

CAKE & COCKHORSE

The Magazine of the Banbury Historical Society



Vol. I, Nos. 5-8

1960/1961

Issued four times yearly, September, November, January, March

Price to non-members, one shilling and sixpence

BANBURY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

President : The Rt. Hon. Lord Saye & Sele, M.C., D.L.
Chairman : J.H. Fearon, Fleece Cottage, Bodicote.
Nr. Banbury. Oxon.

Hon. Secretary:

J.S.W. Gibson,
Humber House,
Bloxham,
Banbury.
(Tel: Bloxham 332)

Hon. Treasurer:

A.W. Pain, A.L.A.
c/o Borough Library,
Banbury.
(Tel: Banbury 2282)

Hon. Editor : Dr. C.F.C. Beeson,
Westway Cottage, Adderbury, Banbury. (Tel. Adderbury 272.)

Hon. Archaeological Director:

V. Bromley.

Hon. Research Adviser:

E.R.C. Brinkworth, M.A., F.R.Hist.Soc.

CAKE AND COCKHORSE

O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O

The Magazine of the Banbury Historical Society
 Issued to Members four times a year.

 VOLUME I. NO. 5. SEPTEMBER 1960.

PROGRAMME 1960

Tuesday, 18th October. - A Members' Meeting at which short talks will be given by members on "Church history in architecture", "Tracing your ancestors" and "Antiques and bygones"; any member offering to contribute a talk on another subject will be welcome.

In the Court Room of the Town Hall at 7.30 p.m. It is hoped to serve coffee.

Instead of the usual two autumn meetings in September and November, this year the Society, in conjunction with the Oxford University Delegacy for Extra-Mural Studies, is sponsoring a series of ten illustrated lectures on "Archaeological Techniques", by Mrs. Charmian Woodfield, of the Herbert Museum and Art Gallery at Coventry. They will be held at the North Oxfordshire Technical College & School of Art, 51, The Green, Banbury, at 7.30 p.m. on Thursday evenings, from 6th October to 8th December. The course fee, payable to the O.U.D. for E.M.S., will be 10/-; members attending this course may claim a refund from the Society of up to half their Ordinary Subscription.

The 1961 programme will be announced in the November issue.

EXCURSIONSBRACKLEY

On Tuesday, 31st May a visit was made to the Brackley Historical Exhibition held in Brackley Lower Town Hall which celebrated the grant of the town's Charter; an interesting collection of prints, documents and maps was displayed.

At Magdalen College School Mr. E.G. Forrester kindly showed visitors the Old School Chapel.

STEANE PARK

About 28 members visited Steane Park on the evening of June 21st., where the chief feature of interest was Sir Thomas Crewe's Chapel. This building, dated 1620, has a mixture of Jacobean Gothic and Classic styles which provoked much speculation until the history of its construction was explained by Mrs. Norris, the owner of Steane Park. It contains some remarkable monuments of former Barons of Steane and of the Bishop of Durham and Oxford, some signed by the sculptors, John and Matthew Christian.

This Chapel has the unique privilege of an altar dated 1700. Also on view was a Charles II Bible and Prayer Book of 1660. At the junction of the south and west walls are two unusual sundials.

Dr. Brinkworth has promised to contribute an account of Steane on a future occasion.

R E S E A R C HPARISH REGISTERS

The copying of the Marriage Registers of Banbury has now been completed to 1837. Printing of the first part of these, from 1558 to 1754, for publication later this year, is well in hand. The remainder will be published next year.

A start has been made on copying Bloxham and Milcombe parish registers. The earliest volume, for Milcombe only, from 1562 to 1640, with irregular entries of births to 1766, marriages to 1711 and burials to 1719, has been completed, and so have the marriages from the first Bloxham register, 1630-1745.

Baptisms are at present in progress.

ARCHAEOLOGY

Excavation has started at a new site at Park Farm, on Lord Saye & Sele's land, by kind permission of the President and occupant. The labour of about a dozen workers has brought to light a section of a stone wall, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon pottery, Roman coins, a brooch and bones. It appears that the site dates from 200 to 300 AD. Sections have been drawn and photographs taken of the progress of the work.

We have been promised an account of the results of a dig undertaken at Bloxham by the School.

