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Plate 56  Acton, Suffolk. The ealdan hege ‘old hedge’ mentioned in the description of the bounds of Balsdon in 1000–02. It has seven shrubby species in a 30m length, indicative of at least a medieval date

Plate 57  A traditional East Anglian field boundary with a hedge, bank and ditch. This hedge is both a parish boundary and a former hundred boundary. It has eight shrub species in a 30m length, indicative of a medieval date, and documentary evidence suggests its existence by 1251
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Plate 58  Aerial view of recently flattened hedges at Brook Hall, Ilketshall St Margaret, Suffolk, 1973. Much of the historic landscape of this area has now been lost

Plate 59  A ‘prairie’ landscape on the clayland of Suffolk resulting from the removal of numerous field boundaries in the second half of the twentieth century

Plate 60  A Suffolk hedge that has recently been coppiced in the traditional East Anglian way. Coppicing is a way of restoring a hedge by cutting it down to ground level and then allowing new growth to spring up

Plate 61  Dullingham, Cambridgeshire. Part of the area of Harlock’s Moor on the southern boundary of the parish

Plate 62  Dullingham, Cambridgeshire. View westward across a former common field, called Middle Field, that was enclosed in 1810

Plate 63  Burrough Green, Cambridgeshire. View northward across the large former common field called Radfield towards Dullingham Ley

Plate 64  Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk. View southward from Finningham Road towards Hartshall Lane, across probable former common fields

Plate 65  Finningham, Suffolk. View north from Walsham Road over part of the former Allwood Green. This large green was enclosed in several tranches from 1804 to 1819

Plate 66  Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk. View southward from Finningham Road towards Hartshall Lane, across probable former common fields

Plate 67  Finningham, Suffolk. View north from Walsham Road over part of the former Allwood Green. This large green was enclosed in several tranches from 1804 to 1819

Plate 68  Dullingham, Cambridgeshire, Part of the area of Harlock’s Moor on the southern boundary of the parish

Plate 69  Burrough Green, Cambridgeshire. View northward across the large former common field called Radfield towards Dullingham Ley

Plate 70  A Suffolk hedge that has recently been coppiced in the traditional East Anglian way. Coppicing is a way of restoring a hedge by cutting it down to ground level and then allowing new growth to spring up

Plate 71  A laid or plashed hedge in Cambridgeshire. The living hedge plants have been partly cut to make them pliable, bent sideways and reinforced with a series of vertical stakes of ‘dead’ wood. The tops of the stakes have been linked by ‘edders’ made of intertwined long wooden rods to make a strong fence

Plate 72  A good example a traditional large hedge on the clayland of Suffolk, here associated with a grass buffer strip (similar to what were called ‘hedge greens’) that is highly beneficial to the health of the hedge
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Summary

The Historic Field Systems of East Anglia Project was carried out from 2000 to 2005, with support from English Heritage’s Monuments Protection Programme. The project formulated a way of analysing the historic landscape in terms of eight basic ‘land types’ that could be further broken down into eighteen sub-types. Of especial significance were common fields and their antithesis, ancient ‘block holdings’ or holdings in severity (i.e. farmsteads surrounded by their own group of fields). This form of analysis was applied to twelve detailed case studies of historic land use that were carried out across the region: three in Norfolk, four in Suffolk, three in Essex and one each in Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire. In each place the landscape was categorised, mapped and quantified according to the land types. The varying percentages of all the land types was calculated and common fields were shown to be most prevalent in the north and west of the region, while block holdings dominated in the south, with some areas showing no evidence of ever having had common fields.

By using trend lines derived from the computer-based Historic Landscape Characterisation mapping (recently carried out in the region under another English Heritage sponsored project) in conjunction with a variety of other data sets, it was possible to suggest a wider context for the case-study based conclusions. Of particular, and unexpected, importance was a division running diagonally across the claylands of central Suffolk, approximately on the line of the River Gipping. To the south of this there is gently undulating land which had a high potential for arable farming in pre-modern times, while to the north there is mainly flat land, with an historic tendency towards dairy farming. It was also possible to demonstrate a high incidence of block holdings in the southern area and, conversely, a link with a form of common fields to the north.

But beyond these topographically explicable differences, it was also apparent that the ‘Gipping divide’ was a significant cultural boundary. This can be seen in vernacular architecture, both in constructional methods and in plan forms; in the terminology used to describe greens and woods; and in inheritance customs. The patterns seen in south Suffolk extend into Essex and those in north Suffolk extend into Norfolk, indicating that this was a boundary of regional importance that has a greater cultural significance than the existing county boundaries.

In examining the origins of the region’s field systems, consideration was given to claims that some areas had extensive co-axial field systems of pre-Roman date. A careful examination of the evidence suggests that although co-axial systems do exist, they are not vast terrain-oblivious entities and that they have varying dates and purposes. Some co-axial systems may incorporate prehistoric elements, but others are likely to be late Saxon or early medieval in date. Importantly, they are not automatic indicators of early land allotment. The case studies suggest that ‘locational’ analysis involving soil type, drainage potential and access to water is a more certain way of identifying the areas most likely to have been used for early agriculture. In the northern part of the region these ‘core’ arable areas tended to develop into common fields, but in the southern zone they tended to become block demesnes, that is large fields that were the exclusive property of manorial lords. This divergent development probably had its genesis in the late Saxon period and has an obvious significance for the understanding of the origins of common fields on a wider, national, level.

The late Saxon period witnessed very significant advances and changes in agriculture that were to have far-reaching consequences. The factors driving and influencing these changes are complex but included a climatic amelioration, an increase in population, the development or re-introduction of the mouldboard plough and the Viking invasions. The project produced evidence pointing towards a linkage between areas of Viking settlement/influence and the appearance of common fields — but not in a simple sense of an imported idea, as current evidence suggests that the English common fields are earlier than those of Scandinavia. However, the adoption of common fields may have arisen out the social upheaval caused by the Viking interventions or in the reorganisation following the English re-conquest. If so, this could suggest an origin for common fields in the late ninth or early tenth centuries. Conversely, areas that showed minimal Viking influence seem to have developed block demesnes, possibly as a continuation of farming practices that could have their roots in the Roman period or even earlier.

These findings confirm that East Anglia has an important legacy of ‘ancient’ enclosed fields, corroborating the sixteenth-century observation by Sir Thomas Smith that it was one of the areas ‘where most inclosures be’. Ancient cultivation traces within the fields are, however, rare. This is not because ridge-and-furrow, as found in the Midlands, has been eroded away, but because over most of East Anglia ‘stetch’ ploughing was the norm and this produced low ridges that seldom survive as earthworks. The conservation priority therefore is the preservation and the historically appropriate management of the boundaries of these fields, for changing the appearance of boundaries can change the local character as much as changes to the pattern. The report has therefore pulled together a key collection of historical descriptions of the nature and management of field boundaries across the region, as an aid towards the informed conservation of the East Anglian landscape in the twenty-first century.
Résumé

Le projet Historic Field Systems of East Anglia s’est déroulé de 2000 à 2005 avec l’appui du programme Monuments Protection parrainé par l’English Heritage. Ce projet propose une façon d’analyser les paysages historiques en fonction de huit « types de terrains », qui peuvent être décomposés en dix-huit sous-types. On remarquera l’importance particulière des « common fields » et de leur antithèse, les anciens « block holdings » qui représentent des propriétés en possession individuelle (c.-à-d. des fermes entourées de leurs champs). Cette forme d’analyse a été appliquée à douze cas d’études détaillés portant sur l’usage de terres historiques dans la région: trois d’entre elles se trouvent dans le Norfolk, quatre dans le Suffolk, trois dans l’Essex auxquelles s’ajoutent une dans l’Hertfordshire et une dernière dans le Cambridgeshire. Dans chacun de ces endroits, le paysage fut cartographié, classé par catégories et évalué sur le plan quantitatif en fonction des types de terrains. Les variations de pourcentage de tous les types de terrains ont été calculées et il est apparu que les « common fields » se trouvaient surtout au nord et à l’ouest de la région, tandis que les « block holdings » dominaient au sud, certaines zones ne contenant aucune preuve d’existence de « common fields ».

En utilisant les lignes de tendance tirées de la cartographie informaticque du Historic Landscape Characterisation (qui fut récemment réalisée dans la région dans le cadre d’un autre projet parrainé par l’English Heritage) conjointement avec tout un ensemble d’autres données, il a été possible d’approfondir les conclusions des études de cas en proposant une vision plus large. Ainsi, il est apparu que le parcours de la rivière Gipping, qui traverse diagonalement les terres argileuses du Suffolk central correspondait approximativement à une division importante et inattendue. Au sud de cette ligne, on trouve des terres légèrement vallonnées qui, à l’époque pré-moderne, offraient de grandes possibilités pour la culture, alors qu’au nord, s’étendent essentiellement des terres plates qui ont été historiquement portées vers la production laitière. Il a également été possible de démontrer l’existence d’un taux élevé de « block holdings » dans la zone sud et, inversement, d’un lien avec une forme de « common fields » vers le nord.

Mais, au-delà de ces différences explicables sur un plan topographique, il est également apparu que la Gipping divide représentait une limite culturelle importante. Cette limite est visible aux niveaux suivants : l’architecture locale (tant pour les plans que pour les méthodes de construction), les coutumes d’héritage et la terminologie utilisée pour décrire les pâturages et les bois. Les configurations constatées au sud du Suffolk s’étendent à l’Essex et celles du nord du Suffolk gagnent le Norfolk. Il existait ainsi une limite importante sur le plan régional, qui exerçait une influence culturelle plus grande que les limites existantes du comté. En examinant les origines des systèmes des champs de la région, il est apparu qu’il fallait donner du crédit à l’idée que certaines zones possédaient de grands systèmes de champs coaxiaux datant de l’époque prémoniale. Un examen minutieux des preuves rassemblées suggère que les systèmes coaxiaux, dont l’existence ne fait pas de doute, ne sont pas des grandes entités indépendantes de la nature du terrain mais qu’elles correspondent à des dates et des objectifs variés. Il est possible que certains systèmes coaxiaux intègrent des éléments préhistoriques, tandis que d’autres datent probablement de la période saxonne tardive ou du début du Moyen Âge. D’une façon significative, ces systèmes ne sont pas des indicateurs automatiques d’une affection précoce des terres. Les études de cas suggèrent que l’analyse de « localisation », qui comprend le type du sol, les possibilités de drainage et l’accès à l’eau, permet d’identifier avec une plus grande fiabilité les zones qui ont été très probablement utilisées aux débuts de l’agriculture. Dans la partie nord de la région, ces terres cultivables d’une importance « capitale » sont plutôt devenues des « common fields » alors que dans la partie sud, elles ont pris la forme de domaines composés de grands champs possédés exclusivement par des seigneurs et qui formaient un bloc. Cette divergence de développement, qui trouve probablement son origine dans la période saxonne tardive, joue manifestement un rôle dans la compréhension des « common fields » sur le plan plus large de la nation.

Au cours de la période saxonne tardive, l’agriculture a connu des avancées et des modifications très significatives dont les conséquences ont été considérables. Parmi les facteurs complexes qui ont amené ou influencé ces modifications, on trouve une amélioration du climat, une augmentation de la population, le développement ou la réintroduction de la charrue à socs et les invasions Vikings. Les preuves rassemblées au cours du projet tendent à montrer qu’il existe un lien entre l’apparition des « common fields » et les zones où les Vikings se sont implantés ou ont exercé une influence. Toutefois ce lien ne correspond pas à la simple importation d’une idée car on possède maintenant des preuves qui suggèrent que les « common fields » anglais étaient antérieurs aux « common fields » scandinaves. Cependant, l’adoption des « common fields » provient peut-être des bouleversements sociaux provoqués par les interventions des Vikings ou par la réorganisation qui a suivi la reconquête anglaise. Si cette hypothèse était exacte, on pourrait en conclure que l’origine des « common fields » se situe à la fin du neuvième ou au début du dixième siècle. A l’inverse, les zones qui ont été très peu influencées par les Vikings, semblent avoir développé des domaines formant un bloc. On peut éventuellement y voir le prolongement des pratiques de culture dont les racines remonteraient à la période romaine, ou même à une période antérieure.

Ces découvertes confirment que l’East Anglia possède un héritage important d’« anciens » champs clos, ce qui corrobore la remarque de Sir Thomas Smith, qui, au seizième siècle, considérait que l’East Anglia était une des régions « where most enclosures be » (où l’on trouvait le plus d’enclosures). Toutefois, ces champs contiennent très peu d’anciennes traces de culture. Ce n’est pas parce que les bilans, tels qu’on les trouve dans les Midlands, ont disparu sous l’effet de l’érosion, mais parce que dans la plus grande partie de l’East Anglia, le labourage par « stetch » était la norme. Or celui-ci produisait des crêtes de terre peu élevées qui ont rarement subsisté comme formes de terrassement. C’est pourquoi la priorité en matière de conservation doit porter sur la préservation et sur la gestion, historiquement appropriée, des limites de ces champs, car en modifiant
Zusammenfassung


Die Funde bestätigen, dass East Anglia ein bedeutsames Erbe älter eingeholter Feldfluren besitzt.
Writing a preface is a luxury, a chance to welcome the completion of a piece of research and to write in personal terms untrammelled by the need for footnotes or bibliographic references. The hard work has already been done by the two writers, particularly by Edward Martin in nurturing and expanding this highly ambitious and complex project and bringing it down an unmapped road to completion. The authors were helped by having a great subject, and by the opportunity to break new ground methodologically and theoretically from its very first stages, when Max Satchell forged new methods of characterising the medieval aspects of the landscape at detailed but not overly-particular scales, to its successful outcome in this volume. The book has outgrown its origins, but those origins — as one of several inter-linked experimental landscape-focussed projects commissioned as part of English Heritage’s Monuments Protection Programme in the late 1990s to further the evolution of archaeological approaches to the landscape itself and to instructive, suggesting that it is fieldscapes, both ‘ancient’ and ‘planned’, that particularly characterise the English landscape when viewed at a pan-European scale.

And yet, fields often seem to be one of the least understood aspects of our historic environment. Schoolchildren are told about Open Fields and Parliamentary Enclosure, but these over-simplified constructs only partly reflect a few centuries of the long duration of English landscape history. More significantly, they only reflect parts of England, primarily the ‘central’ village province. Other regions of England have other historical and social trajectories, and other types of fields. These ‘other’ regions can contribute different chapters to our national parks and many areas of ‘outstanding natural beauty’, but it is in the managed, manicured and manufactured landscapes of fields with their villages, hamlets, and farms that the spirit of England seems most often located by residents as well as visitors. The external view of visitors from overseas, with their own distinctive contexts of comparison, is particularly instructive, suggesting that it is fieldscapes, both ‘ancient’ and ‘planned’, that particularly characterise the English landscape when viewed at a pan-European scale.

Of all the material remains of the past that create the contemporary English environment — the present past, as it were — fields make one of the biggest and most basic contributions to rural landscape. We can enjoy the grandeur of the less obviously man-made uplands that characterise our national parks and many areas of ‘outstanding natural beauty’, but it is in the managed, manicured and manufactured landscapes of fields with their villages, hamlets, and farms that the spirit of England seems most often located by residents as well as visitors. The external view of visitors from overseas, with their own distinctive contexts of comparison, is particularly instructive, suggesting that it is fieldscapes, both ‘ancient’ and ‘planned’, that particularly characterise the English landscape when viewed at a pan-European scale.

A Preface, ‘dwelling in the midst of (its) own occupying’
by Graham Fairclough
consequence, planning policy has tended to convert scattered and dispersed groups of settlement in western and eastern regions into ‘villages’ — not functionally of course, but merely cosmetically, just as the creation of new ‘dispersed’ settlement in areas of historic dispersed settlement would also be cosmetic not functional, without any primary agricultural functions.

Farming, pastoral or arable, however, was never the only determinant of settlement patterns. Industrial activity has also been a factor in where people lived. In those parts of the country that underwent heavy industrialisation from the early eighteenth century onwards different patterns were created, from the spinning and weaving settlements of, say, the Pennine fringes or the Cotswolds valleys to the dense dispersions that underlie and gave rise to our modern metropolitan conurbations. From the middle of the twentieth century the seductive and irresistible rise of car-based personal mobility has been creating completely different settlement types that have a significant relationship to fields only through hobby farming and ‘horsiculture’. We are now seeing the development of something very different, a form of settlement that is neither rural nor urban in the historic sense, and that is tied to territorial scales far removed from the parishes or townships that framed and structured medieval and early modern settlement, whether at the nucleated or the dispersed end of the settlement spectrum.

Such changes to settlement patterns have weakened long-standing historic regional distinctions and changed the relationship of rural settlements to the land. They represent a change to the landscape just as great (though until recently much less remarked on) as the great wave of hedgerow removals of the post-1950 period which is well-recognised and bemoaned. Unlike agricultural intensification, it is also a process that is still continuing, and indeed accelerating and growing, rapidly turning into peri-urbanisation, where again opinions differ, one commentator’s ‘urban sprawl’ as town ‘eats’ country is another person’s new style of urbanised settlement as landscape becomes lifestyle. Thus landscape changes, as it always has, and hopefully as it always will.

These thoughts may at first glance seem far removed from historic fields, the topic of this book, but fields and settlements were always sides of the same coin, always the chicken to the egg, the ridge to the furrow. People lived where they did in order to use the land, but how they used the land in turn determined where and how they dwelt — in every town together or in the midst of their occupying, to paraphrase William Harrison’s words from the sixteenth century (quoted at the start of chapter 6). We cannot understand pre-modern settlement (and thus our present landscape and how it functions) without understanding its associated field systems. Historic field systems will adapt to both agricultural and settlement changes, but a better understanding at strategic and regional scales is required if we are successfully to guide that adaptation in historically-sensitive ways rather than merely preserving one or two hedges. One of this book’s aims is to explore ways to develop precisely such broader understanding in one particular important and distinctive region.

We know that fields — their boundaries, whether hedge, wall, bank or fence, their shapes and patterns, the character of their relationship to settlements — vary enormously across England’s regions, from township to township, and even between manors and farmsteads. We know too that some fields are old, others more recent, but we still debate their origins and date, sometimes within very wide margins: are the sprawling so-called co-axial systems late prehistoric or medieval, for example? How far ‘back’ can we push the field systems that are not village-focussed? In some parts of south-west England, around Exmoor for example, a mid-to-late first millennium AD date seems likely, but how to reconcile this with the second-millennium BC reaves of Dartmoor or the prehistoric fields of western Cornwall? Where does East Anglia fit in such debates?

We speak of ‘Enclosure-period field systems’, for example, but no fieldscapes are wholly of any single date. Instead they nearly always reveal change as well as continuity over centuries or longer, and provide one of the greatest indicators of time-depth in the landscape. Almost all fieldscapes contain traces of antecedent land-use, and have been modified and reworked since first enclosure, sometimes slightly as when we can still the curve of medieval town-field plough-lands in the enclosed strip fields of the sixteenth century, but sometimes drastically, as when we have to look hard to see even the very faint ghosts of even parliamentary enclosure in areas of later-nineteenth-century improvement or late-twentieth-century intensification.

Detailed understanding — or rather, consensus on what is known — used to peter out rapidly as our gaze moved back beyond Domesday, although this is starting to change as landscape-scale and archaeologically-driven research takes more hold of this subject. But we still use different ideas and theory, or define words differently (‘enclosure’?), on the two sides of the Roman divide. Thinking in terms of ‘history’ and ‘prehistory’ is not useful for landscape, nor for that matter (the shadows of 1066 and 43 being equally long and baleful) is the insular British reluctance to adopt the north European ‘long’ Iron Age (an issue present in another MPP ‘landscape’ project, on Roman rural settlement).

This book on East Anglia’s fields directly and indirectly reflects upon all of these very big questions. It is focussed on the Middle Ages, but in the context of much longer time spans both backwards into a more ancient, even less well-understood past (as in chapter 2, and indeed chapter 7) and forward to the present (chapter 4, based on the present day landscape character) and (in chapter 8) the future. It reports not only the results of the Historic Field Systems of East Anglia Project, but also many other avenues of research that the project has opened up. In the end it has drawn on a wide range of archaeological field research by a host of workers, but also for example on place-name and dialect studies, on landscape studies of many types, on historical and documentary work, on vernacular building research. It demonstrates the inter-disciplinarity that any landscape demands in its study.

The Fields project had starting points in two other pieces of English Heritage’s MPP-linked work — the regional and national patterning of the Settlement Atlas and the Historic Landscape Characterisation programme — and in bringing these together it has broken new ground. In building its research on these two programmes, the project has been able to operate at a range of scales, from national to local, and in the local sphere, not only the particular, parish scales of its original case-studies, or for that matter, of a very great deal of English historical
landscape studies. It was one of the earliest pieces of work to begin to exploit Historic Landscape Characterisation for research purposes rather than as the tool of management and information for which it was initially designed. The original project was also designed to be a pendant to another MPP project, a character-based approach to understand the landscape inheritance of the East Midlands town-fields that was published a few years ago by Northamptonshire County Council as *Turning the Plough*.

Unlike Norfolk, this book cannot be characterised as flat — each chapter has a rich diversity and texture, a mixture of answers and questions, insights and unknowns, theories and conclusions. It is a book about patterns and process, causes and results. It also proposes particular methods that might move us closer to large-scale understanding of landscape and the processes that have changed it and continue to do so. Nor is it an exercise in pure research, either, but of applied research, being as much about the present as it is about the past. It tries to offer the type of generalised understanding that should clearly inform spatial planning and land management decisions, and this is why the book concludes in chapter 8 with thoughts about management and the future of landscape.

It is perhaps no coincidence that this project unfolded in parallel with the writing, issuing and finally adoption by the United Kingdom, in 2007, of the European Landscape Convention. This book is a contribution to the continuing implementation of the ELC, with its view of landscape as a common European heritage and as perception (‘an area of land, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and human factors’, as the European Landscape Convention puts it in its crisp, concise and comprehensive fashion). It also reminds us that there is a European scale beyond the national, regional and local scales of this book: what patterns at that scale might this book’s methods and approaches help to define?
Part I
Introduction and Context
Chapter 1. Introduction and project aims

by Edward Martin and Max Satchell

The member States of the Council of Europe ... Aware that the landscape contributes to the formation of local cultures and that it is a basic component of the European natural and cultural heritage, contributing to human well-being and consolidation of the European identity; ... Believing that the landscape is a key element of individual and social well-being and that its protection, management and planning entail rights and responsibilities for everyone; ... Acknowledging that the quality and diversity of European landscapes constitute a common resource, and that it is important to co-operate towards its protection, management and planning; ... Have agreed ...

Extracted from the preamble to the European Landscape Convention, Florence 2000.¹

1. Fields and the East Anglian Landscape

'Very flat, Norfolk.' For many outsiders, this terse statement that Nöel Coward put into the mouth of Amanda Prynne in his play Private Lives (1930) is about as much as they know about the East Anglian landscape. This vision may be only slightly tempered by memories of John Constable’s paintings of Dedham Vale and of modern combine harvesters traversing huge fields of wheat. But those who live in East Anglia, or have actually visited it, know that these stereotypical observations and images hide and underate the complexity and distinctiveness of this region’s landscape, both visually and historically.

It was John Constable, that great observer of the East Anglian landscape, who remarked that ‘we see nothing truly till we understand it’ (Leslie 1845, 350). Without an understanding of how the landscape evolved we are unable to assign a value to the things that we see. We are able to appreciate that one area is different to another, but not why it appears so. It is these local differences that we understand about prehistoric and Roman fields in the region. It is principally, however, a study of medieval field systems across the region (Martin and Ford 1999).

