

Before we go on to study this topic, there are two other stories we should relate, because they may have a significant relevance. The first of these stories relate to a place. To start with we received a piece of information telling us that there is a place in South Devon called Whitlocksworthy, which is apparently just a cross roads, near a place called South Milton, south west of Kingsbridge. Also there is apparently a farm there called Whitlocks Farm, which is named in Domesday Book.

So it was decided to investigate this.

I have been unable to trace any reference to the farm or cross roads in the Devon section of the Domesday Book. However the name Whitlocksworthy is mentioned in the index of Part 2. of "Place Names of Devon", published by Cambridge University Press, from the English Place Names Society, Vol: IX. It is mentioned on page 309. This page is in Part 1 of this publication, from Vol: V111 of the English Place Names Publications. It is listed in the Stanborough Hundred at South Milton. (Mideltona). The 6 inch Ordnance Survey Map show it as Wylakesworth. The 1244 Assize Roll, Nos: 174, 181, 188, 189, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196 and 198, as Wyght-Locks-Worthy. (PRO reference JUST 1/175. Unpublished). The Feet of Fines of Devon, (1391) as White Ioxworthy. (PRO reference CP25/1/44/66 or CP25/1/45/67. Unpublished). The Miscellaneous Books Land Revenue. LRMB191 as Wihlacs Worpig.

(PRO reference LR2/191.Unpublished).The Place Names of Devon state that the name later may have been influenced by the Middle English surname Whitelock(s),rather than the name being connected with the surname at the relevant time.Middle English considered a period between 1350-1550.The personal names compounded in Devon Place Names state that Wihlāc is Anglo-Saxon.This form of spelling has been encountered in the Domesday Records of Hampshire.

The second story concerns the evolution of double names.

It was with a financial purpose that William 1 had the Domesday Survey made,William Rufus left few useful records,Henry 1,an extremely efficient man,started the system of Exchequer Accounts, known as the Pipe Rolls because its enormous roll looked like pipes. It lapsed during the anarchy of Stephen,but the energetic Henry 11 soon started it again and organised the Exchequer on such a firm basis that the Pipe Roll runs in unbroken line from the first year of his accession right down to the nineteenth century.It gives a detailed account of the Kings receipts from rents and fines,and much of his private expenditure,and its early sections,printed and well indexed by the Pipe Roll Society,are invaluable as a source of names of the upper and middle classes.

When Edward 1 came to the throne as an eager young Prince recalled from the Holy Land,ambitious to achieve great things in England after his fathers mismanagement,his first impulse was to find out exactly what his resources were and what money he could rely on. This we have already touched on.

For this purpose he instituted an inquiry into all rents and taxes owing to the Exchequer throughout the land,the results of which are set out in the Hundred Rolls of 1275.These were printed and made available to students early in the last century,with an index containing approximately seventy thousand entries,and this convenient report on the whole country was much used as a quarry for names by Canon Bardsley,the first serious writer on the subject.Most of the early examples in his Dictionary of Surnames come from the Hundred Rolls.

Edward 1 not only left us a wealth of records,but had actually a large if indirect influence on the fixing of surnames.His legislation reorganised and clarified the system of land ownership,establishing the system of primogeniture as a basis of English inheritance,and copyhold tenure for normal land.These arrangements affected all

classes. The humble peasant with only one virgate of land was as anxious to claim it by right of being his fathers oldest son as the rich man inheriting a large estate. The land could be claimed and awarded only at the Manorial Court, being held "by copy of the court roll", which meant that the life tenants name was inscribed there on permanent record.

It is from these sources that the usual information on surnames was compiled in works such as "A Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames" C.W. Bardsley. 1901. "A Dictionary of British Surnames". P.H. Reaney. 1958.

All through the foregoing review of original sources there have been two separate themes to follow. The proportion of the population who have surnames at all, and secondly the question of whether these names are permanent.

The first question is fairly easy to answer by straight forward statistics. At the time of the Conquest and up to 1100 about 45% of all recorded men, humble as well as great, Saxon as well as Norman, have second names. By 1200 this figure has gone up to at least 90%, but during these two centuries it must be admitted that the records have been predominantly upper class, and though as many of the proletariat as possible have been included, the proportion is nothing like correct. By 1300 the range is much wider and the figure is something like 99%. It is rare to find a man without a surname. Whether each man knew what the clerk had written down, and kept it for further use is quite another matter.

The second question is much harder to answer. How can we distinguish the permanent name from the temporary. How can we say at a particular date that surnames in general are fixed.

