

## **Running Amuck? Urban Swine Management in Late Medieval England**

**Dolly Jørgensen**

Published in *Agricultural History* 87 (2013): 429-451.

See published version for illustrations.

*Swine as agricultural products were extremely common in the medieval townscape, but pigs are also notoriously damaging if allowed to run amuck. This article explores how local governments tried to regulate pig rearing as an integrated element in urban space, arguing that the authorities attempted to control the movement, feeding, and slaughter of swine as much as possible to circumvent damage to goods, crops, and even people. Urban government and court records from the most populous English urban centers as well as smaller towns from the end of the thirteenth century through the sixteenth century show that swine were not free roamers in towns of the Middle Ages. Because swine were a daily part of urban life, and an integral part of local agricultural production, they required cradle-to-grave controls.*

Whereas great injuries and dangers so often have happened before this time in the City of Norwich and still happen from day to day in as much as boars, sows and pigs before this time have gone and still go vagrant by day and night without a keeper in the said town, whereby divers persons and children have been hurt by boars, children killed and eaten, and others [when] buried exhumed, and others maimed, and many persons of the said town have received great injuries as wrecking of houses, destruction of gardens of divers persons by such kind of pigs upon which great complaint is often brought before the said Bailiffs and Community imploring them for remedy on the misfortunes, dangers and injuries which have been done to them.  
*Norwich Book of Customs* entry, 1354<sup>1</sup>

In 1354 the town council of Norwich took up the issue of a major urban hazard--swine roaming the streets. This was a critical problem. Swine were running loose, damaging property, killing children, and rooting up bodies from the cemetery. Something clearly had to be done. So the town leadership decided that all pigs had to be kept in sties both day and night. If an animal was found wandering the town without a keeper, the finder or anyone else willing to do so could kill the pig without penalty. Every Saturday from noon until the evening, owners could let the pigs out of their enclosures in order to clean them, but the owners still had to ensure that the pigs caused no injury while out of the sty. As soon as the sty was cleaned, the pigs had to be returned to it. This small window into medieval urban life reveals the complexity of dealing with swine when they became an urban nuisance.<sup>2</sup>

Cattle, horses, and pigs were an integral part of medieval urban life. They were all regularly traded in urban markets and often made their homes within the town walls. Perhaps

surprisingly, these interlopers in the city have received scant attention from agricultural historians. Urban life is generally included in agricultural history only as a source of demand for rural products or as a source of waste materials shipped out to farms for use as fertilizer. As H. R. French has pointed out in his study of Suffolk's urban agriculture and town commons, most scholars consider agricultural structures and functions within the urban milieu as "an anomaly, a case of terminological confusion." It is rare to find any discussion of livestock in medieval urban history, except in reference to livestock raised in the countryside and brought to the urban market. So while pig rearing and breeding in the English countryside has an extensive historiographical base, historians have largely overlooked the implications of the pig's continual presence in the city. Archaeologists, on the other hand, have studied pigs in both rural and urban settings, primarily analyzing morphological changes, swine-feeding habitats, age at slaughter, and human meat consumption patterns. But while bones can help address lingering questions about feeding and slaughtering patterns, the archaeology must be married with historical evidence to reveal how pigs were handled on a day-to-day basis.<sup>3</sup>

Swine as agricultural products were extremely commonplace in the medieval townscape. Although the consumption of pork appears to have declined among the wealthier classes at the very end of the medieval period, the low cost of keeping pigs, the ease with which the meat can be preserved as bacon and cured ham, and the meat's high fat content encouraged pork consumption among the lower classes. Even though pig bones are less common in the archaeological record than cattle or sheep, the latter animals may have been brought into the towns for slaughter from outer pastures, whereas the pigs often lived among the townspeople. Because pigs have omnivorous diets, they do not require large pasture areas, making them particularly suitable for urban environments. Taxation assessments of Colchester and four villages in 1295 and 1301 show that 149 out of 383 taxable households owned at least one pig or piglet, and in King's Lynn at about the same time, an assessment of one ward recorded that forty-three households owned a total of fifty-three adult pigs and forty-three piglets. These figures show that pig keeping was a common urban household practice.<sup>4</sup>

Pigs in the urban spaces of medieval England were not just interlopers--they were permanent fixtures of agricultural production and consumption that would last well into the nineteenth, and in some places twentieth, century. The single pig raised by an urban family could provide either additional income or fill the larder for the year. Archaeological evidence shows greatly increasing numbers of neonatal pig bones in English urban communities in the early modern period. This points to increasing on-site urban swine breeding. As urban populations grew and housing became denser, pigs turned into the object of long-drawn out battles over city reform.<sup>5</sup>

In histories of nineteenth and twentieth-century urban sanitation, pigs are typically mentioned as commonplace garbage scavengers doing their part to create an organic urban ecosystem. Scholars investigating waste handling and recycling, as well as urban hygiene and beautification, always discuss pigs roaming the city streets. While these depictions may hold true for modern times, one should not assume that the role of pigs in urban spaces has gone

unchanged. Little has been said about any earlier attempts to control animals in the urban space, and there is an underlying assumption that pre-industrial cities must have been as “organic” as the nineteenth-century ones with swine running amuck through the streets. The agricultural practices of keeping swine in urban areas thus deserve to be investigated to determine if this holds true for the late medieval period.<sup>6</sup>

Records from the most populous English urban centers of the late medieval period from the end of the thirteenth century through the sixteenth century, including London, York, Norwich, and Coventry, as well as smaller towns such as Nottingham and Maldon, show that local governments tried to regulate pig rearing as an integrated element in the urban space. Authorities attempted to control the movement, feeding, and slaughter of swine as much as possible to circumvent damage to goods, crops, and even people. The evidence found in one jurisdiction’s local council proceedings, guild regulations, court records, and financial accounts rarely gives a complete picture of swine management because issues tended to be recorded only when things had gone wrong, and there are often gaps in the records. But taken together, the evidence from these far-flung urban areas over a relatively long period of time can offer insights into common urban swine-handling practices in England during the Middle Ages. Fortunately, however, there is a rather complete set of court records from the small town of Ramsey from 1268 to 1600, which provides fertile ground for a more focused case study.<sup>7</sup>

