ca 6,000 words.

The document describes the landscape of Barmston quite closely and records several place names as well as names of the various landowners and institutions (for an overview list, see p. 113). The beginning of the text (fol. 1v) identifies the area and date at which the bounding starts:

The 3eer’ of owr lord M’cccc lxxiiij and the xij day of octobor~ Was’ bowndyd Bowllom’ leys’ Eueremans’ os y= ly in ye west feld of Barnston’
‘The year of our Lord 1473, the 12 day of October, the bounding was carried out of the Bowllom Everyman’s leas, as they lie in the West Field of Barmston’

Thereafter the various strips of land are systematically divided between the landowners. The following main areas or categories of lands are covered in the document:

- The West Field: The Bowllom Leys Everyman’s Land
- The West Field: the Mill Field Everyman’s Land
- The East Field
- The Middle of the Village (?) (medyll byis)
- The North Field
- The Toft Steads

The document is written on six large sheets of paper, sewn together to form a booklet. The first recto side is empty, apart from the label ‘Barmston’ written in a post-medieval hand. There is no foliation or any pricking or ruling. The text begins at the top of fol. 1v. The first two and a half lines give the dating and placing information; this is not highlighted in any way, except that the text of the bounding that follows begins on a new line.
Most of the text is written in large blocks, with few layout features. It is undecorated, with the exception of four calligraphic headings (fol. 2v, l.9, fol. 3r, bottom of the folio, fol. 4r, top of the folio and l.20) and large initials (fol. 4v and fol. 6r). There are no illustrations or illuminations.

While layout features are used sparingly, the divisions of the text are marked precisely by verbal means. Except for the first section, which begins with the dating clause, the description of a new area is generally signalled by a heading; however, Scribe 5 instead uses the opening phrase *Memorandum*, followed by the incipit “here begins”:

1) *Memorandum* that heer’ begynnes the bowndes of ye North Feld of barnston’ (l. 239)
   ‘It is to be remembered that here begin the bounds of the north field of Barmston’

2) *Memorandum* that her’ begynnes the bound~ of Barnston’ fro the lonyng’ at Coteman’ Croft syde to ye est end of Barnston’ of all the Toft steeds (l. 373)
   ‘It is to be remembered that here begin the bounds of Barmston, from the lane beside Coteman’s Croft to the east end of Barmston, of all the toftsteads’

All scribes mark the references to the individual lands with the terms *inprimis* and *item*. *Inprimis* marks the first sentence of a section dealing with a new area, and is used for this purpose consistently through the document:

3) *Inprimis j brod leye longyng’* to the maner (l. 5)
   ‘First 1 broad lea belonging to the manor’

4) *Inprimis ij brod-landes longyng’* to yᵉ kyrke and rynd~ throwe [fro] rowker to schepe bryge dyke (l. 26)
   ‘First 2 broadlands belonging to the church and running through from Rowker to the Sheep Bridge dike’

5) *Inprimis to be-gyn’* att arland~dyke at yᵉ south side off yᵉ feld (l.84)
   ‘First to begin at Erland’s dike at the south side of the field’

6) *In-primis to begyne at þe west sid of þe feld nexste þe leye clos euere manes as pey lye (l. 222)
   ‘First to begin at the west side of the field next to the lea enclosure of Everyman’s lands as they lie’

7) *In pⁱᵗ to begyn’at ye West syde of ye sayd feyld next ye ley Clos of euery mannys as thaí lye (l. 242)
   ‘First to begin at the west side of the said field next to the lea enclosure of Everyman’s lands as they lie’
8) *Jn*-*prim*is a Toft stede contenyng’ a brode-land longyng’ to Crosse haldyng’ (l. 374)
   ‘First a toft stead containing a broadland belonging to the Crosse holding’

All the other entries following within the same section are then marked by ‘item’:

9) *Item ij* brod leys longyng’ to the frehold | of *sir Edward Rowth* (l. 5)
   ‘Item 2 broad leas belonging to the freehold of sir Edward Rowth’

10) *Item j* brodland longyng’ to the haldyng’ of jon’ of tyndall & Wyllm Smyth (l. 10)
    ‘Item 1 broadland belonging to the holding of Jon of Tyndal and William Smyth’

The text is written in continuous prose, and new entries only exceptionally begin on new lines.

   The text is by four main scribes; in addition there are three and a half lines on fol. 3r
   that may have been written in a fifth hand. The first scribe has written folios 1v-3r. l.1. The
   following lines are written in a different ink, by a hand that does not look entirely similar to
   either the preceding or the following hand; for the present purpose, the hand of this stretch
   will be referred to as ‘scribe 2’ even though it is not completely certain whether this in fact
   represents a different hand (see further p. 78). What is certainly a different hand from the first
   one, here referred to as that of ‘scribe 3’ begins on line 15 of fol. 3r. The third hand continues
   to about mid-page on fol. 4r (line 19). The fourth hand copied the remainder of fol. 4r from
   line 20 to the bottom of the folio; from here, the stretch in the fifth hand continues from fol 4v
   to the end of the document (fols 4v-6v).

   The writing of all the scribes is for the most part clear and legible; all of them
   produced fluent Anglicana hands with some Secretary features, except for scribe 4, who wrote
   in a rather idiosyncratic Secretary hand (see further p. 53). There are few signs of use or
   annotation; these consist of underlinings and notae on the first two folios, and are discussed in
   Chapter 5 (see p. 44).

   The style of the document is extremely monotonous; by far most of the text consists of
   a list of landholding entries written out as prose. Virtually all entries are of the format ‘x land
   units belonging to N.N.’, if necessary followed by a brief geographical definition. The
   document is entirely in English.
3. The study of Middle English scribal texts

3.1. Background

The Middle English period (ca 1100-1500) is marked by extreme variation within the written language. According to Milroy (1992: 156) it would be correct to argue that “the label of ‘Middle English’ does not refer to a coherent entity, but to a complex series of divergent, rapidly changing and intertwining varieties retrospectively seen as transitional between ‘Old English’ and ‘Modern English’”. There are many reasons, of political, historical and linguistic kind, why the language has been parted into these groups (Blake 1996: 4). Even though boundaries between periods are always approximate and to some extent fortuitous, there is one event that marks the division between Old and Middle English quite clearly: the Norman Conquest.

In Anglo-Saxon England, a more or less standardised form of writing had developed, based on the dialect the West Saxon kingdom. Even though people continued to use their dialects in speech, the vast majority of texts surviving in this period were written in the Late West Saxon standard. The reason why this particular variant developed a status approaching that of a standard is most likely due to the supremacy of the Wessex area under King Alfred (Burrow and Turville-Petre 2005: 3). However, after 1066, Wessex lost much of its prestige, and was gradually reduced to nothing more than a remote part of the new, French-speaking king’s territory. Consequently, the standard deriving from this area lost status as well.

In 1066, England was invaded by William the Conqueror from Normandy. The consequences of this invasion were numerous, both politically and linguistically. According to Blake (1996: 107-108), the Conquest did not lead to a mass immigration of French-speaking settlers in England, as many believe. He suggests that the amount of French speakers in England in the Middle English period never exceeded 10 per cent of the population. Nevertheless, as most of the French speakers were found in the ruling class of the country, and most positions of power in church and state were filled by them, the prestige connected to the French language was greatly increased.

At this point, there were three main languages in use in England: Apart from the Celtic language, which was still in use in a few areas along the Welsh and Scottish borders (Strang
1970: 283), English, French and Latin were frequently employed, Latin mainly in writing. In speech, English was still predominant. The majority of the inhabitants of England were illiterate peasants, and to be able to communicate properly, English was necessary. In written language, however, the situation was different. Most of the literate people and the centres for text production were in connection with the monastic institutions, which again were, in the Early Norman period, dominated by French speakers.

English as a written language lost national and regional functions after the Norman Conquest, and as Smith (1999: 9) notes, English was “primarily used in its written form for initial education and for the production of texts with a local readership”. The Late West Saxon standard that had been in use in the Old English period had no specific function anymore and was no longer enforced by formal education or official use. In addition to this, the standard ceased to reflect the spoken language in England. Blake (1992: 10) argues that the Old English standard had been “the written standard of an educated elite” in the first place, and that it failed to represent the variety of spoken dialects in England. The changes that took place around the time of the Conquest may have increased the mismatch between the two modes.

Earlier, most dialectal features had been concealed by the use of one written standard. As the written tradition from Old English went out of use, scribes no longer had a model to follow. It was not until late in the 15th century, following the development of printing, that something similar to a literary standard again emerged (Benskin 1981: xxviii). Writing in the Middle English period then came to reflect the spoken mode more closely, and the concept of what was correct in spelling began to fade. By the 13th century, the gap between the two periods had become so wide that an Old English text would appear as incomprehensible to a Middle English reader. Thus, anyone who wished to write in the 12th or 13th centuries would more or less have to work out their own system. As a consequence of this, local varieties of Middle English developed and dialectal writings flourished. In this way the extreme amount of dialectal variation became visible.

In the aftermath of the Scandinavian invasions, from the eighth century onwards, there had been a considerable influence from Scandinavian language, mainly manifested in Northern and Eastern dialects (Blake1996: 4). As Smith (1999: 92) puts it:

Since the constraints of the OE standardised usage had been lifted, the full impact of the very substantial contact between English and Scandinavian was expressed only after the Norman Conquest.
This eventually resulted in Middle English developing into a highly dialectal written language, exceeding any other period, both before or since, in demonstrating diversity in written texts (Milroy 1992:156) Barbara Strang (1970: 225-226) notes that, even though dialects have been spoken at all times, it was in the Middle English period that local usages were found in written form. Strang asserts about Middle English that “It stands alone in having a rich and varied documentation in localised varieties of English, and dialectology is more central to the study of ME than to any other branch of English historical linguistics”.

3.2. What is dialectology

The term ‘dialect’ needs some discussion, as it has been defined in very different ways. According to Chambers and Trudgill (1980: 3), in common usage a dialect is “a substandard, low status, often rustic form of language, generally associated with the peasantry, the working class, or other groups lacking in prestige”. The term may also be associated with isolated places, with having no written form, or as a deviation from an accepted norm. The definition of ‘dialect’ used by Chambers and Trudgill, and by most linguists, is, however, simply a variety of language: everyone speaks a dialect of some sort. Speakers of an ‘accepted norm’ use one sort of dialect, while someone living in the periphery of a country speaks another.

While it is possible to speak of ‘social dialects’ and the like, traditionally the term ‘dialect’ is reserved for varieties of a language found in different geographical areas. However, such varieties do not form homogeneous entities: if one tried to establish the exact number of dialects in a country, the simple answer would be that there is no specific answer. Dialects normally form a continuum, so that the variety found in one place differs only slightly from the variety in the neighbouring place. This makes it impossible to determine whether certain varieties belong to the same dialect, or to separate ones: this depends on how one wishes to draw the boundaries.

However specific a scholar wishes to be, it will always be problematic to define dialect boundaries. In most cases, it will not be possible to separate one dialect area from another. Most dialect features will be scattered about without much consideration to which county boundaries they happen to cross. As Burrow and Turville-Petre (2005: 6) point out, “an individual dialect feature...will not normally be separated off from his neighbouring alternatives by a clear boundary.” Instead of this, the researcher will usually find that the distributions overlap in a dialect continuum. In order to understand language, it is essential to
accept that it is inherently variable and disorganised, and that trying to systematise it completely without the sufficient amount of data will be a frustrating and almost impossible task (Stenroos 2008: 11). This lack of clear distinctions was apparent already from the findings of the first great dialect surveys of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (ref. to Wenker and Guilleron); nevertheless, its implications have taken long to be accepted, and English dialectology dealt largely with dialect boundaries until after the Second World War.

The boundary mentioned in the quote by Burrow and Turville-Petre is called an isogloss, meaning ‘equal language’ (Chambers and Trudgill 1980: 103). Isoglosses are not entirely precise either. Still, if we know some specific words and spellings that are characteristic of one part of the country, but not in the rest, it is possible to draw an isogloss in order to mark more or less where the boundary goes.

3.3. Traditional Dialectology and Middle English dialects

Regarding the varieties found in Middle English, there have been several ways of classifying them, depending on how detailed and precise one wishes to be and on which criteria one wishes to focus. According to Burrow and Turville-Petre (2005: 6), John Trevisa, in a text from the 14th century, simply distinguished between “Southeron, Northeron and Myddel speche”. In traditional dialectology, the Middle English dialects have been divided into quite broad regional divisions. Benskin (1992: 72) claims that

These rest heavily (and, it may be thought, perversely) on the boundaries postulated for the regional dialects of Old English – boundaries that may reflect more of what is known about Anglo-Saxon political groupings than about anything that pertains directly to language.

The main aim of traditional historical dialectology was to identify and describe what have been called ‘pure’ dialects. This meant language varieties found within specific areas that one would be able to trace historically as units (Stenroos 2008: 4). In most cases, a surviving manuscript would not be the author’s original text, but the copy of a scribe, often at many removes from the original version. As Benskin and Laing (1981: 55) point out:

It has in general been assumed that for linguistic purposes most M.E. MMS. are therefore untrustworthy witnesses: because a MS. is a copy, and perhaps a copy of a
copy...of a copy, it has been taken to represent not the language of some one scribe or of some one place, but a conglomeration of the individual usages of all those scribes whose copies of the text stand between this present MS. and the original.

This resulted in a huge number of manuscripts being excluded from study. The texts that did qualify for the traditional dialect surveys were mainly authorial holographs; texts that appear to be written by the author. All texts showing potential signs of mixture of different dialects and influence from other languages, were considered useless.

In spite of this strict selection, there were still many texts to examine. In contrast to Old English, which provides only a restricted number of written materials, of which most follow written standard, the amount and dialectal variety of Middle English manuscripts provided another problem: making sense of the variation, so as to produce a “manageable pattern” (Blake 1992: 2).

One attempt to systematise the variation found in Middle English was carried out by Moore, Meech and Whitehall (1935) in their study *Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries* (1935). The study examined 266 texts that had known geographical associations, stretching in time from the 12th to the 15th century, and attempted to establish and limit the various characteristic features by drawing isoglosses. Firstly, the researchers produced a dialect map illustrating the distribution of eleven Middle English phonological and morphological characteristics. When this was done, they were able to draw a second map dividing England into ten different dialect areas: Kentish, Southern, south-east Midland, central east Midland, north-east Midland, south-west Midland, south-central west Midland, north-central west Midland, north-west Midland and Northern (Wakelin 1977:31). In this way, the researchers hoped to be able to isolate the dialects found in Middle English texts. However, as Millward comments, this “previously accepted neat picture is a gross oversimplification” (1996: 212), and later research would criticise this method in several aspects.

### 3.4. The Linguistic Atlas of Late Medieval English (LALME)

By the time Angus McIntosh started to develop the basic ideas of what would later become LALME, the suggestion of adapting principles from a modern survey of a living language and using them in Middle English dialectology was something quite extraordinary. No one had earlier attempted to produce an Atlas for Middle English dialects, and the whole idea was
strikingly dissimilar to the ideas of the traditional approach. LALME is known to be the most comprehensive survey so far within Middle English dialectology, occupying three decades of research before it was published in 1986 (Milroy 1992: 184). In addition to McIntosh, who initiated the project, the main researchers were Michael Samuels and Michael Benskin.

According to Benskin (1981: xxix), the surveys by Oakden (1935) and Moore, Meech and Whitehall (1935) had both attempted to answer two questions:

1) What were the regional dialects of Middle English?
2) What were their geographical limits?

Even though these questions may seem reasonable, McIntosh believed them to be misconceived. He claimed that dialect boundaries would mostly be illusory, and that these surveys failed to consider the existence of a dialect continuum.

First of all, the surveys by Oakden and Moore, Meech and Whitehall used a very limited number of texts. McIntosh (1989: 23) also criticised the number of items searched for in each text: “(...) the number of items which they decided to record, and subsequently plot, was far too small”. While Oakden’s survey investigated 45 items, Moore, Meech and Whitehall examined their selected texts for only 11 items. In contrast, the LALME survey started up with 75 items and later stepped up to a total of ca 280 items in order to obtain as precise results as possible. An example by Wakelin (1977: 31) explains how several variants that were ignored in Moore, Meech and Whitehall’s survey were found to be clearly noteworthy through LALME:

(...) Moore, Meech and Whitehall classify the third person plural pronoun, *hem*, etc., as forms simply having *h* or not -h- (i.e. as *h-* or *th-* forms), without eliciting various sub-sets of the two types. Many of these, however, have non-random geographical distributions and are therefore dialectally important, e.g. the form *hom* (an *h-*form) has a distribution of its own which does not emerge from the Moore-Meech-Whitehall treatment, but which now turns out to be significant.

Another point in which the LALME methodology differs from the procedures of traditional dialectology is that it focuses on written language, not spoken. Instead of concentrating on the phonemic aspect, the main aim of LALME has been to record the graphemic forms and treat the dialectal material descriptively (Wakelin 1977: 32). McIntosh (1989: 24) writes that “Thus, if there is a contrast <bane> : <bone> between the North and elsewhere, then for our purposes it is best treated as a contrast in graphemes irrespective of their phonemic ‘value’
As Kristensson (1967: 4) notes, while Moore, Meech and Whitehall and similar studies tried to distinguish isophones and isomorphs from each other, the guiding principle of LALME has been to include all the various items that may indicate a variation between areas. He claims that at least four contrasting features may be captured through using this principle: phonemic (ban:bon), morphological (ride:rides), word-geographical (kirk:church) and orthographic (it:itt, she:sche).

In contrast to modern dialectology, there are no live informants to interrogate about Middle English, and generally researchers have very little information about what the language in this period sounded like. In traditional dialectology, spoken language was considered to be more suitable for linguistic study than writing. However, as Stenroos (2008:14) points out, “it is an inescapable fact that all linguistic evidence for historical periods consists of writing”. When there is no information about the spoken language, research based on it can only be assumptions and not facts. Because of this, McIntosh decided to base all his research on written texts. He pointed out that, since he was investigating a dialect of which all evidence was found in written form, the most important thing was to plot all the various written forms onto a map (Wakelin 1977: 32). Only after this could any systematic phonological or phonetic interpretation of them be attempted (McIntosh 1989: 24). Writing varies systematically, just as speech does, and variation in written language is in itself significant, whether it reflects spoken variation or not.

In contrast to the traditional approach, which held scribal texts to be largely useless for dialectological purposes, the LALME researchers considered these texts highly valuable. Most of the surviving texts from Middle English are not the author’s original version, but copies by scribes, usually at many removes. Because of this, researchers up until the 1960s considered these to be “untrustworthy witnesses” (Benskin and Laing, 1981: 55) and refused to include them into their research. They presumed that scribes would not copy letter for letter or translate properly, and in this way they would only contribute to corrupting the original dialect further. Strang (1970: 225) criticises this view and writes that “It was as if medieval scribes were taken to be concerned with setting up a speech-encoding device for us to break, rather than a means of communication to be interpreted by fellow-speakers with a knowledge of the same writing conventions.” McIntosh, on the other hand, worked out from the assumption that scribal translation and copying was relatively thorough and systematic. After studying their scribal habits, he described the various treatments that a scribe might choose when copying a manuscript that differs from his own dialect (Benskin and Laing 1981: 56):
A) He may leave the language more or less unchanged, like a modern scholar transcribing such a manuscript. This appears to happen only somewhat rarely.

B) He may convert it into his own kind of language, making innumerable modifications to the orthography, the morphology, and the vocabulary. This happens commonly.

C) He may do something in between A and B. This also happens commonly.

In this way, provided that the scribe was sufficiently consistent, the copy would be of philological value regardless of the state of language in the versions between the copy and the original. Even if it failed to provide evidence for an authorial dialect, “it could still present a language that was genuinely individual (Benskin 1981: xxx).

McIntosh’s method of research was to study linguistic forms found throughout England. In order to do this, he divided the country into blocks of about 50 square miles, and then identified manuscripts from each of the blocks (Blake 1996:145). The survey by Moore, Meech and Whitehall included texts from the 12th to the 15th century, and McIntosh (1989: 25) argued that this was much too wide a chronological spread. He claimed that linguistic differences due to chronological factors might easily be confused with genuine dialectal differences. McIntosh decided to reduce the span of time to approximately one century, from the period 1350-1450. The main reason for this choice was that there are very few texts written in Middle English before this time, and McIntosh realised that it would be problematic to achieve any complete coverage of an earlier (Blake 1996: 145). Text written after 1450 would generally be standardised and consequently of little value.

One of the main aims of the LALME survey was to identify the various scribes’ characteristics and create a Linguistic Profile for each of the texts used in the survey. In order to produce these profiles, the researchers went through the texts with a pre-determined questionnaire consisting of approximately 280 items and collected the various forms used by the scribes.

While the study by Moore, Meech and Whitehall mainly used already localised literary texts in their survey, McIntosh, Samuels and Benskin applied another procedure. The researchers started by plotting dialect information from texts with a known provenance onto maps. These texts, which have been named ‘anchor texts’, consist mainly of local documents. Anchor texts then functioned as the starting point for further localisations. McIntosh (1989: 25) explains this method with an example:
Let us suppose that one takes the trouble to plot on maps as much as possible of the dialectal information available in localised documents which come from various parts of S Lancashire, Cheshire, SW Yorkshire, W Derbyshire, N Staffordshire and N Shropshire. If one of them examines the language of Gawain and the Green Knight, it eventually becomes clear that this text, as it stands in BL Cotton Nero A x, can only fit with reasonable propriety in a very small area either in SE Cheshire or just over the border in NE Staffordshire. That is to say, its dialectal characteristics in their totality are reconcilable with those of other (localised) texts in this and only this area.

This method was first outlined in 1963, named the ‘fit-technique’. Through progressive elimination of the areas where a dialect feature does not belong, it may be used to delimit the area where it does belong (Benskin 1992: 9). Through a comparison with anchor texts that contain similar assemblages of features, the text may be plotted on a map. As the process continues, and more texts are studied, the localisation of the texts becomes increasingly more precise. In this way, the ‘fit-technique’ has proved to be of great use in localising Middle English texts. Even though it may be difficult to decide the absolute positions of the texts this is of little consequence as long as the researchers are certain that their position relative to each other is topologically solid (McIntosh 1989: 27). The map that is constructed during this process does not necessarily show where the texts have their exact origin. It does, however, represent a typology indicative of the approximate geographical origin. In some cases, the map may provide a very precise overview of the original area of usage, while in others it may be much less specific (Stenroos 2008: 15).

3.5. The importance of documentary texts

The compilers of LALME distinguish between ‘literary texts’ and ‘documentary texts’ in their work. Literary texts comprise a wide range of fictional texts and discursive writings. Documentary texts also include a diversity of texts, but of a different kind. According to LALME (I: 9), a local document could include “personal correspondence, records of manors and municipalities, the records of courts, secular or ecclesiastical (though the latter are commonly in Latin), and legal instruments.” The ‘legal instruments’ include for instance depositions, indentures, conveyances and arbitrations. Most of these texts will include some indication of their origins. In addition, it is common that they “attest some form of the written language, if not precisely of the stated place, then of somewhere near to it” (LALME I: 9), and are thus potentially usable as anchor texts.
Most documents provide information about their origin at the beginning or end of the text. Usually there is a so-called *dating clause*, a sentence specifying the date and place where the document was written. The following examples from Cumberland documents in MEG-C illustrate such clauses. The first one demonstrates a dating clause at the beginning of the document, while the second is an example of dating clause in the final line of a document:

This indentour mayd at penreth yᵉ xxiiiij day of yᵉ moneth of Apprile yᵉ xxiiiij 3er~ of yᵉ reng~ of kyng~ Edward and yᵉ 3er~ of our~ lorde m¹ cccc lxxxiiij (L1182)
‘This indenture made at Penrith the 24th day of the month of April, the 24ᵗʰ year of the reign of King Edward and the year of our Lord 1484’

Gifen~ at Cornay xxiiij day of Janur~ in~ ye yhere of ye Reynge of kyenge henry ye sext next after+ye conquest of yngland xvij (L1145)
‘Given at Cornay (the) 23ʳᵈ day of January in the 17th year of the reign of King Henry, the sixth next after the Conquest of England’

The documents used in LALME usually refer to named places, and one of the researchers’ tasks is to try to determine whether the language of the document really reflects the place it refers to. For many documents, this is not the case. As McIntosh et al. write: “Men travelled, and so did their language...: it is always possible that the language of a document does not belong to the place of which, on all other counts, the document itself is firmly associated.” Even though the place name given in the document may be where the document was in fact written, that does not necessarily mean that the scribe producing the text was from that area. At the same time, for the purposes of mapping the geographical reference is at least a starting point:

When... the language of a document... conforms to general expectations for the area in question, then there is at least a reasonable basis for regarding that place, rather than some other, as the dialectal locus (LALME I: 42).