TREASURER'S REPORTMEMBERSHIP

The total membership is now at the satisfactory figure of 165. Of this figure the following members have paid their subscriptions for the current year:- Life 23, Record (includes Life/Record Members) 33, Ordinary 57. - Total 113. May we urge those of you who have not yet paid to forward your subscriptions as soon as possible, please?

It is with considerable regret that we have to record the death of two of our members, Mr. R. Rowntree and Mrs. N. Butters.

FINANCIAL

Since the Annual General Meeting the main items of expenditure have been:-

Postage & Stationery	£3. 13. 0.
Insurance	£1. 15. 0.

In addition the sum of £1.1.0. was sent to the National Trust in appreciation of the excellent film that was shown at the Annual General Meeting. The present bank balance is £76.4.10.

* * * * *

BANBURY CASTLE

By R.K. Gilkes, M.A. (Oxon.)

On 27th May, 1648, the House of Commons, prompted, no doubt, by a petition from the citizens of the town, resolved "that Banbury Castle be forthwith demolished." Its destruction was not complete; William Stukeley in 1712 saw the "remains of four bastions," and two towers at least remained in the latter part of the 18th century, but today virtually nothing remains above ground to remind us of the great castle, standing on the North side of the Market Place, which had dominated the town for over 500 years.

Banbury Castle, in building in 1136, was one of three great castles (the others were at Newark and Sleaford) built by the princely Norman ecclesiastic, Alexander of Blois, Bishop of Lincoln. Its central mound, over a hundred feet in diameter, was surrounded by a double wall and ditch, the water for the moats being supplied from the Cuttle Brook. Although known at the court of Rome as "The Magnificent," Alexander may have had an eye to economy in his building, for he did not put up an expensive tower keep, but the inner wall of the Castle constituted a shell keep, and within it on the North side and against the wall itself were built the various living and administrative apartments; solidly built of stone and later extended, for a survey made in 1606 speaks of "a Mansion House within the inner gates...twenty-three bays covered with lead." The 13th century saw additions to the defences with the building of at least one flanking tower, together with a gatehouse, and a barbican. These were formidable improvements, but their strength was never tested by actual fighting until the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642, and by that time some restoration work was needed to be done as for years before only the barest maintenance work had been carried out; by 1564, in fact, the Castle was reported to be in "greate decaye...and the repayringe of the said Castell will cost aboue fyftie pound." How much that meant had to be done can be judged from the fact that when Banbury became a free corporate borough in 1556, and a hole was knocked in the Castle wall to allow the transfer of a wooden cage to the new Town Hall, the repairs to the wall cost fourpence!

On the death of a Bishop of Lincoln the land and possessions of the bishopric passed to the King, and for this reason Banbury

Castle was held by the King for several periods between 1166 and 1318; but in 1321, when Henry Burghersh was rash enough to support the Earl of Lancaster's revolt against Edward II, the Sheriff of Oxfordshire was ordered to seize the Castle and deliver it into the hands of Robert of Ardern, knight of the shire, who lived at Wykham. The Bishop of Lincoln ceased to hold the Castle from 1547 when it was transferred to the Duke of Somerset, and, on his overthrow in 1549, to his rival, John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland. When Northumberland paid the price of his treason the Castle reverted to the Crown until 1595, when it was leased, at an annual rent of 78s. to Sir Richard Fiennes for the lives of his three children, William, Ursula, and Elizabeth. Charles I renewed the grant to William Fiennes in 1629, and the Castle and Castle lands remained with the Saye and Sele family until their sale in 1792.

The custodian of the Castle was the Constable, an office held by several members of the Segrave family of Chacombe, although the actual duties of the office were usually carried out by men lower down the social scale and of widely differing ability and integrity. Thomas Chaucer, possibly the son of the poet, who fought at Agincourt, was a member of the King's Council and already Constable of Wallingford Castle became Constable of Banbury Castle in 1412. In 1507 the offices of Constable and steward of the hundred of the Castle and town of Banbury were held jointly by Sir Richard Empson (the unscrupulous and unpopular minister of Henry VII's last years) and his brother, Thomas.