At a most basic level, local governments in England restricted where urban animals were permitted to go. Based on the Norwich experience in 1354, it is easy to see why. Town officials were particularly diligent about restricting pigs roaming free in the urban space. Swine control is included in many of the earliest surviving town ordinances, which date from the late thirteenth century. For example, in York’s older ordinance, dated to 1301, no one was permitted to keep pigs that roamed the streets either during the day or at night. Later, the town government specified that pigs and other beasts were not permitted on the walls of the town, in the market streets, in alleys, on the Ouse Bridge, or on the quay. London’s city government also banned pigs in the streets or ditches in 1277, although an order by the king to London’s mayor and sheriffs in 1316 to remove wandering pigs from the streets would appear to indicate that the ban met with limited success. Beverley outlawed swine except those with piglets or in the custody of swineherds from the streets in the late fourteenth century. Why they made an exception for sows with piglets is not recorded, but perhaps they were considered less aggressive and dangerous than adult males and thus not as problematic.<sup>8</sup>

In order to put some teeth into such regulations, urban authorities exacted monetary penalties for violations. There appears to have been a fairly standard fourpence fine for roaming swine in late medieval English towns, the proceeds of which was split in different ways. York’s 1377 ordinance titled *De porcis euntibus* (of pigs going about) set a fine of fourpence if a pig was found wandering in the town during the day or night; the sergeant or other officer who found the pig could kill it if he wanted to and keep the carcass until he received the fine, which saved him the trouble of caring for a live pig. The smaller town of Maldon likewise impounded the pig (which could then be sold on behalf of the town) and exacted a fourpence fine, of which half

went to the town and half to the man who found the pig. Bristol was stricter with adult pigs, charging sixpence if the pig was worth a shilling (twelve pence) and twopence for smaller, less valuable pigs. They ingeniously decided to cut the tails of pigs caught roaming, and if a pig with a clipped tail was caught again, its throat was cut. Rather than implementing a fine, the Norwich council ordered that owners would simply forfeit all pigs roaming the streets of the town, and Colchester did the same. The loss of the pig was probably more devastating than the fine, since a pig carcass could be worth as much as four shillings. In these examples, a fine and/or the loss of the pig must have been a disincentive to allow precious livestock to roam free.<sup>9</sup>

At the same time, there are numerous court records showing that some owners did not restrict their livestock's movements as well as they should have. In a 1398 Nottingham court case, John Bank claimed that Robert Hayward had allowed his pigs to roam free instead of keeping them in a sty or in his house contrary to the mayor's ordinance. The pigs had devoured a cock and some red herring that belonged to Bank, causing ten shillings in damages. Although the outcome of the trial is not recorded, the case shows that free-ranging pigs could be costly. There are also some interesting cases from Colchester: William Leycetre's sow illegally entered Walter Fuller's property, so Fuller drove it away with a rod; Roger Alfred's servant killed a pig owned by Richard Clerius when the pig wandered into Alfred's garden; and Elena Ravenes complained that Sampson Fullo used a stick to kill her pig that was walking on the road (Fullo was found not guilty). In some cases, killing a wandering pig could be allowed: Maldon specifically permitted a landowner to kill a pig by beating it or setting his dogs on it if it came onto his pasture or the town's common pasture without having to pay damages to the pig's owner.<sup>10</sup>

Traditionally, there had been an exception to wandering pig rules throughout western Europe: the Hospitallers of St. Anthony were allowed to tie a bell around a pig's neck and let it run freely to forage in the town and no one would harm the pig. Bells and pigs became prominent in later medieval iconography of St. Anthony because of this tradition. The City of London in 1311 reprimanded the master of St. Anthony's for claiming swine found in the street for St. Anthony and putting bells on them, even though they had not been donated to the house. In 1555, however, the York council ordered all people with swine roaming the streets, including the master of St. Anthony's, to remove them immediately. There was no room for a religious exception in this case.<sup>11</sup>

Instead of wandering about town, regulations required that residents keep their pigs penned. In Nottingham, the mayor ordered that all swine had to be kept within the owner's house or a sty. In Norwich, pigs had to be kept within sties except when dung was being removed on Saturday afternoons. The same held true in early fifteenth-century Lynn where swine could be taken out of their sties only on Saturday afternoon in order to clean them. The point of this cleaning was to remove dung, which then required disposal. Medieval pigs probably produced something around 1.3 liters of manure a day. So even with a conservative estimate that only one in five urban households had one pig, for a town like Coventry or York with around one thousand households in the later Middle Ages, the amount of pig manure would be 1,820 liters (or 1.8 cubic meters) per week when the stalls were cleaned. And this is just the pig manure,

which does not account for any soiled hay or other material placed in the stall. Some residents did not manage this waste acceptably, throwing their muck into the streets, ditches, and rivers. In Nottingham, for example, there are numerous jury presentments for placing muck in the road; of the thirty-four citations on October 13, 1407, twenty of them deal with improper dung disposal in the streets, in the common caves, in front of doors, and in a churchyard. Although most of these nuisance presentments do not specify the animal who generated the dung, there is one entry in 1395 that charges an individual with depositing ordure of swine in the street unlawfully.<sup>12</sup>

Artistic evidence from the period, although not from England, offers insights into sty design. The typical configuration appears to have been a dedicated small building. An early sixteenth-century French woodcut illustrating activities for the month of December reveals a group of pigs eating from a trough within a small urban building, while one eats from a trough outside of the building (see Figure 1). In the same image, swine are eating acorns knocked down by the swineherd, and one pig is being slaughtered on the ground. This picture juxtaposes urban feeding in a stall, with rural feeding in woodlands within the space of one image in order to capture the many faceted aspects of swine management. The use of a small building as a sty is confirmed in other images. A woodcut illustration by Albrecht Dürer in Sebastian Brant's "Das Narrenschiff" (1494) shows two pigs and geese housed inside of a wooden building sticking their heads out of an open hinged wooden door in order to eat from a trough. In a French manuscript illumination from c. 1480, pigs are feeding in a trough in front of a small wooden building, presumably the sty, while the swineherd closely watches them. Another French illumination from Rouen c. 1500 shows a pig peering out of a small house with a tile roof and straw or wooden door to see the slaughter of one of his comrades. In a slightly different presentation, a Flemish breviary from c. 1500–1510 shows a brick pig stall constructed under a dovecote; two large pigs are standing inside the stall behind wooden bars and sticking their heads out to eat from a trough, while two smaller piglets are outside of the sty. Husbandry texts of the sixteenth century also describe closed swine sties with little light and stone floors. Although these texts and images often depict small village practices, the evidence from the larger town regulations would appear to confirm that they applied in the urban setting as well.<sup>13</sup>