The evidence of local documents is particularly crucial for the Northern part of England; here, documents written in a non-standardised language are plentiful, and, in some areas, they form the main or only dialectal evidence.
3.6. The language of Northern texts

Studying the Northern Middle English materials presents various problems. First of all, there are very few Northern texts that can be dated before the fourteenth century, and especially legal documents are rare prior to 1423. Secondly, the material is skewed when it comes to types of texts: in some areas the document is either the only or the predominant text type found. Even though there has been localised a relatively large number of religious verse and prose in the West Riding and Lancashire areas, very few secular texts have been localised in the Northern area. The distribution of texts is thus uneven regarding chronology and text type (Stenroos 2010 A : 5). In addition, Northern texts have proved to be difficult to localise using the ‘fit technique’.

The Northern area, as defined in the MEG-C Manual (Stenroos and Mäkinen, 2009-), includes the counties of Cumbria, Durham, Lancashire, Northumberland, Westmorland and Yorkshire, as well as the Isle of Man. The dialect continuum of which this area forms part stretches from Scotland in the North to the Welsh and Cornish borders in the South. The lack of early Middle English texts from this area makes the writing of the Northern language history a difficult task, and the history of early Northern English is based on an extremely low amount of texts. Because of this, only assumptions can be made about the changes that led to the dialect characteristics that are found in the Northern texts from the 14\textsuperscript{th} and 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries (Stenroos 2010 A: 4).

Most of the Northern dialectal characteristics have been attributed to the Scandinavian settlements (see e.g. Samuels 1985); however, because of the lack of texts from the early period, there is very little evidence for how these characteristics developed. By the late fourteenth century, however, Northern English dialects were clearly very different from non-Northern ones, to the point of causing problems of intelligibility. A famous comment on this appears in John Trevisa’s translation of Higden’s \textit{Polychronicon} (1385) (Harvard Geoffrey Chaucer website\textsuperscript{3}):

\begin{quote}
Al the longage of the North-humbres, and specialich at York, is so scharp, slyttyng, and frotyng and unschape that we Southeron men may that longage unnethe understand. Y trowe that that is bicause tha t a beth nigh to strange men and aliens, that speketh straungelich, and also because that the kinges of Engelond woneth alwey fer from that contray.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{3} http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~chaucer/canttales/rvt/dialect2.html
'All the language of the Northumbrians, and especially at York, is so sharp, tearing and grating and deformed that we Southern men are hardly able to understand that language. I think that it is because they live close to strange men and foreigners, who speak in a strange way, and also because the kings of England always live far from that country'.

The Northern dialects differ greatly from non-Northern ones at all levels of language. At the level of morphology, one of the most easily recognisable dialect markers in Middle English is the -es ending both of the 3 singular and the plural present indicative of verbs. The plural ending, which would always be –eth in Old English, was replaced in Middle English by –en in the Midlands (loven) and –es in the North (loves). The Southern varieties preserved the Old English ending to some extent, using –eth (lovethe) (Baugh and Cable 1993: 187). The 3 singular ending remained -eth in the Midlands and the South. Other distinguishing features that were predominant in the North are the ending –and in present participle, retained from Old English but probably reinforced by Scandinavian (see p. 66), as well as the third-person plural pronouns with initial th- (e.g. yai, thay, their, yaim, see p. 69), which are commonly held to be borrowed from Scandinavian. A syntactic feature that is particular for the North is the Northern Subject Rule (NSR), where the inflectional ending of a verb is left out when it follows a personal pronoun (see p. 65).

There were also numerous phonological differences, many of which are shown in the orthography. The long vowels seem to have developed differently; most notably, OE long ā remained unrounded (e.g. stone, bothe, two in the South would remain as stane, bathe, twa in the North, see p. 70). Another difference in pronunciation is that the ch-sound in the south often would correspond to a k-sound in the north, such as Southern church, michel, ech and Northern kirk, mikel, ilk (Pyles and Algeo 1982: 145, Baugh and Cable 1993: 187). The spelling <qu>, <quh> or <qw> was used instead of initial <wh> (as in quhen, quhat, qwhat); this may also have signalled a difference in pronunciation. A purely orthographic difference, however, seems to involve the equivalent of Present-Day English th: In writing, the letter <y> would commonly be the realisation of both ‘y’ and ‘þ’ (‘the’, for instance, would often be written ye) (see further p. 73).

The Scandinavian loanwords that had worked their way into the Northern dialects also led to lexical differences between the north and the remaining dialect areas. Many words and meanings introduced by the Scandinavians would have appeared as alien and unrecognisable for people further south.
The use of regional dialect in writing, clearly distinguishable from standardised language, seems to have survived until relatively late in the Northern area. Documentary texts written in regional dialect are found much more frequently in the Northern than in the Southern part of England. That is because standardisation, which gradually spread in the Southern documents at a rather early point in the Middle English period, did not spread as quickly through the North: Northern legal documents written in regional dialect seem to have been produced until the end of the fifteenth century, and occasionally even later (Stenroos 2010 A: 5).
4. The geographical and historical context

4.1. The East Riding of Yorkshire

Yorkshire, the largest of England’s counties, is divided into three Ridings: the North, the West and the East. In addition, it includes the city of York. The word *riding* is believed to derive from the Old Danish word *thriding*, which meant a third part of something (Hey 2005: 65). The division into Ridings took place long before the Norman Conquest. In contrast to most of England’s counties, being divided into *hundreds*, the county of Yorkshire was quite unique in being divided into Ridings. Subsequently, each of these Ridings was parted into a multitude of wapentakes. According to Hey (2005: 65), the term *wapentake* derives from “the symbolic flourishing of weapons at assemblies to signal agreement on matters of law and order”. Because each of the Ridings was of considerable size, these smaller, administrative areas were necessary in order to govern properly. In 1823, Baines’ (1823: 5) registered 7 wapentakes in the East Riding: Buckrose, Dickering, Harthill, Holderness, Howdenshire, Ouse and Derwent and Hull. At present, the number of wapentakes in the East Riding has increased to 12; as Harthill and Holderness have both been divided into three subdivisions.

The East Riding stretches over approximately 750,000 acres, and at its broadest it extends about 68 km from East to West and 53 km from North to South. As Pevsner and Neave (2005: 21) explain, the East Riding is almost entirely bounded by water, as there is either river or ocean on all sides of it. While the boundaries are formed by the rivers Denver in the North, Ouse in the West and Humber in the South, the eastern boundary is clearly marked by the North Sea. The only land-based boundaries are the 11 km between Stamford Bridge and York and the 13 km from Binnington Carr to North Cliff, Filey.

The East Riding is divided into five natural regions: The Vale of York, the Jurassic Hills, the Yorkshire Wolds, the Vale of Pickering and the Plain of Holderness. The latter covers most of the coastline in the East, including Barmston. The landscape of Holderness has mainly been shaped by a variety of glacial and post-glacial deposits (Allison 1976: 25). Earlier, large areas in Holderness were covered with wet, boggy ground; such area were called *carrs*. The inhabitants of Holderness would settle on the “islands” of sand and clay that rose above these carrs. During recent years, however, the river Hull and numerous other dikes
have functioned as an effective drainage system, resulting in a drier landscape (Allison 1976: 25).

There has always been a restricted amount of natural resources in the Holderness area, and according to Prevsner and Neave (2005: 23) this presented the medieval builder with quite a few problems. Because woodland was sparse and there was a lack of proper building-stone, the only materials left to build from were clay and chalk. As Prevsner and Neave (2005: 23) point out, “[b]oth are of limited durability in their natural state and it was only with the development of brickmaking and cement manufacture that their potential was realized”. There is also evidence showing that mud and thatched housing was common in the Holderness area. Today, houses from before Georgian times (1714 – 1830) are scarcely found. Houses from the Middle Ages are practically non-existent, and houses from the 16th and 17th centuries are also rare. Allison (1076: 26) claims that the lack of houses from this period clearly reflects the poverty found in the East Riding during the Middle Ages.

From about A.D. 450 the East Riding was settled by Angles and Scandinavians. This invasion lasted for approximately five centuries, and Allison (1976: 43) underlines that during this time Angles and Danes contributed greatly in shaping the landscape: “The patterning of villages and hamlets which eventually emerged from the centuries of Anglian and Danish settlement is essentially what we are still familiar with today” (1976: 55).

4.2. Feudalism in Europe

The term feudalism does not seem to have been used in the Middle Ages, and did not appear as a term until the late 18th century (Stephenson 1942: 1). The word feudum, on the other hand, was, according to Bean (1968: 1), used to designate a piece of land. This land was called a fee, and one held this in return for military service. The feudalistic system in Europe can be traced as far back as the fall of the Roman Empire, even though it did not become widespread until about the 10th century. Its principle was that people of certain rank and power could provide the ones lower in rank with land, protection and the like. In return they would get rents, services and loyalty.

One specific example can be given from the Frankish kingdom of the Merovingians and the state of Gaul. Under Merovingian rule, the Gauls were rarely at peace. According to Ganshof (1996: 3) there would frequently be periods of anarchy and chaos. This was both because of family feuds within Gaul and, later on, rivalry between the regional aristocracies
of Austrasia, Neustria and Burgundy. Due to a large extent to the primitive structure of the state, Gaul was unable to maintain the security of its inhabitants, and eventually it became necessary to look to their more powerful neighbours for protection. Usually such protection would be granted in exchange for some service. In rare cases, this protection could involve that the one seeking it became slave to the protector. Nevertheless, it was more common that he would keep his status as a free man, yet offering his services to the protector. Ganshof (1996: 4) notes that these people were referred to as *ingenui in obsequio*, meaning free men in dependence. In Latin, the relationship between these two parts was called *patrocinium*, implying that both superior authority and protection was involved. The legal act where one person put himself under the service and protection of another was called a commendation, in Latin *commendatio*.

In the early middle ages, Western Europe was a mainly agricultural society, and the main form of economic prospering was through farming the land. In order to assure that the land was properly maintained, it was possible for the lord to grant areas of land to a vassal. The vassal was to maintain this land for the lord. According to Ganshof (1996: 5), the word *vassal* is a Latinized form of the Celtic word *gwas*, meaning a young boy or servant. The vassal was usually from the military class, a knight. Further, *vassalus* appears to derive from the adjective *gwassawl*, meaning one who serves. The land granted from the lord to his vassal would usually be a tenement. This meant that the vassal had all rights to the given area, even though it did not belong to him legally. The tenements were often held for life and were in many cases hereditary (Ganshof 1996: 10). In return for this land, the vassal would pay the lord back in rents and labour.

### 4.3. Feudalism in England

Although it has been claimed that feudalism was introduced to England by the Normans, it appears that the system which feudalism is based on was not wholly unfamiliar to the inhabitants in Anglo-Saxon England. Dodgson and Butlin (1979: 82) argue that, rather than bringing change and innovation to England after the Conquest, the Normans merely played on “themes already established by the time it began”. The feudal system in England had already started to develop in Anglo-Saxon times. In order to raise armies and keep the finances in order, it was common that Anglo-Saxon *thegns*, meaning lords or knights, were given land by the king in return for military service.
William the Conqueror employed the principle of feudalism to reward his followers after the Conquest. According to Poulson (1840: 183-184), William I divided all of England, except the royal demesnes, into baronies. Subsequently he conferred these lands to his closest supporters in return for stated services and payments. In addition, the tenants ceremoniously pledged their loyalty to William I by swearing to serve and protect him. Thus, by delegating responsibility to such men that he knew would remain faithful to him, it was easier for the king to govern the land. In feudalism, all land belonged to the king, even if someone else tended it. Consequently, the barons and earls who were rewarded with land became tenants-in-chief to the king.

In the fourteenth century, the chronicler Jean Froissard (1968: 211) commented on the English version of the feudal system:

It is the custom in England, as in several other countries, for the nobles to have strong powers over their men and to hold them in serfdom: that is, that by right and custom they have to till the lands of the gentry, reap the corn and bring it to the big house, put it in the barn, thresh and winnow it; mow the hay and carry it to the house, cut logs and bring them up, and all such forced tasks; all this the men must do by way of serfage to the masters. In England there is a much greater number than elsewhere of such men who are obliged to serve the prelates and nobles.

In feudalism, there existed a complex hierarchy of landholders below the king who assisted him in controlling the land (Dodgshon and Butlin 1979: 91). The tenants-in-chief were authorised to share out parts of their land to vassals. The vassals then had the right to share their land with the ones below them in rank, namely the peasants. At the very bottom of the structure were the unfree peasants, or serfs. Through this system, everyone knew their place and what they were expected to do.

### 4.4. The village of Barmston

Barmston village is situated at the Northern extremity of Holderness (Bulmers 1892). Today it is bounded by the North Sea in the East and by Earl’s dike in the North and West. Earl’s Dike is a very old stream and used to form one of the boundaries of the Holderness wapentake (North Division), separating it from the neighbouring wapentake of Dickering. In the South
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and South-West the village is bounded by other streams. Barmston is situated in a shallow valley on the Hull road (Kent 2002). It is built in an east-west direction and is divided into two parts: One part contains the church, the former manor house and a few other buildings, while the rest of the village is situated about 500 metres further east. Apart from a few boulder constructions, most of the village is made from brick.

The church in Barmston is a very old stone building, dedicated to All Saints. As Poulson (1840: 202-203) notes:

> From the Domesday survey, it does not appear that Barmston was then distinguished by a religious edifice. The endowment of the rectory, and the original erection of the church, may therefore, with great probability be subscribed to the family of Monceaux, which settled here about the reign of Henry I.

He also notes that there is a church recorded in Barmston in 1168, and that this was granted to the abbey of Whitby by Sir Alan Monceaux and his son, Ingram. Inside the church there is a large marble monument representing a knight in full armour. This is believed to be the memorial of Sir Martin de la See, who died in 1494. There are also memorials of members of the Boynton family dating from the 17th century. The families of Monceaux, de la See and Boynton have all been holders of the manor in Barmston at different times.

Most of the Eastern boundary of Barmston consists of cliffs, and stretches from about 8 to 23 metres above sea level. The area that does not comprise cliffs is called the Low Grounds. This area stretches along the streams that function as boundaries in the north, west and south. By these streams there can be found deposits of boulder clay, alluvium and river gravel. The greater part of the parish, however, lies on masses of sand, gravel and laminated clay.

The term ‘medieval village community’ is defined by Dyer (1994: 408) as “an association of people living within a specific territory, sufficiently organised to have some control over the use of resources (usually fields and pastures) and to have dealings with superior authorities such as the state”. A village could either consist of a nucleation of inhabitants packed around one specific centre, or the hamlets and farmsteads could be scattered more freely. Dyer notes that the village is sometimes confused with the manor, which was the “administrative device that allowed a lord to levy labor, rents, and dues from his tenants and subordinates” (1994: 408). The density of villages varied greatly in the East Riding, depending on water supplies and soil. In the Holderness area, the soil was generally fertile and there were sufficient amounts of surface water.
Due to various reasons, it is generally a difficult task to explain or describe the shapes or plans of early settlements. The original layout of a village may have changed to a great extent over the years. What is known is that most villages were built in groups near their church and their water supply. Still, from the time when a village was built it may have been expanded or changed in many ways.

The name Barmston is likely to be Anglian, mainly because of the –ton ending, which was typical of later Anglian villages. Fellows-Jensen (1972: 253) notes that Barmston also has been recorded as Benestone, Benestun and Berneston and that -ton originates from Old English tun ‘enclosure’ (the Present-Day word ‘town’). She adds that the first element of the word might be the Scandinavian personal name Bjørn, but that it is more likely to be the cognate Old English personal name Beorn.

The parish in the middle ages included one or sometimes several townships, and usually had a function in local government and civil administration. The parish of Barmston also included the hamlets of Hartburn and Winkton. Both of these were inhabited up until the fifteenth century, but they are now gone, due to coastal erosion. A case study by Euroision states that 30 coastal villages along the coast of Holderness have been destroyed by erosion since the Roman times. As Mee (1964: 14) puts it, “During 600 years they have been washed off the map by the resistless tide”. Coastal erosion is still a threat to several settlements along the coast, and as Barmston village is built on layers of boulder clay and sandstone, it is particularly susceptible to this. The Euroision-study notes that it is difficult to predict erosion, because it depends on time, weather and place. However, it also states that in Barmston, October 1967, there was recorded a loss of 6 metres during two days of storm.

Because of the lack of woodland, the East Riding has always been a mainly agricultural area, and Barmston is no exception. Wilkinson (1980: 3) points out that “It contains no minerals, no coal for smelting iron or wood for charcoal and no rapid streams to provide the power to drive machinery”. However, the vast fields found in Holderness are well suited for agriculture.

In the Middle Ages, the agricultural system that was most commonly used was the open-field system. It is believed that this system was developed from the Anglo-Scandinavians’ way of cultivating their farmlands. According to Wilkinson (1980: 3), this system was most likely “the outcome of the gradual clearance and cultivation of an area by a

---

5 http://copranet.projects.eucc-d.de/files/000164_EUROSION_Holderness_coast.pdf
large group of settlers, working together and sharing the results of their labour”. However, the system varied somewhat from village to village.

Landholdings would usually be measured in oxgangs and ploughlands, where a ploughland consisted of eight oxgangs. Sheppard (1974: 120) suggests that oxgangs and ploughlands, as well as other measurements such as marks and orae, were introduced by Scandinavian settlers. The land which surrounded the village might be individually owned, but the inhabitants would farm it together. Even though the inhabitants would cultivate and manage their own holdings, cooperation must have been necessary for a variety of tasks. For instance, full plough teams were something not every peasant could afford. In addition, the grazing of their animals would often be supervised by a common herdsman, who was paid with cash and food that the peasant households raised together (Dyer 1994: 410).

The land used for agriculture was divided into three main divisions: arable, meadow and common. The arable is the land that is fit for ploughing. These arable fields would often be named, usually after where they were situated, such as the West or East field. Wilkinson (1980: 3) notes that they sometimes also “record some distinguishing feature (Church, Mill and Hill are common)”. The arable fields were divided into strips, or lands, and again divided into groups where all the strips of one group ran in the same direction, usually determined by the landscape. These groups have been known as furlongs, shotts, falls or flats. Wilkinson (1980: 4) explains that

One individual’s holding in the arable land of any parish consisted of a number of strips scattered at widely distant points in various flats in each of the fields; a share in each of the fields being necessary because the system of cultivation required one of them to be left fallow each year, during which it was used for pasture and thus fertilised.

The meadows were large, verdant areas and equally important to the peasants as the arable. The hay which the meadow land produced was essential for them to be able to feed their livestock during the winter. The meadows and former marshes were also referred to as ings, leys or carrs (Wilkinson, 1980: 5). These areas were, like the arable, allocated to the inhabitants of the village. After the growing season, when the hay had been collected from the meadows, these areas were used as common grazing fields.

Finally, each parish would usually have a moor, over which there would be common rights, meaning that all the villagers had rights to make use of it. These commons were used as rough pasture for their animals. On a map from 1756 (see map 1), the fields in Barmston
are divided into South, East and West areas. In the present text, the divisions are labelled the East, West and North fields. One possible reason for this change could be that the names have simply been changed, or there may have been a change in the location of the fields. It is also possible that the change has had to do with erosion or with the construction and development of the village, or both.

According to Dodgshon and Butlin (1979: 100) a manor was “a unit of lordship whose meaning centred on the co-existence of a demesne worked by customary tenants”. In the feudal society of medieval England, the manor was a system of land tenure. It functioned as the administrative unit in charge of the economic and social organisation of each of the villages in England. The manor was held by a vassal and would usually contain the manor house, the church, the village and the fields surrounding it. In some cases, the manor could include several villages. The holder of the manor had many rights and advantages. He was in charge of the inhabitants of the village and was required to provide the peasants with food, strips of land and clothing. In return for this, the peasants and serfs had to pay him back in labour and taxes. Poor as they were, the tax would often consist of services or a certain percentage of the peasant’s produce. There was a difference between peasants and serfs: While the peasant was considered to be free, a serf was legally bound to the land and his lord.

The earliest mention of Barmston is in the Domesday Book. The Domesday Book was commissioned by William the Conqueror in December 1085, and the first draft was completed in August 1086, with records of 13,418 settlements throughout England (The Domesday Book Online). The information usually recorded in the Domesday Book was the following (Finn 1972: 2):

- a) The name of the holding
- b) Who held it at the time of the survey and also who held it before the conquest
- c) Its assessment for geld etc.
- d) The number of plough-teams possible there
- e) The plough-teams, both demesne and tenants’
- f) The number of household or able-bodied men, and their social or economic standing
- g) The equipment in woodland, meadow, mills etc.
- h) The value in 1086 and that of 1066.

http://www.domesdaybook.co.uk/contents.html
According to the records in the transcribed version of the Domesday Book (Morris, Faull and Stinson 1986: 324 b,c) there were four main proprietors in Barmston in 1086:

In BENESTONE. Torchil. Siuuard Bonde 7 Alchil. h’b’r viii. car tre ad gld’ . 7 totid’ car poss ibi ee. Wats est. T.R.E. ual. LX. Fol.

‘In Barmston Thorketill, Siward, Bondi and Alfketill had 8 carucates of land taxable; the same number of ploughs possible there. Waste. Value before 1066, 60s.’

The term waste can mean different things. Traditionally this term implied that it had been laid waste by the Normans after the wars of William the Conqueror in the winter of 1069-70. However, it could also mean that it was unfit for agricultural use, and thereby regarded as untaxable (Domesday Book website). Waste could also mean the uncultivated land which served for public roads and common pasture for the animals of both the lord of manor and the inhabitants of the village.

When the text refers to a certain number of ploughs, this meant the taxable amount of land that could be ploughed by a team of eight oxen (Domesday Book website).

Shortly after this record was made, the four landowners were dispossessed by William I, and their lands were given to one Drew de Bevrere. The manor was, in the beginning of the 12th century, held by Sir Alan de Monceaux (Kent 2002). Monceaux is likely to have been the vassal of Stephen, Earl of Albemarle and lord of the Holderness wapentake. This grant of land is likely to have happened around 1120. The manor of Barmston stayed in the Monceaux family for about two decades, and was in 1287 registered to include five carucates and six bovates in demesne in Barmston, Winkton and Lissett (in Beeford). Further, the tenants of Ingram Monceaux, who was lord of the manor at that time, occupied nearly two carucates in Barmston and Winkton. After William Monceaux’s death in 1446, the manor passed to William’s sister, Maud. She was by then married to Brian de la See. Their son, Martin de la See inherited the manor in 1463, and after him it went to his daughter, Margaret. This was in 1497. She was married to Sir Henry Boynton, and the manor remained in the Boynton family until 1948, when the property was sold to Glendon Estates Co. Ltd. It then consisted of 2,232 acres of land. It thus seems that the manor was held by the de la See family in 1473 when the survey of Barmston was made.
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7 http://www.domesdaybook.co.uk/glossary.html#w
8 http://www.domesdaybook.co.uk/glossary.html#w
4.5. The landholders in the Barmston survey

Altogether 17 landholders are named in the Barmston survey. However, only a few of these can be said to hold substantial amounts of land: these are ‘the manor’, ‘Crosse’, Edward Rowth, the church, ‘the nuns of Kyllyng’ and ‘Rallynson’. While most of these landholders can be verified in historical records, the identities of ‘Crosse’ and ‘Rallynson’ are unclear.
The Victoria County History account (Kent 2002) lists the known medieval landholders in Barmston as follows: the family holding the manor (at this point the de la See family); the ‘St John’s estate’ granted to Gerald de St. John in 1250 but not possible to trace since the late thirteenth century; Bridlington Priory; the Knights Hospitaller and Nunkeeling priory; in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, land was also granted to Thornholme priory (Lincs) and Thornton Abbey (Lincs).

