

Tithe map polygonisation Project Guide

This document has been produced to provide guidance on issues that may arise while completing this project. We have looked at the various fields in the tithe apportionment/award records and have provided advice and guidance on how to deal with issues that may arise due to the variation of data entries and of the peculiarities of some of the tithe apportionments. The tithe surveys were carried by many surveyors who had their own way of working and recording the information.

Tithe Apportionment Fields

Parish – This is the parish name and should be in all entries

Hamlet/tithing – Unless there is a hamlet in the parish, i.e. Ash Thomas in Halberton parish this will repeat the parish name.

Owner

The name of the owner should be in all entries and in the form John Smith, Sir or Hannah Abbot, Mrs or James Clark, Junior. All title abbreviations should be written in full as various different ones have been used and this avoids any confusion. In some cases there will be multiple owners for a plot and these have been separated by a comma in the one field rather than multiple entries per plot number. There are instances where a major landowner is listed with various other owners as tenants, or lessees in which case the term lessee is included after the name of the tenant. Where trusts or churchwardens are the owners there may be multiple names. Where there are differences in description of names where it is obvious there they are the same then standardise together

Example 1 – same person, described slightly differently

George Back and William Wippel as trustees for the children of the late William Gater – 1 record

George Back and William Wippell for the children of the late William Gater – 38 records

Example 2 – same name, but additional information

William Harris Arundell, Reverend – 18 records

William Harris Arundell, Reverend (Glebe) – 14 records

In this case, more information is required to determine whether this is one person recorded two different ways or whether it is in fact two different people. The definition of “Glebe” is a piece of land belonging to a church and lent temporarily to a member of the clergy to provide additional income. This would make sense in this instance as the individual is a member of the clergy. This would therefore need to be recorded as two different values as the records without the Glebe suffix may belong to the individual outright. Consult with DCC to gain confirmation that your interpretation is correct.

Example 3 – names with suffixes

Andrew Hewish – 13 records

Andrew Hewish Senior – 1

It cannot be assumed that these are the same person as Andrew Hewish may be the son but junior was not noted or it could be another Andrew Hewish, not related. As the whole survey was carried out around the same date it is not possible to assume Andrew Hewish

was known as Andrew Hewish Senior after the birth of a son. This would require checking parish registers and even then may not be conclusive.

These examples have been included to demonstrate the issues that will need to be considered when reviewing & combining the existing records into one consistent database. It is crucial that these are identified and addressed early in the process so that the database can be designed appropriately.

Occupier

Similar name treatment as above. There may be multiple occupiers for a single plot and this sometimes occurs where there are several cottages on one plot. This can be seen on the tithe map. Sometimes the number is bracketed on the original award with separate descriptions and owners and/or occupiers. These have generally been separated out where there are separate descriptions and acreages so will need separate numbers, so 461a, b, c, d etc in award as 461.1, .2, .3 (Upton Pyne p.1)

Plot numbers

The numbers appearing on the tithe map as xxxa, xxxb etc have been standardised in the transcriptions as xxx.1, xxx.2 etc to make manipulation of the data easier.

Plot numbers can be problematic as the surveyors have often used the same number more than once and also missed out numbers in the plot number sequence. This can only be verified by checking the map.

Where numbers are illegible or do not appear to correspond to the map refer to DCC as these can be checked on the original apportionment and resolved in most cases.

Some examples noted included:

One plot number but two or more different plot names, state of cultivation and acreages

No plot number but description as waste in 178, 179 (Egg Buckland) where there is a distinct area of waste in plot on map but not numbered - in this case assign a number to area of waste 178a, 179a.

No plot number but description as waste in xx but no waste identifiable in plot on map – then include description in plot number but cannot give individual plot number.

Roads and rivers to be given numbers as appropriate but may need to discuss where boundary lines for roads going through farms etc. should go, and how to relate divided plots resulting from this in database. Need to be consistent as far as possible. There are roads that are parish roads and have no owners/occupier but lead up to and from farms or go round plots as opposed to farm roads/tracks going through farm property where a farm owner/occupier applies. These are usually listed in the award.

Measurements

Some plots have combined measurements where several plot numbers have 1 overall total. This is usually recorded in the transcript after the last plot number with either total of no xx, xx etc or with plot no xx etc. Where some plots have different cultivations but one total the then the individual acreage of waste etc is sometimes included in the description.

Hedges

Some awards have given plot numbers and measurements for hedges, South Brent being the best example. We would not expect hedges to be linked in the database. Hedges can be taken as field boundaries.

Estate

Consistent spelling and format for estate names.

Example 1 – misspelt name

High Lower Endicott – 1 record

Higher Lower Endicott – 46 records

This example is a fairly obvious typographical error. The second value would be used consistently throughout the database.

Example 2 – part of estate

Part of Chilton Barton – 6 records

Chilton Barton – 34 records

In this instance it is not clear whether the records labelled “Part of Chilton Barton” should actually be recorded as in the “Chilton Barton” estate. It may be that only part of the parcel falls within the estate and it would therefore be invalid to include this as Chilton Barton. In this case it is best to keep to the description ‘part of’ as recorded. There are numerous instances of this in the awards, often with several parcels referred to ‘part of’ the same estate in different parts of the award.

There are also instances where the estate name has carried over from the previous page and may be described slightly differently on the following page. This will need standardising.

Cultivation

Standardise but include all entries, even roads, water, buildings and yard, cottage, house, churchyard etc. as the field indicates not only cultivation but also the land use of the plot.

Where there are null entries at end for summary of roads, rivers etc. then these can be recorded as ‘not specified’ or ‘null’.

Some cultivation can be inferred by the plot descriptions i.e. garden, waste, common, orchard etc. where the cultivation field is blank.

Map

Some tithe maps have small sections of plot missing due to tears, damage etc. In many cases it is possible to fill these in using the 1st edition OS map to infill boundary lines etc. as these will have changed very little between c.1840 to 1881/1890. Larger gaps or areas where the plot number cannot be identified may be more problematic and may need to be discussed further on an individual basis. Reference to the original map may resolve some of these and DCC staff could check these. There may be additional parish copies of some maps or reference to TNA copies of map.