< **Figure 1: Woodcut of the Activities of December.** Source: *Compost et Calendrier des Bergers*, Troyes, France, 1531. Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Res V 279/Microfilm R 34575, fol.12. Reproduced under license from Bibliothèque Nationale de France.>

Town leadership did not let individuals place pigsties wherever they wanted. In Coventry people could not keep pigs in their stalls by the street, and butchers were not allowed to tie livestock to their door. Coventry's government ordered the removal of pigsties on the River Sherbourne and a large urban ditch known as the Red Ditch several times. Pigsties appear as nuisances in these cases, similar to latrines. The same type of problem was recorded in London's Assize of Nuisance in the mid-fourteenth century when the justices required John de Besseville to remove pigsties and privies he had built over an urban waterway, the Walbrook, because the

pilings were blocking the water's course. Placement of sties on an individual's property could thus be considered a public nuisance.<sup>14</sup>

While sties themselves might be problematic as sources of odor and waste, local authorities mandated their use in order to remove pigs from the streets. The presence and use of sties does not mean that swine were only stall-fed; evidence indicates that at least in some of the towns they were often taken out to pasture. More than anything, the sty served as a place to contain pigs when they were at home without a keeper.

Urban governments required swineherds to walk with the pigs when they were moved through town. Coventry allowed swineherds to drive pigs only to empty fields in and around the town, forbidding them on the main market street, in urban gardens, and in urban pastures. Regulations from Dorchester and Beverley assumed that swineherds took the animals out to pasture. An ordinance recorded in the Leicester *Hall Book* indicates that owners had to keep their swine at home until the whole herd went to the field. This would appear to mean that the swineherd walked through town gathering up all the swine to go out at one time, similar to twentieth-century swine management practices in Spanish villages that fed pigs on the *dehesa* (open wood pasture).<sup>15</sup>

Some towns officially appointed municipal swineherds. Nottingham annually appointed an official keeper of the swine, who ensured that the pigs did not do any damage to urban walls or gardens. One court case reveals this swine-herding practice in action. In this case, Ralph Pollard sued the swineherd Nicholas in 1395 for allowing the pigs to damage Pollard's garden. Pollard claimed that Nicholas did not look after the swine properly and thus permitted them to destroy his garden walls. Nicholas, however, said that swine had always been herded to the place in question, so the damage was not his fault. The judgment was made in favor of Nicholas. This short case reveals that the herder was understood to have the responsibility for herding the pigs to proper places. Nottingham was not alone in naming a town swineherd, as Lynn likewise employed a town pig-keeper by at least 1360. The provision of a town-appointed keeper stresses the governmental involvement in controlling urban animals. It also shows that the swine were regularly taken out to graze in designated areas under a swineherd's oversight.<sup>16</sup>

Pigs do not appear to have regularly foraged for food in the medieval street, even though they may have been fed domestically generated wastes, such as brewery dregs. Whereas Coventry's pigs were taken to empty fields in and near the urban settlement for pasture, in thirteenth-century London, pig owners were allowed to feed their pigs only inside their houses or in open fields away from the streets. Archaeological evidence from late medieval York supports these textual sources. A study of the wear patterns on pig teeth indicates that pigs at the Gilbertine priory of St. Andrew were either fed in stalls with hard floors (i.e., inside) or in paddocks with short grass because their teeth show evidence of a soft-textured diet and no rooting behavior. This supports the conclusion that they were not free-ranging or scavenging. Some medieval images, including the *Compost et Calendrier des Bergers* (see Figure 1) and a late fourteenth-century English manuscript (see Figure 2), depict swine feeding from troughs

inside or in front of their stalls, which also supports the idea that pigs were fed rather than scavenged for food.<sup>17</sup>

<**Figure 2: Swine Feeding from Trough.** Source: Bohun Psalter and Hours made in England during the second half of 14th century. British Library, Egerton 3277, f. 127. Image in the public domain; scan courtesy of British Library>

In a couple of cases, towns even controlled what pigs were permitted to eat. Although it appears that St. Anthony's pigs in London regularly consumed food from the dunghills, Coventry's butchers were told not to take their pigs to the disposal pits to feed on butchery entrails or other "filthy" material, and two butchers in London were fined for feeding their pigs butchery waste in the street. These are interesting cases because pigs have served as garbage recyclers since ancient times, often being fed butchery waste and even human excrement. In an early sixteenth-century English treatise on husbandry, farmers were encouraged not to keep more swine than they could feed with their offal wastes. It was not until the 1890s that scientific investigations in the United States began to question whether or not swine fed on garbage were fit for human consumption. Even though the practice was discontinued after these studies, many places resumed the practice during World War I. During the 1930s studies once again linked pigs fed on garbage to disease, and the practice was slowly phased out. The Coventry regulation and London fines indicate that feeding pigs butchery waste was sometimes not considered an acceptable practice even in late medieval England.<sup>18</sup>

Even beyond simply controlling where the pigs might go, several cities forbade the animals in the town altogether. In these cases, swine were raised outside of the town walls and brought into town only for slaughter. In 1423 the Coventry council decided that no one, including butchers, would be permitted to keep swine in sties, stalls, or houses. Violators would be fined three shillings and threepence and forfeit the pig. In 1444 the council reiterated that no one could keep pigs any where in the town "to the injury of his neighbours." When the town listed all of the duties of aldermen in 1517, they included ensuring that there were no swine sties within the walls of the town. It appears that such restrictions were enforced, at least some of the time: the baker John Lichefield was fined six shillings and eightpence for "keyping swine within the Cite" of Coventry in 1540.<sup>19</sup>