In the Barmston survey, the manor is by far the biggest landholder with 275 strips of land. Table 1 provides an overview of where the Manor held land in 1473 and how much. For an explanation of the various measures, see Appendix 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Field</th>
<th>West Field</th>
<th>North Field</th>
<th>Toft Stedes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodlands</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowlands</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodbreds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brod leye</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1, The holdings of the Manor

The second largest landholder in Barmston is referred to as ‘Crosse’:

1) Item j brodland longyng’ to Cros haldyng’ (l. 11)
   ‘Item 1 broadland belonging to Crosse’s holding’

2) Item iij Brode- land~ and j Narow longyng’ to Crosse haldyng’ off yº same bownd~ (l. 136)
   Item 3 broadlands and 1 narrow belonging to Crosse’s holding of the same boundes.’

As no first name is provided, it is uncertain even whether Cross is a person, family or institution. However, the Cross estate holds several strips of land in each of the areas described:
The name *sir Edward Routh* (also *Rowth* in the manuscript) is mentioned frequently throughout the document and he is one of the major landholders in Barmston at this point, with altogether 77 strips of land listed (Table 3). *Dominus Edward de Routh* is listed as rector in Barmston in the mid 15th century (Poulson 1840: 205, Genuki website⁹). Poulson (1840: 205) writes that Routh was a presbyter and that he was instituted July 3rd 1456. He also notes that when *dominus* is prefixed to a name, it usually denotes that he was a knight or a clergyman. A note by Poulson (1840: 207) may provide an indication of Edward Routh’s time of death: “Edward Routh, dies intestate, administration of goods granted 26th January, 1486”. It is likely, then, that he died the previous year, in 1485.

As rector of the church of Barmston both his personal holdings as well as the church’s were in his interest. The Church is recorded with 60 strips (Table 4); in addition, eight broadlands are defined as belonging to the parsonage.

### Table 2, The holdings of the ‘Cross Estate’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Field</th>
<th>West Field</th>
<th>North Field</th>
<th>Toft Stedes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodlands</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodbreds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name *sir Edward Routh* (also *Rowth* in the manuscript) is mentioned frequently throughout the document and he is one of the major landholders in Barmston at this point, with altogether 77 strips of land listed (Table 3). *Dominus Edward de Routh* is listed as rector in Barmston in the mid 15th century (Poulson 1840: 205, Genuki website⁹). Poulson (1840: 205) writes that Routh was a presbyter and that he was instituted July 3rd 1456. He also notes that when *dominus* is prefixed to a name, it usually denotes that he was a knight or a clergyman. A note by Poulson (1840: 207) may provide an indication of Edward Routh’s time of death: “Edward Routh, dies intestate, administration of goods granted 26th January, 1486”. It is likely, then, that he died the previous year, in 1485.

As rector of the church of Barmston both his personal holdings as well as the church’s were in his interest. The Church is recorded with 60 strips (Table 4); in addition, eight broadlands are defined as belonging to the parsonage.

### Table 3, The holdings of Edward Routh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Field</th>
<th>West Field</th>
<th>North Field</th>
<th>Toft Stedes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodlands</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brod leye</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ [http://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/Misc/PhotoTs/ERY/BarmstonRectors.html](http://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/Misc/PhotoTs/ERY/BarmstonRectors.html)
Another landholder who is prominent in the document is the nunnery of Kylyng or Nunkeeling Priory. Nunkeeling is also situated in the wapentake of Holderness (see Map 2). Agnes de Arches built a nunnery for Benedictine nuns here in the time of King Stephen (1096-1154). The nunnery was raised in honor for the saints Mary Magdalen and Helen (Genuki website). The nunnery was not a rich institution to begin with, but its holdings gradually increased as other prosperous and pious people granted them land. By the time of the Reformation, the nunnery held lands in a number of nearby villages, including Barmston (Genuki website). In the present document, 52 strips of land are recorded as being held by the priory (Table 5).

Table 4, The holdings of the church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Field</th>
<th>West Field</th>
<th>North Field</th>
<th>Toft Stedes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodlands</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5, The holdings of the Nuns of Kylyng

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Field</th>
<th>West Field</th>
<th>North Field</th>
<th>Toft Stedes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowlands</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodbred</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The name Rallynson is, like Crosse, never found in connection with a first name. There are 50 strips of land associated with Rallynson; these fall into three groups. First of all, many entries refer to a holding that was ‘sometime’ Rallynsons or is ‘called Rallynson’s’; other entries specify ‘Rallynson’s holding in the manor demesne’, while others simply refer to ‘Rallynson’s holding’:

3) Item j Narow-land longyng’ to Rallynson’ haldyng’ jn mann dm (l. 144)  
   ‘Item 1 narrowland belongs to Rallynson’s holding in Manor demesne’

4) Item a brode-land sum- tyn’ longyng’ to Rawlynson’ haldyng~ (l. 228)  
   ‘Item a broadland sometime belonging to Rallynson’s holding~’

5) Item j brod-land longyng’ to Rallynson’ land of yé saym’ bownd~ at both end~ (l. 77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East Field</th>
<th>West Field</th>
<th>North Field</th>
<th>Toft Stedes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodlands</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowlands</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodbreds</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6, The holdings of Rallynson
The Knights of St John of Jerusalem (the Knights Hospitaller) held two bovates with tofts in Barmston in 1312, and are recorded as landholders there both in the Barmston survey of 1473 and later (Kent 2002).

The remaining nine landholders are all named individuals and hold relatively little land each: Jon Jelyan, Jon Kae, Jon Tyndal, Jon Wyske, Robert Dybnay, Thomas Dubnay, William Hagget, William Smyth and William Wyemarke.

Of the major landholdings listed by the Victoria County History, the two largest ones after the manor have not been accounted for here: the disappeared ‘St John’s estate’ and the holdings of the Bridlington Priory. As the latter had a large estate in Barmston, and continued to hold it until the Dissolution, the absence of references to Bridlington in the present document is surprising. An identification with the otherwise unknown ‘Cross estate’ or *Crosse holdyng*, with its 131 strips of land, would solve the discrepancy, but does not rest on any actual evidence.
5. The Barmston Survey as evidence for literacy practices

The Barmston survey is of considerable interest as evidence for late-medieval literacy practices, both because of its format and for what can be deduced about its production. The fact that there were four or five different scribes taking part in it is suggestive of a general availability of literate people; at the same time, other aspects of the document suggest a culture that is still to a large extent oral.

From approximately the 13th century onwards, there was a particularly rapid growth in the need for literacy, especially among the middle classes. The ability to read and write for oneself became increasingly important for business purposes, and it became gradually more necessary to rely on the written word (Parkes 1973: 557). The trend of growing literacy continued throughout the 14th and 15th centuries, in parallel to the increase in use of the English language instead of Latin and French. The knowledge and use of Latin and French became more and more restricted gradually disappeared from texts to do with daily life (Parkes 1973: 564).

During this period most people, even serfs to some extent, became acquainted with text and documents at some level (Clanchy 1993: 53). In the Middle Ages, reading and writing were considered separate skills, and for most people writing would not be needed as often as reading (Clanchy 1993: 47). Even though they were familiar with written texts and able to read, many people from the middle and lower classes would not necessarily be able to write.

Throughout the Middle Ages, it was mainly clerks who were responsible for written texts (Clanchy 1993: 53). In order to be able to study the Bible and perform the various sacraments of the Church, all the clergy were expected to be literate (Orme 1973: 12). However, especially from after the middle of the fourteenth century, there survives a huge amount of written material, including charters, court rolls, accounts, works of scholarship and imaginative literature, which shows that a high number of people must have taken part in the various types of text production (Orme 1973: 11).

Even though there was a general increase in literacy, people in the villages had only limited opportunities to be educated. For the unfree tenants in the villages, it was common that education was restricted by their lords; on one hand, the lord of the manor could have use for literate workers. However, as Orme (1973: 50) notes: “schooling presupposed a career in the church or in some trade or profession, and hence departure from the manor and acquisition
of free status. The lord would lose the services of an educated villain...”. In this way, education in the villages were usually restricted, but not impossible.

Lawyers were educated at the Inns of Court and Inns of Chancery in Westminster, and would usually return back to their home regions after their finished education (Benskin 1992: 89). However, it is important to keep in mind that the people producing legal documents, especially in the provincial areas, would not always have a professional education. It was not uncommon that people educated themselves through “amateur scrutiny of such legal instruments as came his way, rather than from a formal education or pupilage” (McIntosh et al. 1986: vol I: 45). The requirement of formal legal education in order to draw up documents did not appear until later. The primary condition for being employed was in many cases based on gaining the confidence of the client and not necessarily the amount of formal education.

Both Clanchy (1993: 132) and LALME (I: 45) suggest that such ‘amateur’ scribes are generally recognisable from their idiosyncratic or ‘uplandish’ handwriting styles. In LALME (I: 45), competent ‘law hands’ writing in regional dialect are associated with ‘substantial but still local’ families:

Documents written in competent law hands and dated from very small villages or hamlets are intrinsically unlikely to represent the language of precisely the places to which their texts belong. Such places could not of themselves support an independent notary, and a man with proper legal education in such parts must have sought employment in the service of a substantial landowner, if indeed he were not from a like family himself. The retinues of the great might well be drawn from several counties... By contrast, substantial but still local families... can be supposed to have drawn their retainers from their own neighbourhood, at lest for the most part.

The village of Barmston was relatively small: in 1292 there were counted 46 tenants on the manor; 26 houses were assessed for the hearth tax in 1672 and in the mid 18th century about 30 families lived there (Kent 2002). No school is recorded in Barmston until the eighteenth century; the nearest recorded medieval school was in function in Beverley from 1436-1456. On the other hand, the manor of Barmston was held by what was undoubtedly a ‘substantial but local’ family, and there are surviving court rolls for the manor of Barmston for 1468 and 1590. In the late fifteenth century, local officials included a constable and several dike-reeves, as well as two aletasters (Kent 2002).

In the introduction of LALME (McIntosh et al. 1986, vol I, p.45) the point is made that small villages normally would be unable to support an independent notary, and that the writer of the document often would be hired from a nearby town. However, as there are four
to five scribes who have contributed in the Barmston survey, there is reason to assume that
the manor supported an administrative and bureaucratic apparatus of some size. As Orme
(1973: 36) points out:

The household of servants with which every great man surrounded himself, whether
bishop or abbot, earl or knight, contained a significant proportion of men engaged in
literary tasks, not to say of the stewards, receivers and bailiffs in charge of the lord’s
estates, whose work also involved them with documents to a greater or lesser extent.

The survey of Barmston is likely to have been carried out as a sort of *perambulation* (LALME
I: 44), a walking where the various land areas and boundaries are noted. The walking starts
out in the West Field, continues through the East Field, the middle of the village and the
North Field, before it describes the various toftsteads found in the village. It seems likely that
the entries were noted down in abbreviated form and then expanded by the scribes in order to
produce the text of the document: this is suggested by the different constructions used to
relate the same information in the passage copied both by scribe 4 and scribe 5 (see p. 83).

The document is remarkably little reader-friendly. There are 13 people involved in the
distribution of the open fields of Barmston, and the ones who hold much land are mentioned
frequently. However, it is a difficult task to get an overview of who owns what in the different
areas; most of the text is written in relatively long blocks where one entry follows the other
without starting on a fresh line. Hence, it becomes a time-consuming task to locate a specific
name in the text, especially if the person holds much land in different fields; for the present
study, the information had to be entered onto a database in order to be manageable. The only
help the reader gets from the document is the headings indicating which area is being
described.

One might ask why the bounding should be produced as a document written in
continuous blocks of text instead of a list or a map. The latter possibility, while useful, would
have been a completely different task: it would require specialised skills to draw, and would
not answer to the conventions of a legally binding document. Such a document requires
sentences that are written out properly, and formulated carefully so as not to be
misinterpreted, and hence a mere list of the names and places involved would not be
acceptable.

Even so, there would seem to have been simple ways of making the Barmston survey
more reader-friendly. From the 13th century it became increasingly more common to use
different varieties of written indexes, as opposed to the *mental indexing*\(^\text{12}\) used earlier (Clanchy 1993: 179). In order to provide an overview, scribes used layout and indexes to make the contents clear and understandable. In the Barmston document, however, there is no use of either layout or indexing to make the document easy to use. A simple way of improving readability would have been to begin each entry on a new line. This convention was used commonly in manorial court records; an example may be taken from the Selby court records, produced not very far from Barmston (MEG-C Corpus, text L0415f, unpublished):

> Item William Bacon keeps 2 dogs unlawfully and is charged to keep one on leash and put away the other on pain of 20 shillings;
> Item that John Coltard keeps a bitch unlawfully, put her away on pain of 40 shillings;
> Item that Richard Dysshford kept fish in his shop for 24 days until it stank so much it had to be carried to the Ouse; therefore if he do it any more he is to forfeit 6 shillings and 8 pence’

In addition, it would have been possible to highlight the names and/or draw lines connecting related entries, neither of which convention was unknown for Middle English writers. However, as documents concerning land areas were generally produced in one continuous block, this might simply be a genre convention.

There are some signs in the manuscript that the text has been used, or been meant for use, for reference purposes. In the left-hand margin of fols. 1v, 2r, 2v, 3r and 4r there can be found two different types of notae; + and one looking somewhat similar to a pointed double c, <<. In fol. 3r it is difficult to decide if there is a marginal marking or if it is merely a stain. There are no notes explaining what these markings indicate, but in fols. 1v, 2r and 2v the cross seems to appear where either *Edward Rowth or the church* is mentioned:

**Fol. 1v**

6) *Inprimis* j brod leye longyng’ to the maner § *Item* ij brod leys longyng’ to the freholt of *sir Edward Rowth* (l. 5)

7) *Item* j brod-land longyng’ to the freholt of *sir Edward rowth* (l. 9)

---

\(^\text{12}\) Mental indexing meant memorizing information “by indexing it in the mind’s eye”. (Clanchy 1993:178)
Fol. 2r

8) Item ij brô'd- landes stynttyng’ at ye mylln’ sclake at ye west endes and _ ye est end at’ schepe bryg’ dyke. longyng’ to ye fre-hald of sir Edward Routh (l. 44)

9) Item _ j land end buttand on ye sam’ land be-west ye gate to rowker longyng’ to ye kyrke land (l.49)

10) Item j brod-land longyng to ye fre-hald of sir Edward Routh (l.53)

11) Item j brod-land of _ longyng’ to ye fre-hald of sir Edward Routh of ye saym’ bownd- at’ both end- (l.59)

Fol. 2v

12) Item iiij brod-land- longyng’ to ye fre-hald of syr Edward Rowth and ye stynt- at both endes a-pon ye com’ and lys next ye com’ at north syd of ye myllnfelld (l.78)

13) Item ii brod’-land- longyng to ye frehald of sir Edward Rowth of ye saym’ bownd- (l.100)

In addition, all references to Edward Routh and the church are underlined in these folios. This suggests that the person using the document would have been connected to the church in Barmston; it may well have been Edward Routh, the rector, himself who annotated the document to get an overview over his and the church’s holdings.

The cross is not used consistently in marking where there are underlinings, and there are several underlined names in the mentioned folios where there is no cross in the margin. In the three folios where the cross appears, there are altogether 18 underlinings and only 10 marginal crosses.

In the rest of the document, after fol. 2v, neither underlined words or cross markings are found. It is impossible to guess why the markings stop here, apart from the perhaps suggestive fact that 3r is the first page that was not finished by scribe 1. If the annotation had been done by scribe 1 after finishing each page, this might indicate that he was connected with Edward Routh and the church; however, this can only be speculation. The points to conclude are that at least the first few pages show a wish to make the text easier to use for quick reference, by Edward Routh or someone connected to him.

The fact that the document is so badly suited for reading could suggest that it was not mainly meant to be read. Even though there had been an increase in literacy skills during the
preceding centuries, the literate mentality was not very deeply rooted yet (Clanchy 1993: 185), and the text could well have been meant for reading aloud. Even this was not the case for the present document in particular, the general habits of writing may still have reflected a conception of writing as something to be listened to. As Clanchy (1993: 186) puts it:

Medieval writing was mediated to the non-literate by the persistence of the habit of reading aloud and by the preference, even among the educated, for listening to a statement rather than scrutinizing it in script.

This would suggest that the document belongs to a community where literacy was still restricted at this point and that the oral modes were still predominant. It appears as rather paradoxical, then, that while five scribes contributed in the production of the document, showing that there were a high number of skilled writers in the area, the document itself is of an oral character, and few of the possibilities of the written page have been made use of.
6. The scribes of the Barmston survey: a palaeographical study

In LALME (I: 45) it was suggested that some types of documents are more likely to be of local origin than others (see p. 42). For instance, the ones that are produced in a competent law hand and dated from small villages or hamlets are not very likely to represent the language of the area it is dated to be from. On the other hand, documents that are written in other scripts than law hands, “particularly those scripts that are uplandish, and documents written in an eccentric fashion” (LALME I: 45) are much more probable to be a local product.

This chapter provides an analysis of the handwriting of the scribes who contributed to producing the Barmston survey. As well as assessing the hands in the terms of the qualities discussed in LALME, the aim is to compare the palaeographic usages of the scribes in detail. The description and classification of the hands is necessarily based on subjective assessments, and there is so far no Atlas of Middle English scripts to help place scribes. However, it should still be worthwhile to compare their usages, if only to confirm that they are distinct.

6.1. The scripts: a brief background

The three main types of script that were used in fifteenth-century England were all members of the Gothic family of scripts. In accordance with the terminology established by Parkes (1979), they will be referred to here as Anglicana, Secretary and Textura. It is the former two that will be most relevant for the present discussion.

From about the mid 12th century onwards, an increase in the demand for books, as well as in the size of works to be copied, led to new developments in scribal techniques. Lowe (2005: 2904) describes the period as a “watershed in the history of palaeography”. At this time, secular professional scribes took over much of the professional production of books, which earlier had been the responsibility of the religious communities. The reason for this was a growth in the need for lay people to use reading and writing in everyday life. Speed and ease of writing became important to all scribes, both the ones who copied books and the ones who prepared and drafted documents (Parkes 1979: xiii). This led to scribes starting to use
different kinds of handwriting, depending on the sort of text they produced or copied, and the result was that a new hierarchy of scripts arose.

The script with the highest status, used mainly for texts in Latin and for Bible texts, was Textura. This script was elaborate and highly calligraphic in display. None of the letters were connected, and it took time to produce. One particular feature of textura was ‘biting’, where two letters were partly linked together (i.e. d and e, where the lower part of the stem of the l forms most of the lobe of the e).

As producing texts was expensive, it became gradually more important for the scribes to save time and energy, as well as to conserve space, as more texts were produced and text production became a commercial activity. Because of this, smaller and simpler hands were developed. According to Parkes (1979: xiii) the scribes seem to have taken as their model a type of handwriting from about 1200, that was used for writing marginal comments, and from this, the smaller, gothic book hands were created. This script was “highly compressed, closely spaced and full of abbreviations” (Parkes 1979: xiii).

The Anglicana script came in use from the end of the 12th century and was used mainly for writing documents (Lowe 2005: 2903). From the end of the 13th century, it was also found in books. Being a cursive script that made use of many abbreviations, this script was ideal for texts which had to be produced as quickly and cheaply as possible. In order to write rapidly, the scribe would modify the duct of his handwriting. Wherever he could, the scribe would replace straight strokes with curved ones, which are easier to control in quick writing (Parkes 1979: xiv). The scribe would let some of the letters be linked together and lift the pen from the surface as seldom as possible. Some of the letter forms that were characteristic for the Anglicana script were the two-compartment a, d with looped ascender, forked ascenders, two different kinds of e; the pointed and the cursive variety with reversed ductus, the tight, 8-shaped g, the long r, descending below the line of writing, the sigma-shaped s which reminds a little of the numeral 6, long s and f with stems descending below the line of writing, w produced by two long initial strokes and completed by bows, and finally x made with two separate strokes (Roberts 2005: 161, Parkes 1979: xiv-xv).

In the beginning of the fourteenth century, changes appeared in Anglicana, most likely in order to further increase the efficiency of the script. The forked ascenders fell out of use, and a new form of cursive e appeared, where the stem and the lobe were formed in one circular movement, and clearer distinctions were made between the letters to prevent confusion (Parkes 1979: xv-xvi).
About 1375, a new cursive script came into use in England; the Secretary script. This script is likely to have originated in Italy, and came to England through France. Being even quicker to write than Anglicana, the Secretary script was soon adopted as the main business script (Roberts 2005: 211). As both the Anglicana and the Secretary script arise from the Gothic system of scripts, they have many similar features. Still, there are some clearly distinctive features that make it in principle possible to tell the one from the other. The distinction between the two scripts lies both in the duct of the script and in how the strokes and letter-forms are produced. As Parkes (1979: xix) explains it, “First, the duct of the new script was based upon the regular antithesis of broad strokes and hairlines placed in different diagonals according to the angle of the slanted pen, thus giving to many of the hands a characteristic ‘splayed’ appearance”.

Secretary is a slightly more angular script than Anglicana and there is usually a clear contrast between the use of thin and thick strokes. Parkes also describes how angular broken strokes can be found where one would expect to find curved ones in most other scripts, for instance in the lobes of the letters a, d and g, in the formation of o and the so-called 2-shaped r, and also in the stems of c and e. In addition, the Secretary script is known for its “horns” that may be found on the heads or sides of the letters, especially of e, g and t. Secretary script can also be recognised through the use of the pointed, single-compartment a, both e with a bow and with two strokes, g that is closed with a separate line at the top and with an open tail curling to the left, r that does not descend below the line of writing, often produced with a central well (sometimes called the v-shaped r), w made with three strokes, resembling the w in modern writing, and x produced in a single stroke.

Both the Anglicana and Secretary scripts were commonly used in fifteenth-century documents, and many scripts may be considered hybrid ones, combining features of both. The Textura script was not generally used for document texts; however, short stretches of Textura, or Textura-like features, such as biting, often appear in headings and other highlighted parts of text. The ‘law hand’ referred to by the LALME editors presumably refers to the kind of cursive Anglicana-type script that occurs commonly in fifteenth-century documents, and a variant of which is identified as the ‘Chancery hand’ in Benskin: (2004: 11-12); during the fifteenth century, Secretary forms become more and more common in these hands, but they can still be described as 'modified' versions of Anglicana.
6.2. The hands

The five hands of the Barmston document are described in what follows. Because it is the handwriting that is described in this section, the line-numbers here refer to the manuscript, rather than the transcription.

6.2.1. Scribe 1

The hand of the scribe of folios 1v-3r, l 1 is overall a cursive Anglicana script which displays some Secretary features as well. The looped ascenders in b, h, d and l are typical of the Anglicana script, and are found throughout the text. The only exceptions are dall in fol.1v, l.12, and longyng in fol. 2r, l.8. In dall, the double consonant is marked with a crossbar. The g is without exception realised with a characteristic Anglicana form; it is close and curly and resembles the numeral 8. The circular, cursive Anglicana e is used throughout the text without any variations.

Even though the double-compartment a, which is typical for Anglicana, is found several places in the text, the Secretary single-compartment a is used most frequently. Double-compartment a is used in initial position, with only a few exceptions (fol. 1v, l. 23 at, fol. 2r, l.11 at, fol. 2v, l.26 apon and fol. 2v, l.7 at). Except in fol. 2r, l.10 narow, a appears solely in the single-compartment variant when it is found within a word. The letter r is found both with and without descender, and these variants seem to be used rather interchangeably. They are both found in initial positions as well as in the middle or end of a word, without any obvious pattern (long descender: fol. 1v, l.5 rodbred, fol.1v, l.3 toward, fol.1v, l.19 meyer. Short form: fol.1v, l.10 rodbred, fol.1v, l.3 thorne, fol.1v, l.1 owr).

The w in this hand is the variant found in the Secretary script; both the majuscule and the minuscule letters are very much like the modern w (fol. 1v, l.1 owr and was). The x is also characteristic of a Secretary hand; while the Anglicana one would be formed by two separate strokes, the Secretary one is made in a single stroke. In this text, the scribe has connected the arms on the right side, forming a loop.

The text looks slightly untidy, with quite a few corrections and additions, including both above-line additions and underlining of words; however the hand is generally clear and legible. The lines are kept straight without there being any sign of pricking or ruling. The first
scribe has not used any heading in the start of the document. Where a new area is being described in the middle of fol. 1v, three lines are indented, but no heading is provided. However, on fol. 2v there is a clear division in the text and a heading introduces the description of the East Field.