The major credit for opening our eyes and enabling us to understand the landscape must go to Professor W.G. Hoskins. In his book The Making of the English Landscape (1955) he made the observation that ‘despite the multitude of books about English landscape and scenery ... there is not one book which deals with the historical evolution of the landscape as we know it’. He had come to realise that the ‘English landscape itself, to those who know how to read it aright, is the richest historical record we possess.’ (Hoskins 1955, 13–14).

Awareness of the importance of the historic landscape grew over the next three decades, along with a realisation that very little was being done to protect or conserve this cultural resource (Darvill 1997, 70–91). The issue was raised in the government’s White Paper entitled This Common Inheritance in 1990 (Department of the Environment 1990). In response, English Heritage commissioned the Historic Landscape Project (1992–94) to investigate methods of defining historic landscapes to facilitate their conservation (Fairclough et al, 1999). Aising from this, English Heritage has further commissioned a series of Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) projects, starting in Cornwall in 1994–5 and currently (2005) covering nearly two-thirds of England (Cornwall County Council 1994; Herring and Johnson 1997; Clark et al 2004; http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/landscape_character).

An Historic Landscape Characterisation Project in Eastern England was set up in 1998, starting with Suffolk (1998–99) and then moving to Hertfordshire, Essex, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Norfolk (Martin 1998; Ford 1999). At the outset it was recognised that the morphology of the fields was a major factor in determining landscape character and it was clear that more research was needed to elucidate the mapping work that was being undertaken for the HLC project. The Historic Field Systems of East Anglia Project was therefore formulated to answer a number of questions about the history, morphology and beneficial management of field systems across the region (Martin and Ford 1999).

2. The Historic Field Systems of East Anglia Project (HFSEAP)

Initially, this was a two-year project (2000–2001) funded by English Heritage as part of its Monuments Protection Programme (MPP). The data collection and an initial analysis was carried out by Dr Max Satchell, based in the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council. This work was done in collaboration with the archaeological services of Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk and Suffolk county councils, and controlled by a management committee drawn from English Heritage, the county councils and invited specialists. The project was completed (2002–5) by Edward Martin of the Archaeological Service of Suffolk County Council, who re-analysed the material, produced new syntheses and undertook the production of this report.

The project analysed the origin, evolution, operation, morphology, distribution and survival of field systems in East Anglia. The term ‘historic’ in the title perhaps needs a little explanation. It does in fact refer to fields that survive, whatever their origin, in the present day landscape, because this was a project aimed at characterising the existing world. The project is nevertheless largely focused on medieval and early modern fields; these are the periods whose legacy, at least in terms of field patterns, has contributed most to the region’s landscape character. The project always also had one eye on the more distant past, not least because of the ‘co-axial’ debate that for some years now has dominated much research and thinking about the East Anglian landscape. This book therefore includes a short summary of what is known and understood about prehistoric and Roman fields in the region.
patterns and of how they have changed and been augmented in the few centuries since then. The term ‘East Anglia’ also need some explanation. It is here used in a general sense to cover eastern Cambridgeshire, Essex, eastern Hertfordshire, Norfolk and Suffolk.

The work was intended both to be informed by and to further develop two other English Heritage-sponsored projects: the Historic Landscape Characterisation in the East of England Project (as has been already mentioned) and the national Terrain and Rural Settlement Mapping Project (Roberts and Wrathmell 1995; 2000; 2002). The latter had demonstrated England’s division into three broad ‘provinces’ of distinctive settlement and landscape and the HFSEA project was intended as an exploration at a regional scale of precisely why East Anglia stands out as being so different, not just to the ‘central province’ of village and common field England, but also to the superficially similar western province of irregular fields and dispersed settlement. The HFSEA project was therefore also intended as a study of an area that would complement but contrast with that studied in a third English Heritage-sponsored project, the East Midlands Open Fields Project (Hall 2001).

The project aims are stated in full in the HFSEA project design (Martin and Ford 1999). In summary, the main aims were to:

- Characterise both current and earlier field systems within the study area, with regard to date, form, local diversity, soil type, associated settlement patterns and tenurial and social background. This to be done with reference to Historic Landscape Characterisation, where available, and to the Atlas of Rural Settlement, and by extrapolation from detailed local case studies that would be carried out by the project.
- Map the distribution of different field system types thus characterised across the study area (‘East Anglia’, as defined above) and analyse the distribution of different field systems with relation to settlement provinces and landscape areas.
- Consider how field systems might be evaluated, both for their component elements and their overall landscape-scale value.
- Explore mechanisms for the management and protection of the field systems.

3. The selection of the case studies

At the core of the project was the investigation of twelve case studies, mostly covering one whole parish but one encompassing a group of four adjacent parishes. These were designed to elicit a detailed understanding of the field, settlement and land-holding patterns of representative areas and specific types that could then with confidence be extrapolated to wider regions. The selection of the case studies was governed by two principal criteria:

- Each case study must be representative of a larger area or type of field pattern.
- The case study must be viable to achieve the aims of the project.

Field systems should not, of course, be studied in isolation from the overall pattern of local settlement, as they constantly influence each other in a recursive relationship. As a consequence, each case study would need to have enough evidence both to establish the layout of its pre-nineteenth-century field systems and to understand the wider settlement pattern. It also needed to have material that allowed the majority of the different elements of the field systems to be characterised in terms of land-use and approximate date. Only when field system elements are characterised in this way can convincing links be made between economic, political, social or geological factors and specific aspects of the field systems in the East Anglian landscape.

Evidence for earlier changes would also be valuable, as would clear information about economic, political, social or geological factors and specific aspects of the field systems in the East Anglian landscape.

The project took, as its starting point, the division of East Anglia into a series of ‘local regions’ by Professor Brian Roberts and Dr Stuart Wrathmell (Fig. 1) (Roberts and Wrathmell 1995; 2000). Their regions were characterised primarily on the degree of population nucleation or dispersal in the mid-nineteenth century. Some of the boundaries of the ‘local regions’ were also drawn in relation to major differences in relief or soils. In some instances they also characterised a ‘local region’ as having specific landscape features, such as very large numbers of greens. As a consequence, it was decided that each case study had to have the typical settlement, soil, relief and other features of its ‘local region’.

Representativeness of different types of rural medieval tenurial regime was also deemed important. Studies of field systems have tended to focus on the more fully documented estates belonging to monastic houses, biasing the information towards one specific tenurial type. It was therefore decided that HFSEAP would also include examples of lay estates.

It was also decided to target areas where there was a reasonable survival of the field boundaries marked on the first edition Ordnance Survey maps of the 1880s, as they would have greater ‘field’ evidence and would also be of more use for formulating realistic strategies for positive management. By way of contrast, areas that had undergone fundamental landscape changes were avoided.

Potential case studies were examined on the basis of the presence/absence of a variety of sources necessary to fulfil the criteria outlined above. With the exception of the documentary material, the sources listed below were deemed desirable rather than essential; they are listed roughly in order of importance:

- Early maps, surveys or fieldbooks to reconstruct the layout of pre-nineteenth-century settlements/field systems in the landscape and to provide information on the organisation of the field system.
- Field walking surveys to identify and date settlement sites, and in some instances arable fields.
- Excavation of settlements that provide details and dates of specific settlements/field systems.
- Hedgerow surveys to enable specific boundaries of field systems to be dated.
- Cropmarks, particularly in areas of lighter soils, to indicate earlier settlements/field boundaries.
Figure 1 Settlement provinces and local regions in eastern England, from *An Atlas of Rural Settlement in England* (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000). For the numbered local regions, see Table 2.
**Representativeness**

- Typical settlement: Yes
- Typical soils: Yes
- Typical relief: Yes
- Other features specified by Roberts and Wrathmell for the local region: -

**Sources**

- Early maps, surveys or field books: Yes
- Field walking surveys: No
- Excavations: No
- Hedgerow surveys: No
- Cropmarks: No
- Standing buildings survey: No
- Standing earthworks: No
- Previous archaeological or historical studies that can be utilised and built upon: Yes

**Preservation**

Survival of field boundaries marked on 1st edition OS 6 inch map with current landline data:
- 75%+: No
- 75–50%: No
- 50–25%: Yes
- Less than 25%: No

### Table 1: Example of an HSEAP case study score sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EANGL-I. North-East Norfolk</th>
<th>Case Study: Worstead, Norfolk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical settlement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical soils</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical relief</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other features specified by Roberts and Wrathmell for the local region</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval tenure of the manor/s of the township:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay tenure</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed tenure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastic tenure</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early maps, surveys or field books</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field walking surveys</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavations</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerow surveys</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropmarks</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing buildings survey</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing earthworks</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous archaeological or historical studies that can be utilised and built upon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival of field boundaries marked on 1st edition OS 6 inch map with current landline data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%+</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75–50%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–25%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Roberts and Wrathmell’s local regions in East Anglia (their EANGL sub-province with a part of EWASHE), with the case studies chosen to characterise them.

**EANGL**

1. North-East Norfolk
   - Place, county: Worstead with Worthing, Norfolk
2. Mid-Norfolk (greens)
   - Place, county: Swanton Morley, Norfolk
3a. Isle of Flegg
   - Place, county: No case study
3b. Broads
   - Place, county: No case study
4. High Norfolk and Suffolk
   - Place, county: South Elmham St Michael, Suffolk
5. Tas-Waveney Divide (greens)
   - Place, county: Scole, Frenze, Thorpe Parva and Thelveton, Norfolk
6. Mid-Suffolk (greens)
   - Place, county: Worthingworth, Suffolk
7. North Stour Slope
   - Place, county: No case study
8. Sandlings
   - Place, county: No case study
9. Blackwater-Colne Divide (greens)
   - Place, county: Great Henny, Essex
10. Lower Colne
    - Place, county: No case study
11. Lower Blythe
    - Place, county: No case study
12. Coastal Plain
    - Place, county: Sutton, Suffolk
13. North-West Essex
    - Place, county: Felsted, Essex
14. Central Essex
    - Place, county: Ingatestone, Essex
15. East Hertfordshire
    - Place, county: Ardeley with Luffenhall, Hertfordshire
16. Upper Ash
    - Place, county: No case study

**EWASHE**

4. Black Bourne
   - Place, county: Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk
7. Granta
   - Place, county: Dullingham, Cambridgeshire
Standing building surveys to provide details of settlement layout, date and social context.

Standing earthworks that indicate the layout earlier settlement/field systems.

Previous archaeological or historical studies that can be utilised and built upon.

Potential case studies were then scored against each other (for an example, see Table 1) and the best ones chosen.

This co-ordinated strategy enabled the following case studies to be selected (see Table 2 and Fig. 2).

4. The purpose and structure of this book

The initial products of the HFSEA project were:

- twelve case study portfolios, containing maps, data, documentary analysis etc of fifteen parishes
- a preliminary assessment of their results at a more regional level (which was presented in an unpublished Internal Report (Satchell and Martin 2002).

It was clear early in the project that a more synthesised report would be required for public consumption, and the present volume has been written for this purpose. The raw data is retained in the project archive, but is only summarised in this book (in part II), which contains significant additional contextual and concluding material.

The book has been divided into three parts:

Part I: Introduction and Context

This opening section of the book, of which the present chapter forms part, sets the scene and describes the wider background to the project. In particular, it offers a new and very full summary (set out as a glossary of medieval and later terms) of what is known about the context of medieval farming and landholding in East Anglia, without which the field patterns inherited from that period would be difficult to understand. This introductory section also includes a summary of the evidence for pre-medieval fields; this is necessary to inform discussion later in the book about the possibilities of long-term continuity and survival.

Part II: The Character of East Anglian Fields

The heart of the book presents the newly-querried data on which the project and its conclusions are founded: firstly, a new classification of ‘land types’, and, secondly, the detailed historic landscape and settlement descriptions and analyses of the twelve case studies. These two new sets of information formed the starting point for the wider enquiries presented in part III.
The project’s overall conclusions are presented in this final section. These have been developed by extrapolation from the case studies to wider regional patterns. But also, importantly, they use other map-based data sets in conjunction with the project’s own data to produce new insights on the regional (and sub-regional) character of the East Anglian landscape and the roots of its culture. This concluding section is also concerned to highlight the relevance of better and more focused understanding to any consideration of how the future of the East Anglian rural landscape, and its historic and highly distinctive field patterns, is to be managed and shaped. It is particularly important to recognise that the management of the historic environment at regional and landscape scale requires an understanding of patterns at that level as well as the more traditional approach of evaluating and managing heritage items at a site level.

Endnote

Chapter 2. The archaeological evidence for early fields in East Anglia
by Edward Martin

Although the majority of this report is concerned with medieval and later field systems, the agricultural exploitation of the East Anglian landscape was obviously well underway long before the Middle Ages. If, as Hoskins showed, the appreciation of the present day landscape requires understanding of its earlier history, notably the medieval period, so an understanding of the medieval fields systems calls also for some awareness of what went before. This is especially so for a region such as East Anglia where claims have been made for the survival of land allotments on a large scale from the late prehistoric period within the modern landscape. This chapter therefore summarises the current state of knowledge and understanding for earlier prehistoric and Roman-period fields.

1. The nature of the evidence

At the outset, it is worth emphasising that although field ditches are commonly referred to in excavation reports, there are some very real problems in assessing and understanding the field systems to which they relate. First, they tend to contain few dateable artefacts and are therefore poorly dated. Secondly, the scale of the excavations is often too small for the units to be properly understood. Thirdly, even when the excavations are on a large scale, the units are still fragmentary (through erosion or latter disturbances), or there is a profusion of poorly-dated ditch lines and many hypothetical units, of varying sizes and shapes, could be reconstructed. Fourthly, issues of how excavated sections of field systems relate to the local topography and the wider landscape are frequently ignored in reports.

Although excavated plant remains from Neolithic sites in East Anglia demonstrate that wheat, barley and flax/linseed were being cultivated before the middle of the third millennium BC, solid evidence of any fields in which these crops might have been cultivated has proved elusive (Murphy 1996, 171–2; Brown and Murphy 1997, 12). Indeed, these crops may not have been grown in recognisable fields but in opportunistic clearings on a scale that has been described as ‘garden horticulture’ (Thomas 1999, 25).

2. The Fens

Fields, of course, are not solely used for the cultivation of crops, they are equally important for the confinement of grazing livestock. In fact some the earliest fields in the region appear to relate not to crop cultivation but to animal husbandry, as at Fengate, near Peterborough on the western edge of the Fens. Francis Pryor’s long sequence of excavations here since the 1970s revealed a series of enclosures of varying sizes, some square, some oblong, bounded by parallel droveways that run at right-angles to the fen edge. The ditches are relatively shallow, only 20 to 30cm deep, and Pryor has suggested that these were supplemented by hedges. The droveways were also narrow, frequently only about 1.25m (4ft) wide. The size of the units is difficult to calculate because most are incomplete, however one of the smaller units was a square enclosure containing about 0.15ha (0.4 acre). Pryor has argued that these narrow droveways and associated enclosures would be particularly suited to the management of sheep. The system was laid out ‘around, or shortly after, 1800 BC and continued in use until about 900 BC (Pryor 1980, 23–87, 169–189; 1991, 58–9; 1998, 89–91).

The period 1800–1500 BC in fact saw the appearance of fields, or at least some form of land divisions, in several parts of England. Most famous, perhaps, are the co-axial land divisions called ‘reaves’ on Dartmoor and the ‘Celtic fields’ of the Wessex chalk downlands (for a more detailed explanation of these terms see Chapter 3, 6) (Fleming 1988; Field 2001). In eastern England, field systems similar to those at Fengate have been identified on and around the western edge of the Fens at West Deeping, Borough Fen and Eye to the north of Peterborough, and at Fen Drayton, Needingworth, Over, Stukeley and Sutton to the south and south-east of it (Pryor 1998, 109–13; 2002; Malim 2001; Evans and Knight 2001). The similarities between these systems has led Francis Pryor to describe them as an ‘East Anglian style of aligned fields’, characterised by droves and linear parcels of land lying at right-angles to watercourses or other wetlands, with scattered farmsteads spread through the systems (Pryor 2002, 24–25). It cannot be assumed, however, that field systems developed in all areas around the Fens at this time. Excavation at West Row Fen, on the eastern edge of the Fens at Mildenhall, an unenclosed settlement dating from c.1500–1700 BC, produced no excavated or cropmark evidence for associated fields, even though the inhabitants were demonstrably engaged in animal husbandry (particularly cattle) and grew a variety of crops (wheat, barley and flax) (Martin and Murphy 1988; Olsen 1994).

The Fens have also produced considerable evidence for fields of Roman period date, mostly in the form of cropmarks but also occasionally as surviving earthworks, as at Hilgay in Norfolk (Silvester 1991, 44, fig. 52a). Analysis of a sample of about 800 measurable fields in the northern part of the Fens, north-west of the River Welland, clearly showed that the vast majority of these fields were small, with 54% being under half an acre (0.2ha) in size and 76% under one acre (0.4ha). Only 13% lay between 2 acres and the maximum recorded of 8 acres (0.8ha–3ha) (Hallam 1970, 64–66). Most were described as ‘short rectangles’, with 63% having breadth that were between 40% and 80% of their lengths. The enclosure systems tend to cluster around each settlement, ‘while a looser mesh of
drainage ditches spans the relatively empty areas between. The enclosures were thought to be mainly for animals.

A more recent appraisal of these fenland enclosures has suggested a predominance of square (or rhomboid) shapes and a general lack of an adherence to a planned axial design (Hall and Coles 1994, 119). A notable exception is at Christchurch in Upwell, Cambs., where there is a large block of rectangular ditched fields covering at least 85ha that appears to be offset from the southern side of the Rodham Farm Canal/Fen Causeway, a mixed canal and road system of Roman date (Phillips 1970, 223, pl. VIIIb and map 13; Hall and Coles 1994, 119). The system makes partial use of natural watercourses, but is still markedly regular and the overall dimensions of approximately 1200 x 700m suggest that it was laid out using Roman units of measurement. The overall measurement approximately equates with a Roman measurement of 34 x 20 actus. This is a significant example of Roman landscape planning, even if it probably cannot be taken as an example of the formal method of land apportionment called ‘centuriation’ (which was usually laid out on a grid of 20 actus, see Chapter 3, 6.iv). The lack of finds within the area of the system suggests that they were pasture rather than arable enclosures, as it appears were most of the Roman-period field systems in the Fens.

3. The Thames valley and south Essex

In the southern part of the eastern region, in the Thames valley and in southern Essex bordering the Thames estuary, there is further evidence for the emergence of early field systems of a similar character to those of the Fens. David Yates’s research suggests that fields first appeared in the middle Bronze Age (c.1500–1150 BC) and that by the late Bronze Age (c.1150–700 BC) there was a series of ‘bounded landscapes’ forming ‘distinct enclaves’ along the river valleys, probably associated with stock raising and usually of co-axial form (Yates 1999; 2001). An excavated example at South Hornchurch had three co-axial fields, measuring between 45m and 50m in length, suggesting units in excess of 0.3ha (0.7 acre). The fields lie at right-angles to the River Ingrebourne, a tributary of the Thames, and are bounded by a double ditched dromeway, 14m wide, that ran parallel to the Ingrebourne along the high ground of the gravel terrace (Guttmann and Last 2000).

4. North Essex and the Stour valley

In north Essex, an extensive series of cropmarks at Gosbecks, on the south-west side of Colchester, include a Roman fort, temple and theatre as well as trackways and enclosures. Lying centrally in the complex, close to the headwaters of a tributary of the Roman River, is a large trapezoidal enclosure that seems to contain a farmstead of the first century AD. To the south of this is an area of probable field boundaries and trackways that extend for some 3km along the northern side of the Roman River and cover about 650ha. The ‘fields’ are roughly rectangular, tending towards being square, but varying in size and regularity; the commonest size being around 0.25ha (0.6 acre). To the east of the main group, however, Philip Crummy identified a smaller area of more regular field boundaries. These had a regular grid layout and covered an area of 16ha (40 acres). Crummy tentatively suggested a possible link with centuriation (see Chapter 3, 6.iv and below) though he admitted that the grid was not quite rectangular and its lines were only about 4 actus apart, rather that the 20 actus measurement more normally found in centuriation (Crummy 1978). Its proximity to the Roman *colonia* at Colchester does nevertheless make centuriation a serious possibility.

Another interesting series of cropmarks has been identified to the north-east of Colchester at Ardleigh. The area is best known for its large ‘urnfield’ cemetery of mainly middle Bronze Age date (c.1500–1150 BC). But surrounding the cemetery is a complex of linear cropmarks that take the form of a number of slightly sinuous and branching trackways with linear field boundaries set off from them. Most appear to define small strip fields that vary from about 12 to 30m in width and from 75m to 100m in length. Where excavated, the trackway ditches have been shown to be largely early Roman in date; they appear to respect the bounds of the Bronze Age cemetery, however, which suggests that either it was still visible or that routes of the trackways may have been Bronze Age in origin (Brown 1999, 178–83).

In the Stour valley, on the Suffolk/Essex border, it has been known for some time that cropmarks of fields apparently have significant associations with Bronze Age ring-ditches. Over twenty years ago Peter Fowler drew attention to a group of ring-ditches at Lawford, on the Essex side of the Stour, which appear to be enclosed by a trapezium-shaped field, c.130x130m (c.2ha or 5 acres), that is linked to other enclosures and trackways (Fowler 1981). More recent work by Essex County Council on the cropmarks of the Stour valley has shown that although there are numerous examples of linear boundaries and field systems, ‘their often fragmentary nature, both in terms of their episodic occurrence along the valley and in terms of the partial plans of each of the areas where they do occur, makes interpretation difficult’ (Brown et al 2002). It is also clear that the cropmarks are a multi-period palimpsest and in their complexity they hint at a long history of changes and re-alignments. Interestingly, they do not indicate a strongly co-axial layout with associated dromeways, as at Fengate. Instead they suggest a more piecemeal accumulation of enclosures and boundaries.

The work on the cropmarks of the Stour valley also highlighted the frequent association of burial monuments with field systems; a relationship also noted in the Fens. In an interesting example at Stoke-by-Nayland, on the Suffolk side of the Stour, a now-flattened round barrow was used as a focal point for a linear boundary, as the boundary’s two contact points with the barrow are slightly staggered (Lawson et al 1981, fig. 31A; Brown et al 2002, fig. 2 (erroneously identified there as Highham)). Boundary lines were constructed, from opposite directions, up to a standing barrow, which was then incorporated into the boundary.

5. South-east Suffolk

It has often been suggested that barrows, in addition to being burial sites, had additional original functions as landmarks of various kinds (Grinsell 1959; Fleming 1998, 59). This is strikingly seen in the project area with the linear barrow cemeteries in the Nacton/Levington area
of south-east Suffolk, where a group of twenty-nine barrows and ring-ditches is strung out along the line of later parish boundaries (Lawson et al 1981, 82–87). In a very real way, it looks as if the buried ancestors were being called on to bear witness to their descendents’ claims to certain tracts of land.

As will be seen in the Sutton case study, elements of early field systems were excavated in the 1980s and early 1990s at Sutton Hoo. Initially claimed as being later Neolithic or early Bronze Age in date, it now seems that although some elements may be early Bronze Age, most of the wider pattern revealed by cropmarks is probably Iron Age or of the Roman period (Copp 1989; Hummler 1993; Hummler pers. comm. 1997; Carver 1998, 94–100). More certainly, a radiocarbon date (at 1 sigma) of cal AD 262–427 (cal AD 242–535 at 2 sigma; AA-43641, GU-9470) obtained from the base of a re-cut to one of the ditches in further excavations in 2000 indicates that the system certainly continued in use in the Roman period (Martin et al 2001, 87–88). The cropmarks indicate a field system that covers an area of approximately one square kilometre. The individual fields are mainly square or oblong, and of two sizes: the larger ones are about 1ha to 1.25ha (2.5–3 acres) in size, whilst the smaller ones contain about 0.25ha (0.6 acre). The smaller ones resemble the prehistoric ‘Celtic’ fields recorded elsewhere in England, but the larger ones exceed the normal range for ‘Celtic’ fields, which is usually between 0.1 to 0.6ha (see Chapter 3, 6.iii).