Although Bishop Alexander may have preferred a shell keep at Banbury because it was cheaper (and quicker) to build than a tower keep, his ideas were grand enough for us to be quite sure that he planned a building that would be fit for the entertainment, not only of Bishops of Lincoln, but also of the King himself. The Bishop, obviously, was a frequent visitor; of the best known holders of the bishopric the saintly Bishop Hugh lodged in the Castle in 1191, as did the learned Robert Grosseteste in 1240. Nor were royal visitors infrequent, as Banbury was included in the annual itinerary of the medieval kings, who passed through on their way from Chipping Campden to Northampton. Henry III visited the Castle no less than six times between 1218 and 1266, which is sufficient recommendation for the accommodation and entertainment provided, as indeed is the fact that Edward I, on his second visit in 1277, stayed for a week. Edward III was at the Castle in 1328, 1329, and 1348, Richard II in 1397; Henry VI in 1438 and 1457, and Edward IV in 1470 and 1474. A Royal Council was held at the Castle on 5th February, 1501. The last monarch to

visit the Castle was Charles I, a fleeting visit in 1645, long enough to dine at the Castle before continuing on his way to Oxford.

The statutes of the Council of Lambeth of 1261 required that every bishop should provide himself with one or two prisons in his diocese. Banbury Castle was the Bishop of Lincoln's prison, and Leland in his 'Itinerary' mentions "a terrible Prison for Convict Men" in the outer bailey of the Castle. It is safe to assume that conditions in this prison were pretty grim and uncomfortable, for it was generally considered that it cost only a farthing a day to keep a clerk in prison, which suggests the lowest of low diets when one remembers that the recognised rate for the support of the Friars Minor was fourpence a day! In 1510, when 19 convicted clerks were imprisoned in the Castle - 10 of them for the whole year - the cost of their maintenance was also a farthing a day. Only once a year - on Maundy Thursday - was the prison cleaned, by two men who were paid 4d. apiece. Fresh straw for the upper part of the prison and the dungeon cost 17d., and during the cleaning process the prisoners were allowed out in the town, under guard, to beg for alms in wallets specially provided by the bailiff at a cost of 12d. each. After this spell of fresher air they returned to the care of five warders, and the attention of Thomas Langley, who received 13/4d. in the year for "serving...and cleansing nature of said convicts." But the Castle prison was not escape-proof, however "terrible" it may have appeared. Some who escaped were recaptured, but a fair number got clear away; John Longlond, the Bishop's gaoler, lost 28 prisoners in the three years 1534, 1539, and 1544. William Basiate, a convicted thief, was, therefore, clearly out of luck when he escaped in 1276; having taken sanctuary in the church he abjured the realm and made for the coast, but the Constable, Philip de Burne, possibly over-zealous, but more likely afraid of the heavy fine that might be imposed upon him, sent men in pursuit, who, catching up with Basiate, beheaded him on the spot.

As well as criminous clerks, religious dissidents were lodged in Banbury Castle. In 1415, the year of Agincourt, the Archdeacon of Oxford was ordered by the Bishop of Lincoln to hand over any Lollards to the Constable of the Castle, while during the religious troubles of Elizabeth I's reign recusants were housed there. They were better provided for than the ordinary prisoners, in fact their provisions allowance was

increased in 1596 in step with rising prices - not necessarily indicative of excessive charity, of course, as they were expected to contribute to their own keep. Generally, they were leniently treated, but changes in the political-religious barometer in the latter half of the 16th century meant changes in the official attitude towards recusants; in quieter times parole was allowed, but in 1592, 1596, and again in 1599, letters were directed to the Constable from the Privy Council ordering him to exercise stricter vigilance over his charges. However, such restrictions were soon eased, and we find Thomas Throgmorton, detained along with 15 other recusants "of quallitie and calling," in 1589, regularly being allowed on parole, either to settle some apparently recurring legal business, or, as in 1593, for five months because of ill-health. Accommodation for the recusants seems to have presented no problem until 1612, when Lady Stonor and five other gentlewomen were committed to the Castle, and a tenant, Downes, who had leased apartments there from Lord Saye and Sele, was, very much to his annoyance, turned out to make way for the ladies.

For over 500 years Banbury Castle had pursued its un-military way, but with the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642, it entered very much into the thick of things, and it was most certainly rapidly placed on a war footing, so that Joshua Sprigge, writing immediately after the second siege of the Castle in 1646, could say that it had been "recovered and revived by art and industry unto an incredible strength, much beyond many places of greater name and reputation."

