

***A 1642 – A partial translation by Dorothy Jamieson of the full transcription of the Arundel Castle Archives by Lucy B. Moyes, PhD (Duke University USA) 1985***

*The account below is the copyright of the Duke of Norfolk, Arundel Castle, and is reproduced for study purposes only. It is translated from a partial photocopy (received February 11<sup>th</sup> 2009) of the full transcript of Arundel Castle Archives, see above.*

*It is the only surviving Receiver's Account for Willington and shows a difficult period in the history of the manor:*

- *Arrears from the bailiff of £30*
- *Money not paid by the former Warrener, William Cook and 2 former warreners William Walter and John Warner are mentioned*
- *Two lots of money from William Ryder not allowed for with-holding settlement of the account*
- *Most of the wages for the new Warrener were paid half way though the term of 2½years 66 days*
- *The figures penciled in by the auditors do not match the document, see below.*

*The Willington account is followed by details for Bedford Castle, Newnham, Bromham, Linslade, Wing, Seagrave.*

**Receiver's Accounts for Willington 1421 to 22**

And for £30, received as part of the arrears of William Rydere, from the hand of William Gillow, bailiff of the manor of Fennystanton, from 2 tallies, sealed with the seal of William Gillow himself, of which the first contained £14 and the other £16

And for £17 4s 3d [which] should be answerable from the arrears of William Cook, lately warrener there, from the sale of wood in the 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> year<sup>1</sup>, and for profits from the dovecote the said fifth year<sup>2</sup>, charged above by the Receiver General to pay various creditors of the lord for meats and other foodstuffs for the use of the lord received from the same creditors, and not yet paid by the said William, without tally.

And for £12 13s 4d [which] should be answerable from the arrears from the said Bailiff, whence 100 shillings was received by the said Receiver General before the feast of St Michael in the 7<sup>th</sup> year of the said king<sup>3</sup> from the aforesaid bailiff recently disallowed, for defect of discharge.

And for £7 13s 4d received by the same Receiver at Newnham on the same day on which John son of the lord earl, received from Newnham outside John Lancaster's house, that is to say in the month of May in the 8<sup>th</sup> year of the said King<sup>4</sup>, similarly disallowed, for defect of discharge. It should be received without discharge whence the said bailiff did not have the first allocation.

---

<sup>1</sup> That is from Michaelmas 1417 to 1418.

<sup>2</sup> This phrase interlined.

<sup>3</sup> Before 29<sup>th</sup> September 1419

<sup>4</sup> 1420

And for £6 3s 10<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>d should be answerable from John Warner, lately the warrener there, whence 60s lately disallowed for defect of discharge now should be paid to the said Receiver, as the same Receiver has recognized before the auditors on the account of Ash Wednesday in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the same king<sup>5</sup>, 60s should now be paid to the said Receiver General, as the same Receiver has acknowledged from a tally freely shown by the same John on the account.

And 3s 10<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>d should be charged on the said Receiver General on the account because they should be able to be raised.

And £8 2s 8d , should be answerable as paid in money to Robert Wylllyton, surgeon and warrener of Willington, as put below in title of fees, which the lord earl put in his letters patent at Rothomagn<sup>6</sup> on the 24<sup>th</sup> day of January in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of Henry 5<sup>th</sup> (1419) granted 2d a day for keeping the Warren of Willington and of the wood of Shirehatche for the term of his life from the issues and profits of the manor there, just as William Walter<sup>7</sup>, formerly warrener there formerly had from a grant from the lord, as long as the said Robert manages his office well at the usual terms, that is to say in full payment of the aforesaid wages from the 24<sup>th</sup> January in the said 6<sup>th</sup> year until Michaelmas in the 9<sup>th</sup> year (1421) of the same king, for 2 full years and half a year and 66 days, taking for a day as above, therefore the total due is £8 2s 8d<sup>8</sup> by two discharges for the said Robert, into the hand of Margaret his wife at Willington from the first date, at Willington on Wednesday next after the Feast of Pentecost in the eighth year of the same king<sup>9</sup> containing £7 16s 8d and the other on 15<sup>th</sup> December in the 9<sup>th</sup> year<sup>10</sup> of the said king, containing 6s, in full payment of the said wages up until the Michaelmas in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the said king<sup>11</sup> notwithstanding the date of the last discharge.

And for 66s 8d [which] should be answerable, paid in money, to William Bachiler esquire which the lord earl granted in a certain year at 10 marks a year for the term of his life. That is to say from Easter in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the said king by the agreement of the said William, dated at Bedford on the Saturday next before the feast of Saint Barnabas the apostle in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the said king<sup>12</sup>, and henceforth nothing should be paid because the said William died about the Feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist<sup>13</sup>.

And for £27 which should be answerable from 2 indentures made by Robert Byrkenshawe, servant of the said Receiver, charged by the said bailiff from the arrears of the last year and the issues and profits there this year for which the first is dated the 10<sup>th</sup> day of June in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the said king containing £18, and another dated at Willington on the 10<sup>th</sup> November in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the said king next after the account contained £9.

---

<sup>5</sup> 25<sup>th</sup> February 1422.

<sup>6</sup> Most likely Rouen, the Latin word for which is Rotomagense or Rothomagensis (Barbara Tearle). In Latham 'Rothomagenis' is a coin from Rouen. Might the earl have been fighting in Rouen at this time?

<sup>7</sup> This may be a scribal error as Walter is not used as a family name in earlier rolls. It may have been Waryn' or Warner, although the only mention of a William Waryn seems to have been in 1409

<sup>8</sup> 364 days a year paid for

<sup>9</sup> 29<sup>th</sup> May 1420

<sup>10</sup> 1421

<sup>11</sup> 29<sup>th</sup> September 1421

<sup>12</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> June 1421

<sup>13</sup> 24<sup>th</sup> June 1421

And for £6 8s 4d [which] should be answerable from (blank) paid in money in part payment of the larger sum owed by William Bachiler, the lord's esquire, for lands and tenements he sold in the town of Bedford, paid in money by him on the warrant of the lord's seal, remaining in the keeping of the said receiver general for the discharge by the Receiver.

And for £12 [which] should be answerable and charged from the said William Ridere bailiff before the auditors on the account at Newnham on Friday 17<sup>th</sup> February in the 9<sup>th</sup> year of the said king from the discharge of the said receiver general dated 17<sup>th</sup> February written above.

Summa blank

***Auditors' notes in the margin***

***£123 4s 1d half and quarter has been proved***

**NB – the totals above do not correspond with those proved by the auditors:**

£30,	as part of the arrears of William Rydere
£17 4s 3d	from the arrears of William Cook
£12 13s 4d	from the arrears from the said Bailiff
£7 13s 4d	by the same Receiver at Newnham
£6 3s 10 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub> d	from John Warner
3s 10 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	should be charged on the said Receiver General
4s 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> d	paid in money to Robert Wyllyton (£7. 16s 8d paid previously)
66s 8d	paid in money to William Bachiler esquire
£27	from 2 indentures made by Robert Byrkenshawe
£6 8s 4d received from	(blank
£12 received and charged from the said William Ridere	

**Total £122 19s 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, slightly less than the auditors' total.**