Etched into the earlier ground surfaces beneath the Anglo-Saxon burial mounds were some probable plough-marks that could relate to these fields, though they were at a slight angle to the field ditches. Those beneath Mound 2 consisted of a series of parallel grooves, but those under Mound 5 formed a cross-hatched pattern (Copp 1989). Such criss-crossing marks are often held to be the result of cross-ploughing with an early form of plough called an ard. However modern experiments with replica ards have shown that marks penetrating into the subsoil are not produced by ploughing with normal ards. To achieve deep scratches, a special type of plough, that the late Peter Reynolds termed a ‘rip ard’, would have been needed. Reynolds suggested that this type of plough would only have been used for breaking new ground or old fallows (Reynolds 1981). The marks are therefore not the result of normal cultivation, but of a special event. Francis Pryor has gone further and warned that the plough-marks mentioned below in the Scole case study. The marks are thought to date from the middle Saxon era and indicate ploughing both parallel and at right-angles to the river, with minor variations that suggest at least four ploughing episodes (Grill and Tester forthcoming). As at Brandon, the occurrence of the marks in low-lying and poorly-drained land suggests that they are connected with the management or creation of meadows, not arable farming. Nearby, in Stuston, excavations have revealed ditches crossing similar low-lying land beside the Waveney that are late Bronze Age or Iron Age in origin (radiocarbon date of 790–400 cal.BC for the basal peat in one and 390–100 cal.BC for a middle peat layer in another, Tester forthcoming).

Further east again along the Waveney valley, recent excavations at Flixton Park Quarry have revealed field boundaries of Iron Age and Roman date, as noted in the South Elmham case study. These boundaries seem to be part of rectangular blocks that are probably between 1ha and 2.5ha in size (2.5 to 3.5 acres). The axes of the blocks are aligned approximately parallel and at right-angles to the River Waveney, an alignment that they share with the post-medieval landscape associated with Flixton Hall (Boulter 2000b; 2002).

Recent excavations at Carlton Colville, on the outskirts of Lowestoft in north-east Suffolk, have revealed a field system of Roman date. The system here consisted of small rectilinear fields set off both sides of a ditched and banked trackway that gently curved around the side of a low hill, parallel to a watercourse. Overlying this Roman period layout was an Anglo-Saxon settlement of the sixth to early eighth centuries. In this period the hollow of the trackway was infilled through its use as a midden, suggesting that it was no longer in use (Mortimer 2000; Martin et al 2001, 90–93). The line of the trackway does not correlate with anything in the recent landscape; and even though some of the nineteenth-century fields had a similar alignment to some of the Roman ones, they were not actually continuations of them.

7. Continuity or discontinuity?

A lack of continuity is in fact a significant factor that emerges from this study of early field systems in this region. Francis Pryor has argued that the Bronze Age fields at Peterborough continued in use until about 900 BC, when they were replaced ‘by another, seemingly less tightly organised landscape’. This probably lasted through the Iron Age and Roman periods, but was abandoned after
the third century AD ‘in the face of continued and widespread flooding’ (Pryor 1998, 89–91). At North Shoebury in south-east Essex, excavations revealed some fragmentary rectilinear enclosures of middle Bronze Age date that were followed in the late Bronze Age by a more extensive system on a different alignment. In the late Iron Age a new system on another alignment was laid out, and this probably continued in use through to the early Saxon period. The historic landscape, as shown on a map of 1703, was on yet another alignment, making it clear that the recent rectilinear landscape of North Shoebury ‘bears no relation to the prehistoric and little to the Roman boundaries’. The earliest features to fit the modern pattern were found to be early medieval in date (Wymer and Brown 1995, 170–2). Extensive excavations on a sand knoll beside the River Lark at West Stow, in north-west Suffolk, revealed a complex system of field ditches and enclosures early enough to have been realigned in the late Iron Age. These were later overlain by an Anglo-Saxon settlement and then subjected to medieval ploughing on an alignment that bears no relation to the preceding land divisions (West 1990, figs 10, 17 and 33). At Preston St Mary in south Suffolk, excavation showed that a ditched field system of late Iron Age/early Roman date was altered in the late third century, with the historic field layout being on a different alignment again (Boulter 1996). Finally, at Mucking, on the Thames estuary in south Essex, there is a rare example of an excavation on a truly landscape-scale (24ha). Here, Iron Age enclosures developed into an early Roman system of small enclosures, which was replaced, by the later third century, by larger fields. Some of these large fields may have been in a derelict state by the late fourth century and little of the Roman landscape survived in use into the Saxon period (M.U. Jones 1978; Going 1993; 1996, 101).

In the Fens, however, Stephen Upex has recently produced evidence to suggest that a group of small (under 5ha) medieval furlongs at Haddon in Cambridgeshire were developed from Roman fields (Upex 2002). The area of these furlongs, which are mostly square or short rectangles, contains three scatters of Roman pottery and excavations through a sample of five medieval headlands produced evidence of underlying Roman ditches. Excavations on one of the settlement scatters indicated a continuation of activity into the sixth century. Although the presence of medieval ridge-and-furrow indicates that they were used for arable crops, their marked tendency to square shapes suggests that this was not their primary use, as does their location adjacent to the existing settlement at Haddon and to an area of possible meadow. As most of the Roman fields recorded from the Fens seem to have had a pastoral use, it is more than likely that the Haddon fields originated as animal paddocks and were only converted to arable for a relatively short time in the medieval period. Roman arable fields may thus still be elusive.

This important question about the continuity of early field systems into the medieval and later landscape will be further explored in Chapter 7.

Endnotes
1. For a recent analytical study of Bronze Age phasing, see Needham et al 1997.
2. Some work in progress suggests an average size of 135x105m (1.4 ha) for cropmark fields in the coastal zone (Hegarty and Newsome 2004, 38).
Chapter 3. The context of medieval farming and landholding in East Anglia, with a glossary of modern field-system descriptors

by Edward Martin

It is difficult to discuss medieval farming without using technical language, some terms being those actually used in medieval documents and others that are used by modern historians to interpret the information. This chapter therefore is designed as a commentary on the main terms used in this report.

1. Social structure

i. Vill and parish

Medieval documents frequently use the Latin term villas to refer to an inhabited territorial unit that had some kind of corporate identity, usually for administrative, taxation or ecclesiastical purposes (Adams 1976, 77; Lewis et al 2001, 155). Within the vill there were one or more manors that owned and administered the land and its tenants. Modern authors also use the Anglicised form, vill, in a less specific way to refer to named places in Domesday Book and other early documents. In many cases the vill equated with the territory of an individual church. That territory was normally called a parish (Latin parochia), a term originally used for a bishop’s diocese, but used in its present sense by 1086, as is shown by occasional references in Domesday Book to parochia and to parrochiani ‘parishioners’ (DB Suffolk 1, 1/1 and 2/8).

Not all vills and parishes were of equal antiquity and status, for in many areas it is possible to identify ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ units. This is a complex subject which involves two parallel concepts, that of the ‘multiple estate’ and that of ‘minister parishes’. The concept of ‘multiple estates’ was put forward by G.R.J. Jones as an explanation of land holding and agrarian production in the Anglo-Saxon period (Jones 1979; Gregson 1985; Hadley 1996a; Faith 1997, 11–14; Lewis et al 2001, 92–4). In this, the subdivision of large ‘primary’ units into smaller ‘secondary’ ones is suggested where groups of parishes share a common name, as in the case of the South Elmhams (S), where nine parishes form a large rectangular block that was referred to as the ferthing (i.e. a quarter of a hundred) of South Elmham in Domesday Book (DB Suffolk 1, 1/115, 4/12, 6/135). Although in some areas of England these berewicks represent ancient links between settlements, the East Anglian evidence is less certain. Domesday Book states that Bentley (S) was added as a berewick to East Bergholt by Earl Ralph after 1066 (DB Suffolk 1, 1/101). Tom Williamson has identified similar ‘late’ berewicks in Norfolk and has suggested that they represent administrative conveniences rather than economic sub-units of an estate (Williamson 1993a, 93).

The subdivision of large ‘primary’ units into smaller ‘secondary’ ones is suggested where groups of parishes share a common name, as in the case of the South Elmhams (S), where nine parishes form a large rectangular block that was referred to as the ferthing (i.e. a quarter of a hundred) of South Elmham in Domesday Book (DB Suffolk 1, 1/100–3). Yet, in a royal charter of 1094, Bergholt, Shotley, Bentley and Shelley are all stated to have been berewicks of Brantham, Bergholt’s eastern neighbour (Monasticon Anglicanum III 1846, 246 no.xiii; Harper-Bill 1989). Even curiouser, Domesday shows Brantham to have been in different ownership to its supposed berewicks, though its soke was stated to be in Bergholt (DB Suffolk 1, 3/73, 3/82, 3/85 and 6/27).

The subdivision of large ‘primary’ units into smaller ‘secondary’ ones is suggested where groups of parishes share a common name, as in the case of the South Elmhams (S), where nine parishes form a large rectangular block that was referred to as the ferthing (i.e. a quarter of a hundred) of South Elmham in Domesday Book (DB Suffolk 1, 1/100–3). The division of these units was clearly underway by 1086, as Domesday records examples of same-named places, distinguished by terms such as parva ‘little’ or just altera ‘other’, in all the eastern counties (Darby 1971, 102, 156, 212, 267).

In Suffolk there are a number of instances where place-names ending in -ham and -ing are shared by two or more neighbouring settlements, e.g. the Stonhams and Creeting, but there are no examples of divided -ton names. Differences are also apparent in the status of the two groups of names: most settlements with -ham or -ing names became separate parishes, but quite a number of -tons occur as subsidiary settlements in other parishes.

This suggests that the -hams and -ings represent a relatively early stratum of substantial settlements that were capable of later subdivision, while the -tons in many cases seem to represent daughter settlements that were established, from perhaps the mid-eighth century
onwards, in areas capable of supporting increased populations. This impression of secondary settlements is reinforced by names like Newton and Nouton, and also by names that appear to imply a relationship with a parent settlement, e.g. Easton, Weston, Norton and Surton (Martin 1999a, 50–1).

Even when there is no shared place-name, a primary/secondary relationship between settlements can sometimes be deduced, either from documentary evidence, topographical analysis or a combination of the two. For instance, Hitcham and the adjoining but smaller parish of Wattisham (S) together form a roughly rectangular block, and there is documentary evidence indicating that the manor of Wattisham was regarded as a dependency of Hitcham (Martin in preparation). A relationship can also sometimes be revealed by the ecclesiastical provision, with the dependent churches being termed chapelries of the original ‘mother’ church.

In settlement terms, it is likely that primary and secondary vills will differ in several significant respects. The primary vills are more likely to be larger and to occupy the best lands in terms of soils, access to water and suitability of land for the growing of crops, their demesnes are likely to reflect this and be larger, and they are more likely to have ancient well-endowed churches. Secondary vills, in contrast, are more likely to be smaller, be less favoured in terms of soils, water and topography, to have smaller demesnes, but more likely to contain evidence of former woodland, commons, heaths or other forms of ‘waste’, their churches are more likely to be late, poorly endowed, and to be regarded as dependent chapels.

In the case studies, Felsted (E) stands out as a probable undivided primary villa. It has a large size (2600 ha or 6426 acres), a location on good agricultural land beside a river and before the Norman Conquest it was rated as containing five hides, which would have made it of a size appropriate for a thegn (see below, carucate or hide). Although its church is not mentioned in Domesday Book, as is common in Essex), the gift of the estate to the Abbey of Caen soon after the Conquest suggests that there was one here and it was certainly subsequently large. The four parishes in the block that makes up the Scole (N) case study may be an example of a divided primary villa. Scole, itself, is the likely estate centre, with its substantial share of the prime farmland, a riverside position and evidence for a major Roman settlement. It is flanked on either side by Frenze and Thorpe Parva, both of which are noticeably small parishes (161ha and 142ha, as opposed to Scole’s 332ha). Thorpe also bears a name (the Old Scandinavian term thorp) which implies a secondary, dependent, settlement. Thelveton, situated on poorer and higher land to the north, forms a broad band across the top of the other three parishes and probably originated as a settlement expansion into a less favoured area that was almost certainly more wooded. Its name, an Old Scandinavian /English hybrid, also implies a late settlement. The small parish of South Elmham St Michael (S) is also clearly a secondary villa and its complex manorial structure results from its development out of a larger unit.

**ii. Manor**

The term derives from Latin manerium, meaning ‘a residence’, but was also, importantly, a unit of lordship. Within what has been described as the ‘classical bipartite manor’ there were two elements: the demesne and the tenanted land. The demesne (French: réserve; German: Salland) was managed and cultivated directly for the lord; the tenanted land was held and cultivated by manorial tenants for themselves, in exchange for services and payments to the lord. The system probably originated in the Frankish kingdom between the late sixth and the eighth century, spreading more widely across north-western Europe from the eighth century (Verhulst 1966; 2002, 33–7; Devroey 1989).

In medieval England the manor was the basic unit for the administration of both farmlands and their associated settlements. A manor could be coterminous with a parish or vill, as it was frequently in the Midlands, but in East Anglia there were frequently several manors within a parish (Maitland 1897, 22–3; Adams 1976, 74–5). Manors could also extend over parish boundaries (Miller and Hatcher 1978, 19–22). An essential aspect of the manor was the division of the land into two types: that being worked directly for the lord of the manor (the ‘inland’ or ‘bordland’, later the demesne) and that being worked by his tenants, in return for rents and services to the lord (the ‘warland’ or ‘outland’, later the tenanted land). The system was in wide use by the time of Domesday and a late Saxon origin is likely, though the system continued to develop in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Faith 1997, 57–8; Lewis et al 2001, 9–11).

New manors could be created by a variety of means: through subdivision between heirs or heiresses; through subinfeudation, whereby a lord granted part of an existing manor to another person, to hold as a dependent manor; or through the gift of land to churches and monasteries. However in the late thirteenth century these mechanisms were limited by a series of statutes: Mortmain 1279 (stopping the unauthorised alienation of land to the church), De donis conditionalibus 1285 (regulating inheritance) and Quia emptores terrarum 1290 (stopping sub-infeudation) (Titow 1969, 62). Although these processes undoubtedly added to the multiplicity of manors in East Anglia, they are not the root cause of its manorial complexity.

The complexity is already apparent in Domesday Book, where villas in divided ownership are commonplace in this region. The holdings are often expressly stated to be manors (the formula is usually: x holds y amount of land ‘as a manor’), but not always. In some cases the manors were large and are likely to conform to the ‘classical’ image of a manor (Titow 1969, 18–19), whereas others were small and must approximate to single farms. Over the next two hundred years or so, some of these ‘unmanorial’ holdings evolved into small manors, while others were absorbed by neighbouring larger manors. Some of the smaller Domesday ‘manors’ were similarly absorbed or attached to other larger holdings.

In many areas it is possible to identify ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ manors. The primary manors were large and occupied more than 50% of the land of their vills. They had large demesnes, which frequently occupied the locally best land and their manorial halls frequently lay in a central position beside the church in a ‘hall and church complex’. The primacy of some manors seems to find confirmation in a survey of the lands of Bury St Edmunds Abbey (S), c.1279–80, called the Iter of Saloman of Rochester, which has a standard reference to the ‘chief lord’ (capitalis dominus) of each vill surveyed, even though lands of other lords may be mentioned (Pinchbeck
common fields. Other places fell within these two blocks of exclusively demesne land, with nothing in tenants in common fields, whereas, at the other extreme, at some places, e.g. Worstead (N), the demesne consisted of differences in the way that demesne land was organised. In this study, the terms 'core block demesne' and 'detached block demesne' have been used to differentiate between these two types of demesne. At Ardeley (H), the detached block demesne is referred to as a 'berewick' in the twelfth century (see below). In several instances (South Elmham St Michael, Great Henny, Felsted, Ingatestone and Ardeley) there are indications that the areas of detached block demesne originated as areas of woodland that was subsequently converted to farmland.

From the fourteenth century many lords increasingly favoured long-term leasing of demesne over direct farming (Campbell 2000, 58–60). In some cases former demesne was broken up to form new customary holdings. This means that demesne can be under-represented in the earliest maps, which are usually sixteenth- or seventeenth-century in date. Sixteenth-century breaking up of demesne land to form new customary holdings is documented in the Great Henny (E) case study.

iv. Berewick and wick
Literally, in Old English, a bere-wic or ‘barley farm’, but this had developed the sense of ‘an outlying farm’ before the Norman Conquest, particularly one that was dependant on an estate elsewhere (Parsons and Styles 2000, 87–8; Faith 1997, 42–7). Berewicks were an important feature in the area of the northern Danelaw and they were normally detached portions of ‘inland’ or demesne. These dependant berewicks have been interpreted as the outlying parts of ‘multiple estates’ (see above, vill). In the case studies, an area of detached block demesne at Ardeley was referred to in the twelfth century as a ‘berewick’.

As a place-name element, ‘wick’ (either by itself or in compounds) is particularly common in parts of Essex, mainly in the marshes along the Thames and the coast, and around Colchester (Reaney 1935, 569). The Essex section of Domesday Book has a particular use of the term ‘pasture for n sheep’ (pastura n oves) which is mainly found in these same coastal areas and it is likely that the wicks are these sheep pastures (Darby 1971, 241). This finds confirmation in the term bercaria ‘sheep farm’ being used sometimes to describe a wick (Reaney 1935, 594). The production of cheese from sheep’s milk was an important Essex activity and in the seventeenth century the hundreds of Tendring, Dengie and Rochford were famous for their ‘great and huge cheeses’; it is precisely these hundreds where wicks are most numerous (Darby 1971, 242; Reaney 1935, 569). The dairying link is made explicit at Wick Farm in Layer Marney, which is described as ‘the Wyke or the Dayrey’ in 1545 (Reaney 1935, 319). Wicks were not exclusively for sheep, for in 1729 there is a reference to ‘a wick or dairy of 20 cows’ in St Osyth, though in 1086 there was ‘pasture’ here for 400 sheep (Reaney 1935, 594; DB Essex 3/14 and 34/33). R.H. Britnell has drawn attention to a distinctive group of compact farms called ‘wicks’ in the Colchester area, which probably originated as appendages to large estates. In existence by the fourteenth century, they frequently had a strong pastoral element, often associated with sheep-farming on the marshes or heaths and were detached from the halls to which they belonged (Britnell 1988, 161–2).
Although not as common as in Essex, ‘wick’ occurs in over a dozen minor names in Suffolk, either by itself in the singular (The Wick, Boxted and Wick Farm, Stoke-by-Nayland) or plural form (Wyken Hall, Stanton/Bardwell (dative plural wicam), Wykes Bishop and Wykes Ufford, Ipswich) or in compounds (e.g. Eastwick Farm, Stoke Ash, Ganderwick, Thornndon and Blackwick, Hitcham). Some, in the Stour valley and on the Orwell estuary, are probably a continuation of the off the Essex marshland pattern, but others are in more inland positions. The majority are situated on the boundaries of parishes, often in association with woods or more localised marshes. This suggests that these were areas of ‘waste’ used mainly for pasture. The occurrence of a place called Manewic (Manauic) in Domesday Book is of interest because the name must be Old English gemene + wic ‘the common wick’ (DB Suffolk 1, 4/2–3, 6/19 and 2, 16/32).\(^9\) The implication being that this wick was subject to common rights of grazing. Greenwich, now swallowed up by the industrial sprawl on the south-east side of Ipswich, was Grenewic, the ‘green or pasture wick’, in 1086 and occurred as Grenewychgrene in the mid-thirteenth century (DB Suffolk 1, 8/14; SRO(I) HA93/2/41). In the nineteenth century this was Greenwich Farm, with no actual ‘green’ apparent. However the occurrence of the term ‘green’ here provides an interesting link between wicks and the common pastures called ‘greens’. It may be that in some of the wicks of the Domesday period we are seeing the first stage in the development of the common pastures that later generations called greens (see below, greens and commons) though the actual progression from a wick to a green cannot yet be fully substantiated. Greenwich’s position on the Orwell estuary suggests that it was probably, in origin, an area of sheep pasture of the Essex type.

In Norfolk, there are two places named Hardwick, one near King’s Lynn and one near Norwich, which, must be similar pasture grounds, for the name comes from hearde-wic ‘a wick for a herd’ (Smith 1956 I, 244).\(^8\) The use of ‘wick’, in the sense of a dependent farm, also occurs in Westwick, which adjoins the case study of Worstead. Westwick was included in the valuation of Tunstead in 1086 and Blomefield records it as a ‘berewick’ of Tunstead, but notes that many lordships extended into it (DB Norfolk 2, 26/5 — Westuuic; Blomefield 1810, XI, 80–2).\(^\) This suggests that it may have originated as an area of ‘waste’ in which several settlements in the Hundred of Tunstead had rights, including the case study of Worstead, which adjoins the west side of Westwick. The positioning does indeed suggest that Westwick was named in relation to Worstead. Westwick appears to have contained a considerable amount of dry, heathy ground, and it is therefore likely that its main use was as a sheep pasture.

v. Inland

The meaning seems to be ‘the inner estate’ and referred to that portion of a Saxon estate that was run for the benefit of the owner, foreshadowing the concept of demesne land. A crucial difference seems to be that the inland was inhabited (in the sense of tenants or workers) whereas the demesne was the lord’s uninhabited home farm (Faith 1997, 49). Inland is referred to in documents by about the tenth century, particularly associated with royal and church estates, where it had a privileged status, most notably an exemption from geld payments, in this it was the opposite of ‘warland’ (Faith 1997, 15–55).\(^1\) In some areas, at least, this exemption was later widened to include other demesnes held ‘in hand’ by tenants-in-chief, but the extent of this is debatable (Faith 1997, 54–5; Roffe 2000, 237). Domesday makes mention of some of these geld-free lands, but none are recorded in East Anglia, except for one example at Colchester in Essex (Faith 1997, 268). In Essex the term is said to have been used for pieces of demesne land rented to villeins (Adams 1976, 18). Areas of detached inland were sometimes referred to as ‘berewicks’.

vi. Bordland

This term seems to have been largely synonymous with ‘inland’ and referred to land that served the lord’s table (from Old English bord ‘a board, a table’, Parsons et al 1997, 127–8) (Winchester 1986). Rosamond Faith has suggested an etymological link with the term ‘bordar’ (bordarius) (Faith 1997, 72). This term is mainly recorded in Domesday where it is used for a sizeable group of smallholders that appear to be the same as cottarii ‘cottagers’ (the more usual term for this class in later surveys). Others see the derivation as being from Old French bord ‘a cottage’ (Parsons et al 1997, 128). There are some explicit links between bordars and inland but it is not an exclusive link. The inland was probably populated by a group of workers that included slaves and bordars/cottars, who owed heavy labour services to the lord, but might also hold small pieces of land for themselves (typically between five and eight acres) (Faith 1997, 73–4). Bordars also occur in Domesday attached to sokemen and therefore presumably could occur on lesser holdings away from the lord’s demesne.