York likewise attempted to ban urban pig keeping. In 1498 the local government commanded that no swine could be kept in the town or the suburbs because of "the foule corrupcion that cometh of theym." This foul corruption was most likely the stench of the pigsties, which may be one reason that they were supposed to be cleaned out once a week. But such a blanket order to remove all pigs does not appear to have been successful in the long run. In 1541 the council required the removal of urban livestock as part of a program to clean up the town before a visit by King Henry VIII. Cattle and swine had to be taken out of the town and suburbs until after the king and queen had departed. Obviously, by this time--forty-three years after the order to remove all swine--people were once again raising pigs within the town. A similar order was recorded in 1549 prior to the visit of the Earl of Shrewsbury. In this case, all swine sties were to be pulled down and all swine removed from the town. Violators would be assessed a six shillings and eightpence fine for each pig or pigsty in town after the order. Six

years later, the York council ordered all people with swine roaming the streets to remove them immediately. The council made a point to specify that even the master of St. Anthony's had to obey the order. Urban swine keeping was clearly an attractive activity for residents even if forbidden by the government.<sup>20</sup>

The reason to have pigs in the town at all was for their meat. Most parts of a pig were eaten in the Middle Ages: blood, organs, and intestines in sausages and pottages; meat salted as ham; ribs roasted on a grill; bacon and lard as cooking fats. Butchery was messy business, so local governments attempted to control where butchers slew their animals. The most obvious remedy was to forbid butchery within the walls of the town, but just as moving pigs out of the urban area had proved difficult, banning urban butchery was not easy or practical.<sup>21</sup>

Take the case of Coventry. Some people lodging at the Coventry priory complained to the king in 1380 that "certain evildoers" had thrown animal wastes into the River Sherbourne repeatedly, thus corrupting the water that flowed into the priory mill and "infecting the air." The king responded by issuing a commission of inquiry into the complaint. The list of wastes-- "bones, hides, and offal of oxen, swine, and sheep"--in the complaint indicates that the likely perpetrators were butchers and tanners. The actual results of the investigation have been lost, but in 1421 the mayor outlawed the slaughter of all livestock except swine within the town walls, and pig slaughter had to take place at the common scalding house, which was currently under construction in Palmers Lane, along the River Sherbourne next to a latrine. The location of the scalding house is telling as it provides easy access to water, as well as being situated near other "dirty" facilities. Scalding houses were not models of cleanliness. The operations involved pouring boiling water over the pig carcass, which loosed the bristles, after which the hair was scraped off, the organs removed, and edible entrails cleaned of feces. In 1370 a complaint was brought in London against a butcher and his wife for having a scalding house in their tenement because the water used in the scalding process, mixed with blood and hair, was ejected into a ditch that led to the Friar Minors garden, causing a vile stench. At least using a common scalding house avoided replicating the waste problem throughout town.<sup>22</sup>

After mandating pig slaughter at the scalding house, the Coventry council soon faced problems with these restrictions. At the October 1422 meeting, the council noted that they had previously prohibited killing animals within the town walls, but it had not been a satisfactory arrangement, so they decided to allow butchers to kill cattle, calves, and sheep in their own houses and pigs at the common slaughterhouse for the current year. The reason for this change of heart is not recorded, but Coventry may have faced resistance from the butchers or price increases, which was what had indeed happened in London when the king banned butchery within city's walls in 1391. The council did not back down, however, on basic sanitary requirements. In 1447 the council reiterated that all butchers were to scald animals only at the slaughterhouse in Palmers Lane. Although in-town pig slaughter was permitted, the town government still tried to maintain minimum levels of cleanliness by allowing it only at the common scalding house.<sup>23</sup>

These efforts at controlling the location of pig-slaughtering activities might have implications for understanding meat consumption in late medieval England as well. Archaeological evidence has shown a decreasing trend in the number of pig-bone specimens after the Norman Conquest and continuing through the sixteenth century; this has been interpreted as decreasing pork consumption in towns. In light of this historical evidence for pig-butchnery regulation, however, perhaps the slaughtering activities had simply been relocated from the older common butchnery sites to newer designated sites, such as Coventry's new pig scalding house. If these new sites have not been identified and excavated, the late medieval evidence for consumption might be yet unearthed.<sup>24</sup>

The records show at least some enforcement of the restrictions on urban swine husbandry. Lynn's bylaws against free-range pigs were enforced--six pounds, eight shillings, and eightpence were collected in fines from forty-seven pig owners in 1370 and 1371. The financial accounts of Leicester's mayor from 1375 to 1376 also indicate that fines totaling one shilling (which would have been three fines of fourpence each) for roaming swine were collected that year; the chamberlain's accounts for the following year again reported one shilling in monetary fines, but they added a list of goods seized as payment for additional wandering pigs: a jug, a laver, a hammer, a pan, and a small pot each served as the fine for one pig trespass. Enforcement could be painful, as a case in Leicester in 1356 proves: the goldsmith John Sabyn and his son physically attacked the town crier who had seized their pigs caught wandering in the street.<sup>25</sup>

London's pig control evolved from the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries through a growth of a specialized structure for handling the urban pig problem. The first ordinance controlling pigs from 1277 allowed whoever found the pig to kill it or receive fourpence from the owner as redemption money. Fifteen years later, the city elected and swore in four men to kill loose pigs. These "swine killers" operated under the 1277 ordinance's conditions, either killing the pig or taking fourpence from the owner. That these men were actually elected, sworn in, and ordered to commence their duty on a specific day shows how seriously the London government considered urban swine control. In 1390 the London town government named a new specialist, the Surveyor of Streets and Lanes, charged with fining waste disposal violators and killing all the free-roaming pigs and geese in the city. He was told to sell the meat at the highest available price and keep half of the profits, with the other half being remitted to the city government. London's city government thus targeted swine management as a critical city function and put structures in place to enforce restrictions on pigs.<sup>26</sup>

Combining the scant evidence from multiple urban centers together shows that pigs were not permitted to roam freely in the late medieval town. They were kept in sties and taken only to designated feeding areas when out. They were not generally freely rummaging through garbage or lying in the streets. Of course, this does not mean that pigs were not found in the streets in violation of the laws--clearly Lynn's records show that many individuals were fined for their deficient pig-keeping practices. Steps by the town councils to remove all livestock from within the town walls also appear to have met with limited success, as pigs probably continued to be

standard household inhabitants among the lower urban classes. But attempts to control how pigs moved and lived within the urban environment should not be underestimated.