The town declared for Parliament, yet, with the geographical disposition of the King's areas of support, the Castle was of obvious importance to the Royalists. Twice in 1642 the Castle was attacked, the second attack on 27th October, when cannon were brought up, and, just as soon as they began firing, the garrison surrendered. A Parliament report gives a garrison of almost 1,000 men, and suggests that they surrendered through lack of supplies necessary for withstanding a siege, but the real weakness was that the defenders were divided in their loyalty, for two regiments of foot and a troop of horse from the garrison took service with the King.

Leaving a garrison under the command of the Earl of Northampton, Charles moved on with his main army to Woodstock. Strenuous efforts were made in the late summer of 1644 to win back the Castle for Parliament. Colonel John Fiennes, with some 3,500 men, drawn from Warwick, Northampton, and Coventry, together with cannon and mortars, besieged the Castle and seemed certain of success. The walls were breached, and the small garrison, only about 400 men, commanded by Sir William Compton, had consumed their normal provisions and all but

two of their horses. Then a relieving force under the Earl of Northampton reached Banbury on 25th October and raised the siege, which had lasted for fifteen weeks.

The Royalist position in the Castle was not a happy one as the town remained loyal to Parliament and made it difficult for the garrison in the matter of supplies; the damage caused to the town in the hard fighting of 1644 had further aroused the hostility of the townsfolk. Strategically the Castle was of the greatest importance to the King, for, should Oxford be lost, the King's strength in the centre of England would depend wholly on his possession of Banbury; thus the year 1645 was busily occupied in further strengthening of the Castle defences, pulling down houses in the Market Place and digging fresh earthworks, and adding to the Castle itself "2 new bulwarkes and 2 sally portes."

These preparations were opportune. In 1646 Colonel Whalley, commanding about 1,000 foot and some 4 troops of horse, arrived before the Castle and proceeded to attack, as Sir William Compton, the young Governor of the Castle, had summarily rejected Whalley's surrender demand. As in 1644, although the Royalist garrison again numbered only 400 men, the Castle defences held firm; engineer Captain Hooper's efforts to undermine the Castle were countered, and "by flinging down stones and hand-grenadoes" Compton "mightily annoyed the enemy." But the heart had gone out of the Royalist cause; attempts to relieve the Castle had failed, and on 27th April the King left his headquarters at Oxford, giving himself up to the Scots at Newark a few days later. That same day, 6th May, fifteen weeks after the siege had begun, surrender terms were agreed between Sir William Compton and Colonel Whalley.

Almost immediately the levelling of the Castle outworks was ordered, and on 14th June, 1648, the House of Commons resolved that the Castle itself should be demolished, "leaving only... a little Stable, and another little Storehouse, both lately built for the Lord Say to keep his Hundred Courts in: And that the materials...be employed and bestowed for the use and repairs of the town of Banbury," which had suffered considerable damage; compensation of £2,000 was to be granted to the owner of the Castle and land, Lord Saye and Sele.

Had the Castle survived it would not, perhaps, have been for long; the attitude that consented to the destruction of a beautiful church would have had no time for a decaying castle. For castles had passed out of fashion - long before 1642, even - and after 1556 the small Town Hall was of more significance than the lowering Castle, symbolising as it did the newer moods of independence and civic freedom.

* * * * *

C O R R E S P O N D E N C E

Letters and enquiries addressed to the Society will be referred to the appropriate experts.

From the Rev. M. Frost, The Vicarage, Deddington.

Sir,

The following entry from the earliest register of Deddington Church suggests that there was some disinclination to baptise an infant. Did the parish in which a baptism took place thereby become responsible for the mother and child if they happened to be 'travelling' paupers?

Richard a base childe sonne of Ason borne within y^e parish of Barford S^t Johns. y^e woman being delivered on y^e other side of y^e brooke whin y^e field of the said Barford S^t Johns neere unto a mill commonly knowne and called by the name of Bakers Mill and being brought into the said mill did here abide untill y^e said childe was baptised within this pish and that by direction of the ordinary y^e xxvith day of July anno dmi 1640.

Yours etc.

M. FROST.

C O R R E S P O N D E N C E (Continued)

From Mr. R.W. Edge, 79, St. Anne's Road, Banbury.