In the case studies, bordland appears to be evidenced by a place-name at Ingatestone (E).

vii. Warland

This term refers to land which owed wara or ware. Old English waru means ‘defence or guard’ and by extension the term was used for land that owed geld payments for its obligations to public defence and administration (Stenton 1910, 4; Faith 1997, 91). The geld payments were assessed on the hundred (notionally a hundred ‘hides’ or, in East Anglia, ‘carucates’). In Norfolk and Suffolk the assessment was further divided up amongst groups of vills known as ‘lettes’ (Hart 1992, 83–93; Williamson 1993a, 131–2; Warner 1996, 159–65); each vill within a lete paid a share and within each vill the obligation to pay was laid on the ware acres. In some places, as on the Ely and Ramsey abbey estates, the geld payments were payable to the manorial lord and not to the king direct (Stenton 1910, 12). In origin, the holders of ware acres were probably freemen or sokemen, but by the time of Domesday they included villani ‘villeins’ as well, each of whom had a holding that reflected a subdivision of the geld payment due. The ‘warland’ is held to be the antithesis of the ‘inland’, the inhabitants of the warland being freer than those of the inland and having larger land holdings; except in its explicit linkage to geld, warland can be regarded as synonymous with ‘outland’ (see below). D.C. Douglas thought that the terminology of ware acres (acras de wara, acras de ware or akyrwar) was archaic from the thirteenth century and noted that in East Anglia it mainly appeared
on the lands of the abbeys of Bury St Edmunds and Ely (Douglas 1927, 96–7; Feudal Documents 1932, cxxiv–v).

In the case studies, holdings rated in ware acres were noted at Worlingworth (S), Great Henny (E), Sutton (S) and Felsted (E).

viii. Tenanted land, gavolland, outland or terra villanorum

_Utland_ ‘the out land’ was the Saxon counterpart of ‘inland’ and indicated that part of an estate held by tenants in return for rent or tribute to the lord; in most respects it was the same as ‘warland’ (see above). _Utland_ or _gavolland_ (land that paid gafol, i.e. rent or tribute) is mentioned in various places around AD 1000 (Faith 1997, 30–1, 105–6; Adams 1976, 24–5).19 In Domesday this was the _terra villanorum_ or ‘land of the villeins’ (Faith 1997, 114; Smith 1956, II, 34). In medieval times this was the land of the tenants of a manor. Holdings were sometimes defined in regular units variously called, virgates, yardlands, ‘full lands’, etc or more loosely in ‘lands’ or ‘tenements’ (see below). There was also an important distinction between land that was free and unfree (for a more detailed discussion of free and unfree tenures, see Bailey 2002, 25–37).

• **Free land.** The tenants of free land paid cash rents for their holdings but owed few services to the manorial lord other than attendance at the manor court. Significantly, the holders of free land were also personally free and this had important social implications. Free holdings could be of ancient origin, such as those belonging to the free men (_liberi hominii_) recorded in Domesday Book, or could be created through later assarting or, as an especial favour, by the lord’s grant. Because of their limited manorial obligations, free holdings had a tendency to drift away from manorial control and are frequently under-represented in manor court records. In some cases, free holdings became, by repute or in actuality, manors themselves.

• **Bond, customary, villein, or copyhold land.** The holders of this type of land also owed cash rents (frequently higher than those for free land), but also onerous labour services, later commuted for money payments. Unfree tenants also had their corn for their lord’s mill, they might also have to serve from time to time as a manorial officer or servant, such as a reeve, ploughman or shepherd. Land that owed labour services is frequently described as _terra operaria_ or ‘workland’. Tenants of this type of land were also personally unfree and were referred to by a number of different names: bondmen (bondi), customary tenants (customarii), villeins (villani), sometimes with their inherent unfree status being emphasised by the term ‘serf by blood’ (_nativus de sanguine_).20 Holders of small pieces of land were often described as bordars (bordarii) and cottars (cottarii) in the Domesday period, but mainly as cottars in later documents (cotmanni ‘cot-men’ and smalmanni ‘small men’ were also recorded in Felsted (E) in 1223/4). Unfree holdings were much more frequently defined in terms of regular units, such as virgates, than were free ones. Unfree tenure declined after the Black Death as tenants were able to exploit the shortage of manpower by either migrating to a more sympathetic lord or by forcing concessions from an existing one. By the sixteenth century it had all but disappeared, though some examples of claimed ‘serfs by blood’ do occur — for instance, the manumission of bondsman is recorded at Swanton Morley (N) in 1567 (NRO MS 20015, 123x3). In the fifteenth century former customary holdings became known as ‘copyhold’ land, in that the tenants’ written title to their lands was a copy of the entry in the manor court rolls which recorded their formal ‘admission’ to those lands. Copyhold tenure was finally abolished in 1926.

• **Molland.** The _malmanni_ (molmen) were an intermediate category between the free and customary tenants, in that they were unfree tenants who paid rent (Late Old English _mal_ ‘rent’) for their lands (called _molland_) rather than performing the onerous labour services usually associated with customary holdings (Adams 1976, 19). Molland was recorded in the Sutton (S) and Walsham-le-Willows (S) case studies. In both they probably indicate a later group of holdings than the villein holdings with labour services.

ix. Glebe

The glebe (_Latin gleba_ ‘soil, land’) was the land provided for the support of a resident parish priest. It normally consisted of a dwelling house and a quantity of farm land. The original endowment was probably made when the church was founded, but could have been augmented with later gifts. Because the original endowment was often made by the local lord, the glebe land frequently has a close spatial relationship to demesne land. The implication in many cases is that the glebe was formed out of the demesne. Glebes varied considerably in size, but most were similar to the other agricultural holdings in their particular parishes. They were also similar in character to the other holdings, being in strips in common-field areas or closes where severality was the norm.

Detailed surveys of glebe land, known as terriers, survive in considerable numbers from the later sixteenth century onwards, with a few of earlier date. They give valuable information on the changing nature of farmland over the centuries, as David Dymond has recently demonstrated in his excellent study of glebe in West Suffolk (Dymond 2002).

An important aspect of glebe land was its resistance to change — as David Dymond put it, ‘the parson’s glebe, in a sense, was the last surviving medieval tenement in the modern landscape’ (Dymond 2002, 91). Glebe land in strips tended to remain un consolidated long after the other strips had been amalgamated, often surviving to be recorded on nineteenth-century tithe maps. These relic strips are sometimes the only surviving clues as to the former presence of common fields. Often these strips existed in memory alone, being lost in the consolidated blocks of other owners. Such strips were sometimes known as ‘quillets’ (Adams 1976, 88–9).

x. Greens, commons and tyes

These are all terms used for areas of common pasture. _Green_ is derived from Old English _grene_ meaning the colour green and, by extension, a grassy area, in particular a piece of public or common grazing land. In the latter sense it is not documented before 1300, though it occurs in a very few place-names of the late eleventh century, such
as Mangreen in Norfolk (Manegrena 1086), becoming more widespread in the thirteenth century (Smith 1956, I, 209; DB Norfolk 9/193). Common comes from Latin commune, -ia, meaning something held in common, developing the meaning of a piece of unenclosed land or ‘waste’ belonging to a manor by the twelfth century. Tye is derived from Old English teag, meaning a small enclosure, but in south Suffolk, Essex and Kent it developed, from at least the thirteenth century, the meaning of a common pasture (Hoskins and Stamp 1963; Martin 1995). Until recently the terms have, to a certain extent, been interchangeable. The term tye, however, is not found north of the River Gipping in Suffolk (Martin 1999a, 62–3).

In the Middle Ages common land was normally owned by the lord of the manor, but was subject to the common rights of some or all of his tenants. Some common land could be shared by more than one manorial lord, as is Mellis Green (S) (Mellis Common Advisory Committee 1994). Other commons could have even wider groups of right holders. On the large Greshaw Green (196 acres) in the parishes of South Elmham St Cross and St James (S) there were 177 common rights (and a quarter — a right claimed every fourth year) in the eighteenth century, belonging to the inhabitants of the four parishes of South Elmham St Cross, St James, St Margaret and St Nicholas. The most important right was ‘common of pasture’ — the right to graze animals. These rights were usually attached to particular land-holdings or tenements (rather than to the tenants themselves) and specified exactly how many animals of a particular type (cattle, sheep, geese etc.) could be grazed. In Suffolk, the rights were called ‘beast-goings’ at Bungay, ‘stints’ at Kelsale, ‘shares’ at Greshaw Green in South Elmham, and ‘cattle gates’ and ‘geese rights’ at Bedfield Long Green. The grazing rights were strictly regulated by the manorial communities and could include limitations as to when grazing could take place. At West Harling (N) bosage was payable at the annual rate of a penny a head ‘for all cows and great cattle that feed on the commons’ and the same for ‘every 10 sheep of the cullet, that laid in the lord’s fold’ (Blomefield 1805, 1, 299). Other common rights, such as estover (the right to take small branches, gorse or bracken for fuel and animal litter), turbary (the right to dig peat for fuel), bote (the right to take timber to make or repair ploughs, houses etc.) might also exist. The tenants might also have ‘common in the soil’ — the right to take sand, gravel or stone. In some places intercommoning existed, where two or more communities had rights on the same piece of land, as at Button Haugh Green (S) where four parishes (Elmswell, Ashfield, Hunston and Norton) shared common rights (Dymond 1968, 41–2).

Not all common pastures had the same nature and character and it is possible to identify a number of sub-types in East Anglia.

**Type 1 (droves)**

These are roads with wide verges that were used for common grazing. They often connect other areas of common grazing, as at South Elmham (S) where a broad drove runs between St Margaret’s Green and All Saints’ Common. There is mention of a viridie via ‘green-way’ in an extent of Rumburgh (S) of the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century (SRO(L) HA12 Add.741/30).

Occurred in all the case studies, except Swanton Morley (N), Scole (N), Thorpe Parva (N) and Worlingworth (S).

**Type 2 (small greens)**

These small areas are frequently no more than a small area of ‘waste’ around a crossroad and their form is frequently determined by the number of roads that join — a triangle around three roads being particularly common. Occurred in all but five of the case studies: South Elmham St Michael (S), Scole (N), Thelveton (N), Thorpe Parva (N) and Worlingworth (S).

**Type 3 (medium to large greens)**

These substantial areas of common pasture are normally sited on water-retentive clay soils on elevated plateaux. Where there are wide and flat interfluves there was a tendency for large greens, such as the 530-acre former Allwood Green in north Suffolk. Greens frequently have substantial ditched boundaries, around which are sited farmsteads and cottages. Greens occurred in all but five of the case studies: Worstead (N), Swanton Morley (N), Thorpe Parva (N), Great Henny (E) and Sutton (S).

**Type 4 (wet soil commons)**

This can be divided into three sub-types:

- **Type 4a (riverside commons)**. These are sited on wet, often peaty, soils beside rivers. They are usually linear in form. In the case studies, this type was only found at Worstead, Swanton Morley, Scole and Frenze, all in Norfolk.

- **Type 4b (fen commons)**. These are sited on larger areas of wet peaty or silty soil, as on the western margins of Norfolk and in north-west Suffolk. These could be very large, extending over thousands of acres.

- **Type 4c (coastal and estuarine marsh commons)**. Sited on areas subject to regular or occasional inundations of sea water, or adjoin such land. These occur all around the East Anglian coast. This type would include a number of the ‘wicks’ on the Essex coast, though these are a mixture of common and several pastures (see above, ‘berewick and wick’).

**Type 5 (common heaths)**

These are areas of dry pasture on sandy or chalky soils. Some of the heath commons in Breckland and the Sandlings contained thousands of acres (e.g. Lakenheath Warren (S) had 2,328 acres). In the case studies, this type was only found at Worstead (N) and Sutton (S).

**Type 3 commons or ‘greens’, with their girdles of houses are the most important in terms of settlement.** Place-name evidence, both nationally and locally, suggests that greens were rare before the twelfth century. The archaeological evidence from Suffolk, mainly from the fieldwalking of deserted sites around the margins of greens, as was done by Mike Hardy around Greshaw Green in South Elmham and by Edward Savery around Rush Green in Bardwell/Stanton, also suggests a twelfth-century starting point for green-edge settlements (Martin et al 1986, 148–50; Martin et al 1991, 264). Fieldwalking around greens in Norfolk has produced similar results, with the late eleventh or twelfth centuries being suggested as the starting point there (Wade-Martins 1980, 86–8; Davison 1990, 71–2). The presence of Saxo-
Norfolk, however, has led Tom Williamson to suggest that common-edge settlement was already taking place by the time of Domesday (Williamson 1993a, 169). A large part of the dating problem is the ‘obscure’ ending of the Thetford Ware tradition. John Hurst originally suggested that it ended in the twelfth century and the early twelfth is perhaps the best advance on that dating (Hurst 1957, 29; Rogerson and Dallas 1984, 123 and 126). Andrew Rogerson’s fieldwalking in Fransham (N) produced thirteen sites on or near common edges that he dated to the eleventh century, thirty-eight sites of the twelfth century and fifty-three of the thirteenth century (Rogerson 1996, 62). This suggests a gradual start somewhere in the eleventh century, but much greater activity in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

However earlier dates have been suggested by some scholars. In Suffolk, Peter Warner has suggested a ninth- or tenth-century origin, but this rests too heavily on a couple of associations with late Saxon metalwork. It also confuses the evidence for settlements on the peripheries of parishes (or actually straddling the boundaries) some of which were certainly in existence by 1086, with the evidence for undoubted greens (Warner 1987, 17–18). In Cambridgeshire, Susan Oosthuizen has used topographic analysis to suggest that commons there originated in the early or middle Saxon periods, or even earlier (Oosthuizen 1994; 1998, 100). In the case studies, greens were found to appear, in documentary terms, between the early thirteenth century (1235 at Felsted) and the early fifteenth century.

The only ‘green’ in East Anglia to be mentioned in Domesday Book is Mangreen in Norfolk, just south of Norwich, where one free man and a half held 33 acres. The name is clearly Old English gemæn + grene, ‘the common green’, but confusingly, Mangreen does not now appear to have a green. The Old English term for common land, gemene + lanede, occurs as early as AD 849 in the description of the boundary of an estate in north Worcestershire, but it is not clear whether this was common arable land or pasture. A charter of AD 961, however, explicitly refers to an open common pasture on an estate in Oxfordshire (Hooke 1989, 21). This makes it clear that the concept of common land was current in late Saxon England. The Suffolk section of Domesday Book has only one reference to a common pasture (pastura communis), which was at an unspecified place in the Hundred of Colneis (in the Felixstowe peninsula) and was for all the men of the hundred. This may well have been a coastal marshland pasture of the ‘wic’ type discussed above (see ‘berewick and wick’). In the Domesday period, wic and grene may have been interchangeable terms for an area of marginal or detached pasture that was largely unenclosed and subject to multiple rights. In which case, Mangreen may have been identical in meaning to Manwick (see above, ‘berewick and wick’). In this sense, the Domesday grene is ancestral to the later meaning of ‘green’, not its equivalent.

Greens tend to be located on land with poor natural drainage, often on the periphery of their parishes, suggesting that they are secondary features in the medieval landscape. They share the same topographical locations as woods and quite a number of greens actually have ‘wood’ names, e.g. Norwood Green in Craftfield (S). This suggests that some greens, at least, arose from the felling of woods or the over-grazing of wood-pasture, as can be demonstrated at Breachwood in King’s Walden, Hertfordshire. What had been a wood in 1300 was converted, through the felling of the best trees (in 1333) and then by intensive grazing, into an open green by the end of that century (Roden 1968). A progression from a common wood to a green is suggested by Manwood Green (Man(e)wode(s)grene 1272) in Hatfield Broad Oak (E), for the name means ‘the green at the common wood’ (Reaney 1935, 41). A similar progression from Handley Wood to Mill Green can be seen in the Ingatstone case study.

The fast-growing population in the two hundred years or so before the Black Death resulted in great pressure to take into cultivation former areas of ‘waste’, including woodland and wood-pasture. The Statute of Merton, 1236, allowed manorial lords to enclose and improve wastes, so long as they left sufficient common grazing for their free tenants, whose rights they could not extinguish (Statutes 1810 I, 2–3; Titow 1969, 205). It seems likely that greens were, in effect, such areas of reserved common grazing, established when the surrounding waste was converted into farmland. It is likely that the land least suitable for arable conversion would have been chosen for the common pastures.

Settlement shifts associated with the foundation of greens have been demonstrated in Norfolk and similar movements occurred in Suffolk (Wade-Martins 1975, 141–3). At Ixworth Thorpe, a settlement suggested by a scatter of Saxo-Norman pottery in a field adjacent to the now isolated Norman church, seems to have moved in the twelfth century some 700m northward to Thorpe Green, where a new moated manor house was built (Martin et al. 1994, 205–7). At Worlingworth (S) there is such a degree in the regularity of the landholdings on the former Great Green that deliberate planning looks likely. This was owned by the great abbey of Bury St Edmunds, which is notable for its early town planning activities (Ferne 1998; Gauthiez 1998). Regularity is also apparent at two other greens owned by this abbey: Melford Green, Long Melford and The Green, Palgrave. In the case studies, the regular shape of the greens at Scole and Thelveton (N) also suggests that they were planned creations.

2. Land units

i. Carucate or hide

The carucate (Latin carucata, a derivative of car(r)uca ‘a plough’) was a unit used in Norfolk and Suffolk for the assessment of geld payments and, notionally, represented 120 acres. The acres were therefore fiscal ones, rather than actual ones (see below: acre). In Domesday Book, the quantification of land in carucates is a unique feature of the Norfolk and Suffolk sections (Darby 1971, 108; Hesse 2000a, 5). The term carucate is occasionally used in the other eastern counties to mean a unit of 120 acres, but sometimes, apparently, 360 acres in Essex18 (Fisher 1968, 7; Adams 1976, 3–4). The more usual term in Essex, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire, as elsewhere in England (and occasionally in Norfolk and Suffolk, especially before the Norman Conquest), was a ‘hide’. A hide (Old English hid) was, originally, the amount of land needed to support one free family and its dependants, being related to hitwan ‘a household’ (Smith 1956, 1, 246–7). Dr Hart has argued that the transformation of the
hide from an actual agricultural unit to an assessment unit based on arable capacity took place in the first half of the tenth century and that, furthermore, these new hides were divided into virgates which became sub-units of geld assessment (Hart 1992, 294–303). A hide of 120 acres is specified in the will of Ealdorman Ælfgar of Essex (AD 946–51) and this is the usual size for a hide (Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 8–9; Adams 1976, 7).

Other pre-Conquest cognates of the hide found in East Anglia, and other parts of England, are the cas(s)atus (plurals cas(s)atus) and this is the usual size for a hide (Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 8–9; Adams 1976, 7).

Pre-Conquest cognates of the hide found in East Anglia, and other parts of England, are the cas(s)atus (plurals cas(s)atus) and this is the usual size for a hide (Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 8–9; Adams 1976, 7). Other pre-Conquest cognates of the hide found in East Anglia, and other parts of England, are the cas(s)atus (plurals cas(s)atus) and this is the usual size for a hide (Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 8–9; Adams 1976, 7).

The term hide was also used in a number of areas of England, the Domesday record indicates that there was a system of assessing vills in multiples or fractions of five hides and traces of this practice can also be found in Essex (Darby 1971, 220, 274; Roffe 2000, 61; Leaver 1988). This practice has its roots in the Anglo-Saxon concept of a tax on land held by thegn, and then by extension as the unit for assessing military obligation (Faith 1997, 158). Among the case studies, Felsted (E) was assessed at five hides in 1086 and this was used for a quarter of a hide (i.e. 30 acres) where it represented a quarter (a rood) of every acre in the hide (120 acres).

In the first sense, it is occasionally mentioned in the Norfolk section of Domesday Book (DB Norfolk 8.6 and 13.16). In the second sense it would seem to have originated in a common field environment and the term is of frequent occurrence in the Midlands from the time of Domesday onwards (Gray 1915, 345–7; Douglas 1927, 67). It is common in the Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire sections of Domesday Book, and reasonably so in the Essex section, but is almost completely absent from the Norfolk and Suffolk sections. D.C. Douglas thought that the term was an ‘exotic’ import to East Anglia and was being used there in a rather different sense to mean a holding that was of a regular size (Douglas 1927, 67). As discussed above (see 2.1, carucate or hide) standardised units of approximately 30 acres, called mansi or hobae, were a feature of the Frankish farming system from the eighth century and it is highly likely that the English and the Continental systems are related (Nitz 1988a, 251).

The terms virgate and yardland are found occasionally in the twelfth- and thirteenth-century documents of Suffolk and Norfolk, but are more frequently found in Cambridgeshire, Essex and Hertfordshire. The northern equivalents of the virgate, the bovate and oxgang, hardly occur in East Anglia, though some other terms were used there in a comparable way. The term eriuing (or eruing) is recorded at two places in Norfolk (Martham and Wimbotsham) and is derived from Old English eriuing ‘ploughing’ (Hudson 1919b, 277–8; Douglas 1927, 37; Campbell 1980, 178). At several places in Norfolk (Brancaster, Hindringham, Hindolveston, Ludham, Newton, Potter Heigham, Ringstead, Southwood and Wymondham) the term landsetlegium or lancectagium is used, a Latinisation of Old English land-sætte ‘land-dwellers’ (Cartularium Monasterii 1884–93, I 423, III 261–4; Hudson 1919a, 192; Douglas 1927, 37, 40–1). The term landsetles occurs at Horstead in Norfolk c. 1170 (Charters and Custumals 1982, 51 and 53). The root-term, landsethlon ‘land settlers’ also occurs in pre-Conquest Norfolk at Marlford (Cartularium Saxonicum 1885–93, III 217, there identified as ‘Marthingford, Suffolk’). At Troston and Timworth in Suffolk, the term sifta (or dzifte) was used c. 1186–8 to describe a division of a carucate, and would seem to be a derivative of Old English scifan ‘to separate into shares, to divide’. Five sifths were said to equal one carucate, implying that a sift equalled 24 acres; but the same source also states explicitly that half a sift contained 30 acres. The answer seems to be that the carucate was made up of ware acres (see above, warland) and there is here an indication that two ware acres equalled five ‘normal’ acres (Kalender Abbot Sampson 1954, 7 and 43–4). However these regular units in East Anglia were more normally described as plenae terrae or fulllands (‘full lands’) or integrae terrae (‘whole lands’).

Although on any one manor the subdivisions were of a regular size, there is a wide variation from manor to manor, sometimes on a regional basis. At Outwell (N), Terrington (N), Walsoken (N) it contained 80 acres, at Lawshall (S) 50 acres; at Bridgham (N) and Northwold (N) it had 48 acres; at Glemsford (S) it contained 32 acres; at Felsted (E), Walpole (N), Hartest (S) and Monks Eleigh
(S) it had 30 acres; at Dereham (N), Gressenhall (N), and Walton (N) it had 24 acres; at Pulham (N), Felwell (N), Wetheringsett (S), Barking (S), Hitcham (S), Rattlesden (S) it had 20 acres; at Hindolveston (N) it had 18 acres; at Flockthorpe (N) and Shipdham (N) it had 16 acres; at Hindringham (N) and Newton (N) it had 14 acres; at Brancaster (N), Martham (N) and Wimbotsham (N) it had 12 acres (Gray 1915, 345; Hudson 1919a, 192; Douglas 1927, 24, 37; Dodwell 1967, 56–8; Harvey 1984, 8, 36). In general terms, there was a trend towards units based on ten in Suffolk, while in Norfolk units based on twelve seem to have been preferred, though units based on eight, seven and six also occurred in both areas (Dodwell 1967, 56; Harvey 1984, 10). Although frequently encountered in Essex and Hertfordshire, the virgate there is seldom defined, except as a whole or a fraction.24 The manor of Ardeley Bury (H), for example, had half yardlands in 1297, while the yardlands of the manor of Felsted Bury (E) were subdivided into halves and quarters by the sixteenth century. The assumption is that these were units of 30 acres, representing a quarter of a standard hide of 120 acres. Little Domesday, for example, alternately refers to the holding of Gilbert son of Solomon at Felsted in 1086 as a virgate and as 30 acres (DB Essex, 15/1, 73/1).