The medieval town of Ramsey, which probably had around one thousand inhabitants during the late medieval period, has an extensive number of surviving court rolls. Among other issues, the court presided over cases of trespass and nuisance, both of which could involve swine. A review of the printed roll records reveals much about how pigs were managed in a small town setting. In addition to recording fines levied on individuals for violations, the rolls recorded the city ordinances. Because these records are extensive, Ramsey offers the opportunity to see how swine were managed in one place over a long period of time.<sup>27</sup>

Pig keeping appears to have been quite common in medieval Ramsey. The court records name at least seventy-seven individuals who had pigs during the time period, and since only about half of the rolls survive, there were certainly many more. Some residents owned more than one pig: Stephen Parker had three pigs valued at twenty shillings stolen from him in 1341; John Luff had three grown hogs running around town in 1436; Giles Warde and John Boyse each had two wandering sows in 1456, while John Whitewell, Robert Toly, and William Rynge had “diverse” pigs roaming free at the same time; Thomas Taylor had six unringed pigs in 1543. Unfortunately, the occupations of many of the named individuals are not recorded, but for those whose trade is available, bakers and brewers top the list. Since these two trades generate significant waste products edible by pigs, it makes sense that they would have taken the opportunity to fatten pigs rather than let the material go to waste. There are a few instances when pigs were stolen, which can give a sense of the range of the value of the animals: three pigs were worth twenty shillings in 1341, a pig stolen in 1356 was worth two shillings, and a piglet taken in 1459 was worth eightpence.<sup>28</sup>

The first surviving court decision about urban pig management in Ramsey dealt with the location of a pigsty in 1295. Through the fourteenth century, the location of pigsties was the most common swine-related complaint reported by the jury. Pigsties were constructed too close to the road, adjacent to a neighbor's wall or property, or over drainage ditches. There were no early ordinances specifically about sties; instead, these cases were handled as generic nuisances. In 1473 there was an order to remove all pigsties on the common land of New Field Holt. In 1533 pig owners were told to put all swine in their own orchard or sty at night. In this particular case, the court used the phrase “le Coty,” meaning “the swinecote” for the sty. It is possible that there was a town sty held in common by the householders by the mid-sixteenth century, although no proof of that exists. The evidence clearly confirms the construction of urban sties on individual property, although pigs may also have lived in the owner's house. Sties as dedicated agricultural structures in the urban area were probably quite common. The interest in locating sties away from neighboring property, roads, and ditches aligns with the general picture gathered from other town evidence.<sup>29</sup>

In the fifteenth century there appears to be a growing concern about pigs wandering at large in Ramsey. The court issued an ordinance in 1414 banning pigs from lying or feeding in the road. This was followed up in 1423 with an ordinance requiring that pigs be leashed and have a

keeper “out of fear of injury to children.” The “leashing” requirement mentioned in this ordinance may have implied tying a rope to a hind leg of the swine, which was used by the swineherd to securely control the animal. Several contemporary medieval manuscripts show this practice: a swine walks in front of his herder who holds the rope in one hand and a pigging stick in the other. Similar regulations came out in 1443, 1456, and 1460. Repetition of the ban at such a close interval means that the problem of wandering pigs during that time period was systemic. The growth in fines related to wandering pigs would appear to confirm that. Beginning in 1429, owners were fined for having unleashed animals. A single entry in the record for pigs “running loose” on the street can have multiple people listed as violators, so this was not an isolated occurrence.<sup>30</sup>

It would appear that the fear of wandering pigs was because of potential damage to property and, as the court noted, to children. In 1391 Henry Coupere was fined twelvecence for having a pig that ate his neighbor's goslings; the court justified the high fine because Coupere had been warned about the pig's destructive behavior in the past. In 1436 Luff was fined three shillings and fourpence for having a boar and two sows unleashed, and one of them broke down a door, knocked over a baby's cradle, and ate a blanket. This type of incident likely prompted the issuance and reissuance of the wandering ordinances, just as they had in Norwich and the other towns.<sup>31</sup>

It is interesting to note that the fines assessed and the amounts stipulated in the ordinances do not match. The earliest wandering pig ordinance of 1414 specified a fine of fourpence, but nine years later it was raised tenfold to three shillings and fourpence (equals 40 pence). In 1443 it was again three shillings and fourpence, and finally the 1460 version lowered it substantially to onepence (a half pence for piglets) plus the impounding of the animal. Yet the fine incurred for one wandering pig in 1429 and 1430 was only twopence. In 1456 a fine of two shillings was given to several people for “diverse pigs” wandering in town and in 1459, a fine of six shillings and eightpence was handed out for the same. Only this last one, which is equivalent to two times the three shillings and fourpence fine, appears consistent with the fine structure in force at the time. This indicates that the fines listed in medieval local ordinances may have been more of a guideline (and perhaps a deterrent if set high enough), rather than strictly enforced.<sup>32</sup>

Beginning in the mid-fifteenth century, Ramsey required pigs to be ringed when sent to pasture in the common areas of Stocking Fen and New Field Holt. In 1531 ringing was extended to all pigs, inside and outside of the town, from autumn through spring. Swine could be unringed in the summer months. The practice of ringing involves putting a metal ring through the pig's snout to prevent it from digging up the ground. It became common practice in the early modern period to limit damage to crops and meadows. Three people were fined for having unringed pigs in 1543 and another person in 1592. The only other English town identified in this study that practiced ringing in the medieval period is Leicester. There, an ordinance from 1335-1336 required pigs walking on the main high street to be ringed, and a follow-up ordinance twenty years later banned all pigs from walking on the four main streets (ringed or unringed) and required pigs on all other streets to be ringed. Ringing urban pigs would have limited the damage

they could cause by rooting in gardens, but they could still knock things down with their heavy weight, thus the reason for limiting their wandering without a keeper in town.<sup>33</sup>

The preoccupation with ringing aligned with concerns about pasturage in Ramsey. Pigs were only permitted in particular pastures at set times. Most importantly, pigs were not allowed in the grain fields until after the harvest and after the poor had been given a chance to glean the fields according to a 1396 ordinance. In 1425 a group of six swineherds were fined for allowing their pig to trespass in the fields in autumn against this ordinance. The abbot of Ramsey, who owned much of the property around the town, restricted pigs in his woodlands. Pasturage had not appeared as a major concern in the other town records, which included more general provisions for taking swine out of town for feeding. Ramsey's records indicate that pigs were permitted to scavenge fields after the harvest, as well as feeding in nearby woodlands.<sup>34</sup>

The records indicate that there were recurring problems with select individuals. For example, the baker William Barbor was fined three different times for having an improperly placed pigsty. He was fined numerous times for putting dung and ashes on another's property and in the drainage ditch and encroaching on the common ditch in other ways. Likewise, the swineherd William Botiller, who was fined two years in a row for a pigsty and once for trespassing in the fields in autumn with his pigs, was also fined for having a stinking privy over the common ditch and for improper waste disposal. The continual misbehavior of residents like Barbor and Botiller must have been frustrating for the court.<sup>35</sup>

Overall, the Ramsey evidence confirms the general picture of late medieval swine management in English towns obtained from other sources. Many individuals owned pigs and kept them within the urban space. Pig movements were restricted, swineherds stayed with the animals, and feeding practices were specified. In Ramsey there is even information about specific techniques such as leashing and ringing that are not mentioned in the other towns' sources. Fines were handed out to violators, but there continued to be some recalcitrant individuals that were repeat offenders.