Sir,

I feel that, although the Society should concern itself primarily with local history, the Society ought also to concern itself with subjects less closely connected with Banbury. I feel that such subjects would create additional interest in the Magazine and so increase interest in the Society.

I feel that an article should not be excluded or postponed merely because the usual number of pages have been filled. The Magazine has mostly concerned itself with recording meetings and announcing other meetings or activities and I feel that the Magazine should also try to bring in additional material, where it is available, even if this does mean a slightly enlarged edition. Perhaps a brief biographical note on a speaker at one of the Meetings or a review of a historical work recently published or added recently to the Public Library could also be included in the Magazine. Other possible subjects for articles could be county archive offices, other historical societies - (national as well as local) and other history magazines (such as 'History Today').

Yours etc.

R.W. EDGE.

From Miss G.M. Hutchinson, Secretary, Oxfordshire Local
Committee, National Register of Archives,
20, Beaumont Street, Oxford.

Sir,

This committee has, inter alia, been trying to trace and record documents relating to old trades and businesses in Oxfordshire, and we have had a certain amount of success, but we feel sure that there must be a mass of such papers hidden away in

the towns and villages of the county.

Obviously people living in a place are much more likely to know of the possible source of such documents than our committee members. Could members of the Banbury Historical Society possibly help in the search for such records, and either make a list of them for us or let us know of their whereabouts so that we could list them? We should be most grateful for any help of this kind.

We have dealt fairly adequately with the records concerning public houses through the kindness of the firms of brewers who have allowed us to inspect the deeds, etc. We are also in touch with the firms of solicitors through one of our committee members, and these have all been approached about redundant records.

What we now have in mind is the small firm of, say, builders, grocers, chemists, who may have interesting records whose historical value they do not appreciate. If the Society could give us any help in the approach to such firms, we should be delighted.

Yours, etc.

G.M. HUTCHINSON.

From Dr. R.P. Beckinsale, School of Geography, Mansfield Road, Oxford.

Sir,

I am trying to complete a history of the North Oxfordshire Textile Industries that I started nearly thirty years ago. Your "Index to Wills Proved in the P.C. of Banbury, 1542-1858" has been most helpful. The earliest mention in it of local plush-making seems to be of Richard Tyler, shagweaver, 1764.

I wonder if:-

1. You have come across any earlier reference to shag or plush in this or any other connexion;
2. If you have heard in the course of researches of any discovery of records, bills of sale, etc., relating to the plush or girth trade in North Oxfordshire that have escaped the

usual histories, such as Potts', etc. (I know the people at Shutford well).

I have in the past advertised for sources, etc., and have usually drawn such a blank that the absence of accounts (e.g. for Gillett's, or Baughen's) seems quite remarkable.

I would be most grateful if you have come across any leads that I could follow up.

Yours, etc.

R.P. BECKINSALE.

Two members kindly pointed out that there appeared to be an error in the list of names of the Warwickshire Hearth Tax Return published in the last issue of "Cake & Cockhorse", No. 4, March, 1960, on p.45, under Farnborough, and that "Baleigh" should read "Raleigh". Mr. G. Holbeche, of the Warwickshire Record Office, kindly rechecked the original for us, and his comments are as follows:-

"... I consider that you have them in the magazine exactly as they appear, except that Christopher is spelt with a final 'e' ("Christophere") and there are no full stops or commas. It looks as though the surnames were both originally spelt the same and then an 'i' was inserted later into that of George. I consider they both begin with 'B' the same as Browne and Beare later on, for there is no tail as in Rawbone below. They should, of course, be "Ralegh"! The family had held the Farnborough estate since 1322. This George Ralegh died in 1683 and the next year Ambrose Holbech acquired the estate. He was the son of the Ambrose Holbeche of Mollington whom you have in your list - the surname here spelt the more general way with the final 'e'.

GERALD HOLBECH.

Letters have also been received from:-

1. Mr. M.L. Dix Hamilton, concerning the Dix and Hopkins families of Burdrop, Sibford and Epwell.
2. Col. E.M. Harris (of the U.S. Army, stationed in Turkey), concerning the Harris family, particularly the famous Robert Harris, who was Rector of Hanwell and brother-in-law of William Whately of Banbury; also the Danvers family of Banbury.
3. Mr. Eric Sharpe, concerning the Cobb families of Banbury and Adderbury - anyone who knows of a link between the two is asked to inform the Hon. Secretary.