Despite these references to size, it seems that these are purely notional units, the apparent regularity being related originally to the assessment for the payment of geld, but later also for assessing rents (Harvey 1984, 11; Faith 1997, 115–16). These regular units are mainly recorded in documents of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a period when geld payments were still a live issue (Harvey 1984, 9–10).

It is sometimes possible to point out a correlation between the numbers of these regular units in particular vills or manors and the number of tenants of the same estate, as recorded in Little Domesday. Such correspondence almost certainly indicates that important elements of the Domesday estate structure were still being recognised. The manor of Worlingworth (S), for example, had sixteen 12-acre tenements and fourteen 6-acre tenements in 1355. These correspond in number with sixty villeins and fourteen bordars of the estate in 1086 (Warner 1987, 35). A similar thirteenth- to early fourteenth-century naming horizon is also apparent at Hitcham (S) (Martin 2000, 5). Thirteenth- to fourteenth-century naming horizons for tenements were found in the case studies at South Elmham St Michael, Scole, Worlingworth, Sutton, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows, with some evidence for an earlier twelfth- to thirteenth-century horizon at Felsted. Although these studies do not actually date the creation of the tenements, they do indicate their existence by the thirteenth century.

iv. Acre

Crucial to descriptions of the size of land units, the word ‘acre’ has unfortunately three different meanings: the customary or field acre, the measured acre and the fiscal acre (Gray 1915, 373–93; Harvey 1984, 9). In origin, Old English *æcer* had the sense of ‘the amount of land that could be ploughed in a day’, in other words a cultivated strip in a field, and this broad meaning characterises the first type of acre. The field acre (acre campestres) or ‘acre as it lies’ (acre ut lacent) was therefore a strip of ploughed land reckoned to contain an acre, though in fact these strips, by measurement, frequently contained less than an acre (see below 4.ix) (Jones 1979, 10–11). A ‘daywork’ can be a term for the ploughing service relating to such a strip of land, however a ‘daywork’ or a ‘daywork land’ can also be a small unit of land. In Essex, Kent and Sussex it was reckoned to contain 4 perches (i.e. a tenth of a rood or a fortieth of an acre). These small units seem frequently to have been used as house-plots (Adams 1976, 5; Fisher 1942–5, app.III, 93–6).25

A measured acre was held to be 4 x 40 rods or perches (i.e. 4 rods in breadth and 40 perches or a ‘furlong’ in length), but the rod could be of varying sizes (Adams 1976, 2, 9). By the end of the thirteenth century a statutory...
rod or perch was held to contain 16.5 feet (5.0m), but in actuality rods could still vary from about 15 feet to 24 feet (A. Jones 1979, 13).29

A statute acre therefore contains 43,560 sq.ft or 4,840 sq.yds (0.4ha), but in the field this theoretical size was only roughly applied, so there is often a wide discrepancy between stated acreages in medieval documents and their actual size.

Finally, as noted above under virgates, acres were also used in a purely notional way for apportioning liability to pay geld. There may have been an attempt to match reality with theory, but it is unlikely that the regular units were anything more than roughly equal in size. In Hitcham (S) in 1251, it can be demonstrated that the acreages given for the demesne do relate quite closely to actual land units which are identifiable on modern maps. But on the tenanted lands, where the acreages are expressed as whole or parts of virgates, no such correspondence is apparent (Martin forthcoming).

3. Field organisation

i. Two- or three-course (or field) systems, shifts and fallows

In a two-course system, the land was cropped one year and left fallow the next. Medieval farming relied on regular fallowing of the arable land to restore fertility, to cleanse the land of weeds and, where pasture was in short supply, to provide grazing for animals. A three-course rotation allowed more variation and, potentially, an intensification in land use. It commonly consisted of:

- winter corn (autumn-sown wheat or rye), harvested the following summer and followed by a winter fallow.
- spring corn (spring-sown barley, oats, peas, beans or vetches), harvested in summer.
- one year fallow, when the land would be repeatedly ploughed or ‘stirred’ to cleanse it of weeds. Sometimes called a summerley or summerland.

In actuality, rotations could be more complex than this, often regionally varied and sometimes with grassland interludes, called ley(s), that might last for three or four years (Kerridge 1967, 41–180).

Crop rotations have probably been practised since prehistoric times and certainly from the Roman period (Barker 1985, 46). A specific three-course rotation was recorded at the monastery of St Gallen in south-west Germany in AD 763 and other examples are recorded, around the same time, in the Loire area of France; by the tenth century they were to be found across a wide area of north-west Europe, including England (Slicher van Bath 1966, chapter 3; Nitz 1988a; Renes 1988, 164). In the Lechfeld area of south Germany, H.-J. Nitz has suggested that common fields were introduced by the Merovingian state after the Frankish conquest, c.AD 743, as part of the re-organisation of the landscape for Frankish ‘peasant-soldier colonists’. In his view the origins of the system should be sought ‘in the Frankish royal domain or domains of the imperial church (Reichskirche), especially in the large royal monasteries (Reichsklostere) which were closely linked to the crown’ (Nitz 1988b). Even in these continental heartlands fully developed common-field systems (German: Zelgensysteme) may not have come into being until the tenth century (Hildebrandt 1988) Elmhäuser and Hedwig 1993, 351–2; Verhulst 2002, 17). In these systems there were standardised farming units called mansi or hufen; for these terms and their parallels with the English 30-acre virgate units, see above, Sections 2.1–2.

Common fields in England are best known from the Midlands, where they were the dominant way of farming in the Middle Ages (Gray 1915; Orwin and Orwin 1938; Ault 1972; Hall 1995). Documentary evidence points to their existence in that area by the tenth century and David Hall, on more archaeological grounds, has suggested an origin in the eighth or ninth centuries (Hill 2000, 13; Hall 1995, 138). Typically, each village had two or three large fields that followed a two- or three-year crop rotation, giving rise to their description as two- or three-field systems (Adams 1976, 152–3). The typical peasant holding (usually called a virgate) consisted of a number of strips (between about forty and eighty) that were scattered about the fields of the village, no two strips of the same
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holding lying together. In this way all the soils, both good and bad, were equally shared. In large fields, groups of parallel strips were grouped together into unenclosed ‘furlongs’. In a common field falling could not take place on a piecemeal basis but had to be agreed for the whole field, otherwise grazing animals would stray onto crops. By having shares in each field, each holding could have land under crops and fallow each year.

Although common fields certainly did exist in East Anglia, they were frequently irregular both in the number and the size of the fields belonging to particular communities, e.g. the twelve fields at Brandon (S) (Postgate 1973, 292; Bailey 1989, 40–5). There could also be little differentiation between ‘fields’ in the Midlands sense and their subdivisions (Gray 1915, 313–14; Postgate 1973, 292–3). More fundamentally, the strips belonging to individual holdings do not seem to have been equally distributed across the fields, as they were in the Midlands. H.L. Gray gives a number of examples from Norfolk where it is apparent that holdings were concentrated in particular fields, a feature that is apparent in a 1291 survey of Martham (N), indicating that this was not just the result of later consolidation (Gray 1915, 310–25, 329–31, 335–9). This led him to the important conclusion that ‘the original tenementum in Norfolk … seems to have been either a compact area or a group of not widely separated parcels’ (Gray 1915, 341). In this they resembled the holdings in the Kentish land blocks called iuga (Gray 1915, 286). K.M. Dodd noted a similar unequal distribution of holdings at Walsham-le-Willows (S) in 1577, where the holdings were either consolidated or grouped in one part of the parish (Field Book 1974, 37, 44). Unequally distributed strips are also recorded from the common fields in Hertfordshire and Essex (Roden 1973, 343–4). This was not, however, the case in Breckland, where both M.R. Postgate and Mark Bailey have shown that the tenant holdings were evenly spread throughout the fields, perhaps as a risk-management strategy in this area of often poor and dry soils (Postgate 1962, 97–9; Bailey 1989, 50–1).

Another important conclusion, based on fifteenth-century evidence, was that ‘although a three-course rotation usually prevailed, it was not dependent on a three-field system’ (Gray 1915, 332). The underlying factor that separates the East Anglian common fields from those of the Midlands is the different arrangements for the pasturing of animals. In the Midlands, the animals were pastured together on the fallow fields, but in East Anglia Gray found widespread evidence for the separate pasturing or holding of the animals of the manorial tenants (Gray 1915, 325–8, 341–4, 350–1). The ‘field’ was therefore irrelevant to crop rotations and in D.C. Douglas’s opinion the unit of husbandry in East Anglia was the tenementum, not the field (Douglas 1927, 22–3).

Where common fields were present in the case studies, they all contained a large number of units, but nowhere was there anything approaching a formal two- or three-field system. Units with ‘field’ names were certainly present, but they were numerous (around nine at Worstead, thirteen at Ardeley, twenty-one at Dullingham etc.) and were not clearly differentiated from other units that could be called furlongs, shots, culturae, quaerentiae, stadia, iuga (at Scole), wents, wongs, crofts or closes. Most places displayed signs of an uneven distribution of holdings within the various units, e.g. at Worstead, Thelveton, Worlingworth, Sutton, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows. In these places the strips were usually concentrated in the fields nearest to the owner’s house and could be in consolidated blocks. Dullingham (C) gave the strongest indication of holdings that were evenly distributed around the fields and there was also evidence of the lands being organised into three shifts. The evidence from Scole suggested a mixture of practices: in the best fields at the southern end of Scole the fields seem to have been divided between numerous tenants, but in those on the heavier land further north there were often blocks of land in the hands of one tenant.

Where this combination of compact or closely grouped holdings, a lack of an overall cropping regime and provision for the separate pasturing of animals occurs, it is difficult to sustain the idea that these are really ‘common fields’ in anything like the Midlands sense. They appear to be fields in subdivided ownership in which some communal farming activities may or may not have taken place, depending on the varied inclinations of those holding land within a particular ‘field’. We cannot even be sure that the fields were ‘open’ and not subdivided into closes. The individual ‘pieces’ of land that appear in medieval documents could equally well have been in closes as in open fields. At Walsham-le-Willows (S), in 1343, a tenant held a quarter part of a close containing wood and pasture (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 268). That subdividing was going on in the medieval period at Walsham has been demonstrated by David Dymond, who quotes a document of 1407 which details how seven men who shared a holding of pasture in Hordsavewbrook agreed to partition it ‘so that each would know and have his own part separated from the others by a hedge and not by a ditch’ (Dymond 1974, 207). There is also a description in the 1577 survey of Walsham of a ‘close … sometime a common or open field and called Westreat Field but now devided into sondry partes with hedges and dykes’, which contained 19 acres, subdivided into eight holdings belonging to four people (Field Book 1974, 88). Hedge-dating at Walsham suggests that many of the hedges that divide the ‘wents’ (nominally the equivalents of common-field furlongs) there are likely to be medieval in date (West and McLaughlin 1998, 14). Interestingly, William Marshall, when commenting on the situation in Norfolk in 1787, stated that ‘some remants of common-fields still remain; but, in general, they are not larger than well-sized inclosures’ (Marshall 1787, 4). R.H. Britnell has also drawn attention to the occurrence of compact holdings (Colettlond 5a and Savareslonld 6a) within a larger ‘field’ (Monekdloune) at Colchester (E) in 1332 (Britnell 1988, 160).

The distinction between this type of quasi-common field with compact holdings and land farmed in severalty in tenements is very blurred. It could even be argued for places like Walsham-le-Willows, where there was partible inheritance, that this would have produced subdivided ownership even if there had once been holdings in severalty.27

This ambiguity goes some way to answer the question as to why there is conflicting evidence for the two types of farming in many areas of East Anglia, particularly in the claylands. The answer must be that the two systems were not diametrically opposed, but varied only in the degree to which an element of communality occurred in the farming. In appearance, land in the two systems may have looked remarkably similar.
The weakness of the communal aspects of these fields would have made their piecemeal enclosure an easy process. As a result many had disappeared before the period of parliamentary enclosure in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The case studies showed that in South Elmham St Michael, Worlingworth, Great Henny and Walsham-le-Willows the common fields were in a very fragmentary state by the sixteenth century. It was only in Swanton Morley (N) and Dullingham (C) that they were ended by parliamentary acts, the remainder underwent piecemeal enclosure, often in the seventeenth century. Gray suggested that in Norfolk considerable enclosure took place between 1600 and 1700 (Gray 1915, 306–8). In 1787 William Marshall, the agricultural writer, noted that east Norfolk was largely ‘old-inclosed country’, but that west Norfolk was ‘newly-enclosed’ (Marshall 1787, 4). The process of piecemeal enclosure in Norfolk was described by Nathaniel Kent in 1794:

There is still a considerable deal of common field land in Norfolk, though much less proportion than in many other counties; for notwithstanding common rights for great cattle exist in all of them, and even sheep-walk privileges in many, yet the natural industry of the people is such, that wherever a person can get four or five acres together, he plants a white thorn hedge round it, and sets oaks at every rod distance, which is consented to by a kind of general courtesy from one neighbour to another (Kent 1794, 22).

These quasi-common fields contrast with those where there was an even spread of holdings and more developed common farming practices, as in Breckland. This difference was probably an important factor in the longer survival of common fields in that area than in other parts of East Anglia. Late enclosure was also a feature of north Norfolk and northern Hertfordshire (Yelling 1977, 28).

The single term ‘common field’ can therefore be seen to conceal wide and important variations in farming practice. I therefore propose a subdivision into at least three types:

Type 1
This was the archetypical system of the Midlands, where the arable land of the settlements lay in two or three large fields, subdivided into furlongs and cropped and folded on a communal basis. All holdings, including demesne and glebe, consisted of strips equally distributed across the fields. Ridge-and-furrow is a normal ‘type-fossil’. Enclosure was normally effected through parliamentary acts.

Type 2
Like Type 1, this type was usually the dominant arable farming system within individual settlements and the systems frequently needed parliamentary acts to extinguish them. However the number of fields was very variable and there was often confusion in the terminology between ‘fields’ and their subdivisions. Ridge-and-furrow only sporadically occurs. This lack of ridge-and-furrow is not so much the result of erosion, but of different methods of ploughing, particularly ‘stetch’ ploughing, which produced low ridges which were not permanent features (see below). Within this type it is possible to distinguish two sub-types:

• Type 2A: in this sub-type the strips belonging to individual holdings tend towards an equal distribution across the fields. It also tended to have some form of communal cropping and folding arrangements. In terms of the case studies, this sub-type was probably present at Worstead (N) and Sutton (S) suggesting that it occurred in eastern Norfolk and eastern Suffolk.

Type 2B: in this sub-type the strips belonging to each holding tend to be clustered in the vicinity of the holder’s house and there is less evidence for communal cropping and folding arrangements. In terms of the case studies, this sub-type was probably present at Worstead (N) and Sutton (S) suggesting that it occurred in eastern Norfolk and eastern Suffolk.

Type 3
This type is much more difficult to categorise. In many places it had largely disappeared by the sixteenth century and the surviving records are often imprecise about its nature and prevalence. The common field(s) also usually form a minority part of the farmland of individual settlements, normally well under 50% of the parish areas. It seems to have had poorly-developed communal cropping and folding arrangements, with a tendency for holdings to be concentrated in the fields nearest to the farmstead to which they belong, rather than being evenly distributed across all the fields. The impression is frequently one of subdivided closes rather than true common fields. There was little consistency or uniformity in the naming of the units, some may be called fields in one document, but could appear as furlongs, wents or even closes in others. Parliamentary acts were seldom needed to end this type of common field. Ridge-and-furrow virtually never occurs. In the case studies, it is present at South Elmham St Michael, Worlingworth and Great Henny, probably in the main part of Ardeley and perhaps at Thelveton. This, combined with other evidence, suggests that this type of quasi-common field occurred in north-central Suffolk, south-east Norfolk, the extreme south-west of Suffolk and the Stour valley, northern Hertfordshire and perhaps in north-east Essex.

There is a linear progression in these types: Type 1 → Type 2A → Type 2B → Type 3 and a one-stop variation will often be difficult to appreciate, but a two-stop one will be much more apparent. Block holdings (see below under severity) form an extension to the series, progressing from Type 3.

iii. Severally (block and consolidated holdings)
Land held in individual or unshared ownership or tenure, as opposed to that held in common; land cultivated outside a common-field system (Adams 1976, 22; Field 1993, 19). The derivation is from medieval Latin separatis, severalis, an extension of separatus ‘separate, distinct’. Land held in severalty was usually enclosed in some way to define the limits of the separate ownership. There is therefore a very strong link between land held in severalty and enclosed land.

Land held in severalty falls into two main types.
Type A (block holdings)
Land that appears always to have been in separate ownership, there being no discernible evidence for an earlier phase of common fields. In this study these have been referred to as ‘block’ holdings. In the case studies, Felsted and Ingatestone, both in Essex, stand out as areas where all the farmland appears to have consisted of block holdings from the earliest period. R.H. Britnell has argued that ‘compact’ holdings were probably characteristic of the Hundred of Witham in central Essex from the beginnings of recorded history (Britnell 1983, 38). He also argued for the same in the Colchester area and has suggested this was typical of the lower Thames valley and most of Essex as well (Britnell 1988, 159; see also Poos 1991, 51). Hitcham in south Suffolk was also composed exclusively of block holdings by 1251 (Martin 2000, 5). Similar block holdings appear to have been present nearby at Hadleigh (S) in the fourteenth century (Dowdwell 1967, 53; Pigot 1863, app. A, 229–49). In most of the case studies, however, there was evidence for a mixture of block holdings and common field lands. In these instances, the blocks were mainly around the manorial halls and adjacent to the houses of the tenants. The blocks were smallest in the areas with Type 2 common fields, but were quite substantial where Type 3 occurred.

Type B (consolidated holdings)
These resulted from the amalgamation or ‘engrossing’ of former separate strips in common fields. Nathaniel Kent’s eighteenth-century description of this process is quoted above (see common fields). Where an individual’s strips lay close together, as in Type 3 common fields, the amalgamation process must have been relatively easy. Where the strips were more widely spread, amalgamation could frequently only be achieved through the redistribution of all the common-field land under parliamentary acts. In the case studies, the formation of the large demesne farm called Field House Farm in Swanton Morley (N) appears to be an example of a consolidated holding.

Clearly, it will not always be possible to tell whether a particular holding in severalty belongs to Type A or Type B, and in many places with original small block holdings, they will have been enlarged over time with intakes from common fields. However the percentage of land held in this way has been indirectly singled out in the 1520s as a place epitomising enclosed land by the Derbyshire writer, John Fitzherbert (c. 1460–1531): ‘Also it may fortune men wyll say that if all shulde be inclosed that ther wolde be many foule lanes as there be in Essex(e)’ (Boke of Surveyeng 1526, f. li). Their views were echoed by the agricultural poet Sir Thomas Smith (1513–77) in about 1549 defined everyerylond ‘principally inclosed’, many being described as ‘compact ring-fence farms’ (Marshall 1795, 8–9).

iv. Infield/outfield, breck, ol(d)land
In some areas there was a division of the arable land into an intensively cropped ‘infield’ and a periodically tilled ‘outfield’ that normally involved intakes from the waste of a vill. In East Anglia a variation of this system operated in Breckland. There the better land (the infield or everyyerlond) was kept in regular cultivation, while the poorer land (the outfield) was cropped more sparingly. The outfield was regarded as a permanent part of the arable, but could also be supplemented by temporary
intakes from the waste that were known as ‘brecks’ (from Old English brecc ‘breach, land broken up for cultivation’, Parsons and Styles 2000, 11). These intakes were cultivated for a short time and then abandoned to slowly recover their fertility (Postgate 1962, 91; Adams 1976, 82–3, 155–6; Bailey 1989, 57–8). The boundary of the infield and outfield in Breckland appears to have been a fluid one that disregarded furlong boundaries and was not determined by proximity to the village (Postgate 1962, 91–2). M.R. Postgate has pointed out a progression in post-medieval Breckland whereby the infield land became enclosed, the infield expanded into the outfield and the outfield into the brecks (Postgate 1962, 96; 1973, 303).

In the case studies, the term breck was encountered at Worstead (N) and Swanton Morley (N), both in situations on the edges of heaths or similar dry lands. At Swanton Morley the term old(land) also occurred in the same area as the breck names. Old(land), derived from Old English old+t+land ‘old land’, like breck, has the sense of land intermittently cultivated (Parsons et al 1997, 9; Adams 1976, 150). Old(land)s also occurred at Sutton (S), in a similar heath-edge position. At Sutton a jagged edge between some of the fields and the heath suggested that the boundary between the two was fluid and, as in Breckland, there was probably an infield/outfield/breck progression or fluctuation.

v. Folding
The penning of sheep on fallow or cropped arable land, with the particular purpose of enriching the soil with the sheeps’ dung or ‘tathé’. As Bishop Latimer put it in the mid-sixteenth century, ‘A plough-land must have sheep... to dung the ground for bearing of corn; for if they have no sheep to help fat the ground, they shall have but bare corn and thin’ (Latimer’s Sermons 1906, 215).17 The larger the flock, the more effective the enrichment, both through the quantity of dung and through the treading of it in by many hooves. Especially valuable was the transference of nutrients, via the sheep, from outlying pastures (including heaths and fens) to the arable land by grazing them on those pastures during the day and then folding them on the fallow arable land overnight.