Many experiments were carried out.

I believe that the custom of using surnames for all except the intimate circle of the family and household followed quite quickly on their general establishment and in fact accelerated it. In the Paston Letters, which run from 1440 onwards, and are as informal as we could wish, they are in regular use from the start, often both names being expressed, as Clement Spicer, or, John Broor, in fact just as it was to continue for centuries.

On the other hand, in the Poll Tax of 13⁰¹, though surnames seem to be fully developed, the Christian name alone is still used as the regular form for alluding to a person indirectly.

Between the Poll Tax and the Paston Letters there is a gap of only sixty years, yet in the matter of names the one is medieval and the other modern. This was a time of rapid change and the new style of speech was one of its many manifestations. For the next five hundred years and more, surnames were to be the normal form of address. Early surnames, such as our own, can be seen in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and other writings of the period, chiefly in charters and wills. Some are the kind of nicknames men have always given each other, whether in admiration, scorn or fun.

They were indeed surnames, but not yet family names. They were personal and temporary and would not pass on to the next generation. However we have already seen in the previous section, that by the time of the Lay Subsidy of 1332 our family in Devon were using double names. Much can be read into this fact, but, a certain amount of conjecture will remain. Despite this, we must consider the facts, the fact that even in 1332 we were using double names, and the fact that in both instances, the records were of Devon.

Swedish scholars who have done much work on this subject have coined the term "by name" for them, to distinguish them from hereditary surnames, but I do not find this expression convenient in use, as one can seldom know exactly when a temporary name becomes permanent. The one state merges so naturally into the other. Consequently I call them "surnames" from the time they first appear, with the qualification that the earlier ones are sure to change.

Scandinavians were adopting the new style of name-giving, repeating rather than avoiding the names of their forbears, and were much given to the use of nicknames.

Here again we should mention that writings on the origins of surnames have always referred our name to the category under "nicknames", although there are other conjectures. The fact that our name appears in Saxon records, could align it to a Scandinavian, or Viking origin, but more work needs to be done on this topic.

The main sources covering the Anglo-Saxon period are "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle", first published 1839. "Anglo-Saxon Wills". Edited by D. Whitelock, (strangely enough), published 1930. "Anglo-Saxon Charters". Edited by A. J. Robertson. Published 1930. "English Historical Documents". Edited by D. Whitelock and D. C. Douglas, 3 volumes, published 1955. Not much of solid weight can be gleaned from first writers

of British race. The Celtic monk Gildas wrote his tract little before 550, and then mainly to scourge the vices of Welsh kings. The *Historia Brittonum* of the Welshman Nennius was edited after 800, whilst the earliest fragments it contains can hardly be dated before 680, the first Welsh annals come from the 10th century. As far as our two fundamental authorities, Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* is the greatest book of the early Middle Ages, but it was written in a Northumberland monastery and not before 730. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, already mentioned, though incorporating some lost earlier originals, in the form we have it was rearranged not before 890, and compiled under King Alfred's eye for the glory of his dynasty. In *Domesday Book* among holders of land under the new regime

we see hundreds of English names, at least one third of all the names given, though not much more than an eighth of the land, since all the richest prizes went to Normans. One can never be accurate about numbers of people in the Domesday Book because the same name is often repeated in several places, and without fixed surnames it is impossible to know if it refers to the same man or another. Here again the case of our own family is favourable, in that, in Domesday, our name appears to be confined to one area.

However there is clear evidence of hundreds of Englishmen holding land under King William, many of them described as "the Kings thegns", which means that they had taken the oath of allegiance to him. There certainly was no co-operation and perhaps less nursing of hatred than romantic writers would have us believe. Nothing succeeds like success, and among Englishmen there must have been many who admired the Norman vigour and adopted Norman fashions very readily.

In 1985, the University of Leicester had for some time, been carrying out a project known as "The English Surnames Survey", and this proceeded on a county-by-county basis, looking at a range of surnames found in that geographical unit. We contacted them, they pointed out that we must understand that investigations in depth into individual surnames are limited to a representative selection for each county. At that date they had surveyed Norfolk, Suffolk, the West Riding of Yorkshire, Oxford and Lancashire. These counties had revealed nothing of value to us. We contacted the University again in 1992, but unfortunately this time we received no reply. Our enquiry was worded that if no relevant information had been unfolded, a reply would be unnecessary. So we conclude that either this is the case, or our name was not selected as representative for a given unit, or the project was discontinued. Either way we must assume there to be no information in their publications of value to us.