While medieval urban centers had a much more rural character than they do today because of urban agricultural practices, the evidence does not bear out the idea that pigs continually ran amuck. The town council and court records show that swine were not free roamers in an "organic" town of the Middle Ages. Because swine were a daily part of urban life, and an integral part of local agricultural production, they required cradle-to-grave controls. Pigs, in particular because of their destructive behaviors, were closely herded and were not permitted to wander in town. Town governments strictly restrained swine movement, limiting them to pigsties or walking in the custody of a pig herder, and even went so far as to forbid the raising of pigs within the town on several occasions. When pigs were let loose, injured parties were not afraid to appeal to the court or complain to the city governments, indicating the unacceptability of free-roaming swine. Butchery practices were controlled to maintain a cleaner urban space. The ongoing presence of urban pigs as agricultural products was met head-on by town governments who instituted controls limiting the freedom of swine to improve safety, security, and sanitation.

Medieval agricultural production did not take place in the countryside alone. City dwellers regularly raised pigs for personal consumption--so while swine management was not an extensive commercial enterprise in urban centers, it was pervasive. Unlike most other livestock, which was fed outside of the city and only brought in for slaughter, pigs were both produced and consumed in the urban center. Pigs were kept in swine sties or lived alongside their owners in houses, then slaughtered at home or in the town's scalding house, making the urban inhabitants participants in an agricultural system. The ongoing rearing of pigs in medieval towns and governmental attempts at controlling urban swine should make agricultural historians reconsider the urban as a truly vibrant agricultural space.

---

<sup>1</sup>. W. Hudson and J. C. Tingey, trans. and eds., *The Records of the City of Norwich*, 2 vols. (Norwich: Jarrold, 1906--1910), 2:205--206.

<sup>2</sup>. Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>. For consideration of the urban in agricultural history, see, for example, Lorena S. Walsh, "Feeding the Eighteenth-Century Town Folk, or, Whence the Beef," *Agricultural History* 73 (Summer 1999): 267--80; Harry Kitsikopoulos, "Urban Demand and Agrarian Productivity in Pre-Plague England: Reassessing the Relevancy of von Thunen's Model," *Agricultural History* 77 (Summer 2003): 482--522; Barton Blum, "Composting and the Roots of Sustainable Agriculture," *Agricultural History* 66 (Spring 1992): 171--88. H. R. French, "Urban Agriculture, Commons and Commoners in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: The Case of Sudbury, Suffolk," *Agricultural History Review* 48 (2000): 172. For rural swine management in Britain, see, for example, Robert Trow-Smith, *A History of British Livestock Husbandry to 1700* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957); Julian Wiseman, *The Pig: A British History* (London: Duckworth, 2000); Oliver Rackham, *The History of the Countryside* (London: J. M. Dent, 1986). For medieval urban meat consumption, see, for example, C. M. Woolgar, "Meat and Dairy Products in Late Medieval England," in *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition*, ed. C. M. Woolgar et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 88--101. For archaeological work, see, Umberto Albarella, "'The Mystery of Husbandry': Medieval Animals and the Problem of Integrating Historical and Archaeological Evidence," *Antiquity* 73 (Dec. 1999): 867--75; Albarella, "Pig Husbandry and Pork Consumption in Medieval England," *Food in Medieval England*, 72--87; Albarella, "Meat Production and Consumption in Town and Country," in *Town and Country in the Middle Ages: Contrasts, Contacts and Interconnections, 1100--1500*, ed. Kate Giles and Christopher Dyer (Leeds: Maney, 2007), 131--48.

<sup>4</sup>. Albarella, "Pig Husbandry," 73--77; Albarella, "Meat Production," 141--143; Woolgar, "Meat and Dairy Products," 88--89.

<sup>5</sup>. Albarella, "Meat Consumption," 142. Strong responses to the pig menace were understandable. Catherine McNeur estimates that there were twenty thousand pigs in Manhattan in 1820. "The 'Swinish Multitude': Controversies over Hogs in Antebellum New York City," *Journal of Urban History* 37 (Sept. 2011): 639--60.

<sup>6</sup>. Ted Steinberg discusses the town as an ecosystem of humans and animals living in concert in *Down to Earth: Nature's Role in American History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 159. For pigs' role in waste disposal, see, for example, Martin Melosi, *Garbage in the Cities: Refuse, Reform, and the Environment, 1880--1980* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1981); Susan Strasser,

---

*Waste and Want: A Social History of Trash* (New York: Metropolitan, 1999). Frances Trollope also remarked on the scavenging duties of urban pigs in Cincinnati when she visited in 1828, making it clear that as a woman from London, she was not accustomed to seeing urban pigs feeding on garbage: Frances Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (Mineola, NY: Dover, 2003 [1832]), 22-23.

<sup>7</sup>. Edwin Brezette DeWindt, trans. and ed., “The Court Rolls of Ramsey, Hepmangrove, and Bury, 1268–1600,” MPublishing, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.5811550.0001.001> (accessed Jan. 29, 2013).

<sup>8</sup>. Michael Prestwich, ed., *York Civic Ordinances, 1301* (York: St. Anthony’s, 1976), 16. The full sentence is “No one shall keep pigs which go into the streets by day or night, nor shall any prostitute stay in the city,” which suggests that both pigs and prostitutes were considered filthy and morally unacceptable. Maud Sellers, ed., *York Memorandum Book, Lettered A/Y in the Guildhall Muniment Room*, 2 pts. (Durham: Andrews, 1912, 1915), 1:18, 164; Reginald R. Sharpe, ed., fols. 110b–135b, 1275–1298; fols. 91–100, 1314–1337, Calendar of Letter-books of the City of London, British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/catalogue.aspx?gid=58&type=3> (accessed Feb. 14, 2013); Arthur F. Leach, ed., *Beverley Town Documents* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1900), 19.