Even though there appears a *punctus* in a couple of places (fol.1v, l.6 *Rallynson .*, fol. 2r, l.8 *dyke .*) this does not function as punctuation in the modern sense of the word. On the other hand, paraph marks are used to provide divisions between the survey entries, and these are used consistently by the scribe between each entry. The paraph is not used when the end of the entry is at the end of the line; then there is clearly no need to indicate where the division between that and the following sentence goes (see fol. 1v, l.3, l.20 and l.35, fol. 2r, l.8 and l.35, fol. 2v, l.10, l.11, l.12). There is a single exception in the last entry before the new heading on fol. 2v, where the paraph appears at the end. In addition to the paraph marks, each entry starts with *Item*, so it is not problematic to find where a new entry begins.

The name *Edward Rowth* is always preceded by the title *sir* which mostly appears in abbreviated form. The fully spelt form *syr* appears twice (fol. 2v, l.7 and l.17); otherwise there are four different variants of this symbol, which seem to be used interchangeably and without any difference in meaning or function.

The scribe uses superscript letters frequently. The superscript *e* is always used for *‘the’*, which appears as *y’*. In addition, superscript is found in *y’th* (fol. 1v, l. 2), *y’* (fol. 1v, l. 6, l.11, l.15, l.19), *y’om* (fol. 1v, l.25), *y’o* (fol. 2v, l.23) as well as in abbreviation of the name *William* (fol. 1v, l.10) and the term *Inprimis* (fol. 1v, l.4, l.24, fol. 2v, l. 10). Other than that, superscript is mostly used in corrections within the texts (fol. 1v, l.33 and fol. 2r, l.6, l.15 *br’d*, fol. 2r, l.5 *ba’ng*, fol. 2r, l.11 *we’st*), while in fol. 2r, l.5 (*long’ng*) and l.27 (*rallyn’ng*) it appears that the scribe has used superscript merely because the word would otherwise not fit on the line.

6.2.2. Scribe 2

The hand of what is here termed scribe 2 consists of less than four lines in the manuscript. There is no clear dividing line between the hand of the first and the second scribes; the script seems to transform gradually within a sentence (fol. 3r, l.12). The script of scribe 2 is also clearly a cursive Anglicana. Because of this, and because of some shared linguistic forms (see p. 79), it could seem plausible that the first scribe has merely written these lines in a different
duct or with a different pen. It would be strange if the scribe suddenly came to an abrupt halt in the middle of a sentence and a second scribe continued it. However, the forms of the letters are in many places so remarkably different from those of the preceding text that a change of scribe seems most likely. The place where the hand seems to change is after Jon Jelian in line 12 of fol. 3r. If this is the case, the text written by the second scribe would be this:

14) of yᵉ saym’ bownd § Item j brod-land longyng’ to yᵉ maner of yᵉ saym’ bowndes § Item j bœr brod-land & j narow longyng to yᵉ hows of kyllyng’ of yᵉ saym’ bowndes § Item iiij brod & ij narow-landes long to yᵉ maner of yᵉ saym’ bownd §

The first feature that is noticeable after Jon Jelian is that the writing becomes generally bigger and thicker. The change is not dramatic in the first words, yet it is noticeable. In addition, the letter f in of (l.12) is written differently from the text above. The bow at the top of the stem is narrower, and the letters generally become more angular; the letters o and g become almost quadratic (fo: 3v, l.13 bownd, brod, l.15 long. g: l.14 kyllyng, l.15 long). In contrast to the first scribe, no single-compartment a appears in this hand. Another significant change is the w; this was written solely as a Secretary w by the first scribe. Here it is much more decorative and curly, which is typical for the Anglicana w, and the simple Secretary variant does not occur at all. Similarly, the short r, without a descender, is not used in this short stretch. The paraph mark is used in the same function as in the preceding hand above, and superscript is used in yᵉ.

Because the letters as well as the otiose strokes are bold and rather large, the hand seems rather chaotic. Although the text is legible, it is not as neat and clear as the text above or below it. The idea that this hand might be part of the third scribe’s text has also been taken into consideration, but the two hands differ so considerably that this seems quite improbable.

6.2.3. Scribe 3

The stretch copied by scribe 3 starts at fol. 3r, l.15. This hand may also be characterised as mainly an Anglicana script, but there are Secretary features found throughout the text. In contrast to the hand of the first scribe, where the looped ascenders typical for Anglicana were used consistently, the ascenders of b, h and l are not looped in this hand. Rather the ascenders end in a flourish (fol. 3r, l.16 haldynge, bowndes, lande). The d, however, has a looped
ascender. The circular Anglicana variant of e is used throughout the text. The letter g is tight and curly and similar to the numeral 8 in shape, which is another Anglicana feature.

Both single- and double-compartment a is used by this scribe. The single-compartment variant is used within words (fol. 3r, l.16 haldynge, same) while the double-compartment is found in initial positions (fol. 3r, l.26 and, fol. 3v, l.2 and at). One exception is in the first line of fol. 3v, where single-compartment a is used in at. There are also two variants of w found in this hand; the simple Secretary form (fol. 3v, l.19 bownd, l.26 narow, fol. 4v, l.3 Edward) and the curly, decorative Anglicana one (fol. 3r, l.15 narow, l.16 bowndes, l.17 Edward). Even though the Anglicana variant is the one used most frequently, the simple w appears as a variant form throughout the text.

The letter r is also found in both Anglicana and Secretary variants and here none of them seems to be more prominent than the other. The r with a long descender (fol. 3r, l.18 narow-lande, l.19 frehalde) and r sitting on the line of writing (fol. 3r, l.19 Brodeland, l.21 kyrke) are used unsystematically and apparently at random. The x is a typically Anglicana one and produced with two separate strokes (fol. 3v, l.27, l.39, l.44, l.47 and fol. 4r, l.1, l.14, l.19 next). In fol. 3v, l.13 the word open appears with a small dot in each of the lobes of o and p. The dot inside the p also occurs in fol. 4r, l.15 personeche. Here, the dot might indicate capitalisation of the p.

The hand of the scribe is clear and legible, and there are few corrections. Only in one place is there an obvious correction, and apart from that there are only two above-line additions (fol. 3v, l.1 Jt for a forlonge [called Ryhyll] lyng’ South and North, fol. 3v, l.20 B’ode). There are no marginal markings. Although the text slants upwards somewhat, especially right after the change in hand on fol. 3r, the lines are kept relatively straight. There are two headings within the text; one of them, Ryhyll, appears at the bottom of fol. 3r rather than above the text it relates to. The second heading is placed at the top of fol. 4r. In the latter there is biting between m and e in medyll. At the bottom of both fol. 3r and 3v, there is a decorative line-filler of wavy stipules (~ ~ ~ ~). This seems to indicate the end of the description of a certain area, as each of these lines appears before a new heading. The same decoration is found on fol. 3v, l.2., where it appears before a new Inprimis.

Unlike the two previous scribes, scribe 3 does not use paraph marks to separate entries. The punctus is used irregularly, but relatively frequently (fol. 3r, l.24, l.25, l.31, fol. 3v, l.14, l.15, l.28, l.43, l.47, fol. 4r, l.3, l.5, l.14, l.15, l.19). On fol. 3r, l.21 it is difficult to decide if the mark is a punctus or simply a stain. There are no other punctuation marks in this hand.
Before the name *Edward Rowth, sir* is always abbreviated, and there are two variants of the same abbreviation found in this hand. One is made with two strokes (fol. 3r, l.17, l.28) while the other is made with only one (fol. 3r, l.23, fol.3v, l.10). Superscript is used in $y^e$.

### 6.2.4. Scribe 4

The fourth scribe of this document has not produced very much text, less than half of a folio. However, the hand stands out from the others. It is written in a Secretary hand that differs clearly from all the other hands, although it contains some Anglicana features. The letters $d$ and $l$ have looped ascenders (fol. 4r, l. 21 *sid*, *feld*, l.22 *land*, *longynge*) and the $e$ is the circular variant used by the previous scribes. The $w$ is not the typical Secretary one, but rather consists of a combination of two $v$’s put together (fol. 4r, l.22 *narow*, l.25 *Edward Rowth*). This variant appears to be very rare, and a search through the MEG-C archives, consisting of several hundreds of reproductions of samples of Late Middle English texts, could not present any other examples (Merja Stenroos, personal communication). The $x$ is produced with two separate strokes (fol. 4r, l.21 and l.22 *next(e)*, l.29 *oxgang*) and $r$ occasionally has the long ascender typical of the Anglicana script (fol. 4r, l.22 *brade*, l.23 *frehold*).

The scribe uses single-compartment $a$ without any exceptions, and even though the Anglicana variant of $r$ is found sporadically in the text, the Secretary variant is used most frequently. In addition, the letter $g$ is the characteristic Secretary one, with the lobe closed by a separate line at the top.

In the subheading at the start of this hand (fol. 4r, l.20), biting occurs between the letters $d$ and $e$ in *ffelde*. Another notable feature is that the scribe makes a distinction between the letters $p$ (‘thorn’) and $y$, unlike all the other scribes (see p. 74).

The punctus occurs only four times in this hand in l.22, l.28, l.29, l.33. However, in l. 28 and 29 the marks are so unclear that it is difficult to establish whether they were intended as punctuation marks. No paraph marks are used, but there are two notae resembling the ones found in fol.1v, 2r and 2v (see pp. 44, 45). The first one appears next to the heading. After the heading, the scribe has used an incipit (fol. 4r, l.21 *Inprimis*) to specify where the description begins. The second nota is found next to this incipit. The way of using the notae is similar to the first scribe. Apart from the nota, there are two different symbols of abbreviation found in this text; one for *and* (fol. 4r, l.22, l.24) and one for *sir* (fol. 4r, l.23, l.33). The full spelling of these two words does not occur.
While the initials of the names Edward Rowth (fol. 4r, l.23), John Tyndalle (fol.4r,l.29), and John Wiske (fol. 4r, l.30-31), as well as the first letter of Ralynson (fol. 4r, l.27) and Wynkton (fol. 4r, l.32) are capitalised, brod-land, narrow-land and kellynge remains in minuscule letters (one exception in l.25, where Brod-land is written with capital b).

There are not many corrections in the text; a single one occurs on line 26 (holdyng).

6.2.5. Scribe 5

The last, and longest, part of the document is produced by a scribe using a cursive Anglicana script, with a few traces of Secretary influence. The ascenders of b, d, h and l are mostly looped, although there are some inconsistencies, especially in l and b (b: fol.4v, l. begynnes, fol. 5r, l.13 brode, fol. 5v, l.26 boundynge, fol. 6r, l.23 brode, fol. 6v, l.15 boundes l: fol. 4v, l.9, l.12 longyng, fol. 5v, l.7 longyng, fol. 6v, l.1 longyng). Both the Anglicana circular e and the double-compartment a are used invariably by this scribe. In addition, the w looks like a double v, although formed tightly as a single letter shape rather than as two separate letter forms as in the hand of scribe 4; the simple w found in Secretary script does not occur. The shape of this letter is rather similar to the one used by scribe 4. A study of the MEG-C archives identified a variant similar to the one by scribe 5 in two other texts (Leicester L0130 and Staffordshire L0718). Hence, this is a letter form which is not particularly common.

The x is made with two separate strokes. The g is shaped like the numeral 8, but in contrast to the other scribes using an Anglicana script, the g’s found here are long and slim (fol. 4v, l.1 begynnes, l.6 kelyng).

Both the Anglicana and the Secretary variant of the letter r can be found in this hand. Mostly, the long and v-shaped r with the descender going below the line of writing is used. When it occurs in the final position of a word, the scribe tends to produce this letter with a final flourish, looking slightly like an inverted e (fol. 4v, l.1 heer, fol. 5v, l.2 maner). The short, z-shaped r seems to be used particularly often in specific words: frehald (fol. 4v, l.8, l.17, l.23, fol. 5v, l.29), north (fol. 4v, l.1, l.3, l.30, l.31, l.33, fol. 5r, l.2, l.6, l.7, fol. 5v, l.9) and kyrk(e) (fol. 4v, l.9, fol. 5v, l.24, l.28, fol. 6r, l.6). However, it is also found occasionally in other words (fol. 4v, l.3 forsayd, l.5 ffyrst, brode-land, fol. 5r, l.8 othir, l.20 athir, l.22 brode-land, fol. 5v, l.31 Crosse, fol. 6r, l.28 Naffirtoun, fol. 6v, l.1 brode-landes, l.5 Naffyrton).
The hand of this scribe is generally well-arranged and tidy. It appears to be produced by an experienced scribe; the text seems to have been written quickly while being clear and legible for the reader.

In addition, the layout and structuring of the text in this part of the document stands out from the others; the scribe seems to be more aware of legal conventions and the professional ways of structuring a document of this kind. The text begins with three indented lines and an incipit (Memorandum) to clarify which area is being described. Then, as the main part of the text begins, a second incipit (Inprimis) is added as the first word of the sentence. In fol. 6r there is a large space in the text indicating the end of the first paragraph and the beginning of the second. Again, the new paragraph opens with an incipit (Memorandum) and two indented lines presenting the new area, followed by Inprimis.

The scribe varies somewhat regarding use of punctuation between entries; there is either nothing, or there is a punctus or a slash, or virgule. The virgule is used frequently to divide between entries, especially if the end of an entry comes in the middle of a line. Where the end of the sentence is at the end of a line, there is generally no indicator. The punctus is found 12 times in the text as a marker of the end of an entry (e.g. fol. 6v, l.4, l.9, l.12, l.14). At the end of the first paragraph (fol.6r) and in fol. 6v, l.4, the punctus and the virgule appear together. There are no paraph marks.

In addition to being used between some of the sentences, the punctus is also used after the initials of names. The scribe uses initials frequently instead of writing out the names of the various landowners every single time. The name Edward Rowth / Routh is mentioned in full 7 times, while his initials, E.R., appear 17 times. Similarly, W. haggett (fol. 5r, l.25, l.33, fol. 5v, l.19, fol. 6r, l.6), used for William haggett, is mentioned occasionally throughout the text. The name Edward Rowth / Routh is preceded by an abbreviated form of sir. In contrast to the previous scribes, only one variant is used by this scribe; this is one that has also been used by all the others. It resembles the letter s with long descender and with a flourish in the middle, crossing the descender.

Another feature that distinguishes this scribe from the others is that superscript e has not been used in the (ye in manuscript). Instead, the e sits on the line of writing. However, apart from in the incipits, superscript does occur in other abbreviations (fol. 5r, l.33 y', fol. 5v, l.9 w', fol. 6v, l.6 w').
6.3. Summary

After comparing the scribes, it is clear that one of them stands out from the others: While the other scribes use an Anglicana script type with Secretary features, of the general type common in legal documents, scribe 4 writes in a Secretary script of a quite different character. Throughout the fifteenth century, the use of the Secretary script became increasingly common, although it never replaced the Anglicana script. The fact that scribe 4, but none of the others, uses it could imply that his usage was more progressive. On the other hand, his hand lacks something of the fluency of the other scribes. Scribes 1, 3 and 5 use kinds of script that may presumably be characterised as ‘law hands’. The hand of scribe 4 does not fall into this category; however, while some of its letter forms may well be characterised as eccentric, the script does not look awkward or unlearned, which is presumably what the term ‘uplandish’ might indicate.

The forms of w used by scribes 4 and 5 are relatively similar to each other. While the variant used by scribe 5 exists in two other Middle English texts, there is no other example of scribe 4’s variant. However, the likeness between these two forms, and the fact that they are rarely found elsewhere, could imply a connection between the two scribes.

Scribe 4 is also alone in using thorn instead of y for initial /th/- sounds, which was relatively uncommon in the Northern part of England. This does not necessarily imply that the scribe is non-Northern, but he might simply have adopted the non-Northern conventions in his work. Conventions of script varied greatly between scribes and communities during this period; in particular, there were many different varieties of ‘hybrid’ forms combining Anglicana and Secretary features. For different types of text, there were different preferences regarding choice of script (see section 6.1.). In order to draw any further inferences about the background of the scribes, the differences between the scribes need to be seen in conjunction with the dialectal evidence.
7. The dialect of the Barmston survey

7.1. Methodology

This chapter deals with the dialect used in the Barmston document. The first part of the chapter gives an overall description of the main dialectal characteristics of the text. Morphological features are discussed under 7.2., while 7.3. deals with the orthography of the text, including what it suggests about the phonology of the dialect. Section 7.4., finally, compares the different scribal usages and attempts to place them in the context of dialectal variation in Northern fifteenth-century documents.

Two methods have been used in the analysis. Firstly, a questionnaire consisting of 17 items was used to collect the data manually. The analysis was carried out according to the principles outlined in Benskin and Laing (1981: 59-62) producing a partially ordered profile by changes of ink colour. This procedure was essential in order to identify changes within the text and to define the scribal stretches. Secondly, an electronic version of the text, turned into a MEG-C text file, has been analysed using the concordancing program AntConc (version 3.2.1 w)\(^\text{13}\).

Abbreviation marks are referred to using the classification system in Hector (1966), which is also used as a reference system in MEG. As in the edited text, most abbreviation marks are here transcribed using conventional expansions in italics (or in underlining if the entire form is cited in italics): so, Hector 2 appears as \(n\) and Hector 3 as \(er\). It is, however, important to bear in mind that these expansions are in no way intended to suggest that the scribe meant these particular spellings rather than any alternative ones when using the abbreviation: thus \(her\) is not to be considered equivalent to \(her\) as opposed to \(hir\); rather, the three forms are all to be considered as different spelling variants of the same word, all distinct from each other. Final flourishes are problematic in the text and are not expanded (see 7.2.1).

\(^{13}\) AntConc can be downloaded as freeware from http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/antconc_index.html.
7.2. Morphology

7.2.1. Inflectional endings and the ‘Hector 9’ abbreviation

In order to discuss the morphology of the Barmston document, the first task is to consider its use of abbreviations. It is a notable feature of this text that morphological information is extremely difficult to interpret, as ambiguous final flourishes appear in most places where inflexional endings might be expected.

The use of abbreviations in the Barmston document is extensive; being a long and repetitive document where the same words and structures appear frequently, the abbreviations contribute to easing the work of both the scribe and the reader. This includes the use of common abbreviations as substitutes for letters or short strings of letters, such as the indication of nasals by a macron (haldyn, longyn/longyn, styntyn, contend; Hector 2) and the loop usually interpreted as er or re (maner, personeche/personage; Hector 3). There is also a large number of commonly occurring words or terms, especially Latin ones, that are abbreviated consistently throughout the text, e.g. oxiang, inprimis, item, memorandum. Most of these abbreviations are unproblematic in the sense that their interpretation is clear from the context, and does not involve ambiguities of structure. However, the text contains two kinds of final flourish that may be interpreted as suspention marks, and that are very difficult to interpret.

The greatest difficulties arise with the flourish that was categorised by Hector as no.9. This looped vertical marker appears at the end of both nouns and verbs. According to Hector (1966: 38) the system of abbreviation was evolved in Latin writing, and the specific uses of each mark were not automatically transferrable to English:

English was even less fitted than Anglo-Norman French to make full use of the devices intended to shorten the labour of writing Latin. The earliest application of the medieval system to English was...in Latin documents, of native proper names, which were terminated by a mark of suspension to preserve the fiction that they were declinable Latin words. When archives came to be written in the English language there was thus already established a tradition associating the general marks of suspension with a large number of characteristically English word-endings; and it is presumably to this fact we owe the freedom with which in the 15th and early 16th centuries documents in English are peppered with marks which seem to have no abbreviative purpose whatever.
It should be noted that there are, in fact, two variants of what Hector classifies as mark no 9 that occur in the present text; these are very clearly distinguishable and only one can be interpreted as a suspension mark. There is a small, loopless downward flourish that occurs regularly after d and h in the all of the scribal stretches (e.g. fol. 1v line 5; rodbred, fol. 3r line 17; fre-hald); while it is historically a variant of Hector 9, it is never used in a way that suggests an abbreviation, and it is ignored in the transcription.

On the other hand, the flourish that is discussed as Hector 9 in what follows is a large, clearly looped flourish that may resemble an l (fol. 1.v line 6; brod-landes, fol. 2v line 10; Arlandes). In many contexts, it clearly seems to indicate a –Vs ending; however, at other times it equally clearly seems to be otiose, and most of its uses are highly ambiguous, suggesting an inflectional –s ending that may or may not be present in the context. It occurs after both nouns and verbs, mainly in contexts where an –e(s) ending is plausible although uncertain; less commonly, it also occurs in contexts where –e(s) is ruled out. Because of this ambiguity, the Hector 9 mark has not been expanded as –es in the text; instead it is transcribed with a tilde ~, e.g. bownd~. The different nominal and verbal categories where it occurs are discussed in turn below.

7.2.2. Nouns

7.2.2.1. The marking of plural forms

In the document, word-final abbreviation markings are found with both common nouns and, less commonly, proper nouns. They always appear in contexts that are semantically plural or possessive. In the context of the plural form of various measurements, such as brodlands, narowlands and lands, it seems fairly likely that the end stroke is used as an –es abbreviation:

Singular:

15) Item j brod-land and j narow longyng’ to yº maner contenyg’ yº som’ length (1.27)
   ‘Item 1 broadland and 1 narrow belonging to the manor containing the same length’

Plural:

16) Item iij Narow-land~ longyng’ to yº Maner (l. 61)
   ‘Item 3 narrowlands belonging to the manor’
There is also a possibility that the semantically plural nouns here could be interpreted as unchanged plurals, that is, plural forms that are identical with the singular. This phenomenon is a survival from the Old English period and it is particularly common when preceded by an expression of number or quantity (Mustanoja 1960: 57). Therefore it is also feasible that, in contexts like example 17), the scribe may merely have intended the end strokes as flourishes, not as abbreviation markers;

17) Item *ij brd-land~ & ij narow-land~* longyng’ to yᵉ maner buttand on’ rowker at yᵉ west end and on’ schep bryg dyke at yᵉ est end (l. 51)  
‘Item 2 broadland and 2 narrowland belonging to the manor, adjoining Rowker at the west end and Sheep Bridge dike at the east end’.

Nouns with the Hector 9 abbreviation after numerals higher than one are found regularly in the document, altogether 141 times. In this context, there are only two occurrences of forms without a flourish, both of them early in the text by the first scribe (*ij brodland* l.14, *iij rodbred* l. 19). In addition, the words *oxgang* (ll. 7, 12, 16, 20, 30) and *skor* (l. 395) appear without Hector 9 marks. The latter words were generally used without plural –s in the Middle English period. There are no examples of the Hector 9 abbreviation after the numeral one. This suggests that it is used consistently as a plural marker after numerals.

In the cases where plural nouns are not preceded by a numeral, the use of Hector 9 is quite straightforward. There are not many examples of unabbreviated plural forms. These are only found 5 times, all in the text by scribe 5, and appear as –ys, -is and –es: *gryppis* l. 265, *gryppes* l. 278, *nonys* l. 40, *nonnys* ll. 392, 394, 396. Instead, the Hector 9 abbreviation is used quite consistently:

18) Item *j brod-land & j narow-land longyng’ to yᵉ maner of yᵉ saym’ bownd~* at both ends~ (l. 55)  
‘Item 1 broadland and 1 narrowland belongs to the manor of the same bounds at both ends’

In similar contexts, *bound~/bownd~* is found 120 times and *end~* 33 times. *Land~*, either as part of a compound, such as *brodland*, or on its own is found 137 times in the document. The remaining nouns with the Hector 9 ending occur less frequently: *Rodbred~* (1), *sted~* (3), *frehald~* (1), *feild~* (6), *contend~* (3), *rod~* (2), *haldyng~* (1), *kyrk~* (2), *grypp~*
(7). Here it is logical to assume that the final end stroke has in fact been intended as an –es ending.

7.2.1.2. Endingless and –s genitives

For noun genitives, both –s endings and zero endings are found in the document, in addition to four examples of the ambiguous Hector 9 mark. Throughout the whole text, there are only five occurrences of genitive –s:

19) Was’ bowndyd Bowllom’ leys’ Eueremans’ os y² ly in y⁶ west feld of Barnston’ (l.2)
   ‘the bounding was carried out of the Bowllom Everyman’s leas, as they lie in the
   West Field of Barmston’

20) j rodbred longyng’ to y⁶ holdynge² ij oxgang y⁶ was sumtym’ Rallynsons’ (l.17)
   ‘1 rodbred belonging to the 2 oxgang that was sometime Rallynson’s’

21) qwylke is cald y⁶ weste feld of Barnston’ euerylk mans land (l. 22)
   ‘which is called the West Field of Barmston Every man’s land’

22) west sid of þe feld nexste þe leye clos euere manes (l. 222)
   ‘west side of the field next to the lea enclosure called Every man’s’

23) West syde of ye sayd feyld next ye ley Clos of euery mannys (l.243)
   ‘west side of the said field next to the ley enclosure of Every man’s’

Four out of these five examples involves the common noun man (Old English genitive form mannes). Example 20) involves a proper noun in absolutive construction.