We must move on to discuss this possible origin.

In one of the many books written by the writer and broadcaster Ralph Whitlock, he adds his weight to the conjecture, that his branch of our family, (he is a member of a long and well established branch of our family in Wiltshire), and the Devon branch of our family had originated from earlier members of our family in Somerset, "a common stock", he states. He may very well be correct, however I certainly am convinced that our Devon family had originated from the Somerset-Devon boarder region. I will outline my reasons.

The Victoria County History of Somerset tell us that the first Bishop of Bath and Wells was instituted on the 11th September 1244. Known as Roger. We are recording this fact as it is important for us to bear in mind at what precise point of time the separate religious houses of Bath and of Wells, became combined under one Bishopric.

We are told also that the Bishop of Bath and Wells retired to his Manor House at Wiveliscombe in 1348. This record originated from the Register of R. of Shrewsbury and was published in the Somerset Record Society. Vol:10. Page 588. This record is also of importance in compounding our theory, as it indicates that the Manor House of Wiveliscombe was the property of the Bishop of Bath and Wells. We must now consider a record taken from the Somerset Pleas.

Volume 11. Topic 462. Membrane 2. Dated Close of the 12th Cent:-
41 Henry 111. Plea Roll No:756 (Somerset) dated 27 Henry 111 (1242-43).
It states:_"The Prior of Bath puts in his place Henry of Chaverton against Walter Whytlock and Christianna his wife on a plea of land etc: against John de Chamflur on a plea".

(For Chaverton, read Claverton. The Manor of Claverton was amongst the properties of Bath Priory).

John de Chamflur, is recorded as of Huish Chamflower. Huish Chamflower is a Devon-Somerset boarder area parish.

If we were in the process of studying the Somerset Whitlock family, it would be seen that if Walter was at this time in this area, as this record certainly tends to show, then at some stage he moved to the Hundred of Horethorne, which is on the boarder of Somerset-Dorset, for a 1262 record indicates that he was late of here. The same volume of Somerset Pleas, taken from Roll 756, however this time topic 664, states: _

"Cecily, daughter of William, and Joan her sister, who brought a writ of warranty of charter against Henry Blund concerning 3 ferlings and 5 acres of land with appurtenances in Schislode, do not proceed. Therefore they and their pledges to prosecute, namely Humphrey Pratt and John Whytlock are in mercy".

It proved very difficult to establish, even with professional assistance the exact location of Schislode. This professional assistance was sought in Somerset, quite naturally, as it was believed that a Somerset record was being researched. However evidence has emerged which make it important that we should also consider Devon, in our search for this location.

The date of this record, as with that of Walter, is 1242-3.

As it happens, the fact that we could not positively locate Schislode, within Somerset, is not as serious as it might have been, for a further record has emerged for John.

It is a record of The Assize Roll for the County of Somerset. Concerning John Whytlock, dated 1243. The original record is held at the Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, London. Reference Eyre Rolls. Assize Rolls. (JUST:Item 1) Roll 756, membrane 12.

The Calendared version is contained in the Somerset Record Society Vol:11.

Somerset Pleas Richard 1-41 Henry 111 from the Roll of the Itinerant Justices. Somerset Record Society. Volume X1. 1897. P222. No:722. Membrane 12. It states: _

Matilda de Wiveliscombe, who brought a writ of warranty of charter against William son of Roger, does not proceed to prosecute her writ. Therefore she and her pledges, namely John de Everley and John Whytlock, are in mercy".

This record illustrates what was being said in our general descriptive notes. On the one hand, one family were being referred to by their Christian names only, whilst the families of the two

pledges, including our family, were using double names, even at this earlier date of 1243. Again much can be read into such a fact as this, but, more than one member of the family is being referred to, the area is the same, and the dates are the same.

It is believed that Matilda of Wiveliscombe was one and the same person as Matilda de Chamflower, of Huish Chamflower.

Now the situation becomes very interesting, because we do appear to be stabilising our research around this area of Wiveliscombe.

According to the Victoria County History of Somerset, the Parish of Wiveliscombe, with (at this time) a total area of 5310 acres consisted

of the following tythings.Croford and Nunnington,Langley,West Down,
Whitefield East,Okehampton and Whitefield West.