<sup>9</sup>. For example, according to the bylaws of Lynn from 1331, if a pig was taken into town custody, the owner was charged four pence. Stephen Alford, ed., “Lynn By-Laws,” *Medieval English Towns*, <http://users.trytel.com/~tristan/towns/lynnlaws.html> (accessed Feb. 14, 2013). In 1388 a carter’s annual wage was ten shillings, so such a fine was considerable. There were twelve pence to an English shilling, and twelve shillings to a pound. Sellers, *York Memorandum Book*, 1:18; Stephen Alford, ed., “Ancient Usages and Customs of the Borough of Maldon,” *Medieval English Towns*, <http://users.trytel.com/~tristan/towns/maldon6.html> (accessed Feb. 14, 2013); Francis B. Bickley, ed., *The Little Red Book of Bristol*, 4 vols. (Bristol: W. Crofton Hemmons, 1900), 2:31–32; Hudson and Tingey, *Records of Norwich*, 2:88; W. Gurney Benham, trans., *Red Paper Book of Colchester* (Colchester: Essex County Standard Office, 1902), 98; Woolgar, “Meat and Dairy Products,” 89.

<sup>10</sup>. Corporation of Nottingham, *Records of the Borough of Nottingham being a Series of Extracts from the Archives of the Corporation of Nottingham*, 8 vols. (Nottingham: Thomas Forman, 1882–1952), 1:357–59; Isaac Herbert Jeayes, trans., *Court Rolls of the Borough of Colchester*, 2 vols. (Colchester: Borough of Colchester, 1921), 1:8–9, 87; Alford, “Ancient Usages.”

<sup>11</sup>. For discussion of St. Anthony’s pigs in London, see, J. Strype, “Survey of London (1720), I.uu.120,” hriOnline, Sheffield, <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/strype> (accessed Jan. 30, 2013); C. L. ten Cate, *Wan god mast gift . . . Bilder aus der Geschichte der Schweinezucht im Walde* (Wageningen: Center for Agricultural Publication and Documentation, 1972), 140–53; Angelo Raine, ed., *York Civic Records*, 8 vols. (York: Yorkshire Archaeological Society, 1939–1953), 5:129.

<sup>12</sup>. Corporation of Nottingham, *Borough of Nottingham*, 1:357–59, 2:39–43, 1:275; Hudson and Tingey, *Records of Norwich*, 2:205–206; Dorothy M. Owen, *The Making of King’s Lynn* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), no. 471. Waste quantities are derived from K. Pearson, “Waste And Waste Disposal in the High and Late Middle Ages: An Examination of the Technical Problems of Human and Animal Waste and Medieval Solutions,” paper presented at International Congress of Medieval Studies, 2006, Kalamazoo, Mich., paper in author’s possession.

<sup>13</sup>. Sebastian Brant, “Das Narrenschiff,” University of Houston Libraries, <http://digital.lib.uh.edu/cdm4/browse.php?CISOROOT=/p15195coll15> (accessed Mar. 21, 2013); MS 74, fol. 11r, Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, UK; MS M.175, fol. 11v; MS M.52, fol. 7r, Pierpont Morgan

---

Library, New York, NY. For husbandry texts, see, Thomas Tusser, *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry*, ed. William Mavor (1557; repr., London: Lackington, Allen, 1812); an English translation of the French book *L'Agriculture et Maison Rustique* from 1564. See, also, C. A. Drew, "Pigs from Six Medieval Sites in Flanders: A Multiple Methodological Approach to the Study of Their Husbandry Development" (PhD diss., Durham University, 2010), 11–13, <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/710/> (accessed Jan. 26, 2013).

<sup>14</sup>. Mary Dormer Harris, ed., *The Coventry Leet Book: or Mayor's Register, Containing the Records of the City Court Leet or View of Frankpledge, AD 1420–1555, with Divers Other Matters*, 4 vols. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1907–1913), 1:42–43, 1:58–59, 107–108, 2:360, 3:653; H. T. Riley, ed., *Memorials: 1383, Memorials of London and London Life: In the 13th, 14th and 15th Centuries*, British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=57723> (accessed Feb. 14, 2013); Strype, *Survey of London*, I.i.23.

<sup>15</sup>. Harris, *Coventry Leet Book*, 1:27–28; Leach, *Beverley Town Documents*, 19; Charles Herbert Mayo, ed., *The Municipal Records of the Borough of Dorchester, Dorset* (Exeter: William Pollard, 1908), 111; Mary Bateson, ed., *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, 2 vols. (London: C. J. Clay, 1901), 2:292; James J. Parsons, "The Acorn-Hog Economy of the Oak Woodlands of Southwestern Spain," *Geographical Review* 52 (Apr. 1962): 211–35.

<sup>16</sup>. Corporation of Nottingham, *Borough of Nottingham*, 1:151, 269; Alsford, "Lynn By-Laws."

<sup>17</sup>. Wiseman, *Pig*, 12; Harris, *Coventry Leet Book*, 1:27; Sharpe, fols. 110b–135b; T. Wilkie et al., "A Dental Microwear Study of Pig Diet and Management in Iron Age, Romano-British, Anglo-Scandinavian, and Medieval Contexts in England," in *Pigs and Humans: 10,000 Years of Interaction*, ed. Umberto Albarella et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 241–54; Drew, "Pigs from Six Medieval Sites"; Calendar, MS 74, fol. 11r, Fitzwilliam Museum.

<sup>18</sup>. Harris, *Coventry Leet Book*, 2:389; A. H. Thomas, ed., Roll A 5: (i) 1337–1344, 1323–1364, Calendar of the Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London, British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=36658> (accessed Jan. 30, 2013). See, Robert L. Miller, "Hogs and Hygiene," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 76 (1990): 125–40, for a discussion of pigs eating garbage in ancient Egypt. Tusser, *Five Hundred*, 48; Martin Melosi, *The Sanitary City: Urban Infrastructure in America from Colonial Times to the Present* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 180. Considering the number times improper disposal of butchery waste in waterways and pits comes up in these records, it would appear that offal disposal in water or reuse as field fertilizer was much more common than using it as pig feed. See, Ernst L. Sabine, "Butchering in Mediaeval London," *Speculum* 8 (July 1933): 335–53; Dolly Jørgensen, "Local Government Responses to Urban River Pollution in Late Medieval England," *Water History* 2 (2010): 35–52.