By comparison, there are 162 endingless genitives in the text. All of these are proper nouns, except for three occurrences of kyrke (church): kyrke hedland, ll. 107, 152 and kyrke lande l. 146. These are likely to reflect a regular historical development: both Old English cirice and Old Norse kyrkja had genitive forms that would regularly develop into endingless genitives in ME (cirican, kyrkja).

All proper nouns in the text thus show endingless genitives, except from the absolutive genitive in example 20) above. The use of endingless genitives, especially in proper nouns, is a fairly common Northern feature (Mustanoja 1960: 72). It is clear that endingless genitives are generally preferred for proper nouns in this document, while the genitive forms of
common nouns, as far as the present material goes, seem to reflect a conservative
morphology, showing the regular historical development of Old English or Old Norse forms.

The next question is how far the genitive forms may throw light upon the
interpretation of the Hector 9 marks in the document. There are, in fact, two examples of these
attached to nouns that stand in an unambiguous genitive position. In both cases, this involves
proper nouns:

24) Jnprim to be-gyn at arland~ dyke at ye south side off ye feld (l. 84)
   ‘First to begin at Arland’s dyke at the south side of the field’
25) Jtem a brod-land logynge to þe sayd Ralynson~ holdynge (l. 228)
   ‘Item a broadland belonging to the said Ralynson’s holding’

In addition, there are two examples of the Hector 9 mark attached to proper nouns in of-
constructions, which may involve an absolutive genitive:

26) Jtem j Brode-land off Will3am haggett~ off ye same bownd~ (l. 131)
   ‘Item 1 broadland of William haggett(‘s) of the same bounds’
27) Jtem a brod-land of þe fre-hold of sir Edward~ Rowth (l. 224)
   ‘Item a broadland of the freehold of Edward(‘s) Rowth’

It is possible that at least the first example represents a structure of the type ‘a friend of the
king’s’ (Mustanoja 1960: 166), which was becoming increasingly common during the Middle
English period. In the second example, if the flourish represents inflectional –s, it is put after
the first name instead of the last, making for a more unusual construction, but not an
impossible one.

In the light of the genitive usage otherwise, it would seem safe to conclude that the
flourish in the first two examples simply represents an otiose stroke. The other two examples,
however, may represent a genitive –s used in absolutive constructions, as in example 20).
This suggests that the flourish is used for different purposes in the text, and may represent
both inflexional –s and zero.

Genitives formed using a periphrastic construction with the preposition of, rather than
by inflexion, are also found regularly throughout the document; in all there are 85
occurrences. This is a practice which goes back to the late Old English period (Mustanoja
1960: 74). According to Mustanoja (1960: 74), the original meaning of this construction was
out of. In later times, however, several other uses have emerged, many of which differ little, if
at all, from the functions of the inflectional genitive. In the Barmston Survey, the periphrastic construction and the inflectional genitive appear to be used rather interchangeably.

Some of the scribes use periphrastic constructions more than others. Table 7 shows the total number of of-genitives in each scribal text, as well as the frequency per 1,000 words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Of-genitives (absolute frequency)</th>
<th>Of-genitives per 1,000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7, of-genitives

Scribe 1 clearly has the highest frequency of of-constructions. In the texts by the following scribes, the frequencies decrease gradually. It would be an interesting question whether this decrease is due purely to scribal habits, or if there are other factors involved; however, it has not been possible to pursue this question in the present study.

Apart from the general decrease in of-constructions during the text, it may be noted that the of-construction is noticeably more frequent in some contexts than others. First of all, the of-constructions can be divided into two main groups: 1) the ones where something belongs to someone (e.g. ye fre-hald off sir Edward Rowth, l. 215) and 2) the ones where someone belongs to or comes from somewhere (e.g. William Smyth of Naffirtoun, l. 392). The first group is of most interest here, as that is where the of-construction is used in variation with inflexional genitives. There are nine constructions with proper names that belong to the first group, and there is a clear distinction in frequency: Edward Rowth (26), John Tyndale (7), William Wymarke (6), William Haggett (5), Robert Dybbenay (5), John Wyske (3), William Smyth (2), John Jelyan (2) and the nuns of Kyllyng (2). The reason why Edward Rowth’s name is used more often in of-constructions than the others could simply be that he held more land than the others, and consequently his name is mentioned more often in the document. However, the names Rallynson and Crosse, which are mentioned 46 and 53 times in the document, respectively, never occur in of-constructions. This could suggest that periphrastic constructions are used with names that contain more than one element (e.g. first name and surname).
The second group holds only four names: The house/nuns of Kyllyng (33), William Smyth of Naffirtoun (2), John of Jerusalem (1) and John Tyndale late of Barnston (1). Here, the construction is an obligatory one, and the difference in frequency simply reflects the number of land portions held by each landholder.

### 7.2.1.3. Verbal inflexions

The problem whether the final flourish referred to as Hector 9 should be interpreted as an abbreviation or not applies to verbs as well. In order to address this question, it will make sense to first describe the verbal inflexions otherwise, disregarding the forms with flourishes. The text contains two examples of a verbal -s ending, probably plural ones, that are written out in full:

28) Item *iij brod-landes* longyng’ to *y* fre-hald of syr Edward Rowth (...) and *lys* next *y* comon’ at north syd of *y* mylnfelld (l.78)  
‘Item 3 brodlands belonging to the freehold of Sir Edward Rowth (...) and lie next to the common at the north side of the millfield’

29) Item *ij brod-landes* longyng’ to *y* frehald of *sir | Edward Rowth* contennys *y* saym’ longth (l. 28)  
‘Item 2 brodlands belonging to the freehold of sir Edward Rowth contain the same length’

One syntactic feature that is particular for the North is that, in persons other than the 2 and 3 singular, the inflectional ending of a verb is omitted when the verb follows immediately after a personal pronoun, for example *they peel them and boils them, dogs barks, they bark*. In other contexts, the ending is –*es* (Naydenova 2008: 75). This pattern, which is called the Northern Subject Rule, is evident throughout the Barmston document. There are five examples of endingless present plural indicative forms, all following the pronoun ‘they’:

30) os *y*yal *ly* in *y* west feld of Barnston’ (l. 4)  
‘as they lie in the West Field of Barnston’

31) Item *ij brod-landes* longyng’ to *y* frehald of willam haggyt’ of *y* saym’ lenth bot *y*go not’ to *y* dyke for *y* stynttes on a meer in *y* car grund (l.88)  
‘Item 2 broadlands belonging to the freehold of Will Haggyt of the same length, but they go not to the dyke because that stops at a boundary in the carr’
32) *Item ij Brod-landes longyng’ to yᵉ fre-halde off Rob Dybbenay an yai styntt in Browcott Meer at yᵉ North end* (l. 57)

‘Item 2 broadlands belonging to the freehold of Rob Dybbenay and they stop in Browcott Meer at the north end’

33) *Imprimis to begyne at þe west sid of þe feld nexste þe leye clos euere manes as þey lye* (l. 226)

‘Imprimis to begin at the west side of the field next to the everyman’s lea enclosure as they lie’

34) *Imprimis to begin at the west side of the said field next to the everyman’s lea enclosure as they lie* (l. 220)

The present participle ending is a distinctive dialect marker in Middle English. In Early Middle English, the forms were typically -and in the North (in as far as there is evidence), -ende in the Midlands and -inde in the South. As the –ing/ynge form spread in the non-Northern dialects, the distinction came to be between Northern -and and non-Northern -ing. In the document, by far the most frequent ending is –ynge. However, the ending –eng is found once (lyeng, l. 393), and the typically Northern –and(e) occurs five times (butand il, 49, 50, 52, 54, 61). Interestingly, the –and(e) ending is only found together with buttand. Scribe 1 is the only one who uses this word, and the ending is found in no other words in the document. The remaining present participle forms which show a fully written ending (longyng, contentyng, go-ynge, bayyng, stynttyng) all have the –ynge ending.

There are altogether 94 occurrences of the Hector 9 abbreviation after verbs found in the Barmston document. Of these five occurrences are after synt~/stynnt~, four after long~, three after content~-, two after but~/butt~ and one after each of rynd~ and bownd~.

Three of these verbs, rynd~, but~/butt~ and stynt~ are found in contexts where either a present plural indicative or a present participle would be expected:

35) *Inprimis ij brod-land~ longyng’ to yᵉ kyrke and rynd~ throwe [fro] rowker to schepe bryge dyke* (l. 26)

‘First 2 broadlands belonging to the church and run~ through [from] Rowker to sheep bridge dyke’

36) *Item ij Brod-land~ long’ to yᵉ house off keyllyng’ and yᵉ North end~ butt~ on’ appill-garth dyke* (l. 194)

‘Item 3 broadlands belonging to the house of Kylyng and the north end adjoin~ on the dike by the apple garden’

37) *Item ij brod-land~ long’yng’ to wyll haggytt butt~ est end~ a-pon yᵉ see* (l. 85)
‘Item 2 broadlands belonging to Wyll Haggytt *adjoin-* east end-* upon the sea’

38) *Item ij land-* longyng’ to the kyrke *stynt-* at’ arland dyke (l. 84)
   'Item 2 lands belonging to the church *stop-* at Arland dyke’

The remaining verbs, *contend-*-, *stynnt-*-, *long-* and *bownd-*-, are found in these contexts, as well as in both ones where 3 singular present indicative might be expected:

39) *Item j narrow land* long*yn* to y*º* land cald rallynson’ land *contend-* y*º* sam’ lenth (l. 27)
   'Item 1 narrowland belonging to the land called Rallynson’s land *contain-* the same length’

40) *Item ye thorn’ Croft* w*ª* ye leys y*º* longys yerto *stynnt-* at ye frehaldes longyng’ to ye maner’ (l. 309)
   'Item the Thorn croft with the lea that belongs thereto *stop-* at the frehold- that belongs to the manor’

41) *Item ij brod-land-* longyng’ to y*º* frehald of willam haggyt’ …y*º* *stynnt-* on a meer in y*º* car grund (l. 97)
   'Item 2 broadlands belonging to the freehold of Will Haggyt …that *stop-* at a boundary in the carr’

42) *Item a brod-land long-* to þe maner (l. 224)
   'Item a broadland *belong-* to the manor’

43) *Item iiij brod-land-* & *j narow long-* to cros land (l. 225)
   'Item 3 broadlands and 1 narrow *belong-* to Cros land’

44) *Item j brod-land* longyng’ to y*º* maner … *bownd-* a-pon’ y*º* kyrke hedland (l. 105)
   'Item 1 broadland belonging to the manor … *bound-* upon the church hedland’

45) *Item iiij Narow-land-* longyng’ to y*º* Maner and y*º* south endes *bownd-* opon’ Ulrom Scorth (l. 163)
   'Item 3 narrowlands belonging to the manor and the south ends *bound-* upon Ulrume cliff’

The word *longyng* is one of the words used most frequently in the document, altogether 289 times. In the same contexts, which clearly require a present participle form, a variant *long*’ with a final flourish is found altogether 76 times all in the stretches of scribes 3 and 5. This flourish is very clearly not the Hector 9 one, but rather the flourish that is termed ‘squiggle’ in the MEG-C Manual (Stenroos and Mäkinen 2009-). In addition to this, *long-* with the Hector 9 abbreviation mark is used four times, and *belong-* once, all in the short stretch by scribe 4.
These three variants appear to have the same function and are used in the same type of sentences:

46) ij narow land~ of the sayd bound~ longyng’ to W. haggett frehald (l. 357)  
   ‘2 narrowlands of the said bounds belonging to W. Haggett’s freehold’

47) ij brode-land~ of ye sayd bound~ long’ to sir E’ R’. Frehald (l.358)  
   ‘3 broadlands of the said bounds belonging to sir E. R.’s freehold’

48) Item a brod-land long~ to sir Edward Rowth fre-hold (l. 225)  
   ‘Item a broadland belonging to sir Edward Rowth’s freehold’

From this it seems reasonable to conclude that long’ and long~ both represent abbreviated forms of longyng. On the other hand, there is one example of long without any final abbreviation marker (l. 111, 186):

49) ij narow-landes long to ye maner of ye saym’ bownd (l. 125)

The occurrence shown in example 49), however, has a macron above it, which may suggest that an ending was felt to be missing. It would in principle be possible that long and longyng are two forms used interchangeably, and that the flourishes are flourishes, not intended as abbreviation markers. However, their regularity would seem to suggest otherwise. This usage is of considerable interest, as it suggests strongly that the squiggle, usually simply an otiose stroke, is used as an abbreviation mark in these contexts. A similar abbreviation is cont’ used instead of the verb contenyng. This is found 15 times in the document, all in the text by scribe 5:

50) Item a toft stede longyng’ to ye maner cont’ in brede a brode-land (l. 376)  
   ‘Item a toftstead belonging to the manor contains in breadth a broadland’

51) Item iij Toft stedes long’ to the maner contenyng’ in brede iij brode-landes (l. 378)  
   ‘Item 3 toftsteads belonging to the manor contains in breadth 3 broadlands’

The failure of scribe 4 to use the squiggle in these contexts, and instead to use the Hector 9 mark, might suggest that this usage was a local one, or restricted to a particular text community, and that he was not familiar with it.
The uses of the Hector 9 abbreviation may now be summarised. In this document, the Hector 9 abbreviation is clearly used both for zero ending and inflexional –s, and this use is manifested in each of the scribes’ stretches; however, the usage seems to be quite regular within each context. A more difficult question is whether it should also be regarded as an abbreviation for –ing/yng. While scribe 1 always writes out the present participle ending, the later scribes, perhaps feeling the length of the document, commonly abbreviate it. In the most common verbs occurring in the past participle, scribes 3 and 5 seem to use the squiggle for -ing/-yng; whether their occasional use of the Hector 9 abbreviation in less common words should be read as -ing/-yng or -Vs is highly uncertain.

7.3. Pronouns

The Barmston survey contains only third-person plural pronouns, of which subject and object forms are found. The third-person plural pronouns are another highly salient dialect marker. While the native forms in h- remained in the south and Midlands as hi/he, here, hem, forms with initial th- soon became predominant in the north (yai, thay, their, yaim). These forms are believed to have been adopted in the north from Scandinavian, and gradually spread from the north into other dialects (Pyles and Algeo 1982: 145). The subject form with th- spread very early and was used all over the country by the fifteenth century (usually with spellings containing a diphthong with e in the non-Northern areas); however, the h- forms predominated outside the Northern area until standardisation.

In the present material, there are altogether 14 tokens of third-person plural pronouns. As would be expected of a text from the East Riding of Yorkshire, all of these are spelt with initial <th> or <y>. The following subject forms occur in the text: yai (l. 2), yai (l. 184), þey (l. 222) and thai (l. 244) The object forms are tham (l. 286, 293, 295, 295, 333), yª (l. 97), yªm (l. 27) and yam (l. 296, 301). According to the dot maps found in LALME (1986, vol 1, maps 31 and 41), both the varieties of ‘they’ with –ai or –ay and the variants of ‘them’ with medial a are typical Northern forms.

On the other hand, the subject form þey, found in the part copied by scribe 4, stands out in two respects. Firstly, scribe 4 alone of all the five scribes make a distinction between <y> and <þ>, a distinction not typically made in Northern texts (see further 7.4.x). Secondly the vowel string <ey> is mainly a southern feature in this word.
7.4. Orthography and phonology

7.4.1. The long vowels

There is a number of notable differences between the south and the north regarding differences in writing and pronunciation. For instance, the Old English long ā (/ɑː/) , which in the rest of the country was raised to an ‘open o’ (/ɔː/) was preserved in the North. Words that would be pronounced with an /ɔː/ sound in the south, such as stone, bothe, two would remain as stane, bathe, twa in the north (Baugh and Cable 1993: 187, Burrow and Turville-Petre 2005: 6).

OE ā is virtually always spelt as <o> in the present text. By far the most frequent lexical item in which it occurs is the word broad, most commonly occurring in the combination broadland; there are 284 spellings with <o> and only two with <a>, in the stretches of scribes 3 and 5 respectively:

52) Item j lande off a Rode brade & di’ longyng’ | to yᵉ Maner (l. 126)
   ‘Item 1 land of a rod breadth and di’ belongs to the manor’

53) Item iij brade-landes & a narow long’ to Crosse haldyng (l. 330)
   ‘Item 3 broadlands and a narrow belongs to Crosse holding’

In all other cases, OE ā is spelt as <o>: fro (l. 26, 40, 42, 233, 254, 373), go-yng (l. 42), go (l. 98) and one (l. 305). As <a> spellings are frequent in the East Riding area in LALME (Dot Map 633), the dominance of <o> probably reflects the text’s relatively late date. They may show the increasing influence from standard usage, or simply the result of sound change.

Jensen (2009: 33) suggests that, in the West Riding of Yorkshire, the rounding of OE ā was diffusing through the lexicon during the fifteenth century. The single example of som’ ‘same’ in scribe 1’s text might suggest the influence of standardisation, as it looks like a hypercorrection.

The Barmston Survey shows much variation in the spelling of OE a in Homorganic Lengthening environments. Homorganic Lengthening (HOL) was a quantitative change that took place in the Old English period. In HOL, short vowels were lengthened before the ‘homorganic’ consonant clusters mb, ld, rd, rl and ng. The lengthened variant would, in the southern part of the country, have taken part in the sound change that affected OE ā. As the present text otherwise shows almost exclusively <o> for OE ā, it is perhaps likely that the variation here is between the presence and absence of lengthening. In the document, the
words haldynge/holdynge, fre-hald/fre-hold, length/length show that variation between <a> and <o> occurs rather frequently.

Merger between ME /a:/ and /ai:/ is suggested by the forms saym ‘same’ and ya ‘they’ in scribe 1’s stretch; no other scribe shows similar forms. OE ō appears only in the word rode/rude ‘rood’, which is occasionally spelled <o> by scribes 1 and 3 (12 and 15 tokens, respectively), and virtually consistently as <u> by scribe 5 (19 tokens against one of <o>). OE ā, finally, appears in the words ‘house’, ‘our’ and ‘south’, and is spelt <ow> or <ou>, with the exception of one soth in scribe 1’s stretch.

7.4.2. Final –e

Final -e - was originally a remnant from Old English, remaining as a marker of a few inflexional categories, such as the dative singular of nouns. In this document, final –e in nouns occurs in all grammatical contexts and has clearly lost its inflexional significance. Singular nouns are spelt both with and without final –e in the text. There are altogether 24 common nouns spelt with final –e, making up a total of 219 tokens (frequencies in parantheses):

bryge (1), close (2), cote (3), crose/crosse (38), dale (1), dyke (22), felde (1), forlonge (1), fre-halde (17), gate (3), haldynge/holdynge (6), house/howse (15), kyrke (20), lande (17), ley (2), mylne (1), personeche/personage (6), place (1), ploghe (1), rode/rude (22), schepe (4), side/syde (12), slake/sclake (2), stede (21).

Altogether 32 common nouns, with a total of 670 tokens, are spelt without final -e in the text:

bownd (14), breyg/bryg (9), car/kar (3), clos (4), corn (2), crott (2), croft (6), cros (13), dall (1), day (1), dyk (1), end (59), feld/feyld (8), frehald/fre-hald (2), garth (1), grond (1), haldynge/holding (71), hous/howes (11), kyrk (5), lengh/length/lenth (3), land/lond (232), ley (3), maner/maner (135), meer/meir/meyer/mer (15), myln (3), peis (1), ryg (1), schep (5), scorth (2), sid/syd (4) slak (1), ston (1)

The lists show clearly that many lexical items show much variation with regard to final -e. This variation is not grammatically conditioned: as a rule, the variants occur in identical constructions (to ye hows of kyllyng occurs 12 times and to ye house/howse of kyllyng 15 times). Nouns that do not show variation are generally infrequent ones (gate, forlonge, ploghe, dale, place, garth, ryg, slak, ston), although a few items show invariant usage (rude/rode; stede, end, manor, meer).
As with the common nouns, the final –e is also used after proper nouns in the document (frequencies in parantheses):

*Kae (3), Edwarde (11), Kellynge/Kelynge (3), Wyemarke/Weymarke/Wymarke (5), Wiske/Wyske (7), Rowke (1), Tyndale/Tyndalle (9), Juliane (1), Thorne (1), Crosse/Crose (38)*

All of these, except from *Kae* and Rowke\(^\text{14}\)*, are also used without –e ending:

*Edward (27), Kelyng/Kellyng (21), Wymark (1), Wysk (1), Tyndall (7) Jelian/Julean/Julian (5), Thorn (4), Cros (13)*

Final –e is most commonly used after long vowels followed by a single consonant, as in close, schepe, dyke, gate, side, rode/rude, house/howse, stede and place. It is less common after consonant clusters, although there are some notable exceptions, such as kyrke. Despite such general tendencies, however, the use of final -e is very variable. Even though it is more or less the same amount of words that are used with final –e (14 in the stretch by scribe 1 and 2, and 12, 10, 16 in the stretches by scribes 3, 4 and 5, respectively), there is a notable difference in how often they occur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Final -e (absolute frequency)</th>
<th>Final -e per 1,000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8, final -e

It may be noted that, while the frequencies vary, the variation appears in all scribal stretches, and shows approximately the same general patterns: the differences are thus of frequency rather than of system.

\(^\text{14}\) Except from this example, *Rowke* is written *Rowker*. This is found 9 times in the document.
7.5. The consonants

7.5.1. The (th) variable

The text shows three different realisations of the consonantal element that corresponds to Present-Day English <th>, which may be called the (th) variable: <th>, <y> and <þ>. According to Wardhaugh (2010: 145)

"a linguistic variable is a linguistic item which has identifiable variants. For example, words like *singing* and *fishing* are sometimes pronounced *singin’* and *fishin’*. The final sound in these words may be called the linguistic variable (ng) with its to variants [ŋ] in *singing* and [n] in *singin’*.

Middle English is known to show a rather complex pattern of spelling variation when it comes to the particular consonantal element of (th). In Northern texts, there is not typically made a distinction between <y> and <þ>. In the Barmston document, scribe 4 stands out as the only scribe who does make this distinction.

Work carried out by Benskin (1977, 1982) shows that attempts to distinguish between voiceless and voiced dental fricatives are a distinctive Northern characteristic in Middle English texts. He explains that in many Northern texts “words like *think, through, thousand* are spelled th-, but … words like *they, them, there* are spelled þ- or y-“ (Benskin 1977: 506-507).

Most of the scribes in the present text follow this ‘Northern system’ (Stenroos 2004: 265) more or less consistently. In the first part of the text, copied by scribe 1 and 2, the (th) variable is realised as both <th> and <y>. There are altogether 21 words with (th) either in initial, medial or word-final position. Of these words, yɛ, the, this, yð, yø, yœ and yɐ are grammatical words that are assumed to have been pronounced with a voiced dental fricative at this stage, while thorne/thorn, throwe, throwth, both/bowth, length, lenth, longth, Rowth, scorth, soth, south and wreth would have had a voiceless fricative. In all the voiced positions that require a voiced (th) variable, <y> or <th> is used. <y> only occurs in word initial positions. In the voiceless positions only <th> is used, regardless of the position in the word.

The text by scribe 3 contains ten words with the (th) variable; both, garth, length, north, Rowth, scorth, south, yð, yɛ and yø. There is no example of <th> in voiced position, only <y>. <th> is only used in voiceless word final positions.
In the short text by scribe 4, there are only five examples of the (th) variable. Scribe 4 differs from all the other scribes in that he differentiates between the letters <y> and <þ>. The latter is used in the initial voiced positions (pe, pey), while <th> here is used for voiceless (th): northe, Rowth. In addition, the heading of scribe 4’s text begins with initial <Th> in The. While the text is too short to provide reliable information for the use of the Northern system, it may be noted that the scribe here seems to follow the same pattern as the other ones.