The same publication tell us that Wiveliscombe was one of six
parishes comprising the Hundred of Kingsbury West.The others being
Bishops Lydiard,Ash Prior,Wellington,Fitzhead and West Buckland.
In addition,the same publication carries a reference titled,"The
Gift of Matilda de Chamflower of the Advowson of Batheaston".
It concerns a Somerset Record Society,publication Vol:V11.Part 11,
page 1124.

Referring to the Priory of Bath.

The monks of Bath were contesting precedence with the Canons of
Wells.In the middle of the 13th century when the priory was
exhausted with its long contest with Wells,Matilda de Chamflower
made some exchanges of pasture land with them,greatly to the
advantage of the monks and sold them the advowson of Batheaston,
giving back a considerable portion of the price.Sir Alexander de Alnets
and Sir Hubert Husee were also benefactors towards whom the convent
showed their gratitude by their prayers.

This record was taken from two Bath Cartularies,Part 1.1.Part 11.
36.and ibid Part 11.25-50.Somerset Record Society.Volume V11.
Part 1.Page 54.Cartularies of Bath Priory.

However the estates of the Church of Wells comprised the Manor of
Wiveliscombe,amongst others.

Hence we can now see how,later,this manor became the property of
the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

It will have been noticed that two of the tythings of Wiveliscombe
are situated in Devon.

It was the emergence of this fact that has made us realise that
we must research Devon Place Names for Schislode.

Having enthusiastically carried out this research,nothing has
emerged that in any way resembles this location.After all the work
that has now been put into trying to locate this situation,we feel
this line of research must be abandoned.It may be that the location
was small in area,small in importance and modern translation of
records dropped further reference.

Alternatively,taking the two syllables of the word"Schislode",Schis--m,
meaning separation of a church,dividing of a group into mutually
opposing parties,and lode,meaning guiding principle,object of
pursuit.Bearing in mind the feud between the two Churches of Bath
and Wells.

So leaving this behind us, we had better mention a little about the early Chamflowers.

According to the Red Book of the Exchequer Rolls. Series 1, 103, 216, 226. In 1166 Thomas de Chamflower held 3 fees of Gerbert de Percy. Lord of the Barony of Poorstock and was therefore probably a terre tenant of Huish. He may have been succeeded by John de Chamflower, who held a fee in 1196-7 and 1201-2, which Thomas also held of the Barony of Dunster.

According also, to the Book of Fees. Vol: 11. Page 94. The Chamflowers were owners of the Manor of Huish. They held their fees of Gerbert de Percy. Lord of the Barony of Poorstock. (Dorset). Another Thomas Chamflower held 2 fees in Huish of Robert de Newburgh in 1212. The Curia Regis Rolls tell us in Vol: 12. Page 356, that on the death of Thomas de Chamflower, the advowson of the living passed in 1226 to his daughter. Records tend to indicate that this may well have been Matilda.

The Calendar of Patent Rolls 1292-1301. Page 295 go on, it evidently descended in a junior branch of the family until the death of the widow of Matthew de Charflower around 1297, when the Crown presented during the wardship of the heirs.

The fact that the descent of the manor passed to a junior branch of the family is borne out, for the reason that Matilda had not married, and therefore had no direct heirs.

The Somerset Record Society Vol:30. Page 413, and ibid Vol:LV, page 30, and Somerset Record Office DD/AH65/7 say that the advowson thereafter descended with the manor, and after its division with that part, held by the Courtneys between 1422-1525, although a share of the advowson seems to have been included in the Brett Estate in 1508, when it passed to William Methway.

Volume 4 of the Victoria County History of Somerset included a passage which may be of vital importance during future research. Martock Church is in the centre of a large pre-Conquest estate and was probably a minster in 1156 when it was confirmed as a possession of the Abbey of Mont St. Michel (Menche). The Bishop of Winchester having long possessed it, restored it to the Abbey in 1176-8, but it was acquired by the Bishop of Bath by 1190-1, the Abbey receiving pensions in return in 1226, the Bishop dividing the income, half was returned to Mont St. Michel in exchange for the patronage and the other half was assigned to the treasurer of Wells Cathedral subject to an annual pension to Merton Priory, Surrey. HMC Wells 1.36-7.51, 449, 452. Topographer and Genealogist 1.195 say the pension was part of a larger one payable by Otherton to the treasurers.

So by using all these records, what are we trying to indicate?

Well firstly that being that members of our family were using double names before, well before 1300, it probably does indicate that Whitlock had become an hereditary family name already, and that therefore the family were probably more than mere peasants.