SALVAGED FROM SALVAGE (J.S.W.G.)

A year or so ago the muniment rooms of an old established firm of Banbury solicitors yielded several van-loads of historically valuable material that has since been transferred to the County Record Offices at Warwick and Oxford and the Bodleian Library. Later on the residue of the material in the firm's attics and a stable-block were sorted by Mr. Baker, assistant Oxfordshire County Archivist, and myself.

It is only due to the splendidly acquisitive magpie habits of solicitors that historians were left anything to search at all, as the firm would have been completely justified in disposing of these muniments years ago as of no legal value. The contents were mainly 19th c. draft deeds, though there was a large accumulation of Samuelson correspondence including numerous drafts of Sir Bernard's will. Of personal interest was a bundle dealing with the sale of the land in Gatteridge Street where Stone's cabinet making factory now is. This was between members of the Draper family, who were selling the land, and my own great-grandfather and grandfather, Henry and Lewis Wycherly Stone. In another part of the attic were several bundles of very dusty 19th c. Banbury Guardians. As the Borough Library's files only go back to 1948 (thanks to War Salvage) Mr. Muskett has been presented with these. Another printed record was the programme for the Celebrations in Banbury in 1897 to mark Queen Victoria's diamond jubilee. Some 18th c. deeds, apprenticeship indentures and the like were found, but our oldest discovery was reserved to almost the end - a small deed folded to 3"x2" made in the 41st. year of Queen Elizabeth I (1599). It had nothing to do with Banbury but concerned Hanging Aston in Worcs.

THE WARWICKSHIRE HEARTH TAX RETURN FOR 1663 continuedAVON DASSETTHearths Liable.

Samuel Stannton, Cler.	(10)
Richard Woodward, Gent.	(8)
Daniell Neale.	(4)
Richard Kimble.	(2)
John Batchellor, Senr.	(2)
Luke Dod.	(2)
Henry Dod.	(3)
Willm. Batcheler.	(1)
John Nicholls.	(1)
John Rawlins.	(1)
Edward Kimble and)	(4)
Willm. Perkins.)	
Henry Lynnell.	(3)
John Dod.	(1)
Thomas Dod.	(2)
Thomas Hitchcocke.	(2)
Nicholas Duckett.	(1)
Francis Neale.	(2)
John Stukley.	(1)
John Perkins.	(3)
Thomas Rose.	(3)
Richard Glover.	(1)
Francis Perkins.	(2)

59

BURTON DASSETTHearths Liable

Sr. John Tafton, Knt.	(11)
Sr. Richard Temple, Knt. of the Bath & Baronett	(10)
Mr. (? Mrs.) Swabye.	(4)
John Unite, gent.	(5)
Willm. Bradshaw.	(6)
Mr. (blank) Drope.	(2)
James Wagstaffe, gent.	(4)
Richard Brooks.	(3)

Hearths Not Liable.

(blank) Queeney.	(1)
John Tynsell.	(1)
John Batcheler, Jun.	(1)
Thomas Pettifere.	(1)
Willm. Sharpe.	(1)
Widd. Phipps.	(1)
John Smith.	(1)
Leonard Perkins.	(1)
Willm. Ronnd.	(1)
Thomas Gibbs.	(1)
Elisha Smith.	(1)
John Walker.	(1)

12

Hearths Liable (contd.)

Robert Ladbrokee.	(2)
Michaell & Thomas Penn.	(3)
John Puncker.	(2)
Richard Robinson.	(2)
Mary Lidbrooke.	(1)
Richard Elward.	(1)
Jonathan Lidbrooke.	(1)
John Tallett.	(1)
Nathaniell Lidbrooke.	(3)
Robert Ladbrokee.	(3)
Thomas Mason.	(2)
John Leaborne.	(2)
Thomas Gibbs.	(2)
Richard Bayley.	(2)
Edward Leaborne.	(1)
John Alliband.	(2)
Henry Paliner.	(1)
Willm. Norman, and)	(3)
Widd. Smith.)	
Thomas Norman.	(2)
(blank) Hamerley, Cler.	(4)

BURTON DASSETT (Hearths Liable, contd.)