The final scribe, scribe 5, produces 15 tokens of the (th) variable, and the only example in the document of <th> used in voiced medial position is found here (athir/othir). The pattern here is the same as in the texts by the preceding scribes; <th> and <y> are both used in voiced positions (thai, tham, that, the, yam, ye, yerto, yt) while only <th> is found in voiceless positions (north, Routh, Smyth, sowth, thorn).

All of the scribes in the Barmston document appear to distinguish between the use of the (th) variable in voiced and voiceless positions; While <th> can be used in initial, medial or word final positions as well as in both voiced and voiceless, <y> and <þ> are used exclusively in initial voiced position.

7.5.1. Doubling of Consonants

Another variable feature in the Barmston document is the use of double consonants. In most cases, there is also a variant with a single consonant used in the text. The words that are found with double consonants are listed below in two sections; the first one includes words where the double consonant occurs between vowels or finally after a short vowel. The second includes the words where an element of a consonant cluster is doubled. Where there is an alternative spelling with single consonant, this is added in parenthesis:

1) begynnes (begyne), contenyyng/contennys (contenyng/contenys), called/callyd/called (cald), Ralynson/Ralynsson (Ralynson/Ralwynson), Rawlynsong (Rawlyson), Crosse (Cros/Crose), Kylyng/Keylyng (Kelynge/Kelyng), Tyndall (Tyndal), Haggett/Haggyt/Haggatt/Haggytt (Hagyt), Dybbenay (Dybnay), rynnyng, appill, to-gedder, mannys, William/Will3am/Wylliam, Wadall, Ryhill/Ryyll, Seneryll, Naffirtoun; off (of), dall (dale), butt (but~), Browcott.

2) halldyng/halldeng (haldyng) mylln (mylne) felld (feild/felde), halff (half), calld (cald) Debbnay (Dybnay) benndyng, stenttyng/stynnyng/stynnt (styntyng/stynt’), Wyntton (Wynkton).
While the double consonants in section 1 are common features in Middle English, the consonant clusters in section 2 are more interesting. There is a special tendency of doubling the consonant in the first element of a consonant cluster, especially the letter <l>. This occurs in 12 of 25 tokens and in 5 different words (\textit{calld}, \textit{fелld/fylld}, \textit{halld-}, \textit{half}, \textit{mylln}). Double <n>, <b> occur only once each, while double <t> is used 11 times. However, double <t> is mainly used in one word, \textit{stynnt/stentt}, with only one occurrence in \textit{wyntt-}.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Double consonants (absolute frequency)</th>
<th>Double consonants per 1,000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>105.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9, double consonants

The reason why the frequencies of scribe 3 are so high compared to the others is because he uses \textit{off} consistently where the other scribes use \textit{of}. With that in mind, the scribes 1/2, 3 and 5 show similarities in their use of double consonants, while scribe 4 barely uses them at all, and never in consonant clusters.

There are a few examples where double consonants are used initially in a word. This is used both by scribe 4 and scribe 5 (\textit{ffelde} l. 200, \textit{ffirst} l. 201, \textit{ffeild} l. 217, \textit{ffeyld} l. 219, \textit{ffrehald} l. 230). However, this is merely the capital form of the letter \textit{f}, and can not be considered as an occurance of double consonant.
7.5.3. Capitalisation

The use of capital letters also reflects the scribes’ freedom of choice; it is not used completely consistently by any of the scribes. There are also notable differences between the scribes in the number of words with capitalised initial letter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Capitalisation (absolute frequency)</th>
<th>Capitalisation per 1,000 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>143.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10, capitalisation

Scribes 1 and 2 do not use capitalisation particularly often and most of the words are apparently capitalised randomly: *Was, Cald, Est, Barnston, Rallynson, Cros, Wylliam Smyth, jon Tyndall/Jon tyndall, Robert dybnay, Rowker*. The remaining words (*M, Bowllom, Euere mans*) are only noted once. On the other hand, the name *Edward Rowth*, which occurs 15 times, is capitalised consistently, with the single exception of *Edward rowth* (l. 9).

One of the reasons why scribe 3 has such a high number of capitalised words is because he capitalises some of the high-frequency words, such as *brodland, narowland* and *maner*. In addition, he shows a higher degree of consistency, and every proper noun (*Rallynson, Edward Rowth, Jon Tyndalle, Crosse, Will3am Wyemarke, Ryhyll, Rob Dybbenay, Jon Jelian, Jon Wyske, Browcott*) is capitalised. The only exception is *Will3am haggett*. Here, interestingly, the first name is capitalised consistently, while *haggett* never is.

In Middle English, there is no specific capitalised variant of *<h>*. The letter might be enlarged decorated to indicate its function in initial position, but there is no formally distinguished variant. The same level of consistency is found in the majority of the common nouns (*Maner, Mann, Meer, Comon, Close, Croft*). The exceptions here are *rode, narrow, brod, south* and *north* which occur without capitalisation as well.

With the exception of *ffelde* in the heading, and *Brod* (l. 205), scribe 4 only capitalises proper nouns (*Barnston, Edward Rowth, Ralynson, John Tyndale, John Wiske, Cros e, Wynkton*). Because it is a short text, only two of these occur more than once (*Edward Rowth,*
and both are capitalised. However, another proper noun (*kellynge*) appears twice in the text, both times without capitalisation.

The fifth scribe is also consistent in capitalising most of the proper nouns (*Crosse, Edward Rowth, E R, Rawlynson, John Tyndale, John Wyske, Robert Dubnay, Ryhyll, William Smyth, Naffirtown*). As in the usage of scribe 3, *William hagget/W. hagget* is found several times in the text; the first name is always capitalised, while the <h> has no capital form. The proper nouns *Wynkton, Coteman, John of Jerusalem* and *Thomas Dubnay*, all of which occur only once in the text, are also capitalised. In addition, scribe 5 capitalises some of the common nouns as well (*North, Feld, Estermar, Close, Town, West, Fyrst, Frehald, Rode/Rude, Croft, Cote, Est, See, Toft, Stede*). Of the words that occur more than once in the text, *Close, Croft* and *Cote* are capitalised consistently, while *Feld, West, Rode/Rude, South, Est, See* and *Toft* are not.

In general, the level of consistency in capitalisation is notably higher in proper nouns than other words in all of the scribes’ texts. Apart from that, each of the scribes present individual preferences and practices in the document.

### 7.6. Variation within the Document: the Scribal Texts

In order to get an overview of each of the scribes’ practices regarding spelling, some of the words that occur most often and show variation are collected in Table 11. Token frequencies are added in parenthesis. Because the text of scribe 2 is so short, it has been included with scribe 1. Since the text by scribe 4 is only about half a page, the frequencies are also lower here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Scribe 1 and 2</th>
<th>Scribe 3</th>
<th>Scribe 4</th>
<th>Scribe 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The</td>
<td>ye (174)</td>
<td>ye (148)</td>
<td>De (17)</td>
<td>ye (139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>sam (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>saym (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>som (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sam (52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main pattern that appears from Table 11 is that scribe 4 differs from the others in several aspects. Where the other three scribes use <y> for the (th)-variable, scribe 4 uses <Þ>. He is also alone in using <o> in *holdyng(e)* and –ey in ‘they’, as well as the Hector 9 abbreviation in *long~*. The other scribes also show some distinguishing features; in the stretch by scribe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rood</th>
<th>rode</th>
<th>rude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breadth</td>
<td>brod (3)</td>
<td>rode (3)</td>
<td>brede (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>length (3)</td>
<td>length (4)</td>
<td>brede (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding</td>
<td>haldyng (17)</td>
<td>haldyng/-e (21)</td>
<td>haldyng (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongs</td>
<td>longyng (96)</td>
<td>longyng/-e (61)</td>
<td>longyng (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>land (56)</td>
<td>land (38)</td>
<td>land (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>y, th</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Þ, th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural nouns, ending</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es, -is, -ys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>yia</td>
<td>yai</td>
<td>Þey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11. Comparison of the scribes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rood (12)</th>
<th>rode (3)</th>
<th>rude (19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breadth</td>
<td>brod (3)</td>
<td>rode (3)</td>
<td>brede (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>length (3)</td>
<td>length (4)</td>
<td>brede (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding</td>
<td>haldyng (17)</td>
<td>haldyng/-e (21)</td>
<td>haldyng (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongs</td>
<td>longyng (96)</td>
<td>longyng/-e (61)</td>
<td>longyng (118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>land (56)</td>
<td>land (38)</td>
<td>land (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>y, th</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Þ, th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural nouns, ending</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es</td>
<td>-es, -is, -ys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>yia</td>
<td>yai</td>
<td>Þey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main pattern that appears from Table 11 is that scribe 4 differs from the others in several aspects. Where the other three scribes use <y> for the (th)-variable, scribe 4 uses <Þ>. He is also alone in using <o> in *holdyng(e)* and –ey in ‘they’, as well as the Hector 9 abbreviation in *long~*. The other scribes also show some distinguishing features; in the stretch by scribe
one and two, the forms *sam, saym* and *som* for ‘same’ and *rod* without final –e for ‘rood’ are used. These are not found in the remaining scribal stretches. Scribe 3 is the only scribe using *same* and *rode* as well as *lände* with final –e, and scribe 5 stands out in being the only one who uses OE ɔ in *rude* (‘rood’). However, it is clear that the stretch by the fourth scribe is most remarkably dissimilar from the others. In the following, a more detailed description and comparison of the individual scribal usages will be provided.

**7.6.1. A comparison of scribes 1 and 2**

The lines assumed to have been written by scribe 2 differ clearly from the first scribe palaeographically. However, there are features of grammar and spelling which might imply that the lines are in fact written by the same scribe. As we can see from the table above, scribe 1 is the only one using *saym* for *same*. There are also three occurrences of this found in the sentences by scribe 2. It does also seem strange that one scribe should write such a small part of a legal document, and it would seem considerably more likely that the same scribe has simply changed pen. That would explain why the hand looks different. On the other hand, this fails to explain why some of the letters are written very differently, e.g. the w (*bownd* fol. 3.r, l. 11, 12, 13). In addition, the word *same* has not been used in the texts by any of the remaining scribes, and so it is impossible to know if *saym* for *same* would have been used by them. The occurrence of *long* in scribe 2’s text is also worth noting, knowing that scribe 1 keeps strictly to *longyng* in his text.

**7.6.2. Scribe 1**

Scribe 1 is clearly the one of all the scribes in the present document that shows the most strongly Northern forms. These include forms such as *os* for *as*, the *qw*-spelling in *qwylke* (l. 22) and the –*and* ending in *buttand* (ll. 49, 50, 52, 54, 61). There is some inconsistency in the vowel spellings, which in some cases might suggest uncertainty or hypercorrection, perhaps because of a clash between the scribe’s own forms and standardised ones; examples are *saym/sam/som, bred/brod, length/longth* and *frehald/fre-hold*.

The scribal characteristics of this stretch may be summed up as follows. There is not a high concentration of singular nouns with –e ending in this text. In all there are 2.1
occurances per 1,000 words against 6.5, 6.4 and 4.0 in the following texts (see Table 8). The use of periphrastic constructions, on the other hand, is higher than in any of the other texts (see Table 7). 9 out of 12 occurances of verbs with Hector 9 abbreviation is found in scribe 1’s text. This is also the only text presenting examples of endingless nouns without flourishes after numerals higher than 1:

54) Item ij brodland longyng’ to ye kyrke (l. 14)
   ‘Item 2 broadland belongs to the church’

55) Item iiij rodbred longyng’ to ye maner (l. 19)
   ‘Item 3 rodbred belongs to the manor’

There is a rather low number of capitalised words compared to the other scribes: 8.4 per 1,000 words against 143.4, 56.4 and 63.8 in the stretches by scribe 3, 4 and 5, respectively. (See Table 10). The name of Edward Rowth is the only word capitalised regularly in this scribe’s text. The other words that are capitalised also occur without capitalisation:

56) Item j rodbred longyng’ to ye ij oxgang § y’ was sum’tym’ Rallynson’ (l. 6)
   ‘Item 1 rodbreadth belongs to the 2 oxgang that was sometime Rallynson’s’

57) Item j rodbrod long’ynɡ’ to ye ij oxgang y’ was sumtym’ rallynsson’ (l. 19)
   ‘Item 1 rodbreadth belongs to the 2 oxgang that was sometime Rallynson’s’

The only occurrence of a proper noun with an inflexional –s in absolutive genitive construction (Rallynsons, l. 17) is found in the text by scribe 1.

7.6.3. Scribe 2

The language in the second scribal stretch is clearly similar to that of scribe 1. The use of saym for ‘same’ is only found in these two stretches. Similarly, the variant kyllyng, which is otherwise only found in the text by scribe 1, occurs once in the lines by scribe 2. The Hector 9 abbreviation is used three times for nouns; twice for bownd~ and once for land~. There are no occurrences of final –e. All in all, the distinction between these two scribes, except for the use of long with a macron instead of longyng, is mainly palaeographical. It is not possible to draw any certain conclusion whether this is copied a separate scribe or not.
7.6.4. Scribe 3

The linguistic usage in scribe 3’s text is generally similar to the ones of scribes 1 and 5, yet there are some dissimilarities. The only noun with an –eng ending instead of –yng is found here (holdeng, l. 157). The final –e after singular nouns is used frequently; 6.5 times, compared to 2.1, 6.4 and 4.0 in the texts by scribe 1/2, 4 and 5 respectively (see Table 8). The of-construction for noun genitives is also found regularly; 20.8 per 1,000 words (see Table 7).

This scribe is also clearly more thorough than either of the other scribes regarding capitalisation; it is both less irregular and used for a higher amount words. Among these are high-frequency words which occur often in the text, e.g. Maner and Brode-land. The proper nouns are consistently capitalised. The common nouns, on the other hand, are less regular in capitalisation; of a total of eleven capitalised common nouns, six are always capitalised and five occur both with and without capitalisation.

The third scribe is the only one who uses a double consonant in off consistently (only one occurrence of of is found in this scribal stretch). That is the main reason why the amount of double consonants per 1,000 words exceeds the other scribal stretches by far: 105.8 occurrences against 30.7 in the text by scribes 1 and 2, 8.0 in scribe 3’s and 21.2 in scribe 5’s text (see Table 9).

7.6.5. Scribe 4

The text by scribe 4 stands out from the others in several respects. The hand is rather idiosyncratic, being the only part of the document written in a Secretary script. There are also several features that are not typically Northern, such as the use of thorn for (th), the /o/ in holdynge (l. 229) and fre-hold (l. 224) and the form þey ‘they’. Another feature that suggests that this scribe might be non-local is the fact that he simply misunderstands some of the most Northern words and misspells them (see section 7.5.7.) The part written by scribe 4 is copied for a second time by the following scribe, and in this text the scribe “corrects” scribe 4, both in spelling and syntax.

The use of periphrastic genitives in the stretch by scribe 4 is relatively low. As shown in Table 7, the frequency per 1,000 words is 12.1 compared to 22.6, 20.8 and 5.6 occurrences in the texts by scribes 1/2, 3 and 5. Regarding double consonants, scribe 4 is at the bottom of
the list (see Table 9), while the amount of –e endings and capitalised words is quite average (see Tables 8 and 10).

The Hector 9 abbreviation is used for noun plurals, which is also its main use by the other scribes. However, an additional use of the abbreviation mark is found in this stretch, namely to mark the present participle ending in long~ (ll. 225, 226, 227). Here, scribes 2, 3 and 5 show the unusual use of the squiggle as an abbreviation mark for the present participle; again, the fact that scribe 4 does not share this system, but rather extends the use of Hector 9, marks him off as different.

7.6.6. Scribe 5

The stretch by scribe 5 is the longest one in the document with 2489 words. The dialect used is clearly Northern and the linguistic usage is in many respects similar to that of scribes 1, 2, and 3. There are some characteristics in scribe 5’s text that do not occur in the other stretches. The variant rude for ‘rood’, where OE ā is applied is only used by scribe 5. Similarly, scribe 5 is alone in using the abbreviated form cont’ for contenyng (‘containing’). This form occurs 15 times and is discussed above in section 7.2.1.3 together with the use of long’ vs longyng. The long’ variant is also used most often by scribe 5; 42 tokens compared to 32 in scribe 3’s text.

Regarding of-genitives, scribe 5 has the lowest frequency of all the five scribes; 5.6 per 1,000 words against 22.6, 20.8 and 12.1 in the preceding scribal stretches (see Table 7). As far as final –e after singular nouns are concerned, however, scribe 5 is at the top of the list with 100 occurrences where the previous scribes have 37, 92 and 16 (see Table 8). The frequencies in both use of double consonants and capitalised words are relatively average (see Tables 9 and 10).

7.6.7. Comparison of scribes 4 and 5

The text by scribe 5 begins with a rewritten version of the half page written by scribe 4. After this, the text by scribe 5 reaches over nearly five pages. Through a comparison of the texts by the scribes 4 and 5, it is possible to see where the final scribe found it necessary to correct the text. The text by scribe 5 is marked in bold:
58) First a brode-land of croses next þe meir’ (l. 223)
        *Fyrst a brode-land next the meer’ of Crosse haldyng*’ (l. 244)

59) Jtem ij landes a brod & a narowe longyng to kellynge (l. 223)
        *Jtem a brode-land & a narow longyng’ to ye hows of kelyng*~ (l. 244)

60) Jtem a brod-land sum-tym longyng to Ralynson hows holding (l. 227)
        *Jtem a brode-land sum-tyme’ longyng’ to Rawlynson’ haldyng*’ (l. 249)

61) Jtem iiiij brode-land~ & a narow be-logynge to Crosse holding (l. 232)
        *Jtem iiiij brode-land~ & a narow longyng’ to Crosse land* (l. 253)

62) Jtem ij gaires lyes fro Wynkton’ mer~ to þe hede grypp~ longyng to þe maner (l. 233)
        *Jtem ij gyrs leys fro Wynkton mer to the hede grypp~ longyng’ to ye maner* (l. 254)

From this we can see that both the syntax and the grammar of scribe 4 are corrected into what is more common in the rest of the document. In example 1), the place name otherwise written as Cros or Crosse is put in what appears to be a genitive form, croses. The phrase could perhaps be translated as ‘First a broadland of Crosse’s next to the boundary. Although similar sentences are found in other parts of the document, this is the only place where the –es ending is spelled out and not abbreviated. The correction made by scribe 5 suggests that the word ‘cross’ did not have a genitive -es in this variety, and that it was felt to be alien even in an absolutive construction. Even though this is the only appearance of the unabbreviated –es form found in scribe 4’s text, it is worth noticing that the name is here otherwise spelt cros (l. 225) or Cross (ll. 232, 236).

The second correction is of scribe 4’s syntax. He uses a noun phrase in apposition after Jtem ij landes. This is not used anywhere else in the document, and scribe 5 has apparently felt that the meaning of the sentence might easily be misinterpreted: Instead of ‘2 lands, 1 broad and 1 narrow, belonging to the house of Kellyng’, the sentence by scribe 4 could be read as ‘2 lands and 1 broadland and 1 narrowland’, that is, altogether four strips of land. The measurement land is found several other places in the text as an independent measurement (e.g. ll. 13, 73, 260, 280), and could cause misunderstanding.

Examples 3) and 4) are simple corrections of scribe 4’s choice of words and spellings. In example 3) the name Ralynson is changed into Rawlynson’ and holding into haldyng’. Similarly, Crose holdyng in example 4) is corrected into Crosse land. These changes have no effect on the sentence’s meanings and are likely to reflect the scribal habits of scribe 5.
The correction in example 5), however, is of a different kind. *Gaires lyes* in the sentence by scribe 4 could be interpreted here as two *gaires* that lie, or stretch from, Winkton to the ‘main dikes’. However, the form *gyrs* was a common Northern form of the word *grass*. Hence, it is likely that the sentence was meant as 2 *grass arables*, not as 2 *gaires* that lies from Wynkton to the main dikes. Scribe 4 may have misunderstood the meaning, either because of an imperfect command of the dialect or of the local geography.

It is interesting that the two scribes were free to copy the various sentences differently; some of the entries are composed entirely differently. This could suggest that they copied from either a list or notes taken during the perambulation. That would allow for each entry to be produced more freely by the scribe.

There may be many reasons why the fourth scribe did not continue writing. Considering the differences between his usage and those of the others, and also what appear to be mistakes by him, as well as the fact that his text was rewritten, one possible assumption might be that there was doubt whether this scribe was suited to write a Northern legal text. In a text such as this, every detail is of consequence, and any mistakes in the text could be critical for the holder of the land. Although it is possible to tell them apart, the first, third and fifth scribes all show quite similar linguistic usages; this would make good functional sense in the present kind of document, as it would help prevent misinterpretations of the text.

7.5.8. Summary

After comparing the orthography, phonology and morphology of the five scribes in the Barmston survey, both the differences and the similarities between the scribes become clear. Even though the stretches by scribes 1, 3 and 5 are very much alike regarding the overall dialect features, each of the stretches reflect the scribes’ individual habits and practices. Some of the patterns of variation are found in more than one scribal stretch and vary only in frequency, for instance the use of periphrastic genitive constructions and final –*e* after singular nouns (see Tables 7 and 8). Other variants are used only by one of the scribes.

However, it is clear after comparing the dialect features of the scribes that scribe 4 is clearly different from the others. His dialect is not as typically Northern as the others; at the same time, his usage seems colourless rather than clearly non-Northern. He uses the Northern *kyrke* for ‘church’ and seems to be following the Northern system (Stenroos 2004: 265) of distinguishing between voiceless and voiced dental fricatives. Even though the scribal stretch
is short and it is impossible to draw conclusive evidence from it, all the examples of the (th) variable follow the Northern system: be (l. 222) and pey (l. 222), but Rowth (l. 224) and northe (l. 221). Thus, there is no evidence that he does not follow this system. In addition, the stretch by scribe 4 also gives an example of the Northern Subject Rule: pey lye (example 33 p. 66).

All the other scribes are clearly Northern in their usage, even though some of the strongly regional Northern markers, such as <a> for OE ā and the present participle ending - and, only occur rarely and seem to be replaced by the colourless or standardised variants in most contexts by all the scribes.
8. Discussion

The Bounding of Barmston represents something of a paradox seen against the development of literacy. It is produced by several competent scribes, suggesting an abundance of literacy competence in the area. At the same time, as a document it seems to represent a rather early phase of the development of literacy; its general lack of reader-friendliness and visual organisation suggests a community where oral modes were still predominant (see p. 46).

The document is likely to have been of most use for the major landholders in Barmston who held a high number of strips scattered throughout the various fields. For the lesser landholders with fewer strips of land the tradition of mental indexing (see p. 44) might still have been sufficient. As the document functions as legal proof of who the landholders were, it would most likely be consulted if there were any disputes or uncertainty regarding rights to lands. The notae found along the margin of fols 1v-2v (see p.44), where the church and Edward Rowth is mentioned, indicate that someone has been trying to make out the lands held by the church and Edward Rowth. As rector of the church in Barmston, Edward Rowth would have had an interest in the land held both by himself and by the church, and it is possible that Edward Rowth added these marginal markings himself. The fact that someone felt it necessary to add notae and underlinings in order to get an overview of the lands of interest, adds to the point that the document was very little reader-friendly.

One of the major questions of the LALME methodology, which also is of great interest here, is to what extent the language of local documents can be assumed to be local. This question is addressed in the first volume of LALME (I: 39, 42, 45, 47). If the place of production is presented in a document, and we may assume that locally available scribes would have produced it, then the dialect is likely to be that of the area. The question is, then, how likely it is that the scribe was local.

Especially small villages would not normally be able to support an independent notary, and a scribe might have been hired from elsewhere when needed. However, according to LALME (I: 45), “substantial but still local families ... can be supposed to have drawn their retainers from their own neighbourhood” The family holding the Barmston manor would represent such a "substantial but still local family".

As the manor is one of the major landholders in the Barmston survey, and it was in their interest to get an overview of their amount of holdings in the various areas, it is probable that the survey was commissioned by them. The church and Edward Rowth also held huge
areas of land, and as the text seems to have been used by Edward Rowth, it is possible that the survey was either carried out by the church or that this was a copy held by the church. (see p. 45)

Even though it remains uncertain to what degree the lower clergy was involved in the production of legal documents, McIntosh et al. (1986: 45) notes that there are examples found showing that it did occur. While a cleric might produce an eccentric-looking document, he could also be highly skilled and competent in producing documents. It is not completely out of the question that members of the church could have contributed to the production of the Barmston survey.