The next point is that the Whitlocks of Devon did originate from somewhere. There is no record of them in Devon Domesday, nor indeed in any of the calendared records up to the point of Richard in 1257 referring to Exeter. So as I have indicated they had obviously migrated to Devon from somewhere.

We believe the place name record mentioned in our text can be discarded with reference to the origin of our family in Devon.

In fact as there seemed to be some doubt about whether or not the Devon section of the Domesday Return featured any derivation of the surname Whitlock, I had the section checked for a third time, this time professionally, with the following comment.

"The indices to the Devon portion of the Domesday Book has been checked carefully, but with regret the name Whitlock/Whitelock does not appear".

This now dispels any doubts on this score.

However let us proceed.

As both Ralph and I have said, the obvious is a common stock in Somerset, and when considering Somerset, the area in which it so happens two 1240's records have been found, make it a pretty obvious point from where the Devon family were based.

Now exactly what sort of country was, and indeed still is, this area comprising the Hundreds of Willaton and Freemanors, and Kingsbury West. Well it is an area from the Devon boarder, just SW of Wellington to Bridgewater Bay.

The place name "Somerset", means "land of the summer farmers". In general, very early on, Somerset was wetlands, which were visited and farmed by migrant summer farmers, from all over. Gradually as the wetlands were cleared and irrigated, the migrants stayed and became resident.

So why had Devon, and especially why does Exeter and Barnstaple feature in this early Whitlock family.

Well look at the situation. As has been said these two Hundreds encompassed an area from the Devon boarder to Bridgewater Bay, taking in the Brendon Hills, the Quantocks and part of Exmoor. From the Middle Ages until the 18th century, Minehead was the port, at one end and at the other end, Exeter became the important trading centre, and also a busy port, right from the beginning, until c1285, when out of spite, the Countess of Devon, built a weir across the River Exe, hence Countess Weir, when its port ceased until 1563 when its ship canal, the first in England, was opened.

So a reason for a base at Exeter can already be seen, its port. However, as can be seen from the records outlined, whilst our family obviously remained at Exeter, it is not really surprising that the family branched out, into the country, and Barnstaple. Although, it should be realised that when we say Barnstaple here, we are referring to the Barony of Barnstaple. This Barony contained one of the oldest boroughs in England, it was minting its own coinage from the 10th century, and the Barony extended from the coast, towards Exeter, to at least Crediton and maybe even the Okehampton areas.

With the closure, as a port, of Exeter until 1563, when the ship building boom arrived, it was Dartmouth that became the great port of Devon. The fleets for the Second and Third Crusades were assembled here and in 1346 it sent 31 ships, less only than Fowey and Yarmouth, to besiege Calais. So a migration to Dartmouth is not surprising. But we begin to digress from the issue concerning this section, the

15

origin of the Devon Whitlocks, I for one am convinced that this occurred around the middle of the 13th century and that Somerset was involved. Are there any common denominators here? The basic answer to this question is yes, there are two. The County of Devon and the Chamflower family. The County of Devon because, we do have a number of records of the family here back to the middle of the 13th century, but there are no records here, prior to this and back to and including the Domesday Survey. Then the Chamflower family because of the two or three records of the family amongst Somerset records, the Chamflower family have appeared in them.

Based on these common denominators, could we be missing something more crucial.

Well we know that Matilda de Chamflower was also referred to as Matilda of Wiveliscombe.

The Parish of Wiveliscombe was one of six parishes of the Hundred of Kingsbury West.

This is one of the Hundreds that border on Devon.

The Parish of Wiveliscombe consisted of a number of tythings, two of which were in the County of Devon. Namely Okehampton, and West Down.

So before we press on further, it can already be seen that the John and Walter Whytlock could have resided in Devon, in one or other of these tythings. Taken in their context, the records of these two members of our family, would have to be classified as Somerset records, irrespective of where John and Walter actually resided at the time.

Now we know that Walter had resided in another area of Somerset later, but neither John or Walter, nor indeed any other member of the Whitlock family have been found recorded in any Somerset records prior to 1242-3, back to and including the Domesday Survey.

In fact whilst having the Devon section of the Domesday Book checked professionally, in case any future doubts arose regarding the Somerset section of this book, I asked that this section be checked professionally as well. The result was the similar comment.

"The indices to the Somerset portion of the Domesday Book has been checked carefully, but with regret the name Whitlock/Whitelock does not appear".

It would therefore certainly seem that these mid 13th century members of the Whitlock family had migrated to the West Country from somewhere.