<sup>19</sup>. Harris, *Coventry Leet Book*, 1:58, 1:217, 3:652–53; Levi Fox, "Some New Evidence of Leet Activity in Coventry, 1540–41," *English Historical Review* 61 (May 1946): 242.

<sup>20</sup>. Joyce W. Percy, ed., *York Memorandum Book (B/Y)* (Gateshead: Northumberland, 1973), 217–18; Raine, *York Civic Records*, 4:64, 5:25, 5:129.

<sup>21</sup>. For a sense of the multiple culinary uses of pork in the Middle Ages, see, Gina L. Greco and Christine M. Rose, trans., *The Good Wife's Guide (Le Ménagier de Paris): A Medieval Household Book* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).

<sup>22</sup>. *Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office, Richard II, vol. 1, 1377–1381* (London: Public Record Office, 1895), 579. Harris, *Coventry Leet Book*, 1:32. The location is

---

given in two land leases, BA/C/4/3/1, Dec. 1, 1448 and BA/C/4/3/2, Dec. 25, 1465, Coventry Town Archives, Coventry, UK. The second lease allowed the butchers access to draw water for the scalding house. Helena M. Chew and William Kellaway, eds., misc. roll. FF, Feb. 16, 1369–May 5, 1374 (nos. 550–599), London Assize of Nuisance 1301–1431: A Calendar, British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=35981> (accessed Feb. 14, 2013).

<sup>23</sup>. Harris, *Coventry Leet Book*, 1:42–43, 232; Sabine, “Butchering,” 335–53; David R. Carr, “Controlling the Butchers in Late Medieval English Towns,” *Historian* 70 (Fall 2008): 450–61.

<sup>24</sup>. Albarella, “Pig Husbandry,” 74–76.

<sup>25</sup>. Alsford, “Lynn By-Laws.”; Bateson, *Borough of Leicester*, 2:154, 165, 104.

<sup>26</sup>. Perhaps London had earlier incentive to specialize governmental duties than the towns of Norwich and Coventry because of its greater population and larger urban area. Sharpe, fols. 110b–135b; Reginald R. Sharpe, ed., Folios 1–9, 1291–1309; fols. 253–290, 1375–1399, Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, British History Online, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/catalogue.aspx?gid=58&type=3> (accessed Feb. 14, 2013).

<sup>27</sup>. All court cases are from DeWindt, “Court Rolls of Ramsey,” cited as roll:entry number.

<sup>28</sup>. Ibid, *BLAdd.Roll39702*:8, *BLAdd.Roll39649*:25, *BLAdd.Roll39653E*:27, *BLAdd.Roll39666B*:8, *BLAdd.Roll34366d*:65, *BLAdd.Roll39653B*:8; Wiseman, *Pig*, 12.

<sup>29</sup>. DeWindt, “Court Rolls of Ramsey,” *BLAdd.Roll39598r*:81, *BLAdd.Roll34362r*:17, *TNA/SC2/179/18 m.5r*:94, *BLAdd.Roll39603r*:47, *BLAdd.Roll39611d*:54–56, *BLAdd.Roll39632r*:48, *BLAdd.Roll39652*:41, *BLAdd.Roll39627r*:37, *BLAdd.Roll39629r*:38, *BLAdd.Roll34368*:42, *BLAdd.Roll34369*:25, *BLAdd.Roll39656*:32, *BLAdd.Roll3966d*:28.

<sup>30</sup>. DeWindt, “Court Rolls of Ramsey,” *BLAdd.Roll39645r*:45, *BLAdd.Roll34369*:45, *BLAdd.Roll39650*:39, *BLAdd.Roll39653E*:28, *BLAdd.Roll39653A*:35, *TNA/SC2-179/59 m.8r*:38–39. For manuscript illustrations of leading pigs, see, for example, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS 2092, fol. 18v; Pierpont Morgan Library, MS S.7, fol. 12r. The practice of leading pigs by a rope is discussed in H. Meyer, “Schwein am Seil,” *Deutsche tierärztliche Wochenschrift* 111:9 (September 2004): 364–65.

<sup>31</sup>. DeWindt, “Court Rolls of Ramsey,” *BLAdd.Roll39630r*:13, *BLAdd.Roll39649*:25.

<sup>32</sup>. Ibid, *BLAdd.Roll39645r*:45, *BLAdd.Roll34369*:45, *BLAdd.Roll39650*:39, *BLAdd.Roll39653A*:35, *TNA/SC2-179/59 m.8r*:39, *BLAdd.Roll39646r*:58, *BLAdd.Roll39653E*:27, *BLAdd.Roll39653B*:25.

<sup>33</sup>. Ibid, *TNA/SC2/179/63 m.5r*:35, *BLAdd.Roll39659*:20, *BLAdd.Roll39658*:22, *BLAdd.Roll39666B*:8–10, *BLAdd.Roll34406*:31; Bateson, *Borough of Leicester*, 2:21, 103. For general descriptions of ringing practices, see, Robert Malcolmson and Stephanos Mastoris, *The English Pig: A History* (London: Hambledon, 2001), 76–82 and ten Cate, *Wan god mast gift*, 109–15.

<sup>34</sup>. DeWindt, “Court Rolls of Ramsey,” *BLAdd.Roll39635*:47, *BLAdd.Roll39643*:45, *BLAdd.Roll39658*:8

<sup>35</sup>. Barbor’s misdeeds are recorded in DeWindt, “Court Rolls of Ramsey,” *BLAdd.Roll39627r*:37, *BLAdd.Roll39629r*:38–39, *BLAdd.Roll39630r*:21–22, *BLAdd.Roll39631r*:41, *BLAdd.Roll39632r*:43, 48; *BLAdd.Roll39635*:46. Botiller is cited per DeWindt, “Court Rolls of Ramsey,” *BLAdd.Roll34368*:41–42, *BLAdd.Roll34369*:25, *BLAdd.Roll39643*:45, *BLAdd.Roll39646r*:55

---