The question whether the Barmston document is likely to represent a local variety is impossible to determine completely. McIntosh et al. (1986: 45) discuss this question in their introduction to LALME:

> Documents written in competent law hands and dated to be from very small villages or hamlet are intrinsically unlikely to represent the language of precisely the placed to which their texts belong...Documents written in scripts that cannot be identified as law hands, particularly those scripts that are drafted in eccentric fashion, are by contrast likely to be genuinely local products.

In the fifteenth century, Northern documents varied much in use of script, but Secretary scripts were becoming increasingly common. In the Barmston document, Scribes 1,2,3 and 5 all produce a rather traditional form of Anglicana, used conventionally in legal documents. Scribe 4, on the other hand, used a Secretary script, although not of the usual cursive document type: it may be said to present a form that is somewhat more up-to-date that the others, yet it is less fluent in structure. The stretch does not represent a traditional ‘law hand’ like the others. It cannot, however, be defined as eccentric or ‘uplandish’ (see p. 57).

The scribes 1,2, 3 and 5 produce a fairly strong Northern dialect, although the range of available dialectal forms is limited through the repetitive nature of the text. The use of dialectal forms is interesting considering the date of the document; at this point a written standard had begun to spread. However, in this text there are few signs of actual standardisation, even though a few forms may suggest the choice of colourless forms. The stretch written by scribe 4 is, however, clearly colourless in character (see p.84).

As the stretch by scribe 4 is very short and in addition repeated by scribe 5, it is possible to interpret this as scribe 4’s text not being accepted in the Barmston survey. It is clear that not just his dialect but also his phrasing is different from that of the other scribes.
This could suggest either that he was not familiar with the conventions of the text, or that he was not familiar with Barmston, the landholders and the geography. In addition he shows difficulties understanding some typically Northern expressions (e.g. *gyrs* for ‘grass’).

However, there are also some similarities between this scribe and the remaining ones. Firstly, the Hector 9 abbreviation is used heavily also in this stretch. However, the use is somewhat different from that of the three main scribes; while the Hector 9 abbreviation appears to be used mainly as a marker of plural forms by the other scribes, the stretch by scribe 4 is the only place where it occurs after *long* (l. 225, 226, 227) as well as after a first name (*Edward~*, l. 224). Secondly, the use of the idiosyncratic *w*, which is a variant of the double *v* also used by scribe 5 is interesting. A study of the MEG-C archive (Stenroos, personal communication) suggests that this form is rare; apart from the present scribes, the variant used by scribe 5 is only found in two other texts (see pp. 53-54). No other example is found of the letter form used by scribe 4.

From this it is possible to deduce that scribe 4 could be sharing the geographical background with the other scribes, even though it seems that he may not have the same local knowledge of Barmston. Even though the stretch by scribe 4 does not include any dialectal forms that are obviously Northern, there is still evidence of systematic distinctions suggesting a Northern background, both through the distinction made between voiced and voiceless dental fricatives (see p. 78) and through the use of the Northern Subject Rule. This could suggest that the four scribes might have a shared geographical, even educational background, but that they later have belonged to different ‘text communities’.

The term ‘discourse community’ has been developed by discourse analysts and focuses on the producers and readers of texts. The term has been applied to Middle English materials by Jones (2004: 24), who also advocates a broadening of the term in order to help explain and define groups of people connected by texts, either as part of their relationships within a particular type of community, or solely by the texts themselves, which may be used for different purposes by different individuals. (Jones 2004: 24)

In parallel to the term ‘discourse community’, Stenroos (2010 B: 4) has introduced the term ‘text community’, meaning “a group of texts that have something in common, so that it makes sense to refer to them as entity”. The similarity between them might be that they belong to the same geographical area, for instance the Southwest Midlands, or the texts might belong to one specific network of writers or readers, such as religious literature or legal documents. The
term ‘text community’ reflects the fact that texts “were not produced in isolation but rather within networks of living and interacting language users” (Stenroos 2010 B: 5).

Scribe 4 could have belonged to a text community where scribes were expected to use a colourless or standardised variety of language and a different kind of script. Thereby the scribes would have developed their writing in different directions. Scribe 4 might thus have been an outsider to the usual administrative staff at Barmston, and represented a different tradition of copying.

The Barmston document could thus be seen to represent the clash between two different text communities, where the conventions of one have been rejected as unsuitable by the other. It is interesting that the problems seem to derive from scribe 4’s non-local language: the correction that takes place goes from colourless to regional rather than the other way around. At least in this context, the use of local dialect could clearly be highly functional in a legal text, even during the age of standardisation.

The Barmston survey represents a transitional period in two respects: the transition between oral and literate mode, and the transition from the age of written dialects to standardisation. One remarkable point is the solid position of the Northern dialect in this context.

Several of the questions raised by this survey represent areas in ME dialectology that are still in need of research. In particular, the use of local language in legal documents and its relationship to Middle English text communities and the development of literacy in late medieval England are areas that need much further investigation. It would be particularly important to address these questions in the light of a wide-ranging study of scribal hands and variation in palaeographical and orthographic details, including features such as the problematic Hector 9 abbreviation.
The Bounding of Barmston
Editorial conventions

The main aim of this edition, apart from making it available for scholarly readers, is to investigate the linguistic variation and the various scribal features found in the document. Because of this specific aim, the edition is a mainly diplomatic one. A few adjustments have been made in order to make the text easier to read, e.g. adding hyphens where words have been divided and giving a conjectured reading in brackets where the manuscript is illegible. However, such changes are always clearly indicated and shown to be editorial.

The capitalisation of names and places is highly inconsistent in the manuscript. However, since it will not have much impact on the legibility of the text, the capitalisation remains as found in the text and has not been modernised in any way.

The use of punctuation varies throughout the document, depending on the preference of the scribe in question. As most of the sentences are relatively short and the start of each sentence is indicated by “Item”, there is no need to add modern punctuation for the sake of legibility.

The three punctuation marks in use are the punctus, the virgule and the paraph mark. Even though the punctus and the virgule are commonly used to indicate a short pause while the paraph mark usually signals paragraph divisions, they all seem to have more or less equivalent function here. In some places, the paraph mark is used between every sentence, just as one would use a full stop in modern punctuation. To mark a new paragraph, the scribes tend to use a line of wavy stipple (~ ~ ~ ~) or they simply skip a line. In the edited text the punctus is transcribed as a full stop (.), the virgule as a slash (/) and the paraph mark as a paragraph sign (§). The end of each line in the manuscript has been marked by a vertical stroke (|).

The scribes who wrote the manuscript vary between using <y> and <þ> for the (th) variable (see p. 73). In this edition, these two letters are transcribed as they are found in the manuscript. The letter yogh appears occasionally, but irregularly, in the document, and when found it is represented by ‘3’.

Where words have been abbreviated in the manuscript, the expansions are shown in italics in the transcription, for instance ‘Inprimis’ and ‘longyng’.

Abbreviated forms with superscript letters are found throughout the manuscript. They are generally transcribed in the edited text using superscript, just as they are found in the
document, such as yᵉ and y’. However, where superscript letters are used in abbreviations of names, the abbreviation is expanded in italics:

l. 11  willⁿ transcribed as William
l. 114  Rob’y dybnay transcribed as Robert dybnay

Words that are normally written in one word in present-day English, but that are separated in the manuscript, are connected with a hyphen in the edited version:

l. 13  to gedder transcribed as to-gedder.
l. 19  brod land transcribed as brod-land
l. 42  go yng transcribed as go-ynng
l. 46  fre hald transcribed as fre-hald
l. 47  a pon transcribed as a-pon

In the manuscript, quite a few words are underlined, and especially when names of specific places or people are mentioned. There are also words crossed through where the scribes have corrected their own mistakes. Both the underlining and crossing through are reproduced in the transcription (Edward Rowth, brodland).

Where words in the manuscript are illegible or missing, a conjectured reading is put in brackets ( ( ) ). Where there are additions to the text, words written above the line by the scribe, these are placed in square brackets ([ ]) and included in the edited text. In several places, the scribes use a symbol to replace ‘and’, and even though the different scribes use a variety of different shapes for this, they will all be represented as & in the edited text. Where accents above the ‘i’( í ) and endstrokes after the final letter in a word appear, these are also included in the transcription. The Hector 9 abbreviation (see p. 59) is marked with a tilde (~) in the transcription. The remaining endstrokes and final flourishes are marked with a final apostrophe (’).
Fol. 1v

The 3eer’ of owr lord M’cccc lxxiij and the xij day of octobor~ Was’ bowndyd |
Bowlom’ leys’ Eueremans’ os y’s ly in y’ex west feld of Barnston’ to be-gyn’ at | the com’
toward the thorne clos |

Jnprimis j brod leye longyng’ to the maner § Item ij brod leys longyng’ to the frehold |
of sir Edward Rowth § Item’ j rodbred long’yng’ to the maner § Item j rodbred |
longyng’ to y’e ij oxgang § y’i was sum’tym’ Rallynson’ § Item iij brodland~ and j rodbred longyng’ to Cros’ hal(yng)’ § Item j brodland long15 yng’ to the maner § Item j brodland longyng’ to the frehal of sir Edward rowth § Item j rodbred longyng’ to y’e |

hows’ of kyllyng’ § Item j brodland longyng’ to the hal(yng)’ of jon’ of tyndall & |
Wyll10 Smyth § Item j brodland longyng’ to Cros hal(yng)’ § Item iij rodbred~ longyng’ |
to y’e maner § Item j rodbred cloneng’ in y’e ryg’ longyng’ to y’e ij oxgang y’i was sum’tym’ |
-Rallynson’ § Item ij land ~ [to-gedder] Cald wret(d) dall longyng’ to y’e maner § Item |
ij brodland | longyng’ to y’e kyrke § Item iij brodland~ longyng to y’e maner § Item |
nij brodland~ langyng’ to y’e freland of sir Edward Rowth § Item j brodland longyng’ to y’e |
maner. § Item | j brodland rodbred longyng’ to y’e hal(yng)’ ij oxgang y’i was sum’tym’ |
Rallynsons’ | § Item iij brodland~ & j rodbred longyng’ to Cros land § Item ij |
brodland~ longyng’ to | y’e maner § Item j rodbred & j brodland longyng’ to the hows of kyllyng’ § Item | j brod-land longyng’ to Cros land § Item iij rodbred longyng’ to y’e |

maner § Item | j rodbred long’yng’ to y’e ij oxgang y’i was sum’tym’ rallynsson’ next y’e |
meyer’ | to-ward wynton’ feld syde

The bundyng’ of y’e mylnfylld / y’e qwylke is calld y’e |
weste feld of Barnston’ euerylk mans land os yt’ lys |
to be-gyn’ at y’e soth syd to y’e perce | |

Jnprimis ij brod-land~ longyng’ to y’e kyrke and rynd~ throwe [fro] rowker’ to schepe |
Bryge dyke. contend ij aker § Item’ ij brodland~ next y’am’ long’yng’ to y’e maner |
contend~ y’e saym’ lenth § Item ij brodland~ longyng’ to y’e freland of sir | Edward |
Rowth contenyns y’e saym’ longth § Item’ j brod-land and j narow | narow longyng’ to y’e |
maner contenyg’ y’e som’ lenth § Item j rodbrod lo(ng) | yng’ to y’e ij oxgang y’m is calld |
rallynson’ land contend~ y’e som’ lenth § | Item iij brod-land~ & j narowland longyng’

15 Marking after the g might be a half flourish, but difficult to tell if it has any function.
There is a symbol used here, might be the initials E R.

Something has been crossed over.
to ᵇ rallying ˢʰ | haldyng’ of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ at both end~ § Jtem j brod-land longyng’ to ᵇ maner of ᵇ saym’ bownd at ᵇ west end and a-pon’ thorn’ clos dyke at | ᵇ est end § Jtem j narowe-land longyng’ to ᵇ frehald of sir Edward | Rowth of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ at both end~ § Jtem j narowe-land longyng | ᵇ maner of ᵇ saym bownd~ at both end~ § Jtem v brod-land~ longyng’ | ᵇ kyrke of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ at’ both end~ § Jtem ij brod-land~ & j narow | longyng’ to ᵇ maner of ᵇ sam’ bownd~ at both end~ § Jtem j narow-land | cald Rallynson’ land of ᵇ sam’ bownd~ at’ both end~ |

Fol. 2v

§ Jtem j land clad j wandall & ij narow-land~ longyng’ to Cros-land of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ | at both end~ § Jtem ij narow-land~ longyng’ to ᵇ maner of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ at’ both | end~ § Jtem ij narowe land~ longyng’ to ᵇ hows of kyllyng’ of ᵇ saym’ | bownd~ at both l end~ § Jtem j narow land longyng’ to cros-land of ᵇ saym’ | bownd~ at both end~ § Jtem j narow-land longyng’ to ᵇ maner of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ | § Jtem j brod-land longyng’ to Rallynson’ land of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ at both end~ | § Jtem iij brod-land~ longyng’ to ᵇ fre-hald of syr Edward Rowth and ᵇ stynt~ at | both end~ a-pon ᵇ comon’ and lys next ᵇ comon’ at north syd of ᵇ myllnfeldd § |
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Jnp’s to be-gyn’ att arland~ dyke at ᵇ south syde off ᵇ feld | Jtem ij land~ longyng’ to the kyrke stynt~ at’ arland dyke at ᵇ west end~ | Jtem ij brod-land~ long’yng’ to wyll haggytt but~ est end~ a-pon ᵇ see & ᵇ west’ end~ a-pon’ | howlrom’ scorth § Jtem j brod-land longyng to ᵇ maner of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ § Jtem ij brod’~ | land~ longyng to ᵇ frehald of sir Edward Rowth of ᵇ saym’ bownd~ § Jtem j narowland | longyng to Rallynson’ land § Jtem j narowland longyng to ᵇ maner § Jtem iij brod-land~ & j narow~ | land longyng’ to cros haldehyng’ § Jtem j brod-land longyng’ to ᵇ maner in ᵇ haldyng’ of wyll | wymarke § Jtem j brod-land of longyng to ᵇ frehald of syr Edward Rowth § Jtem j brod-land longyng to ᵇ hows of kyllyng’ § Jtem j brod-land lon’yng’ to ᵇ frehald | of Jon’ wyske § Jtem ij brod-land~ _ & iij narow longyng to ᵇ maner § Jtem j narow~ | land longyng to Rallynson’ land in mann dm’ § Jtem ij brod-land~ & ij narow longyng | to cros haldehyng’ § Jtem j brod-land long’yng’ to ᵇ fre-hald of jon jelyan’ § Jtem ij brod- | land~ longyng’ to ᵇ kyrke all this a-for sayd of ᵇ bownd~ a-
bowne wretyn’ § | *Item* ij brod-land~ longyng’ to yᵉ frehald of willam haggyt’ of yᵉ saym’ lenth bot yᵉ go | not’ to yᵉ dyke for yᵉ styntt~ on a meer in yᵉ car grund § *Item* j brod-land longyng’ | to yᵉ maner in yᵉ haldyng’ of wyll wymarke § *Item* ij brod-land~ longyng to yᵉ frehald | of sir Edward Rowth § *Item* j narowland longyng to kae in mann dm’ § *Item* j narow- | land longyng’ Rallynson’ haldyng’ in mann (dm) contennyng’ yᵉ next’ bownd~ a-bowth | wretyn’ § *Item* iiij brod-land~ & narow longyng’ to cros haldyng’ § *Item* ij brod-land~ | longyng’ to yᵉ maner § *Item* j narow-land longyng to yᵉ hows of kylyng’ § *Item* j brod- | land longyng’ to yᵉ fre-hald of Jon’ tyndall § *Item* j brod-land longyng’ to Cros haldyng’ | also of yᵉ sayd bownd~ § *Item* j brod-land longyng’ to yᵉ maner of yᵉ saym’ bownd | at yᵉ est end and yᵉ west end bownd~ a-pon’ yᵉ kyrke hedland § *Item* j brod-land | longyng’ to yᵉ frehald of sir Edward Rowth § *Item* iiij narow-land~ longyng’ to yᵉ maner |
Item iij Brode-land- longyng’ to yᵉ kyrke off yᵉ same bownd- Item j Brode-lande off Will3am haggett- off yᵉ | same bownd- Item iij Brode-land- longyng’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ same bownd- Item j | Brode-lande off sir Edwarde Rowth fre-halde off yᵉ same bownd- Item j brode-land | longyng’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ same bownd- Item j narow-land to key Item j Narow land | longyng’ to Rallynson’ haldyngge off yᵉ same bownd- . Item j narow-land to key Item j Narow land | longyng’ to Rallynson’ haldyngge off yᵉ same bownd- . jn Mann dm . Item iij Brode- | land- and j Narow longyng’ to Crosse haldyng’ off yᵉ same bownd- Item j brode-land- longyng’ to yᵉ Maner in yᵉ haldyng’ off Will3am Wyemarke off yᵉ same bownd- | Item j Narow-land longyng’ to yᵉ house off keyllyng’ off yᵉ same bownd- Item j brod- | land longyng’ to yᵉ fre-halde off Jon Tyndalle off yᵉ same bound- Item iij brod- | land- longyng’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ same bownd- . Item j brode-lande longyng’ to | sir Edwarde Rowth fre-halde off yᵉ same bownd- Item iij Narow-land- longyng’ | to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ same bownd- Item j Narow-land longyng’ to Rallynson’ haldyng’ | jn Mann dm . Item ijj Brod-land- longyng’ to sir Edwarde Rowth fre-halde Item j brod-lande longyng’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ same bownd- Item j Brode-lande longyng’ | longyng’ to yᵉ kyrke lande off y степени bownd- Ryhyll |
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Item for a forlonge [called Ryhyll] lyng’ South and North butt’ on’ yᵉ Cott dyke at yᵉ | north end- and at yᵉ South end- off yᵉ Crosse hedland - - - - - | Jn-primis iij Brod-land- longyng’ to yᵉ kyrke off yᵉ for’-sayd bownd- Item j Brode- | lande and j Narowe longyng’ to yᵉ fre-halde off Will3am haggett off yᵉ same bownd | Item j Narow-land off Rob Dybbenay off yᵉ same bownd- Item iij Brod-land- longyng’ | to yᵉ fre-halde off sir Edwarde Rowth off y степени bownd- Item j Brod-lande and j | narow longyng’ to y степени Maner off y степени same bownd- Item iij Narow-land longyng’ to Rallyn- | son’ halldeng’ off y степени same bound- Item iij Brode-land- and j narow longyng’ to | Crosse haldyng’ off y степени same bound- Item j Brode-land longyng’ to Jon’ Jelian’ fre- | halde off y степени same bound- Item j Brod-land longyng to sir Edwarde Rowth off y степени same | bound- Item j Narow-land longyng’ to y степени house off keyllyng’ off y степени same bownd- | Item j Brod-lande longyng’ to Jon’ Tyndall fre-halde off y степени same bound- Item iij brod- | land- longyng’ to Crosse land off y степени same bound- Item iij Narow-land- longyng’ to | y степени Maner and y степени south end- bownd- opon’ Vlrom’ Scorth . Item j Narow-lande long’ | to Rallynson’ haldyng’. jn
Mann dm’. Item ij Brode-land~ and j narow longyng’~ to Crosse land off yᵉ same bo(u)nd~ Item ij Brod-land long’ to yᵉ Maner jn yᵉ halde off Will3am Weymarke off yᵉ same bound~ Item ij Brod-land~ longyng’ to yᵉ kyrke | of yᵉ same bound~ Item ij Brod-land~ longyng’ to Will3am haggett fre-halde off [yᵉ same bound~ Item ij Brod-land~ longyng’ to yᵉ frehalde off Rob Debbnay off | yᵉ same bound~ Item j Brod-land off yᵉ fre-hald off sir Edward Rowth of yᵉ same | bound~ Item j B′ode-land and j narow longyng’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ same bound~ Item | j Narow-land longyng’ to Rallynson’ halde off yᵉ same bound~ Item ij Brod-land~ & j narow longyng’ to Crosse lande off yᵉ same bound~ Item j Brod-land longyng’~ to Jon Wyske halde yᵉ same bound~ Item j Brod-land longyng’ to yᵉ Maner | off yᵉ same bound~ Item j Brod-land and j narow longyng’ to yᵉ house off keyllyng’ | off yᵉ same bound~ Item iij land~ off howd’ half rode brode longyng’ to yᵉ Maner | off yᵉ same bound~ Item j Narow-land off Jon Tyndall frehalde off yᵉ sayd bound~ | Item iij Narow-land~ longyng’ to yᵉ Maner next yᵉ Meer . Item j Narow-land longyng’~ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ sayd bound~ Item j Narow-land longyng’ to Rallynson’ halde yᵉ same bound~ and hit styntys at yᵉ Commons at yᵉ south end Item j Brode-land long’ to yᵉ | Maner jn yᵉ halde off Will3am Wyemarke off yᵉ sayd bound~ Item j Brod-lande off | sir Edwarde Rowth fre-halde off yᵉ sayd bound~ Item j Brod-land longyng’ to yᵉ | house off keyllyng’ off yᵉ sayd bound~ Item j Brod-land longyng’ to Crosse halde yᵉ same bound~ Item ij Brod-land~ longyng’ to yᵉ fre-halde off Rob Dybbenay | an yai styntt in Browcott Meer’ at yᵉ North end Item ij Rod~ and j half to sir | Edwarde Rowth frehalde off yᵉ sayd bound~ Item j Narow-land longyng’ to | Rallynson’ halde yᵉ sayd bound~ Item j Brod-land longyng’ to yᵉ kyrke| land of yᵉ sayd bound~ Item ij Narow-land~ long’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ sayd bound~ | Item j Brod-land long’ to yᵉ frehalde off Jon’ Wyske a-bownd~ off yᵉ Common’ | at both end~ Item iij Brod-land~ long’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ sayd bound~ next | yᵉ kar syde Item j land and howd’ half rode brod and styntys at both end~ | off yᵉ Common’ Item j land off yᵉ same bred long’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ sayd bound~ | Item ij land~ off yᵉ same bred long’ to yᵉ fre-hald off sir Edwarde Rowth . | off yᵉ same bound~ Item j land off yᵉ same bred long’ to yᵉ Maner off yᵉ | same bound~ next yᵉ kar syde Item vj Brod-land~ long’ to yᵉ house off | keyllyng’ and yᵉ North end~ butt~ on’ appill-garth dyke and yᵉ south | end~ opon’ Browcott’ Meer . Item j Brod-land longyng’ to Crosse land | off yᵉ same bound~ next yᵉ Common’ ~~~~

§ The northe Felde of Barnston |

Jn-prímis to begyne at þe west sid of þe feld nexste þe leye clos euere manes as þey lye | First a brode-land of croses next þe meir’. Item íj land~ a brod & a narowe longyng | to kellynge Item a brod-land of* þe fre-hold of sir Edward~ Rowth Item a brod-land long~ to | þe maner Item ííj brod-land~ & j narow long~ to cros land Item a brod-land long~ to sir | Edward Rowth fre-hold Item vj Brod-land~ belong~ to þe kyrke Item a brod land | long~ to þe maner Item a brod-land sum-tym longyng to Rallynson hovs haldyng Item a brod- | land logynege to þe maner Item a brod-land logynege to þe sayd Rallynson~ haldynege | Item íííj brod-land~ & a narow logynege to þe maner . Item a brode-land logynege to John | Tyndalle oxgang . Item a narowe land logynege to þe hovs of kellynge Item a brod- | land logynege to þe maner Item a brode-lande logynege to þe fre-hold of John | Wiske & Item íííj brode-land~ & a narow be-logynege to Crose
holdynge Item | Item ij gaires lyses fro Wynkton’ mer’ to þe hede grippes logyng to þe maner | Item a brod-land & a narow logyng to kellynge. Item a brod-land longyng to sir | Edwarder Rowth fre-holde Item a brod-lande logyng to þe maner Item ij brod | & a narow longyng to Crose holdynge Item a narow land logyng to Ralynson | 235

Memorandum that heer’ begynnes the bownd- of ye North Feild |
of barnston’ to begyn’ at the Estermar’ ley Close of ye west syde of’ |
the Forsayd north Feyld of’ the said Town | 240