But although these early records tended to suggest that Somerset may have been the original base of the family, it would seem that we were probably being misled by the nature of the records, and that in actual fact Devon always was the origin of the West Country Whitlocks.

A movement from Devon to Somerset appears to have taken place, followed by further movements to Dorset and Wiltshire later.

17

So let us look at the situation of our family a little more closely. We know that before 1286 Roger Whitlock of Exeter was obviously a trader. Therefore it is possible that he had himself succeeded to this position, as had his nephew after him, probably from Richard who could have been a trader before him. Exeter was always an important trading centre, up to the point that the weir was built, then again, after, when the canal was opened. Between times Dartmouth had tended to feature in this role, and as we have seen our family also featured there. But what were we trading in. We have placed emphasis on the wool industry. This was almost certainly so later, during the late 15th century onwards, however, whilst the general area of Somerset, that we have been discussing was akin to hill farming and therefore sheep, the evidence we have produced in this section, indicates that our family were possibly actually residing in Devon, even in the 1240's, whilst their records feature in Somerset records, for reasons we have stated. This being so, what else could they have been trading in, apart from wool, back at this early time. Well the possibility is grain, were they farmers, trading in grain, or could they have been millers, trading in grain. We set out to establish whether the Manor of Wiveliscombe possessed any mills, and if so, where were they situated. Could one or more have been situated in the tything of Okehampton. We shall enlarge on this topic shortly, but in the meantime, what evidence is there to suggest that they possibly were millers, trading in grain. There are two pieces of evidence which may suggest this. One will be dealt with in the next section, but there is another more applicable here.

We mentioned earlier that Walter, if to be considered of this general area earlier, in the 1240's, as the records do suggest, later had obviously moved, for he and his wife Christianna were, in 1262, described as "late of Mereborne". This record was taken from the Somerset Feet of Fines. However, what was actually implied by the sentence, "late holding a close". It is very difficult to assess. Whether Walter and Christianna had died or whether they had moved is not possible to verify from this record. What we know about the area however is interesting. The Hundred of Mereborne was combined with the Hundred of Morethorne, but the name of Morethorne has survived as the name of the combined Hundreds. The subsequence of this combination was that Millborne (formerly known as Mereborne) became a parish within the Hundred of Morethorne. The necessities of King Richard 1. and King John gave importance to the growth of

chartered boroughs and by 1275, besides the City of Bath and Wells, there were boroughs at a number of places, including Millborne Port, as it became known. Many of these boroughs owed their growth to their trade in wool or wine and their population consisted in part of merchants, tradesmen and artificers, but they still preserved their rural character and numbered among their officials haywards and pinders. (An hayward was an officer of a parish, having charge of fences and enclosures). Linsey Woolseys were formerly made at Millborne Port. (See Pigots Directory, page 703). The full history of the Hundred of Horethorne has not been documented by such as the VCH as at this time (1908). So it can be seen that the areas of importance in the Hundred of Horethorne were important to the wool industry. It is also worth noting that part of the Hundred of Horethorne was in Dorset, to the S.E. of Sherborne. Now the Parish of Millborne Port at this time had an area of 3150 acres, but perhaps more importantly the parish contained the tything of Kingsbury Regis. Later evidence of this point can be found in Kirby's Quest, reporting a Feudal Aid of 1204. "Muleborn Port Et Dorinus Rex. Kyngebury. (Kingsbury Regis in Millborne Port). Hengstrich. Thomas Lanc. This is published by the Somerset Record Society. Volume 3. Part of this explanation will undoubtedly sway the reader back again to the wool industry, but we could be being misled. What do we know of the Manor of Millborne. Records tell us that King Edward held it. It never paid geld, nor is it known how many hides are there. There is land for 50 ploughs. In demesne are 4 ploughs and 5 serfs and there are 70 villeins and 18 borders with 65 ploughs. There are 2 riding horses and 22 swine and 153 sheep. There are 6 mills paying 77 shillings and 6 pence and 170 acres of meadow. Woodland 2 leagues in length and 9 furlongs broad. Pasture 4 furlongs long and 2 furlongs broad and 1 league of moor. In this manor there are 56 burgers with a market paying 60 shillings in the Kings ferm. . One additional point which may bear some relevance. There are no records of the de Burgo family in the VCH's of Somerset generally. However they were certainly in this area as early as 1262. It has always been said that the de Burgo family were generally referred to as of Dorset. The records we have of them in Somerset refer to a period, later 1200's to the early 1300's. They are not mentioned in The Domesday Survey or The Geld Inquest. The de Burgo referred to in this area in 1262 was a Raymond, but a Roger has also been

found later. No reference to a John has been found in this area. Now although the record cited above has indicated quite firmly that Walter and Christianna Whitlock had been in this area prior to 1262, and although we know that they had obviously moved from their previous area, which may well have been Devon, the records do not clearly indicate the nature of Walter's business. The notes do however stress that Millborne had established its borough status due to its growth in trade, especially wool. The records also stress the presence of merchants there. Maybe Walter had become involved in wool.