In the Midlands system, it was normal for all the tenants to share the grazing of the fallow land and other available pastures; the number of animals kept by each tenant being proportional to their landholding (Hall 1982, 19). In East Anglia the situation was more complicated. In some areas the tenants owed the service of ‘foldage’ (faldagium in Latin) — the obligation to fold their sheep with those of their lord. The combined flock was called the ‘culet’ (derived from Old French cueilette, in the sense of ‘collection’) (Davis 1969, 404–5). The lord normally gained the greatest benefit from the folding, through concentrating the folds on demesne land (Adams 1976, 33, 43). At West Harling (N) in the eighteenth century, it was recorded that ‘Foldage is a custom of this manor, that every five sheeps that go with lord’s, whether they be of the culet or no, if the owners will not let them lie in the lord’s fold, but will fold them on their own grounds, they must pay 1d a year, each five’ (Blomefield 1805, 1, 300). There are records of this service in Domesday Book, where it is called ‘fold soke’ (soca falde or more simply ad falda ‘[they belong] to the fold’).18 A developed form of this system was the ‘foldcourse’ (see below).

vi. Foldcourse
An exclusive right to graze sheep (often expressed as a right ‘to erect a fold’, ‘liberty of fold’ or ‘foldage’) on all or a specified part of the fallow lands of the common fields, and often on adjacent permanent pastures (normally heaths or marshes) as well (Gray 1915, 325–9; Allison 1957, 19; Bailey 1989, 65; 1990, 41). The largest foldcourses tended to belong to the lords of the manors, but others could have foldcourses by grant or purchase from the lords. This was a very different arrangement to the Midlands, where the tenants shared the grazing of the fallow land (Postgate 1973, 314). Foldcourses were an important part of the farming system of Breckland, west Norfolk and north Norfolk (Allison 1957, 14). Around 1600 Sir Henry Spelman described the ‘fould-courses’ of Norfolk as being principally in the ‘champion’ districts of west and north Norfolk and maintained that they were ‘the chiefest wealth of our Country’ (John Speed’s England 1953, f.35–6).19 Foldcourses were valuable assets and their owners were opposed to the creation of individually owned closes that might interfere with their foldcourse rights, as is shown by several sixteenth-, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century disputes (Allison 1957, 27–8). Foldcourses are mentioned in the Swanton Morley (N) case study.

vii. Sheepwalk or sheep-gate
Open ground used as a sheep pasture (Adams 1976, 96). Sometimes used as a synonym for a foldcourse, as appears to have been the case at Swanton Morley (N). In the Sandlings of south-east and east Suffolk, the heaths and marshes were divided into ‘several’ or ‘common’ sheepwalks, as at Sutton (Postgate 1973, 315). Sheepwalks also existed around Saffron Walden in Essex, and were denounced by the Rev. Z. Biske of Widdington as obstacles to improvement, describing how the ‘occupiers of the manor farms’ claimed ‘to the exclusion
of all others, their rights of sheep-walk, over-running every thing, doing thereby much injury to their neighbours (particularly with their dry flocks which are driven about by a boy all summer long, to shift as they can) ... the small occupiers being thereby prevented varying their mode of cropping' (Vancouver 1795, 200). Also found at Dullingham (C), where the right was also referred to as 'sheep-gate'.

viii. Shackage

The right to pasture animals on the harvest stubble during the period known as ‘shack’ or ‘Michaelmases shack’, commonly a six-month period from 29 September to 25 March (Feast of the Annunciation) (Allison 1957, 19; Adams 1976, 44; Campbell 1980, 174–5; Bailey 1989, 66). Shackage is referred to at Swanton Morley (N).

ix. Intercommoning

The use of a common pasture (either permanent or fallow in arable fields) by more than one vill or manor (Dymond 1968, 41–2; Adams 1976, 95). In the case studies, intercommoning occurred at Worstead (N), Scole/Frenze/Thelveton (N), Great Henny (E), Felsted (E), Walsham-le-Willows (S) and Dullingham (C).

x. Waste

Derived from Latin vastus, -a, -um, meaning ‘wasteland or desert’, this term was applied to the land of a manor that was uncultivated and unallotted to any individual. It belonged to the lord of the manor, but was usually subject to the rights and claims of the tenants for grazing, fuel or building materials (Adams 1976, 97). It could consist of pasture, heath, marsh or wood. The Statute of Merton, 1236, gave lords the right to enclose waste, woods and pastures, so long as they ensured that their free tenants had ‘sufficient pasture’ and ‘sufficient ingress and egress’ from their tenements to the pasture (Statutes 1810, I 2–3; Titow 1969, 205).

The term ‘moor’ (Old English mor) was also used to mean ‘unenclosed waste’, but not necessarily with the later connotations of heathland or marshland. In the case studies, the term was found at Swanton Morley (N), Felsted (E), Ardeley (H) and Dullingham (C), where it seems to refer to areas of poorly-drained clayland.

Small-scale encroachments on the waste were usually termed purprestures, a late Middle English term derived, through French, from Latin pro + praehendere ‘to seize, take’. Examples of these were recorded in the Felsted case study.

xi. Assart

Latin essarto, assarto, literally ‘to weed or clear land’, but by extension assarting came to mean the clearing of woodland or waste land for cultivation, the process giving rise to an assartatum, essartum, essartum ‘an assart’ or piece of reclaimed land. The practice is most frequently documented in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Assarted land could either become part of the tenanted land, in common fields or as several enclosures, or part of the demesne (Adams 1976, 93). In the case studies, assarting is documented at Worlingworth (S), Felsted (E), Ingatestone (E) and Ardeley (H) in thirteenth-century contexts. The occurrence of fields called Redinge, Redyng, or Le Redingg, at Thelveton (N), Worlingworth and Felsted are also probably signs of this practice, for they are derived from Old English rydding meaning ‘a clearing or an assart’ (Smith 1956, II, 90–1).

4. Field terminology

i. Field or campus

This apparently readily-understood term is in fact one of great complexity. In origin, Germanic feld meant ‘a tract of open country’, as it still does in its descendant, the South African term veld. The Anglo-Saxons used the term as to denote open land in a more general wooded environment, and in this sense it is found in many East Anglian place-names — Ashfield, Bedfield, Wattsfield etc. (Smith 1956, II, 166–7; Martin 1999a, 50; Warner 1987, 206). In the Anglo-Saxon period it also developed the meaning of ‘land for pasture or cultivation’. In some areas, notably the Midlands, it further developed to mean ‘unenclosed land held in common for cultivation’. In the Midlands, therefore, the term ‘field’ (campus in Latin) was applied to the two or three large, roughly equal, blocks of land that made up the agricultural land of a particular vill.

In East Anglia ‘field’ was sometimes used in this developed sense, especially in the areas with Type 2 common fields, but frequently not. There are numerous examples of confusion between ‘fields’ and their supposed subdivisions (furlongs, wents, etc.) — at Norton (S) in 1561 many of the furlongs of Thurston and Church Fields were themselves called ‘fields’ (Postgate 1973, 293–4). At Walsham-le-Willows in 1321 there is mention of ‘land in the furlong called Kerfeld’ and in 1577 several of the divisions or ‘wents’ contained named fields (Lock ed. 1998, 91; Dodd ed. 1974, 59, 120, 134). At Hitcham (S) in 1251, many of the large pieces of core block demesne land, varying in size between 20 acres and 170 acres (8 to 69ha), were called campi or fields. Feld was also used for large demesne units of arable land in Essex, as at Feering in 1289 (Eldefeld 185.5a and Pyrfeld 137.5a), but could also be used for units as small as 7 acres at Eye c.1250 (land ‘in campo qui vocatur Sevenacres’) or even 2 acres, as was Blaxfeld in Witham or Cressing in 1415 (Eye Priory Cartulary I 1992, no.123; Britnell 1983, 39). At Felsted (E) in 1576 there were forty-seven entities that shared twenty-nine separate -feld names, though described indifferently as fields, crofts or closes. These ranged in size from 2 to 30 acres, though some were originally larger, e.g. Forefeld which was said to have contained 60 acres. At Ardeley (H) in 1297 there were large demesne units that mostly bore -feld names and varied in size from 41 to 96 acres (17 to 39ha).

It has been asserted that curvilinear field boundaries, in particular the reversed S or aratral shape, provide evidence for medieval ploughing with large teams and probably indicate the former presence of common fields (Eyre 1955, 86; Baker and Butlin 1973, 32). However very similar shapes are likely to have been produced on the large core block demesne fields that are documented at places like Hitcham and Ardeley.

ii. Furlong, cultura, division, iuga, precinct, quarentina, shot, stadia, went, or wong

The furlong, literally a ‘furrow-long’, was originally the length that a plough-team could plough without stopping for a rest, standardised at 40 perches or 220 yards
By extension it came to mean an area of parallel strips in a common field, sometimes approximating to a square furlong, which is 10 acres, and each of these areas usually had its own name (Adams 1976, 87). In the Midlands, a furlong was the recognised term for a subdivision of the common field. The term furlong also occurs in eastern England and there is a specific reference to a midleste forlong ‘middle furlong’ at Roydon, near Diss in Norfolk, in the will of Thurketel of Palgrave, c.1030 (Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 68–9, 179). In East Anglia there were a number of cognates for the term (Postgate 1973, 292):

- cultura — Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Hertfordshire; medieval Latin ‘a piece of cultivated land’;
- divisio — Suffolk; ‘a divided-off part’;
- iuga — Norfolk; from Latin iuga ‘yokes’ and by extension ‘a plough team of yoked animals’. In Kent the iuga was a measure of land, normally held to be a quarter of a salung, the Kentish equivalent of the hide. In Kent therefore the iuga is the equivalent of a virgate, but in Norfolk it appears to have been used as a synonym for a furlong;
- precinct — Norfolk and Suffolk; from Latin praecinctum ‘space enclosed by boundaries’. This term was also used in the Midlands for groups of furlongs bounded by roads;
- quarentina or quaurentena — Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, Hertfordshire; from Latin quaranta ‘forty’, in the sense of 40 perches, which equal one furlong. Recorded as a unit of length in both the Norfolk and Suffolk sections of Domesday Book;
- shot — Hertfordshire, Suffolk, Essex; from Old English sceart ‘a projecting piece of land’ (Smith 1956, II, 102; Field 1993, 14); John Hunter notes the use of this term on former demesne land in Essex (Hunter 2003, 40). In the Felsted (E) case study, a few ‘shot’ names were found applied to copyhold closes where there was no evidence for the former presence of common fields, but which lay adjacent to demesne land;
- stadia or stadium (both used in the singular) — Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire; from the Latin measure of length — a furlong or 220 yards;
- went — Suffolk, Essex; the etymology is usually held to be from Middle English wente ‘a path, a way’ from Old English wendan ‘to go’, however a more understandable origin might be as a derivative of (ge)wind ‘a bend’ (analogous to German wend-e ‘turn, turn round’) in the sense of a plough turn, i.e. the length travelled before a turn (Smith 1956, II, 253–4, 268). In seventeenth-century Suffolk there are several mentions of land called an ‘ownent’ or ‘unwent’, the meaning of which is unclear;
- wong — Norfolk; Suffolk; from Old Norse vangr or Old English wang ‘a garden, meadow or field’ (Smith 1956, II, 229, 245; Douglas 1927, 27–8). Vang was still used in Denmark (and ving in Sweden) for a fenced section of a large arable unit in post-medieval times (Frandsen 1988, 188). Sometimes these terms appear to have been used in the Midlands sense, but frequently they were used in a less specific way to describe the sub-units of a vill’s land, each being defined by roads, watercourses or other boundaries, without any implication that they were parts of large ‘fields’. The close relationship between these units and the roads that bounded them is brought out by the use of the term ‘went’, which means ‘a way’. These units also frequently contained pasture grounds as well as arable land.

There was also little consistency in the way the terms were employed. At Thornham Magna (S) c.1230 there is mention of land ‘in campo qui vocatur Bradewong’ (Eye Priory Cartulary I 1992, 154, no.190). At Ixworth Thorpe (S) c.1283 we find ‘the quaurentena which is called Passewong’, but at the same time Passewong is also referred to as a ‘field’ (Pakenham Cartulary 2001, 48, nos 25 and 25a). Also at Ixworth Thorpe, in the late thirteenth century, there are ‘fields’ called Longeforlong and Mkyferlong (Pakenham Cartulary 2001, 51, nos 30, 73 and 86).

The inescapable conclusion to all this is that the medieval farmers of East Anglia recognised the existence of blocks of land that were demarcated by obvious features such as roads but were unconcerned as to whether they were called fields, wongs, crofts or anything else. The reason must be because these units had no particular relevance to their cropping regimes, they only helped to locate particular pieces of land (see above, field organisation). It must also be debatable as to whether the use of these terms in East Anglia can really be taken, on their own, to prove the existence of common fields, especially as the Essex evidence suggests that a ‘shot’ (and potentially some of the other terms) could also be a subdivision of a large demesne field.

**iii. Close**

This term is derived from Latin clausum ‘an enclosed place’ and is usually understood to refer to land that had been enclosed with hedges and ditches. The term occurs at Walsham-le-Willows (S) by 1316 (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 106). In Essex, closes of 10 to 20 acres (4 to 8ha) are quite frequent in medieval documents, while the larger ones of 70 to 80 acres (28 to 32ha) were usually demesne fields (Roden 1973, 342). In 1605 there is a mention of a Great Close in East Dereham (N) which contained ‘by estimation’ 100 acres, but which was ‘nowe severed into divers inclosures’. Closes could be subdivided in ownership, as also at Walsham, where, in 1343, a tenant held a quarter part of a close containing wood and pasture (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 268).

**iv. Croft**

Old English craft meant ‘a small enclosed field’ (Smith 1956, 1, 113; Field 1993, 20–1). It was frequently employed in the legal phrase ‘croft and toft’ to denote the land occupied by a building (the toft) and an attached small field (the croft), as at Eye (S) c.1240 ‘unum crufum cum toto messuagio quod vocatur Galleustf’ (Smith 1956, II, 182; Eye Priory Cartulary I 1992, 113 no.121). The term was in use in East Anglia by 1199, when three are recorded at Staverton (S): Munpelescroft (13a.), Alstanescroft (15a) and Dunescroft (30a of pasture) (Feet of Fines Norfolk/Suffolk 1958, 144, no.286).

R.H. Britnell has suggested that in Essex a croft was a small field up to about 12 acres (4.9ha) in size and that it was probably hedged (Britnell 1983, 39–40). A croft
could, however, occasionally be much larger, as at Hitcham (S) in 1251, where a large piece of demesne land called *Horncroft* contained 66 acres (27ha) (CUL EDR G/3/27, f.171v). The case study at Worlingworth (S) revealed that units of demesne land with *-croft* names varied from 12 to 32 acres in size; whilst at Arleley (H) in 1297, the units of demesne with *-croft* names ranged from 3 to 14 acres in size. Several examples of ‘fields’ (*campi*) bearing ‘croft’ names (or *vice versa*) suggests that the distinction between a field and a croft was very vague, e.g. *Westcroft* (described as a *campus*) at Thorpe (N) 1208, *Norfeld* (a croft of 18a) at Havering (E) 1213–4 and *Prestescroft* (a *campus*) at Braiseworth (S) c.1240 (*Feet of Fines Norfolk/Suffolk 1958* no.128; *Feet of Fines Essex I* 46, no.251; *Eye Priory Cartulary I* 1992, 123, no.135). Hedges associated with a croft (*Catelynescroft*) are specifically mentioned at Walsham-le-Willows (S) in 1347 (*Court Rolls Walsham 1998*, 300).

v. *In(h/n)am*
Old English *innam* and Old Norse *innam* meant ‘a piece of land taken in or enclosed’ (Reaney 1937, 583; Smith 1956, I, 303). P.H. Reaney noted various examples of the use of this term in Essex from the twelfth century onwards, noting that it was still ‘a living element’ in Felsted in 1367. At Felsted its use seems to be in connection with intakes from Blackley Forest. Interestingly, two of the examples quoted by Reaney have associations with the term ‘stubbing’ which is often used in connection with asarted land: *Bernefeldesinhome alias dict. Stubbardescroft* (1398) and *Stubberrell Lande or Innome alias Inhams, Nynnams or Innams* (1595). The term was also found in *The Sutton (S) case study*. The term has also occurred at *Wardishamus toft* at Ixworth Thorpe (S) in 1314 (*Feet of Fines Norfolk/Suffolk* 1958, 196 no.407; *Eye Priory Cartulary I* 1992, 122 no.133; *Pakenham Cartulary 2001*, 39 no.1).

vi. *Tye*
Old English *teag* originally meant ‘a close, an enclosure’, but later developed the sense of ‘a common pasture’ (see above greens). It occurs in its original sense in the following phrase which appears in a document relating to land in Kent, dated 832: *clausalum quod Angli dicunt teage que pertinet ad prdictam mansionem* ‘a small close, which the English call a teage, which belongs to the aforesaid dwelling’ (*Cartularium Saxonicum I* 1885, 558–9, no.402)56. P.H. Reaney noted that the word survived as a field-name in thirty-five Essex parishes, with particular concentrations in the clayland hundreds of Hinckford, Dunmow and Chelmsford (Reaney 1935, 591). However the field name frequently refers to a field adjoining a tye (in the sense of a common) and more research is needed to see to what extent tye was used as a term for an enclosed field.

vii. *Pightle*
From medieval Latin *pictellum, pitellum* ‘a little piece’, this term was in widespread use for a small field. Pightles are frequently sited near the farmhouse and the term can often be regarded as a synonym for a croft. Hedges around the *Calipightle* at Walsham-le-Willows are mentioned in 1339 (*Court Rolls Walsham 1998*, 232).

viii. *Toft*
Old Norse *topt*, Old Danish and late Old English *toft* ‘a building site, a curtilage, a messuage’ (Smith 1956, I, 181–3). *Toft* is used as a term for a ‘homestead’ several times in the will Thurketel of Palgrave with reference to his estates on the Norfolk/Suffolk border, c.1030 (*Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930*, 68–9). Toft is often used in conjunction with croft to mean a house site and an adjacent plot of land, though there are medieval examples that indicate that it was sometimes used as a synonym for a croft (Smith 1956, II, 182). There are even examples of *fields* (*campi*) being called tofts, e.g. *Lefchildeslestoft* at Buxshall (S) 1203, *Assetoft* at Thornham (S) c.1240, and *Wardishamus toft* at Ixworth Thorpe (S) in 1314 (*Feet of Fines Norfolk/Suffolk* 1958, 196 no.407; *Eye Priory Cartulary I* 1992, 122 no.133; *Pakenham Cartulary 2001*, 39 no.1).

ix. *Strip, land, pecia, selion or cultura*
The basic ploughing units in an arable field. The units were long and thin and commonly contained between a third and an acre of land (Adams 1976, 90–1). In a common field the strips were held by a number of different people. In the Midlands, strips — there usually called ‘lands’ — averaged about 8 x 200 yards (7 x 180m) and contained about a third of an acre (0.13ha) (Hall 1995, 2). While there were considerable variations in size, the average is very common (Hall 1992, 5). In East Anglia the strips, usually termed *pecia* (‘pieces’) were also usually approximately a furlong in length and commonly contained half an acre, though variations are found, probably due to differences in soils (e.g. *pecia* was a rood at Methwold (N) and three roods at Merton (N)) (Postgate 1973, 291–2). Half-acre *pecie* were common in Breckland, though they could be substantially larger on the poor land of the outfield (Bailey 1989, 44, 61). Strips were also sometimes called *selions*, as at Cotton (S) in 1564 (*SRO(B) E7/6/2*). The term comes from Old English *sulung* (a derivative of *sulh* ‘a plough’) via medieval Latin *selio* (also *seillo, sallio, sullo, pl. seliones*) and Anglo-French *seilon* (modern French *sillon* — a furrow) (Smith 1956, II, 167; Adams 1976, 90–1).

It is important to realise that these terms were frequently used as units of tenure and could embrace one or more actual ploughed strips on the ground. There are four surviving field strips at Westhorpe, a parish adjacent to Walsham-le-Willows (Suffolk HER no. WTP 004). These lie on the western edge of an arable field and run north-west to south-east down a south-east facing slope and (west-east) have widths of approximately 90ft (27m), 60ft (18m), 90ft (27m) and 40ft (12m), and each strip is separated by a grassy bank 2–3ft wide (Pl. 1). The strips are still ploughed and are flat, with no trace of ridge-and-furrow, and have been in that condition since at least 1597 (D. Barker, pers. comm.). The strips are the survivors of eight arable strips shown here on the tithe map of 1839/40, owned by five separate people, including one glebe strip (Pl. 2). They were recorded as varying in size from 1a 0r 18p to 1r 32p (approximately 1a (2), 3r (3), 2r (2), 1r (1) and were all named as *Common Carr*, taking their name from a subdivided pasture at the base of the slope (*SRO(I)* FDA 279/A1/1a–b). Five of the strips belonged to farmsteads within 650m of the site, three to properties within 1300m (including that belonging to the glebe). The strips are currently owned by two farmers (two each). The
glebe strip can probably be identified in the 1637 glebe terrier as ‘one piece of land’ containing 3r [2r 1p in 1839] ‘in a furlonge called Milhill furlonge’, land of William Pope west, land of Phillip Bloysse and now Richard Browne east, the Carre south (SRO(B) E4/4/3).

x. Me(a)re or merebalk and dole or dool

The term ‘me(a)re’, derived from Old English (ge)maere ‘a boundary, a border’, was used to describe both major and minor boundaries (Smith 1956, II, 33–4). The term is used in the form land gemæro in the description of the boundary of Chelsworth (S) in AD 962 (Hart 1992, 474). Hundred boundaries called the Hundred Mere were recorded at Swanton Morley (N), Thelveton (N) and Walsham-le-Willows (S), with a variant Fraunchismere (franchise-mere) at South Elmham St Michael (S). The parish boundary at Swanton Morley was described as the Perambulation Mere in 1692, referring to the practice of walking parish boundaries in Rogation week to fix their course in the memory of the inhabitants (NRO EVL 441, f. 46r; Winchester 1990, 36–8). It also occurs in furlong names at Thelveton, e.g. Wysemer furlong and Whartmer furlong (NRO MC 1732/6 it. 8, ff. 13v and 14r (sixteenth century). Me(a)res could also be the small balks or ridges of unploughed land that acted as boundaries to areas of cultivated land or their subdivisions (Smith 1956, II, 33). In East Anglian dialect, these were sometimes called meer-bauks, merebalks or just balks, usually in the context of unenclosed fields (Moor 1823, 227; Forby 1830, I, 13). The term meare is recorded at Walsham-le-Willows (S) in 1577 where it is allied with furrows and headlands as indications of cultivation (Field Book 1974, 90–1).
In East Anglian dialect, individual boundary marks, either mounds of earth, wood or stone, were often called ‘doles’ or ‘dools’. Robert Forby noted that they were often low posts, called dool-posts (Forby 1830, I, 96). The term comes from Middle English dole ‘a share in a common field’, from Old English dal ‘a share, a portion’ (Smith 1956, I, 126). In the case studies: ‘ancient doles’ marked the parish boundary of Dullingham (C) where it crossed the parish boundary of Dullingham (C) where it crossed unenclosed fields; a doolstone in a subdivided meadow is mentioned at Worstead (N) in 1633; a dool-hay from such land, or even roadsides, was referred to as mark’ on unenclosed land, a Gepp noted that in Essex, although ‘properly a boundary-mark’ on unenclosed land, a dool could also be a strip of grass across a ploughed field or along its borders. Hay cut from such land, or even roadsides, was referred to as dool-hay (Gepp 1923, 41). The ‘green dole’ referred to in the bounds of Milden parish (S) in 1752 was probably a similar grassy strip (SRO(B) FL605/3/12). (For a further discussion of grass strips in arable fields, see the section on ‘hedge greens’ in the annex to Chapter 8).

5. Ploughs and ploughing methods

i. Ploughs

There are two basic forms of ploughs: ‘ards’ that simply produce a groove in the ground and ‘true ploughs’ that both furrow and turn the earth. The term ‘ard’ is a recent borrowing from Scandinavia (there the source is Old Norse aðr, one of a number of manifestations of a common Indo-European root: Latin aratum, Old Irish arathur, Welsh aradr, all meaning ‘a plough’; in German the term is Haken ‘hook’, referring to the simple shape of the implement). The earliest actual examples date from the late Neolithic or early Bronze Age — e.g. the ards from Walle in East Frisia (2570–2460 cal.BC) and Hvorslev in Jutland (1880–1640 cal.BC) — but they are also evidenced as plough-marks in earlier Neolithic contexts both in Britain and the Continent (Glob 1951, 110–11; Lerche 1995, 183–4, 204; Precht 1998; Geyh and Rasmussen 1998; Fowler and Evans 1967; Ashbee et al 1979, 282–3, 296; Thrane 1989; Fries-Knoblaich 1995). On the Continent, ards continued in use well into the medieval period (and even later in some areas), but in Britain their use appears to have stopped by the Middle Ages (Bentzen 1969; Lerche 1994, app.iv). Because ards only grooved the ground, cross-ploughing was normally needed to fully break up the land for cultivation. As the land was thus worked in two directions, it favoured the development of square cultivation plots of the type termed ‘Celtic fields’ (see below).