John Weston	(1)
Willm. Queeney.	(1)
Willm. Bayley.	(3)
John Lidbrooke.	(2)
Willm. Hines.	(6)
Thomas Makepeace.	(2)
Barach (?Barath) Tustin.	(3)
Thomas Robinson.	(1)
John Pettifeare.	(2)
Robert Palmer.	(3)
Willm. Hunt.	(2)
Henry Hunt.	(2)
Willm. Hunt.	(1)
Richard Handcocks.	(1)

115

Hearths Not Liable.

Thomas Harris.	Henry Hichman.
Francis Beesley.	Symon Gibbs.
Thomas Warner.	Widd. Gee.
Thomas Rice.	George Gibbs.
John Williams.	Benjamin Tyner (?)
Richard Grant.	Widd. Squerrill.
Edward Grant.	Elizabeth Whitehead.
George Holtham.	Anne Sheepheard.
Bart. Lewell.	Henry Haslewood.
Richard Freeman.	John Meacocke.
Nathaniell Adams.	Henry Nicholls.
John Bayley.	William Enocke.
Thomas Baseley.	Alice Heritage.
Willm. Tooley.	Richard Tompkins.
Robert Freeman.	Roger Hanson.
Widd. Whithead.	
Sarah Bull.	
Edward Gee.	
Thomas Basse.	
Sarah Jeffes.	
Thomas Rose.	
Widd. Waite.	

—
37
—

FENICOMPTON (FENNY COMPTON)

<u>Hearths Liable.</u>	
Matthias Unett, Cler.	(7)
George Mills, gent.	(8)
John Yonge.	(3)
Widd. Griffin.	(2)
Widd. Pettifeare.	(2)
Willm. Skinner.	(1)
Richard Trimly.	(1)
Willm. Base.	(2)
John Payne.	(1)
Thomas Neale.	(2)
Willm. Neale.	(2)
(blank) Payne.	(1)
Richard Rosell.	(1)
Thomas Quiney.	(2)
Thomas Blick. ?	(1)
Richard Maycock.	(1)
Richard Baseley.	(1)
Robert Baker.	(1)
Jerram Williford, gent.	(4)
Henry Dodd, gent.	(5)
John Pettifere.	(1)
John Warr.	(1)
John Roberts.	(1)
Widd. Turner.	(1)
John Sheasby.	(1)
Edward Freeman.	(1)
Thomas Gray.	(2)
George Knibb.	(1)
Edward Clarke.	(2)
Elizabeth Knibb.	(1)
John Hycorne.	(1)
George Baker.	(1)
Richard Knibb.	(2)
Valentine Heynes.	(1)
George Thomas.	(1)
Joan Adams.	(3)
Katherin Smith.	(5)

THE WARWICKSHIRE HEARTH TAX RETURN FOR 1663 continued.

Willm. Knibb.	(2)
Nicholas Dockett.	(1)
Henry Newman.	(1)
Richard Watts.	(1)
Obadia Pettifeare.	(1)
Matthew Payne.	(1)
Tobias Leake.	(1)
George Heynes.	(1)

83Hearths Not Liabl.

Widd. Maccock.	(1)
John Johnson.	(1)
Thomas Base.	(1)
Henry Pettifere.	(1)
Thomas Edwards.	(1)

Richard Matts.
 Joseph Fawks.
 Jarrett Wildind.
 John Naman.
 Widd. Knibb.
 Widd. James.
 John Base.
 Richard Childs.
 Thomas Veares (?).
 Abraham Roberts.
 Willim Watts.
 Willm. Borrowes.
 Willm. Parker.
 Hanna Roberts.
 Thomas Knibb.

Hearths Not Liabl contd.

John Bighnill.
 Willm. Wesbury.
 Margery Basley.
 Samuel Harris.
 Widd. Tooley.
 John Payne.
 Richard Tayler.
 Widd. Barbor.
 Richard Borrowes.
 Nicholas Hamis.
 Christophere Clarke.
 Alice Knibb.
 John Stock.
 Anne Sinkins.
 John Arish.
 Francis Robins.
 Henry Hoges.
 Widd. Knibb.
 Nicholas Kent.
 Willm. Whethead.
 Thomas Talbott.

Wigginton

A Talk on
Old Wigginton and Its Records
will be given by
Mr. Douglas Price,
in the Schoolroom,
at 7.30 p.m. on Thursday
September, 29th. 1960.

All interested will be welcome.