Only but 15 years after this record we discover another record, this time concerning a William Whitlock. The total contents of the record are not too relevant, excepting what it tells us of William. It is a record from the Somerset Plea Roll No: 1234, dated the 9th May 1277, where William Whitlock became a surety in a court case at Taunton. Verbrane 9D. Vol: 41. It states (briefly), "The jury of 24 knights which a James Russell arraigned against Richard Quintin to conflict the jurors of the assize of novel disseisin which Richard arraigned against James concerning a tenement in Henkestrigge is postponed to Saturday after Whit Sunday (May 22) at Taunton for default of the juries because neither of the 12 jurors nor the 24 came and the Sheriff was ordered to distrain them on all their lands etc: and to have the bodies of all of them on this day and the Sheriff testifies that". There now follows a long list of all the sureties. Of interest to us the passage states "that John Elyot of Hindeston, Hamind of the same, William Whitlock of the same and Andrew de Fontyford became sureties for Roger de Fontyford". Now the point about this record is that as a modern map reference "Henkestrigge" is referred to as just south of Templecombe. (OS ST7022). So is probably to be associated with Henstridge. The survey around Domesday describes Henkestrigge as being within the Hundred of Morethorne, as is Millborne Port. Hindeston is described as being within Henkestrigge. However in the Geld Inquest, Henkestrigge is described as of the Hundred of Meleborne (Moreborne) and Hindeston (now spelled Endeston) is still stated to be within Henkestrigge. Hindeston was probably a tything therefore, rather than an estate, as we know that at least three families were described as of it. So given that this William was basically of the same area as Walter and Christianna, but 15 years later, it may be considered that William was a descendant of Walter and Christianna. However, although the record is important

from this aspect, it reveals no indication as to the nature of William's business.

Following this knowledge, we studied a set of Subsidy Returns of 1327 for the County of Dorset and discovered a member of the Whitlock family recorded for the Parish of "Cylton" in the Hundred of "Ridelane". After consultation with local archivists and with Hutchings History of Dorset (Vol: IV. Page 56), we established that the record was referring to the Parish of Silton in the Hundred of Redlane. Hutchings stated that the Hundred of Redlane, County of Dorset, various tythings, King Edward 1 granted the Hundred in dower to his Queen Margaret in 1303. It was granted 26 and 29 Henry VI (1448-1451) to John Lord Stourton. (This point is interesting). 15 James 1 (1618) with the office of bailiff and seneschal of the same to James Gulley Gent: for 21 years and 5 Charles 1 (1630) to Gilbert North Esq: and heirs. It is situated on the boarder of Somerset and Wiltshire, some 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles north west of Gillingham. (This point is also interesting in that we did feature in the Gillingham area again later). In 1195 Peter del Estane had a rent of 100s by grant of Roger de Novo Burgo. The records appear to indicate that our family were moving south towards Sherborne itself, where our family were to be later prominent. This is important as it was from here that it would appear that Robert, Prior of Montacute, had descended, for whom we have included some history, in with our section on the life of Thomas Whitlock the Cleric.

Finally we found an additional record in the Somerset and Dorset Notes and Queries. Vol: 28. Topic 67. The topic is headed "The Account of the Granger of Glastonbury Abbey 1361-62". (Purchased from William Whitloke quantities of lesser oats). The Granger of Glastonbury Abbey 1361-62, he being a John Lautenal. Dated Sunday in the Vigil of All Saints (31 October) 1361 until Michaelmas (29 September) 1362. The Granger was never described as "brother" (frater), therefore he was perhaps secular. The previous Granger was Richard Carsbrouke (Carsbroke) who supervised the first five weeks of the year, he handed over the residue by indenture, the 47 remaining weeks were held by Lautenal. The Grangers Account is manuscript No: 10643 of the various Longleat manuscripts held by the Marquis of Bath. The Abbey demesnes were in Wiltshire, however these did not supply the Abbey with grain, which was usually

supplied by properties in Dorset, although they were much more distant. A number of manors were involved, although a connection here cannot be found at the moment. Further detail of this account may be found in Longleat MSS Nos: 10761 (1330-31), 10632, 10633, 10763 (1333-34). British Museum MSS Arundel 2 Folio 30.11247 (1368), 10642 (1371). See also Somerset Record Society. Vol: XXXIX.