The second type, usually termed mouldboard ploughs (Streichbrettpflüge or Wendepflüge — literally ‘turn-ploughs’ — in German) have, as the name indicates, the important addition of a mouldboard to turn the earth over after it has been cut. Physical remains are scarcer and much later than those of the preceding type: the fragment from Tommerby in Jutland, formerly thought to be Iron Age in date, has been radiocarbon-dated to cal.AD 1525–1630, and dates for three similar fragments fall in the period 1400–1650 (Lerche 1995, 175, 187, 192–3, 196). However, plough-marks thought to have been made by mouldboard ploughs have been found at Feddersen-Wierde in north-west Germany in a first-century BC context and similar marks are recorded on a number of other sites, mostly on light land, in the coastal arc from the Elbe to the Rhine that date from around this time (Haarnagel 1979, 264, taf.174–5; Gringmuth-Dallmer 1983, 207–9). At Feddersen-Wierde the excavations also produced a number of wooden objects that have been interpreted as mouldboards (Streichbreitre) (Haarnagel 1979, 265, 326, taf. 16). In Britain there are no certain marks made by this type of plough in a Roman or pre-Roman context, though a recent study of some parallel marks at Hengistbury Head in Dorset has concluded that they were probably made by a mouldboard plough and could be Roman, though a later date was equally possible (Lewis 2002).

The available evidence suggests that ards continued to be the main form of plough in the Roman period, though there is some circumstantial evidence from the writings of Classical authors and from the existence of asymmetrical or ‘winged’ ploughshares, that a form of mouldboard (or ‘proto-mouldboard’) plough was also used in this period (Manning 1964, 54–65; Rees 1979, 65–9; 1981, 13–14; White 1967, 123–45). Improvements in Roman plough technology are also indicated by the presence, particularly in the fourth century, of iron coulters (a knife-like attachment that cuts the earth in front of the ploughshare). However their frequent association with iron bar shares suggests that they were used with a type of ard (Manning 1985, 44).

The addition of wheels to a plough is mentioned by Pliny the Elder (AD 23–79) as a recent invention in Raetia Galliae (Switzerland and W. Austria) where the implement was known as a plaumoratum. Servius, writing at the end of the fourth century, used the term carrus ‘a carriage’ to explain the wheels on a plough and this gave rise to the later Latin term carruca for a plough (and, by a further derivation, the French term charreuse) (White 1967, 141; Manning 1964, 56, 65). The word carruca is first mentioned in the polyptich or survey of the French abbey of St Germain-des-Prés, c. AD 825–9 (Elmshäuser and Hedwig 1993, 353–6; Verhulst 2002, 67). Wheels helped to move the plough and prevent the share from digging too deep; they could be used on either ards or mouldboard ploughs and cannot be used as definite evidence for the latter.

Peter Fowler has recently reviewed the evidence for Anglo-Saxon ploughs and has concluded that the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of ards until about the tenth century (Fowler 2002, 184–6, 203–4, 308–10). The first British manuscripts with illustrations of ploughs date from the early eleventh century and show two distinct types of ploughs. The Harley Psalter (British Library Harley MS 603) a Canterbury copy of the Utrecht Psalter made at Rheims c.820, has two depictions of simple ard ploughs. However in BL MS Cotton Julius A.VI, f.3,6, also from Canterbury, there is a depiction of a wheeled plough with a coulter and a substantial wooden sole into which the handles, beam and share are fitted. Similar ‘sole’ ards/ploughs are depicted in BL MS Cotton Tiberius B.V, f.3 (from Winchester) and the Caedmon Manuscript (Bodleian Junior II); the two plough illustrations in the latter could be interpreted as showing mouldboards attached to the sole (Fowler 2002, 187, 194, 199–202; Hill 1998; 2000). A mouldboard is, however, probably shown on a ploughing scene on the late eleventh-century Bayeux tapestry and one is definitely shown on a wheel-less or ‘swing’ plough in the Luttrell Psalter of the early
fifteenth century (Lerche 1994, 13, fig.2.5; Backhouse 2000, 16).

There are very few actual remains of medieval ploughs in Britain and it is not until the seventeenth century that detailed documentation becomes generally available (Surveyors Dialogue 1607; English Husbandman 1635; English Improver 1653; Systema Agriculturae 1675; Whole Art of Husbandry 1707; Brigden 2003). However, using manorial accounts for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, John Langdon has been able to map out a national distribution pattern for three major types of medieval plough: wheeled, ‘foot’ (a simple wood or iron fixing replacing the wheels) and ‘swing’ (wheel-less) ploughs. In East Anglia swing ploughs were dominant in most of the region, except for Norfolk, where wheeled ploughs dominated in all but the most southerly and western parts (Langdon 1986, 132–41; 1988, 89–90; Campbell 2000, fig.14.14). This pattern was still there in the early nineteenth century, when Arthur Young noted that the ‘Norfolk wheeled plough, and the little light swing plough of Suffolk’ were the ‘common implements’ (Young 1813, 32). Young mentions that a blacksmith named Brand had recently improved the Suffolk swing plough by constructing it of iron and another East Anglian entrepreneur, Robert Ransome (1753–1830), led the way in plough design through his nationally famous works at Ipswich (later Ransomes, Sims and Jefferies Ltd), (Weaver and Weaver 1989). The advances in plough design in the second half of the twentieth century have been so enormous that it is salutary to note that, in 1942, 87% of the ploughs in Suffolk were still single-furrow horse-drawn implements (Trist 1971, 187).

The particular significance of the mouldboard plough is that it more efficiently turned the earth and so removed the need to cross-plough. This, allied to the greater weight of the implement, encouraged the development of long fields that needed the minimum number of plough turns for the acreage. The resulting long fields also had the advantage of needing fewer and smaller wasteful headlands for plough turning.

ii. Ridge-and-furrow

The ploughing of land to produce a pattern of parallel ridges and furrows has been taken to be characteristic of medieval ploughing, especially when the ridges are not straight but slightly curved in a reversed S shape (Pt. 3). There is abundant evidence of this type of ploughing in the Midlands, where it forms the principal earthwork evidence for former areas of common fields. The ridges can be up to 1m high, though about 30cm is more common, and usually about 7m wide, but they can vary from 3 to 14m wide (Hall 1982, 5–6; 2001; Clark 1960; Upex 2004). The prominence of the ridges led to them being called ‘high backs’ (Vancouver 1794, 62; Jonas 1847, 41, 47; Orwin and Orwin 1954, 34). The slightly curving shape of the ridges is thought to have been a device to facilitate the turning of long teams of draught animals, particularly slow moving oxen. By having a curve the animals were already starting to turn as they approached the headlands at either end of the strip (Astill and Grant 1988, 71).

The extent to which ridge-and-furrow may or may not have existed in East Anglia has, however, excited a certain amount of debate. No certain ridge-and-furrow was noted in any of the case studies, though small areas have been claimed in the park at Ardeley Bury (H) and in Dullingham Park (C), but neither has been verified. R. Kain and W.R. Mead showed that the principal evidence for ridge-and-furrow in Cambridgeshire lay in the western half of the county (Kain and Mead 1977). In part this may have been the result of differential survival, for in 1847 Samuel Jonas reported on fields being laid flat in central Cambridgeshire (Jonas 1847, 55). But the lack of ridge-and-furrow was already apparent in parts of the county by 1794, when Charles Vancouver reported that at Shudy Camps, in the extreme south-east, ‘the open fields, as well as the enclosures, lie flat; no high back’d lands’ (Vancouver 1794, 62). And as early as 1598 it was recorded that one of the ways to plough was to lay land ‘flatte and plaine, without ridge or furrow, as in most parts of Cambridgeshierie’ (Book of Husbandry 1882, 132).

The detailed survey work of the Fenland Project found evidence for narrow ridged strips of Midland type along the northern and western fen edge, as far south as Cambridge, but an absence in the area east of Cambridge and on the eastern fen edge (except near Downham Market). It is however present on the southern islands of the Cambridgeshire fenland and on the Norfolk island of Hilgay-Southey (Hall and Coles 1994, 140).

In Norfolk, Robert Silvester found good evidence for ridge-and-furrow in the extreme west of the county, but very little elsewhere. This led him to conclude that ‘there can be no doubt that ridge and furrow did exist in central and east Norfolk, but what survives points to sparse and perhaps atypical ridging — very different from the pattern detected around Downham Market’. Importantly, he noted that ‘none has yet been recognised in central and east Norfolk in the parkland of private estates where it might have been fossilised by a change of land use’ (Silvester 1989, 292). These opinions were confirmed by the Norfolk Earthworks Survey Project: of over 300 earthworks recorded, only ten had ridge-and-furrow and with the ‘sole possible exception’ of one site in south-east Norfolk, all these sites were on the western fringe of Norfolk, bordering either the silt fen or the peat fen (Cushion and Davison 2003, 14–25, 69–70, 102–3, 199–208, 227–9). These conclusions accord with Arthur Young’s observation: ‘In June 1776 being at Wallington, adjoining Marshland, I found the high broad ridges begin, which thence spread over a great tract of country, nearly perhaps across the island’ (Young 1804a, 190). In other words, there, on the western edge of Norfolk, near Downham Market, he saw the beginning of a different type of farming that spread from there westward towards the Midlands.

A contrary view has been taken by Robert Liddiard, on the assumption that ridge-and-furrow was the only effective method of cultivating common fields on poor-draining heavy clay soils. He has argued that the paucity of ridge-and-furrow outside west Norfolk reflects differential destruction due to subsequent land use rather than the genuine absence of the technique. A fundamental flaw to his conclusion seems to be his misunderstanding of stitch or stretch ploughing. He asserted that:

The post-medieval period saw the increasing use of the ploughing technique of stitching. Here, a flat surface was retained by cross-ploughing every year. Needless to say, this technique could only be used on enclosed ground. … As stitching is associated with enclosed areas and ridge and furrow with open-field
Plate 3  Ridge-and-furrow near Barford St Michael, Oxfordshire. This is of the characteristic Midlands form with high, slightly curving ridges

Plate 4  Traditional East Anglian ‘stetch’ ploughing. At the centre of the stetch or strip is a ‘head’ consisting of two clashing furrows; other furrows are laid against this head, half lying to the right and half to the left, making a low broad ridge
strips; and as enclosure seems to have increased in Norfolk and Suffolk over time; then it follows that while the practice of ridging would have decreased over time, that of stitching and related practices would have increased. Stitching therefore, would have been responsible for the removal of medieval ridge and furrow on enclosed areas (Liddiard 1999, 3).

However a critical examination of the descriptions of stitch ploughing (see below) makes it clear that cross-ploughing was not an essential characteristic of that technique. Cross-ploughing to improve fallows or to remove redundant ridges was certainly advocated by the nineteenth-century agricultural improvers, but it was not a necessary part of normal stitch ploughing (Marshall 1787, 141; 1818, 344; Jonas 1847, 41–2, 55). In 1787 William Marshall described the ploughing methods of east Norfolk thus:

For wheat, the soil is usually gathered up into very narrow ridges: but for every other crop it is laid into wide flat ‘warps’ or beds of about ten paces wide. … The idea of gathering the soil into ridges, and sinking cross-furrows for the purpose of getting rid of the surface-water is unknown to him [i.e. the Norfolk farmer]. … the Norfolk soil in general is sufficiently absorbent to require neither ridge nor furrow (Marshall 1787, 147–8).

The lack of ridge-and-furrow was further noted by Marshall in 1818, when, commenting on north-east Essex, he noted that ‘they do not plough … so flat as in Norfolk’ (Marshall 1818, 518).

In Suffolk, there are no earthworks of ridge-and-furrow that would stand comparison with Midlands examples. In many cases, claimed examples of ridge-and-furrow turn out to be something else. For example, at Freckenham and Drinkstone there are ridges that are the result of post-medieval ‘floated water meadows’ (Wade in Danes in Danish) will be established along the middle of the strip, as well as observable open furrows. The two methods could be described as ‘high’ and ‘low’ ridge-and-furrow.

Very similar techniques were used in Denmark and have been well described by Grith Lërche. There, as in England, fields were divided for ploughing into strips (called ager in Danish) and the actual ploughing method proceeded like this:

When one starts along the middle line of a strip and the turning is on the right side, the second furrow is ploughed close to the first and the furrow slices ‘ploughed together’ and so on, circling round clockwise until the border of the strip is reached. The last furrows at both borders are left uncovered as open furrows (called ren in Danish). If the same operation is repeated several times a visible marked ridge (called ryg in Danish) will be established along the middle line of the strip, as well as observable open furrows.

If instead the ploughing starts at the borders and proceeds towards the middle line the ridge is split and a double open furrow is produced here and the previous open furrows are filled with the turned furrow slices. When the ‘ploughing together’ is practised more often than the splitting, the ridged
strips become a characteristic feature of the landscape of the old open field system, whereas when interchanging the two patterns the strips and field will remain flat (Lerche 1994, 15–19).

The recognition that the two methods of ploughing are not fundamentally different, but extremes of the same technique makes sense of the available evidence. Documentary references to ‘ridge-and-furrow’ could equally be descriptions of stetch ploughing, as was certainly the case when Arthur Young referred to it in terms of ‘ridges’ (see below). Maps showing narrow strips could be either, as both were ploughed in identical long, narrow strips. The lack of earthwork evidence is also explicable because the low ridges of stetches are easy to remove by ploughing and are likely to be difficult to detect in eroded condition on former arable land that has been put down to grass.99 The impermanence of the traces of arable cultivation was noted at Walsham-le-Willows (S) in 1577, when former divisions in a ‘great pasture’ could not be distinguished ‘by reason that ye ould mencions as meares, furrows hedlondes and other markes are filled up and worne awaie’ (Field Book 1974, 90–1).

Stetch ploughing (or ‘low’ ridge-and-furrow) was in common use in East Anglia by 1610 (see below) and there is no reason to believe that it was not also the main medieval ploughing technique of the region. The distribution of surviving ‘high’ ridge-and-furrow therefore is likely to be a significant cultural indicator related to the Midlands system of agriculture.

As noted above, there is evidence that both techniques were practised on the Continent and, as in England, there do seem to be regional variations in the preferred technique. For instance, Johannes Renes has noted a distinct lack of evidence for ridge-and-furrow in the southern part of Limburg province in the Netherlands, despite the fact that the area contains some of the best evidence for open fields in the Netherlands (Renes 1988, 161, 167, n.5). This seems bear out the findings of excavations at Kootwijk in the Veluwe area of the Netherlands, which produced evidence of mouldboard ploughing but the excavator concluded that ‘the way of ploughing resulted in a dead level of the surface of the fields’ (Heidinga 1987, 39).

iii. Stetch or stitch ploughing

An old East Anglian method of ploughing that was in widespread use until about the middle of the twentieth century (Pl. 4, Fig. 3). The origin of the term is Old English styce ‘a bit, a piece’, used in the sense of a group of furrows that combine to make a strip of ploughed land (Smith 1956, II, 165). The occurrence of the field name Sevensteches in Bedfield (S) in 1532 indicates that the term was in use before that date (SRO(I) HB9:51/11/2). As a dialect term, stetch or stitch was recorded in both Essex and Suffolk in the 1600s (Orton and Tilling 1969, 184–5; Evans 1960; pers. comm. Roy Colchester, retired farmer at Mendlesham).

In 1610 the surveyor William Folkingham noted that ‘stitches are common in Norfolke and Suffolke, even in their light grounds, and in Hartfordshire’. Folkingham usefully describes the various methods of ploughing in his day:

Arable grounds are eared [ploughed] in Selions and that either Flats or Ridges. The first is necessarily required in light and leane land …The second are

either laide in landes or Ridges large and high or round; or in Stitches. The lands or Ridges are fittest in fat strong and fertile grounds that be tough, stiffe, binding cold and wet … But small Ridges or Stitches are accomodated to cold and stiffe ground’ (Fevdigraphia 1610, 48).

This description of ploughing methods is very similar to that given by ‘I.R.’ [James Roberts] in 1598:

The manner of plowing land is in three formes: eyther they be great Lands, as with high ridges and deepe furrowes, as in all the North parts of this Land, and in some sotherne parts also, or els flatte and plaine, without ridge and furrow, as in most parts of Cambridge-shiere: or els in little Lands, no Land containing above two or three furrowes, as in Middlesex, Essex, and Hartfordshire.

The third type seems to the same as Folkingham’s ‘stitches’. I.R. goes on the explain:

For the last, that is, where the grounde is both barren, cold, and stiffe: if there you plough in large Lands, the wether and season will so binde it together, that the seede shall burst, but not finde any passage to sproughte (Book of Husbandry 1882, 132).

In 1638, at Wattisfield in Suffolk, there is mention of ‘fower [four] furrowes to a stetch’.100 In 1796, also in Suffolk, Arthur Young referred to ‘broad ridges, called here steatches’ and he further explained:

Ridges. — The form of laying arable lands upon dry soils, is, on the flat, with finishing furrows; alternate gathering and splitting; but on wet lands, the three foot ridge of two bouts is most common. In some

![Diagram showing how an East Anglian 'stetch' was ploughed in (in this case one consisting of eight furrows). Open furrows were left at the edges of each stetch to facilitate drainage](image)
districts, six, eight and ten feet stetches, a little arched, are used (Young 1797, 46). In Essex, in 1807, Young observed:

*Ridges and Stitches.* — The variation of these is not great in Essex: in most of the western part of the county, wet land is laid on the two-bout ridge, or four-furrow work; a scattering of these is to be seen everywhere; but on the strong land in the maritime district, *eights*, as they are called them, stitches of eight furrows are general. To the south, ten-furrow work is common (Young 1807, 199).

In 1823 the dialect scholar Edward Moor defined a *stetch* as:

The ploughed portion of land between two furrows, which is greater or less, according to the heavy or light quality of the soil. In strong lands we go eight furrows to a *stetch*, which is called ‘eight furrows work’ … what the plough makes at each *bout* is called a furrow till filled up by the next *bout* (Moor 1823, 397).  

In 1847 Hugh Raynbird stated that the ‘Heavy Land’ of Suffolk was being ploughed ‘in 10 or 12 furrow stetches (7½ feet and 9 feet)’ (Raynbird 1847, 268). The previous year Samuel Jonas noted that on the claylands of east Cambridgeshire the lands were ‘generally ploughed into stitches, containing eight furrows’. He described the ploughing process thus:

> the land coming for fallow, the old furrows are opened up with a pair of horses; then with three horses abreast, the ploughman turns a furrow on the edge of each of the furrow-slices thrown out of the old furrows, thus leaving in the middle of each land a baulk, containing two furrows, which the ploughman then splits: thus the ridges, or lands, are made one yard wide; the four furrows thus ploughed out of the middle of the stitch then lie two furrows right and left, lapping on to the furrow-slices thrown out of the old furrows; they are then called three-furrow ridges, as each ridge is thus made one yard wide with three furrows (Jonas 1847, 50–1).

Jonas praised this system because it allowed the lands to be ploughed ‘in straight lands of one uniform width to fit the drill, all treading and poaching are thus avoided. The great advantages also of cross-ploughing the fallow, and when fresh drains are required, of being able to put these drains across the former old ones, are not to be lost sight of.’ He contrasted this with the practices in west Cambridge (also clayland), where ‘we have nearly all the lands on the high backs, scarcely any of them straight lands, but varying in width from 5 to 10 yards, and when the land requires fresh draining, the drains must be put into the same furrows as before and in the same direction; no cross-ploughings can be given, but always ploughing in the same direction.’ He further noted that at Childerley in central Cambridgeshire an improving farmer was ‘getting the lands gradually ploughed down and sized into straight uniform lands’, i.e. converting from ‘high back’ ridge-and-furrow to stitches, which, as discussed above, could be described as ‘low’ ridge-and-furrow (Jonas 1847, 55).

In the twentieth century the Suffolk stitch commonly comprised a ‘land’ of eight furrows, 7½ ft to 9½ ft in width. There were two central clashing furrows (called a ‘head’ or ‘top’) with three or more furrows on each side (Fig. 3). To improve drainage, the furrows on either side of the stitch were ‘tommed-up’ or cleared of clods by using a double mouldboard plough after drilling and harrowing were completed (Trist 1971, 183–4). George Ewart Evans, the great recorder of oral history in Suffolk, gave this explanation of the way stitches were formed:

After he [the ploughman] had drawn the first furrow in the *stetch*, he returned alongside, ploughing a second furrow against the first, thus completing the *laying of the top* or centre-furrows — in shape, exactly like the ridge of a roof.

[Further furrows were then laid alongside the top] till the *moul furrow* (the mould furrow was the last in the *stetch*) had been ploughed (Evans 1960, 33).

Evans also described how the soil’s drainage capacity affected the size of stitches:

Each *stetch* was limited on its two sides by water-cuts or deep furrows that made easy the escape of surface water in the soil; and in fact the main purpose of ploughing in stitches was — and still is, where stitches continue to be used — to ensure effective draining of the land. The lighter the soil the fewer water-furrows were needed and, therefore, the wider were the stitches. In the *strong-loam* belt of Suffolk — the heavy-land districts — however, very narrow stitches of two yards and upwards were necessary effectively to take off the surface water. As the ploughshare most commonly used in the county was one that turned a nine-inch furrow, the two-yard stitches were characterised as *eight-furrow work*; the two-and-a-half yard stitches as *ten-furrow work*; and the three-yard as *twelve-furrow* (Evans 1960, 30).

Both eight- and six-furrow stitches were recorded in Essex in the 1960s, the former also being called ‘eights’. At Tilling (E) an eight-furrow *stetch* was said to be 7½ in broad (Orton and Tilling 1969, 184–5). Interestingly, this information about stitches in Essex was obtained by dialect recorders in reply to the question ‘What do you call the raised parts in a ploughed field?’ The recorders seem to have been thinking in terms of Midland ridge-and-furrow and thought that their question had not been understood, adding a gloss to their report to explain that stitches probably referred to ‘groups of furrows and not the ridges’ (Orton and Tilling 1969, 184–5). The informants, however, clearly understood that stitch ploughing produced low ridges.

6. *Glossary of modern field-system descriptors*

i. **Agglomerative**

Field systems that appear to be the result of ‘organic growth’ rather than systematic planning.

*Synonyms:* accreted, aggregate, Celtic, organic, random.

ii. **Aggregate (regular and irregular)**

A term introduced by Richard Bradley and Julian Richards in 1978 to refer to field systems that appear to have developed through accretion (Bradley and Richards 1978, 53; Bradley 1978). In English Heritage’s monument class descriptions, two variants of the type are recognised — regular and irregular.

*Regular aggregate* systems contain: regularly defined fields … laid out in a block or blocks which lie
approximately at right angles to one another, usually with a settlement as a focal point. Fields are generally square or rectangular and the blocks give an ordered, if irregular shape to the field system as a whole (English Heritage Monument Class Description 1989).

**Irregular aggregate** systems contain: a collection of contiguous field plots which are irregular in shape (rectilinear or curvilinear in plan) and size and which accreted around a focal point, usually a settlement (English Heritage Monument Class Description 1989).

**Synonyms** (regular systems): agglomerative, Celtic, rectilinear;

**Synonyms** (irregular systems): accreted, agglomerative, organic, random.

### iii. Celtic

This term was introduced by O.G.S. Crawford in 1923 to describe the earthworks of prehistoric field systems that he had identified from the air on the chalk downs of Wessex. He described them thus because their layout, 'in a chess-board pattern of squares and rectangles and other figures', contrasted with the strip fields that were associated with the Saxons. By using the term 'Celtic' he was associating them with the Iron Age settlements 'of Celtic-speaking peoples' that also occurred on the downs (Crawford 1923). Simultaneously, the Curwens identified similar fields on the Sussex downs, which they termed 'lynchets' (referring to the stepped, terrace-like form of the fields), which were associated with 'field-ways' that they proposed to call 'Celtic roads', in an unspecific sense of relating to a period 'prior to the coming of the Saxons' (Curwen and Curwen 1923).