In þis to begyn’at ye West syde of ye sayd feyld next ye ley Clos ef euery mannys as
thaí | lye Fyrst a brode-land next the meer’ of’ Crosse haldynge Item a brod-land & a
narow | longyng’ to ye hows of’ kelyng~ Item a brod-land of ye freehald of sir Edward Rowth | Item a brod-land longyng’ to ye maner / Item ûij brod-land& a narow
longyng’ to Crosse | land Item a brod-land longyng’ to sir Edward Routh frehald / Item
vj brod-land~ | longyng’ to ye kyrk / Item a brod-land longyng’ to ye maner / Item a
brod-land sum- | tyme’ longyng’ to Rawlynson’ haldynge~ / Item a brod-land longyng’
to ye maner | Item a brod-land longyng’ to ye said Rawlynson’ haldynge’ Item ûij
brod-land~ | & a narow longyng’ to ye maner Item a brod-land longyng’ to John’
Tyndale oxgang | Item a narow-land longyng’ to the hows of kelyng’ | Item a brod-land
longyng’ to | the maner / Item a brod-land longyng’ to John’ Wyske Frehald Item ûij
brod-land~ | & a narow longyng’ to Crosse land / Item ûij gyrs leys fro Wynktoun mer’
to the | hede grypp~ longyng’ to ye maner / Item a brod-land & a narow longyng’ to ye
| hows of kelyng’ / Item a brod-land longyng’ to sir Edward Routh frehald Item | a
brod-land longyng’ to the maner / Item ûij brod-land~ & a narow longyng’ to Crosse |
haldynge’ / Item a narow-land longyng’ to Rawlynson’ haldynge’ / Item a | narow- | land
& ûij brod-land~ longyng’ to the maner / Item a narow-land longyng’ to ye | maner /
Item a land of a Rode & di’ longyng’ to Rawlynson’ land / Item ûij brod-land~ | & a
narow longyng’ to ye maner / Item a brod-land longyng’ to sir Edward Routh | frehald
/ Item a narow-land & a brode longyng’ to the maner / Item a brod-land longyng’ to |
John Tyndale oxgang’. Item a narow-land longyng’ to the hows of kelyng’ / Item a
brode- | land longyng’ to ye maner Item a brode-land styntyng’ of ye Acrdyke at ye
sowth end & | at ye hede gryppis at the north end longyng’ to ye maner / Item a brode-
land styntyng’ | at the hede grypp~ at ye sowth end and at ye feild~ mer’ at the north
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end longynge’ to John Julian’ frehald / Item ííj brode-land- & a narow longynge’ to
crosse holdynge’ / | Item a narow-land styntyng’ at the Acer’ dyke at ye sowth end & at
the hede gyrrpis | at the north end longynge’ to ye hows of kelyng’ / Item a narow-land
styntyng’ at | the hede gyrrpis at the sowth end & at ye feild- mer’ at the north end
longynge’ to ye maner / Item a narow-land styntyng’ at ye hede gyrrp- at the sowth end
& | at the feild- mer’ at ye north end longynge’ to Crosse land’ / Item a brode-land |
styntyng’ at ye hede gyrrp- at ye sowth end & at ye feild- mer’ at the north |
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dend longynge’ to Crosse holdynge’ / Item’ a brode-land styntyng’ at ye Acer’ dyke at | the
south end & at the hede gryppes at ye north end longynge’ to ye maner / Item | a narow-
land styntyng’ at ye acr’ dyke at the south end & at ye hede gyrrp- at ye | north end
longynge’ to ye maner / Item a land of a Rude & di’ longynge’ to ye maner Item a | land
of a Rude & di’ styntyng’ at ye acr’ dyke at ye south end & at ye hede grypp- | at ye
north end longynge’ to ye maner . Item a land of a Rude & di’ styntyng’ at ye hede |
grypp- at the south end & at ye feild- mer’ at ye north end longynge’ to sir Edward |
Routh frehald . Item a othir land of a Rude & di’ longynge’ to sir E’ R’ frehald Item a |
brode-land & a land of a Rude & dim longynge’ to ye maner Item a land of a Rude & di’
| longynge to Robert Dubney frehald Item ííj land- athir’ of tham a Rude & di’ longynge’ |
to ye kyrk Item a brod(e)-land longynge’ to ye maner Item a brode-land & a narow-land |
longynge’ to Rawlynson’ holdynge’ Item ííj narow-land- & a brode longynge’ to ye maner
| / | Item ííj brode-land- & a narow longynge’ to sir E’ R. frehald Item a narow-land & a
brode | longynge’ to ye maner Item a brode-land longynge’ to John’ Tyndale oxygung’
Item a narow- | land longynge’ to ye howe of kelyng’ Item a brode-land longynge’ / to sir
E’ R’ frehald | Item a brode-land longynge’ to ye maner Item ííj brode-land- & a narow
longynge’ to | Crosse holdynge’ Item ííj land- ilkon of tham a Rude & di’ longynge’ to ye
maner | Item a land of a Rude & di’ long’ to sir E’ R’ frehald’ Item ííj land- athir’ of
tham | a Rude & di’ long’ to Robert Dubney frehald Item ííj land- ilkon’ of tham a
Rude | & di’ longynge’ to ye maner Item ííj land- athir of yam’ a Rude & di’ longynge’ to
William | haggett frehald Item a narow land long’ to Rawlynson’ holdynge’ Item a narow
| land longynge’ to ye maner Item a brode-land long’ to ye kyrk Item a brode-land long’ |
to ye maner Item a brode-land longynge to sir E’ R’ frehald Item a narow land longynge |
to Rawlynson’ holdynge’ Item ííj narow land- longynge’ to ye maner / Item a land of a
rude & | di’ longyng’ to W. haggett frehald Item’ íj land~ athir’ of yam’ a rude & di’ longyng’ | to ye maner Item a brode-land longyng’ to Crosse haldyng’ / Item a brode-land & a narow | longyng to ye howse of kelyng’ Item a brode-land longyng’ to ye maner Item a brode-land | longyng’ to John’ Julean frehald Item ííj brode-land~ & a narow longyng’ to Crosse | haldyng’ and one of ye sayd land~ bownd~ to ye thorn’ Croft leys Item a brode-land | styntyng’ at the fore-said thorn’ Croft leys longyng’ to ye maner’ / Item a brode-land | stynt’ at ye sayd bownd longyng’ to sir E’ R’ frehald Item íj brode-land~ stynt’ at ye | sayd bownd longyng to Robert Dubnay frehald Item íj brode-land~ styntyng’ at the | sayd bownd~ longyng’ to W. haggett frehald Item ye Thorn’ Croft w’ ye leys y’| longys yerto styntt~ at ye frehald~ longyng’ to ye maner’ Item íj brode-land~ long’ | to ye kyrk~ Item íj brode-land~ end~ styntyng’ at ye Cote dyke at the south | end & at ye sawyng corn’ at the north end longyng’ to Rawlynson’ haldyng

Item a narow-land longyng’ to Rawlynson haldyng’ Item a narow-land longyng to | the maner’ styntyng’ at ye castyng vp of the ploghe at the South . Item íj brode-| land-longyng to sir E’ R’ frehald styntyng at the sayd bownd at the South | Item a brode-land longyng’ to ye maner styntyng’ at the sayd bownd Item a | narow-land stynt’ at ye sayd bownd longyng’ to Rawlynson’ land Item ííj narow-land~ & a brode-land styntyng’ at the sayd bownd longyng to the | maner Item a land of a Rude & di’ styntyng’ at ye sayd bownd longyng’ to sir E’ | R’ frehald Item ííj ley end~ styntyng’ of ye Cote dyke at ye South end & at ye | sawne’ corn’ at the north w’ a narow-land styntyng’ at Ryhylle gate at the | north end & at the Cote dyke at ye South end longyng’ to ye maner Item a | narow land styntyng’ at ye sayd Ryhill gate at ye south end & at ye feild~ | mer’ at ye north end long’ to Rawlynson’ haldyng’ Item a brode-land longyng | to Crosse haldyng’ Item a brod(e)-land long’ to John’ Tyndale oxgang Item a narow~ | land longyng’ to ye howse of kelyng’ Item a brode-land longyng’ to sir E R | frehald Item a brode-land long’ to ye maner Item ííj brade-land~ & a narow | long’ to Crosse haldyng Item íj brode-land~ longyng’ to ye kyrk Item a dale callyd Seneryll
as it lyes | Est & West by ye Cote dyke benndyng’ at ye kyrk hedeland at ye west end and | at ye See syde at ye Est longyng’ to ye maner Item ìj brode-land~ bowndyng of the | sayd Seneryll at ye West end & at ye es-See syde at ye Est end longyng’ to ye | kyrke Item ìj brode-land~ & a narow bowndyng of ye sayd Seneryll at ye west | -er end & at ye see syde at ye est end longyng’ to William haggett frehald | Item a narow-land & a brode-land bowndyng’ of ye sayd seneryll at ye west end longyng’ to ye man | er Jt e m íj brode-land~bowndyng of th e sayd Seneryll at ye west end & at ye See syde at ye est end longyng’ to Robert Dubney frehald Item a. | brode-land bowndyng’ of ye kyrk hedeland at ye West end & at ye see syde at ye est end longyng to sir E R frehald Item a brodeland bowndyng’ at ye sayd bound~ | longyng’ to ye maner’ Item ìj brode-land~ & a narow bowndyng’ of ye sayd bound~ | long’ to Crosse haldyng’ Item a brode-land bowndyng’ of ye sayd bound~ longyng to | the maner Item a narow-land & a brode-land bowndyng’ of ye sayd bound~ longyng to | the howse of kelyng’ Item a brode-land bowndyg’ of the sayd bound~ longyng to sir E R’ frehald Item a brode-land bowndyng of the sayd bound~ longyng to Crosse haldyng’ Item a narow-land bowndyng of ye sayd bound~ longyng to Rawlynson’ haldyng’ . Item ìj brode-land~ & a narow bowndyng’ of ye sayd bound~ long’ to the maner Item ìj brode-land~ bowndyng’ of the sayd bound~ longyng to sir E R frehald Item a narow land of the sayd bound~ longyng’ to the maner Item a narow land of the sayd | bound~ longyng’ to Rawlynson’ haldyng’ Item ìj brode-land~ of the sayd bound~ longyng’ to | the kyrke Item a brode-land & ìj narow land~ of the sayd bound~ longyng’ to W. haggett | frehald Item ìj brode-land~ of ye sayd bound~ long’ to sir E R’. frehald Item a brode-land | of the sayd bound~ long’ to the maner Item ìj brode-land~ & a narow of ye sayd bound~ long’ to Crosse haldyng’ Item a brode-land of the sayd bound~ long’ to John Julian’ frehald Item a brode-land of ye sayd bound~ longyng’ to ye maner Item a narow-land & a brode-land of ye | sayd bound~ long’ to ye howse of kelyng’ Item a brode-land of ye sayd bound~ long’ to Crosse | haldyng’ Item a brode-land of the sayd bound~ long’ to sir E R. frehald Item ìj narow land~ of | the sayd bound~ long’ to ye maner Item a narow-land of (the) sayd bound~ long’ to Rawlynson’ | haldyng’ Item a narow-land of the sayd bound~ long’ to sir E R’ frehald Item a narow- | land of the sayd bound~ long’ to Rawlynson’ haldyng’ Item a brode-land of ye said bound~ | longyng’ to ye maner’ Item a brode-land of the
sayd bound~ long’ to sir Edward Routh | frehald Item a narow-land of the sayd bound- long’ to ye maner Item a narow land of ye | sayd bound~ longyng’ to Rawlynson’ haldyng’.

Memorandum that her’ begynn~ the bound~ of Barnston’ fro the longyng’ at | Coteman’ Croft syde to ye est end of Barnston’ of all the Toft sted~ | Jn-prim’ a Toft stede contenyng’ a brode-land longyng’ to Crosse haldyng’ Item a toft stede cont’ | a brode-land & a narow long’ [to] the nons of kelyng’ | Item a Toft stede longyng’ to ye maner cont’ | in brede a brode-land / Item a toft stede longyng’ to Crosse haldyng’ contenyng’ in brede iiiij | brode-land~ & di’ Item iiiij Toft sted~ long’ to the maner contenyng’ in brede iiiij brode-land~ | Item a toft stede long’ to sir Edward Routh frehald next to the personage of the west | syde cont’ in brede ij brode-land~ & di’ Item the personage conten’ in brede iiiij brode-land~ | Item a toft stede long’ to the maner contenyng’ in brede v brode-land~ Item a toft long’ | to John Tyndale & William Smyth of Naffirtoun cont’ in brede a brode-land Item | a toft stede long’ to the maner’ cont’ in brede vij brode-land~ & a narow Item | a toft stede longyng to saynt John of Jerusalem cont’ in brede a brode-land
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Item a toft Stede longyng’ to the maner’ cont’ in brede iiiij brodeland~ & a narow Item | a toft stede long’ to the personage contenyng’ in brede ij brode-land~ Item a toft stede | callid Rawlynsonn toft stede longyng to the maner cont’ v. brode-land~ & a narow. Item a | toft stede long’ to Juliane’ frehald cont’ a brode-land & a narow. / Item ij toft sted~ longyng’ | to the nonsys of kelyng’ William Smyth of Naffyrto & John Tyndale late of Barnston | cont’ iiiij brode-land~ & a narow Except a peis of a toft lyeng’ w’ in the toft of the | nonsys of kelyng’ long’ to Crosse land contenyn’ in brede a brode-land & di’ and contenys | in lengh iiij skor’ foote rynnyng’ in to the toft of the sayd nonsys / Item a toft stede | longyng’ to the maner contenyng’ in brede ij brode-land~. Item a toft stede long’ to John | wiske frehald cont’ in brede iiij brode-land~ Item a toft stede of sir E’ R’ frehald | cont’ in brede ij brode-land~ Item a toft stede long’ to the maner’ cont’ in brede a brode- | land. Item a toft stede long’ to the personage cont’ in brede ij brode-land~ Item a toft stede long’ | to Thomas Dubney frehald contenyn’ in brede iiiij
brode-land~ . Item a toft stede long’ | to the maner’ contenyng’ in brede iiiij brode-land~
Wyse Toft bound~ of the | hye way at the est end of Barnstoun & of Crosse cheif place /
Glossary

Aboun, adv.
Above, MS also: a-bowne, a-bowth

A-for, adv.
Before

Aker, n.
Acre

A-pon, prep.
Upon, MS also: opon

Appill, n.
Apple

Athir, pron.
Both (of two)

Att, prep.
At

Ba(y)ng, v. pres. part.
Begin, MS also: be-gyn, begyne

Be-logynge, v. pres. part.
Belonging, MS also: pres. pl. belong~

Benndyng, n.
Bounding (?)

Be-west, prep.
To the west of

Bot, conj.
But

Bound~, n. pl.
Bounds MS also: bownd~ sg. bownd

Bownds, v. pres.
Bonds; forms a boundary with; sets

Brade, adj.
Broad, MS also: brod, brode, broud

Bred, n.
Breadth, MS also: brede

Bryge, n.
Bridge, MS also: bryg, breyg

But~, v. pres.
Adjoin, MS also pres. butt~, past part. buttand

Cald, v. past part.
Called, MS also: calld, callid, callyd, clad

Car, n.
Carr, an area with wet, boggy ground.

Castyng, v. pres. part.
Casting; in ploughing, the method and operation of turning all the furrow-slices
of a ridge in one direction, and those of
the adjoining ridge in the opposite
direction (OED)

Four hundred, Roman numerals

Main, principal; cheif place main holding

See cold

cloven (?)

Enclosure, MS also: close

Common; patch of unenclosed or
‘waste’ land which belongs to the
members of a community. In MS also
com’

Containing, MS also: cont’, conten’,
contend, contend-, contenyg,
contenynyng, pres. contennys, contenys

A small, detached house such as is
occupied by poor people or labourers;
a slight building for sheltering small
animals or for the storage of anything.
(OED)

A small house or storage building, cf cote.

A piece of enclosed ground, used for
tillage or pasture; in most localities a
small piece of arable land adjacent to a
house; a small agricultural holding worked
by a peasant tenant. (OED)

A valley, MS also: dall (see p. 107).

Lat. ‘dimidium’, a half.

A trench used as boundary of lands and
fields, as the fence of an enclosure.
MS also dyk (see p. 107).

East, MS also: este

Every, MS also: euery, euerylk
**Eueremans, n. gen.**  
Everyman’s, an area/field open for everyone in the village.

**Feld, n.**  
Field, in MS also: felde, feyld pl. feild~

**For, conj.**  
Because

**Fore-said, adj**  
Earlier said, MS also forsayd, for-sayd

**Forlonge, n.**  
Furlong; length of the furrow in the common field (see p. 107).

**Foote, n.**  
Foot, unit of measure.

**Freehald, n.**  
Freehold; ‘permanent and absolute tenant of land or property with freedom to dispose of it at will’ (OED). MS also: frehald, fre-hald, frehalde, fre-halde, freehold, fre-hold, fre-holde, pl. frehald~

**Fro, prep.**  
From

**Fyrst, adv.**  
First

**Garth, n.**  
‘A small piece of enclosed ground, usually beside a house or other building, used as a yard, garden or paddock.’ (OED)

**Gate, n.**  
Way; road

**Go-yng, v. pres. part.**  
Going

**Grippes, n. pl.**  
Small open furrows or ditches; trenches. In MS also: gryppes, gryppis.

**Grund, n.**  
Bottom; ground

**Gyne, v. past part.**  
Given

**Gyrs, n**

**3eer’, n.**

**Haldyng, n.**  
Holding; tenure or occupation of land. MS also: haldyg, haldynge, halldeng, haldyng, holdyng, holdynge, pl. haldyng~.

**Half, n. and adj.**  
Half, MS also halff
Hede, n.
in **hede grippes**: presumably ditches at the end of furrows; boundary ditches (see **Hedeland**)

Hedeland, n.
‘A strip of land in a ploughed field, left for convenience in turning the plough at the end of the furrows, or near the border; in old times used as a boundary’. (OED)

Heer, adv.
Here, MS also: her.

Hit, pron.
It, MS also: yt, it

Hous, n.
House, MS also: hovs, house, hows, howse.

Howd’, n. (?)
In phrase of **howd’ half rode brode**; a form of ‘other’ or ‘hold’ (?)

Hye, adj.
High

Ilkon, pron.
Each (one)

Jnprimis, adv.
First; used to introduce the first of a number of items (OED). MS also: **Jn-primis, Jn p**

Jtem, adv.
Likewise, also; used to introduce a new fact or statement or each new article or particular in an enumeration.

Kar, n.
Carr; wet, boggy ground.

Kyrk, n.
Church, MS also: **kyrke pl. kyrk-**.

Lande, n.
Land, MS also: **lond, pl. land-** (see p. 110)

Lengh, n.
Length, MS also: **lenth, length**.

Ley, n.
Lea; open ground; grassland, pasture ME also: **leye pl. leys**. (see p. 111)

Longynge, v. pres. part.
Belonging, MS also: **langyg, lonyg, longyg, longyg~, long pres. sg. logynge, long~, longynge, longys.**

Lonyng’, n.
Lane; byroad

Ly, v. pres. pl.
Lie, MS also: **lye, lyes, lys (?) sg. lyes lys pres. part. lyeng, lyyng.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maner, n.</td>
<td>Manor, also in the phrase mann dm’ demesme of the manor (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manes, n. gen.</td>
<td>Man’s, MS also: manns, mans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medyll, n. or adj.</td>
<td>Boundary, MS also: meir, mer, meyer (see p. 111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meer, n.</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum, int.</td>
<td>‘It is to be remembered (that)’; phrase a head of note or document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylln, n.</td>
<td>Mill, MS also: mylne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narowe, adj.</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narowe-land, n.</td>
<td>Narrowland, MS also: narowland, narow-land, narow-lande, narow-lond sg. narowland~, narow-land~ (see p. 111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nexste, adj.</td>
<td>Lying nearest in place or position, MS also: next.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonnys, n. pl.</td>
<td>Nuns, MS also: nonys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North, adv.</td>
<td>North, MS also: northe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octobores, n. gen.</td>
<td>Of October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Os, conj.</td>
<td>As, MS also: as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othir, adj.</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owr, det.</td>
<td>Our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxgang, n.</td>
<td>A measure of land (see p. 111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peis, n.</td>
<td>Piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peroke, n.</td>
<td>Parrock; small area of enclosed land; fence of enclosure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personage, n.</td>
<td>Parsonage; rectory; the benefice or living of a parson. MS also: personech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploghe, n.</td>
<td>Plough (see p. 112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qwylke, pron.</td>
<td>Which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rode, n.</td>
<td>Land measure, MS also: rod, rod~, rude (see p. 112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryg, n.</td>
<td>Ridge; elevation between furrows in a ploughed field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rynd—, v. pres. pl.
Same, adj.
Sawynge, v. pres.part
Sayd, v. past
Saynt, adj.
Schep, n.
Scorth, n.
See, n.
Skor, n.
Slak, n.

Soth, adv.
Stede, n.

Stynttys, v. pres. sg.

Sumtym, adv.
Syd, n.
Syr, n.
Thaí, pers. pron.
Tham, pers. pron.
Pe, def.art.
Thorn, n.
Throwe, prep.
Toft, n.
To-gedder, adv.
To-ward, prep.
West, adj. and adv.
Wretyn, v. past part.
W't, prep.
Y'at, rel. and pron.
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Appendix I

Measurements and land units

Dale
A dale is a portion or share of land. It could also be defined as a share of a common field or a portion of an undivided field that is indicated by landmarks, but not divided off.

Dyke
A long and narrow excavation dug out of the ground, also called a ditch. These have been used from ancient times to mark the boundary of lands or fields, either as the fence of an enclosure, or as the defence of camps, castles, towns, or other entrenched place. They are usually filled with water.

Furlong
Originally, a furlong was the length of the furrow in the common field, which was theoretically regarded as a square containing ten acres. The measurement of a furlong has varied through time according to the extent assigned to the acre, but in general it was understood to be equal to 40 poles (rods, perches, see p. 111, 112). As early as the 9th century, the furlong was regarded as the equivalent of the Roman stadium, which was one eighth of a Roman mile; and hence furlong has always been used as a name for the eighth part of an English mile, whether this coincided with the agricultural measure so called or not. The present statute furlong is 220 yards, and is equal both to the eighth part of a statute mile, and to the side of a square of 10 statute acres.

Land
The term land can have different meanings, depending on its context. In the Barmston survey it is likely to have been meant as one of the following: As ground or soil for particular use, such as arable land or plough land; as an area of ground under cultivation; as a strip of land in a field that has been ploughed and is divided by water furrows. The latter would often be taken as a measure of land area or length.

Ley
A ley is a tract of open ground, usually meadow, pasture, or arable land. It was common that ‘ley’ occurred in place names, such as in the Barmston survey: ‘Ley Enclosure’ (see appendix I).

**Meer**

A meer in this context is likely to be a boundary or an object indicating a landmark. Alternatively it might have been meant as a strip of uncultivated land which followed along the line of a boundary.

**Narrowland**

One of the narrow strips which open fields were formerly divided into.

**Oxgang**

An oxgang is a measure of land that was commonly used in both Northern England and Scotland in earlier times. One oxgang was the equivalent to an eighth of a carucate, and one carucate was the amount of land that could be ploughed by a team of eight oxen in a year. Another possible alternative is the usage which was a measure of length, equal to a furlong.

**Perch**

A measure of length used for measuring length of land, fences, walls, etc., but the use could vary slightly from place to place. Later it was standardised at \( \frac{1}{2} \) yards, or \( 16 \frac{3}{4} \) feet (approximately 5.03 m). A perch has also been referred to as lug, rod or pole.

**Ploughland**

A measure of land used in the Northern and Eastern counties of England. It was based on the area able to be tilled by one plough with a team of eight oxen in the year, and it varied greatly in extent; from around 60 to 300 acres. However, it was usually equivalent to around 120 acres and divided into eight oxgangs.

**Rod**

A measure of length, equal to \( 5\frac{1}{2} \) yards or 16\( \frac{3}{4} \) feet (see Perch).
## Appendix II

Landholders and places in the Barmston survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubney, Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dybnay, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggett, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelyan, Jon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Kae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rallynson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowth, Edward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyth, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John of Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndal, Jon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiske, Jon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyemarke, William</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acr Dike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Garth Dike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arland Dike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browcott Meer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote Dike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Ley Enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyman’s Enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Meer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyllyng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naffirtoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneryll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Bridge Dike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorne Enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreth Dall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynkton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>