After checking the microfilm of some of the Longleat manuscripts, (over 900 court rolls and account rolls have been microfilmed), the Eve of All Saints is confirmed. 1362 (or 1361) is mentioned. The Sunday next before Michaelmas 1363 (or 1362) is mentioned. i.e. 47 weeks is confirmed as the computus of (1368) and 10642 (1371) have also been checked. No reference to a member of the Whitlock family have been found here. 10761 (1330-31), 10632, 10633, 10763 (1333-34) are on a separate reel.

So this record does confirm our family were trading in grain at this later time, so were they also throughout the previous 120 years or so. It does however give us the possibility that trading in grain may have been a feature, and undoubtedly this latter William was a descendant of earlier members of our family, which have been discussed here, back to Walter and Christianna.

In order to conclude this section, we must assess the outcome of the study of Devon Place Names, History of Wiveliscombe, (especially with regards mills) and History of Okehampton, (especially with regards mills), to establish the possibilities of the first three recorded West Country Whitlocks being in business as millers or in connection with wool.

We have already stated that the study of Devon Place Names did not reveal any information with regards the location of Schislode, and that therefore this line of research must be abandoned.

With regards the History of Wiveliscombe we can merely recap and mention that no particular references have been found to suggest that the parish was particularly noted for its grain mills. In fact the entire area consisting of Wiveliscombe, Huish Chamflower and so on was to be more associated with the wool industry than any other. Hence the connection of Huish with the Barony of Dunster.

Other aspects concerning Wiveliscombe proved more forthcoming. The parish contained the Manor of Wiveliscombe. This manor was always associated with the Church of Wells. Upon the combining of the Churches of Bath and of Wells under one Bishopric, the manor became the property of the Bishop of Bath and Wells. There was a pension benefit between the treasurers of Wells and the Priory of Merton in Surrey, however this point need not concern us further in this section. The Manor of Wiveliscombe was the property of the Chamflower family.

The outcome of all this is that it is this manor which is most relevant to our present investigations. This is so because the manor comprised a number of tythings, one of which was Okehampton in Devon. So what our research of this manor has done is led us back into Devon, where all our history has centred.

Now we must consider what our research into this tything of Okehampton has revealed.

Okehampton possessed its own manor. Attached to this manor are still today, the Hundreds of Hayridge, Wonford and West Budleigh. Until the reign of Edward 111, the Barons of Okehampton were hereditary Sheriffs of Devon and Keepers of the Castle of Exeter. These barons also held eight manors in demesne, in which they had the power of life and death. They also held several advowsons, and the patronage of the Abbey of Ford and the Priory of Cowick. They also held 3 fees of the See of Exeter and were Stewards to the Bishops at their enthronization, being entitled to all the vessels with which they were served at the first course. Ninety two fees were held of this great barony.

From the year 1151 the Baron of Okehampton was Reginald Courtney. It the connection with this Hundred of Wonford which we feel is of great importance to us.

This Hundred was colossal in area. It encompassed a region from the Teign region, through Exeter, across a section of Dartmoor to Okehampton and beyond through Crediton and into North Devon, towards, but not including Barnstaple.

Every location we have cited from the records quoted in the text comprising this book, where we have located a Whitlock, from the very earliest record we have right up to the middle of the 15th century at least, can be associated with this Hundred of Wonford.

As with Wiveliscombe nothing could be detected from the records of this area to suggest any great dominance of mills, milling grain, but, again, the prominent industry was wool.

We feel therefore that we must conclude that from the very beginnings of our family in the West Country, their business was very probably wool.

In concluding this section therefore, I have very little hesitancy in suggesting that our earliest ancestors in the West Country were connected with the wool trade, both as producers and traders.

Given all the evidence I also have very little hesitancy in concluding that our initial presence in the West Country consisted of the three, John, Walter and Richard. Possibly all of like generation, although there is some evidence to suggest that Walter and Richard, more especially Richard may have been of a succeeding generation to John.

However, what is certain is that there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the West Country is from where our family originated. Therefore they had migrated to the West Country from somewhere, and that is where we must conclude this section.