Collin Bowen retained the term ‘Celtic fields’ in his book Ancient Fields largely because the term was ‘so indefinite, covering all those fields of regular shape which were laid out before the Saxons established themselves in this country’ (Bowen 1961, 2). He identified two subgroups: small fields ‘approximating to the square’ and at most half an acre [0.2ha] in size; and long fields with ‘proportions of 4 or 5 to 1, but only exceptionally more than 6 to 1, up to 1½ acres [0.6ha] in size and, though sometimes grouped in blocks of 4 or 5, never arranged over-all in 'furlongs' of medieval type’ (Bowen 1961, 20–5). Later work by Desmond Bonney characterised ‘Celtic’ fields as ‘nearly always straight-sided, generally square or rectangular in shape and between ¼ and 1 acre (0.1 and 0.4ha) in area’. The more elongated fields appeared to be more characteristic of later layouts, especially those laid out or modified in the Roman period. They survive most commonly on slopes and are usually defined by lynchets, though sometimes by banks and, more rarely, by walls (Bonney 1978).

The term still persists, in spite of the inappropriateness of using a linguistic term to define fields and has even crossed the Channel to France (as les 'celtic fields' or les champs 'celtiques') and the Netherlands (as de 'Celtic fields') (Ferdière 1988 I, 123–9; van Ginkel and Steenhouwer 1998, 48–55).

**Synonyms:** agglomerative, aggregated, cohesive, co-axial, rectilinear.

### iv. Centuriation

A Roman method of land apportionment, whereby large areas were subdivided on the basis of a precise rectangular grid. The unit most commonly used by Roman surveyors was a square called a centuria with sides of 20 actus (776 yards or 710m) and an area of 125 acres or 50 hectares (see below). The usual Latin term for this dividing of the land was limitatio, derived from the limits or paths/roads that both marked the boundaries of the units and provided access to them; however the alternative term of centuratio has given the modern term (Dilke 1971, 82–8; B. Campbell 1996).

Centuriation was usually applied to ager publicus, land acquired by the Roman state through conquest. As Roman colonies were normally established on ager publicus, centuriation is especially associated with colonies. As might be expected, some of the best examples are in Italy, notably the Po valley, where there is an extensive layout of probable second-century BC origin (Dilke 1971, 133–58). Identifying centuriation is not always straightforward, however, even when, as at Orange in France, there are actual fragments of Roman cadastral maps (Pigniol 1962; Dilke 1971, 159–77; Ferdière 1988, 133–43).

**Synonyms:** co-axial, rectilinear.

#### Roman measures of length

- **Pes** ('foot') = 11.6in = 29.6cm
- **Actus** ('a driving’ in the sense of a plough furrow) = 120 pedes = 35.5m

#### Roman measures of area

- **Actus quadratus** = 14,400 pes quadratus = 1,260 sq.m. = 0.31 acre = 0.13ha
- **Iugerus** (connected with iugum ‘a yoke’) = 2 actus quadratus = 0.62 acre = 0.25ha
- **Heredium** (‘inherited area’) = 2 iugera = 1.25 acres = 0.5ha
- **Centuria** (‘a hundred’, in the sense a hundred heredia) = 200 iugera = 124.6 acres = 50.4ha

#### v. Cohesive

A term introduced by Richard Bradley and Julian Richards in 1978 to refer to field systems of ‘Celtic’ type that are based upon straight axes that usually run parallel to each other and are then subdivided to give rectangular units (Bradley and Richards 1978, 53). This term has been largely superseded by the term ‘co-axial’.

**Synonyms:** ‘Celtic’, co-axial, rectilinear.

#### vi. Co-axial

This term was brought into use by Andrew Fleming with this definition:

A coaxial field system has one prevailing axis of orientation. Most of the field boundaries either follow this axis (axial boundaries) or run at right angles to it (transverse boundaries) (Fleming 1987, 188).

Fleming formulated the concept out of his study of the prehistoric land boundaries called reaves on Dartmoor, which he originally termed ‘parallel systems’ (Fleming 1978, 97; Fleming 1988). He also drew attention to their large size in terms of area, noting that ‘the inflexibility inherent in their design, tends to make them terrain-oblivious’ (Fleming 1987, 190). By this he meant that the lines ran straight across valleys and up slopes, quite unaffected by the topography.
Since then the term has been more widely applied to field systems that displayed broadly similar characteristics: long parallel boundaries on the predominant axis that although often straight in short sections, have an overall course that is frequently slightly sinuous. These axial boundaries are intersected at right-angles by transverse boundaries which may themselves run in continuous lines for long distances. The scales of the systems vary considerably, with the axial lines running from under 1km to in excess of 5km, and the intervals between the boundaries can be anything from about 30m to 500m. Some systems terminate on a linear boundary whilst others appear to be set off at right-angles to natural features, particularly watercourses (English Heritage Monument Class Description 1988).

The term has now been applied to relict field systems on chalk downlands that are visible as earthworks, to excavated ditch systems and to arrangements of hedges in field systems that are still in use. It is therefore likely that ‘co-axial fields’ do not represent a single ‘monument type’, but are manifestations of a number of different field system types, probably of different dates, that share a similar morphology. The Suffolk part of the East of England Historic Landscape Characterisation Project distinguished between ‘long co-axial’ fields, where there was a clear and consistent arrangement of long parallel fields, and ‘irregular co-axial’ fields where there was only a tendency for the fields to follow a common alignment.

See also the discussion of co-axial systems, in the light of the case studies undertaken for this study, in Chapter 7. Synonyms: cohesive, ‘Celtic’, rectilinear.

vii. Organic
A term used for field systems that appear to have developed by slow incremental growth, similar to that of a live organism. There is no evidence of overall planning or of a structured layout. Fields typically vary in size, shape and orientation.
Synonyms: agglomerative, aggregate (irregular), irregular, random.

viii. Random
The term used in the Suffolk part of East of England Historic Landscape Characterisation Project to describe groups of fields that display no particular pattern or common axes in their layout; elsewhere in this Project the term ‘irregular enclosure’ was used.
Synonyms: agglomerative, aggregate (irregular), irregular, organic.

ix. Rectilinear
A term which describes any field system bounded by or composed of straight lines. Used in the East of England Historic Landscape Characterisation Project to describe fields that approximate to a rectangular layout, but without any predominant axis.
Synonyms: aggregate (regular), ‘Celtic’, co-axial, cohesive, reticulated.

x. Reticulated
Fields arranged like a net (from Latin rete ‘a net’).

Endnotes
1. The term ‘minster’ is derived from Old English mynster, itself derived from Latin monasterium ‘a monastery’, referring to the group of priests who served the church as an informal religious community.
2. Shelley has been misread in this as Meelfege.
3. Stonham Aspal, Earl Stonham and Stonham Parva; Creeting All Saints, Creeting St Mary, Creeting St Olave and Creeting St Peter; but Market Weston and Coney Weston, though adjacent, are actually different names — Coney Weston is really a Cunegeston ‘king’s tun’.
4. About half a dozen –ham names and a similar number of –ing names are non-parochial (eg. Whittington in Fressingfield, Benningham in Occold and Chicking in Wingfield), but over forty –tons are non-parochial.
5. The term ‘mother church’ (de parochia matriz ecclesiae) is used at Stowmarket (S) in Domesday Book (2. 281b; DB Suffolk 1, 1/1).
6. It is likely that these complexes are late Saxon in origin (see Boddington 1996; Rippon 1996, 124; Reynolds 1999, 132–5; Martin 1999a, 88).
7. A Suffolk example is at Acton, where a field called The Berry was recorded between the church and Acton Hall on the 1839 tithe map and (SRO(B) T92/1, 2).
8. Field Book 1974, 64; ‘one croft of free land houlden of the Hundred of Blacborne’; 66: holdethe one pightell by fire ded …but yt payeth nothinge to the lord of this manor bycause it holdeth (vt dicitur) of the Hundrethe of Blacborne and outh service thether; and 148: ‘close of carrable grounde …bringe free holde whereof two acres is holden of the Hundred of Blacborne’.
9. This has been plausibly identified by Stephen Podd as being on the Winston/Pettaugh boundary, occurring as Manwicke in 1657/8 (Helmingham Hall archives).
10. There is also a Hardwick in Suffolk which is a small extra-parochial area to the south of Bury St Edmunds.
11. Tunstead is separated from Weston by the parishes of Soley and Scottow.
12. The inland of the estates of Bury St Edmunds Abbey was granted exemption from the geld by writ of King Edward c. 1051 (Hart 1966, 72, no.114).
13. A group of tenants called gavelmanni ‘rent-payers’ are recorded at Felsted (E) in the thirteenth century.
14. Free men could hold bond land without losing their freedom, but would have to fulfil the labour services; unfree men, however, were generally prevented from acquiring free land.
15. Since the Commons Act of 1965, commons have been defined as areas of land subject to common rights, principally the pasturing of animals; village and town greens are used for exercise, recreation or sport.
16. For the meaning of cauler, see below under ‘folding’.
17. A right of common on Greshaw is recorded c.1260–80 (SRO(L) HA12/C1/1).
18. The regularity of the tenements on the east side of the green is well shown on a map of Paradise Farm, Worlingworth by Stephen Walker for John Major, 1757/8 (private ownership).
19. The evidence comes from two early fourteenth-century fines concerning property in Stanford Rivers, referring to the same lands, in one fine it is given as 1 carucate, and in the other as 360 acres, see Feet of Fines Essex II, 158, no.421 (dated 1314–5) and 217, no.1017 (dated 1324–5).
20. There is mention of a virgate (urg) at Creeting in Suffolk: DB Suffolk 23.4.
21. The terms verling, erling and verdigge occur in Bocking (E) in 1309 (Fisher 1968, 41).
22. In Domesday Book there is mention of a half bovate (dimidia bouata) at Thetford in Norfolk (DB Norfolk f.169).
23. Though in 1394–5 the holdings were called quarteri, i.e. ‘quarters’ of a virgate, each of 12.5 acres (Saunders 1912, 117).
24. The terms ferlinga/ata, gurn, ferlinglond, ferbynglond ‘a furlong or quarter land’ occur in Essex in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (Fisher 1968, 13).
25. Fisher quotes a note on a W. Thurrlock deed: ‘Be it in mind that one yard of land is 16½ feet, and set up a fork upright and lay out on every side of the fork, 2 yards of the said yard of length and 2 of breadth, and there is one daywork of land; and 10 dayworks of land make one rood-land which is the fourth part of an acre; 4 roods make one acre, and 40 dayworks make one acre’ The term was used at Ingatestone, Essex, c. 1275 (ERO D/DP1150).
26. The statute acre and perch were enshrined in the ‘statute of measurement’ (Statutes 1810 I, 206–7). It must be earlier than the
date of 33 Edward I (1304–5) given in the Statutes as thirteenth-century copies exist.

27. Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 60, Walsham court 1317: ‘the tenements are partible, following the custom of the manor’. See also Smith 1894 for the effects of partible inheritance at nearby Redgrave (S).

28. For a discussion of the different elements of commonality in farming, see Campbell 1981a, 113–5.

29. Block demesnes also occur as a minority type in areas with Type 1 common fields (Hall 1995, 66).

30. Lamond ascribed this work to John Hales, but Smith’s authorship was established by M. Dewar (Dewar 1966). The work appears to have been written c.1540, redrafted in a manuscript of 1565 and then printed in 1581, attributed to ‘W.S.’, probably Smith’s nephew William.

31. A. McRae, article on Thomas Tusser in Matthew and Harrison 2004.

32. Ryecce (for that is how he wrote his name) appears to have written this work c.1603, but it survives in two main manuscripts, the one that the printed version (edited by Hervey 1902) was taken from, which bears a date of 1618 and another that is post-1627 (Harlow 1970).

33. This map is reproduced on the front cover of this report (original is SRO(I) C/3/10/8/12); the Lawshall map is SRO(I) HA93/12-44.

34. Hunter adds ‘There are no field names or features to suggest common fields’.

35. The existing hedge has seven shrubby species in a 30m length (blackthorn, elm, dogwood, Hawthorn, field maple, wild plum and wild rose).

36. The term Breckland for the light soil area around Thetford on the Norfolk/Suffolk border was coined by the Thetford-bred journalist William George Clarke (1877–1925) in an article entitled ‘A Breckland Ramble’ (Clarke 1894, 90–107); this naming was further reinforced by his book In Breckland Wilds (Clarke 1925). But he was clearly influenced by an earlier description of ‘The Breck District’ by Professor Alfred Newton (1829–1907) that was published anonymously in Henry Stevenson’s Birds of Norfolk (Stevenson 1866, xlvi–liv).

37. Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester (c. 1485–1555) was the son of a Leicestershire yeoman farmer.

38. References to it in Suffolk at Aldringham (Phillimore edition 6.74), Risby (14.1), Great Barton (14.6), Pakenham (14.49), Fornham St Martin (14.50), Rougham (14.51), Woolpit (14.55), Ingham (14.69), Stanton (14.72), Stowlangtoft (14.77), Barningham (37.4) and Rushford (37.6).

39. Speed noted that ‘This Description of Northfolk, I received from ... Sir Henry Spelman’. Spelman lived at Narborough in west Norfolk.

40. In campo de Gosepadel 70a, in campo de Hauctonsexoner 42a 1r, in campo de Partepeol [in three parts] 63a, 22a and 20a, in campo de Coldhald 70a, in Belhufoldt 57a, and in Estfeld 50a (CUL EDR G/3/27, f.171v).

41. Amazingly, at Metthold (N) Sir Philip Skippon recorded in 1672 that ‘some men plow 12 furlongs in length!’ [1.5 miles or 2.4km] (Hood 1926, 176).

42. In glebe terriers of Honington, Thelnetham, Troston and Wortham.

43. Amazingly, at Methwold (N) Sir Philip Skippon recorded in 1672 that ‘some men plow 12 furlongs in length!’ [1.5 miles or 2.4km] (Hood 1926, 176).

44. Notes by D.P. Dymond from glebe terriers in the Suffolk Record Office.

45. Testamentary disposition by Werhard the Priest to Christ Church, Canterbury.

46. A Tilefield occurs adjacent to Twinstead Tye (E) — see the Great Henny case study.

47. The term can often not be distinguished from Old English more ‘a pool’.

48. NRO EVL 441, f. 4r (1692); NRO MC 1732/6 ii. 8, f. 23v (sixteenth century); SRO (B) 373/26 (1817); SRO (L) ES 74/HI 12, f. 4v (1538).

49. Identified as ‘John Brand of Lawford (by all accounts a Suffolk man, though living in an Essex village)’ (Raynbird and Raynbird 1849, 91, plough ill. 195).

50. For a detailed study of experimental ploughing with different types of early ploughs see Lerche 1994.


52. The recorded examples were at Babingley, Gayton, Hilgay (two areas), Middleton, Ryston, Stow Bardolph, Stradsett, Tottenhill and, possibly, Shouldham and Tacolneston.

53. Suffolk HER nos FRK023 and DRK008 — water-meadow works at Drinkstone are referred to by A. Young (1813, 197). At Santon Downham (STN 024) there are possible water-meadow works that have been adapted to grow alders in the furrows.

54. Suffolk HER nos ACT023 and BNL010. The technique seems to be particularly associated with early nineteenth-century plantations and involved the planting of trees on straight ridges. Presumably the ridged soil gave young trees a better chance of establishment.

55. In an example at Kirby Cane, straight ridges are recorded as having had hazel bushes growing on them, while at Harling Thorpe ridges occur on a low-lying meadow.

56. Map of 1638 copied in 1756, SRO (B) 1167/11; reproduced in Gage (1838, 138).

57. Quoting TNA E134/10 Jas/East, 27, deposition of Nicholas Tilbororough.

58. In some cases, at least, a more complex ridge produced by four plough runs — as described by the Orwins (1954, 32–4) — was used.

59. A possible example of stitch ploughing preserved in grassland is at the Copdock recreation ground in Suffol (TM 1158 4122). Here there is a series of very slight parallel undulations that are about 12ft wide from mud furrow to mud furrow. The undulations are only just perceptible and are perhaps best detected by the coarser grass growing in the slight furrows. However the recreation ground was recorded as a pasture field in both the Land Utilisation Survey of the 1930s (see Stamp and Willatts 1936) and the 1838 Copdock tithe apportionment, so it is equally possible that these undulations were created as pasture drains. I am grateful to Stuart Boulter for the identification of this site.

60. Glebe terrier; stitches are also mentioned in the terriers of Stanton All Saints 1614, Westhorpe 1637 and Wortham Eastgate 1613/14 — notes by D. Dymond on documents in SRO (B).

61. In the 1813 edition (p.46), Young uses the term ‘stitches’ instead of ‘steatches’ and refers (p.48), to the ‘three foot ridge’ as the ‘three foot Essex ridge’.

62. On p.41 he defines a ‘bout’ as ‘a turn in ploughing … a furrow or rather the operation of making a furrow. ‘Four bouts to a yard’ means that the plough moves or turns over nine inches of soil in each hour’. I am grateful to Stuart Boulter for the identification of this site.
Part II
The Character of East Anglian Fields
Chapter 4. The characterisation of the East Anglian land types
by Edward Martin and Max Satchell

1. Introduction

Analysis of the twelve areas covering fifteen parishes (the Scole case study covers the parishes of Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva) chosen as case studies (see Chapter 5) led to the recognition of eighteen ‘land types’ that are defined and characterised in this chapter.

Within each parish examined the different land types were further analysed according to a set series of criteria. The purpose of this analysis was to establish whether the land types had specific ‘signatures’ in terms of their relative size and position within parishes, their agricultural potential, their form and their susceptibility to boundary loss. The results of this analysis are set out in tabular form at the end of each case study and are repeated in this chapter, re-arranged by land type. The criteria employed are set out below:

1. The percentage of the parish covered by a particular land type. There are two important problems that affect the calculation of these figures:
   i. Missing or unreliable basic data. The source material for the case studies does not always give sufficient direct information about certain land parcels for them to be accurately assigned to a land type. In these cases a ‘best guess’ policy had to be employed. This will, of course, have resulted in some erroneous attributions, but hopefully the general land type (e.g. meadow) is correct even if its breakdown to a sub-type level (e.g. several meadow as opposed to common meadow) is wrong.
   ii. The date that the figures relate to. Land types can change and evolve over time, for instance, areas of detached demesne frequently evolve into areas of core block demesne around a secondary manor, this could then further evolve into parkland and finish up as woodland. The general policy therefore has been to envisage what has here been termed the ‘climax medieval’ situation, where the farming system is well developed but has not yet undergone significant post-medieval changes. It is not always possible to be very strict about this and inevitably the situation revealed by a particularly rich piece of source material will affect the ‘date’ of the figures for that case study. So in some cases that ‘date’ will be more Tudor than medieval, but hopefully this does not cause undue distortion of the statistics.

2. The position of the land type in the parish, simplified as:
   - centre
   - near centre
   - edge
   - near edge
   - dispersed
   - widespread

3. The ‘inherent’ attributes of that land, in terms of:
   i. The slope of the land. Slope has an important effect on drainage and this in turn affects the suitability of the land for agriculture. The slope was calculated in degrees and then assigned to one of five categories:
      - level (<1°)
      - slight slope (1–3°)
      - gentle slope (4–6°)
      - moderate slope (7–9°)
      - steep slope (10°+)
   ii. The drainage characteristics of the soil, according to the definitions and mapping of the Soil Survey (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984). The permeability of a soil also has an important affect on its suitability for agriculture. The detailed descriptions of the soils were simplified into:
      - well drained/dry
      - well drained
      - slight waterlogging
      - some waterlogging
      - seasonal waterlogging
      - wet

4. The external attributes of the land type were assessed in terms of:
   i. The shape of the unit(s), simplified as:
      - compact
      - linear
      - triangular
      - semi-triangular
   ii. The boundary of the unit(s), defined as:
      - gently curved
      - irregular, angular
      - irregular, gently curved
      - rectangular
      - semi-rectangular
      - rounded
      - straight
   iii. Whether the land type was significantly (20% or more) bounded by roads.
   iv. Whether the land type was significantly (20% or more) bounded by parish boundaries.
   v. The external boundary loss of the unit(s) between the first edition Ordnance Survey maps of the 1880s and the current Ordnance maps. The first edition maps were used as the base maps for the case studies as the oldest detailed maps with a consistent scale and mapping conventions. It is important to note that the loss figures relate only to the difference between those two dates, not to the overall loss that a land type may have experienced over the centuries. Loss was estimated in five categories:
      - nil, under 24%, 25–49%, 50–74%, 75% or more.
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5. The internal attributes of the land type were assessed in terms of:

i. The predominant field size, as shown on the Ordnance Survey first edition maps of c.1880. These were divided into three categories:
   - small — under 2 hectares (5 acres)
   - medium — 2 to 6 hectares (5–15 acres)
   - large — more than 6 hectares (15 acres)

ii. The predominant form of the field boundary lines, separated into two categories:
   - gently curved or straight

iii. Whether roads penetrate into the land type or not.

iv. The internal boundary loss between the first edition Ordnance Survey maps of the 1880s and the current Ordnance maps. As with the external boundaries, the loss figures only relate to the differences between those dates, not to the overall loss. Loss was estimated in five categories:
   - nil, under 24%, 25–49%, 50–74%, 75% or more.

2. The land types

1. Block demesne

1.1 Core block demesne (Table 3 and Chart 1)

i. Definition
   
   This land type consists of blocks of exclusively demesne land that abutted or encompassed the hall of the manor to which it belonged, as opposed to ‘detached’ block demesne, which is separated from its hall (see land type 1.2). ‘Core’ therefore refers to the hall-demesne relationship, not to the location of the block demesne within the overall parish area. In terms of land-use, core block demesne includes arable, pasture and farmyards, but excludes demesne meadow, woods and parkland (see types 5.1, 7.1 and 8).

ii. Occurrence
   
   Core block demesne occurs in all but one (Swanton Morley) of the case studies. Its absence in Swanton Morley is probably more apparent than real, due to the abandonment of an original hall site and the absorption of its small core block demesne into demesne meadow and parkland.

iii. Size
   
   Core block demesne varied tremendously from one case study to another. The smallest block was c.4ha in Scole and the largest was c.352ha in Felsted. The percentage of each parish occupied by core block demesne was very variable. In Worstead, South Elmham St Michael, Scole and Dullingham core block demesne represented less than 10% of the area of each parish. By way of contrast over 20% of Thorpe Parva and Felsted was occupied by core block demesne. The other case studies had between 11 and 20% of core block demesne.

   The small core block demesnes fall into two distinct types. Worstead, Scole and Dullingham represent parishes whose demesne land was largely spread as strips in common fields rather than concentrated as a block. In all three parishes the core block demesne does not exceed 1% of the parish area. The second type of small core block demesne is represented by the demesnes of secondary manors, which are generally indistinguishable in layout from large block tenements. These secondary small blocks can be seen at Felsted, Sutton and Ardeley, where they are usually peripheral to larger primary core demesnes.

iv. Position
   
   In four parishes (Scole, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Great Henny) the core block demesne had a centre or near centre position; in Sutton and Dullingham there was a mixture of centre and edge positions, while at Felsted there was a clear division between the primary block demesnes on the edge and secondary ones nearer the centre. Edge or near edge locations occurred in six parishes (South Elmham St Michael, Frenze, Worlingworth, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows). An important factor in the predominance of edge locations for this type is the fact that it is frequently positioned on the sides of valleys and watercourses in the valleys are often parish boundaries.

v. Land quality
   
   In eight out of the fourteen parishes the core block demesne is located on the best available land, in terms of natural drainage and soil type, for arable crops. At Thelveton all the parish is level and suffers from seasonal waterlogging. In the remaining five parishes (Scole, Frenze, Thorpe Parva, Ardeley and Dullingham) the demesnes also had a considerable portion of their land in common fields situated on better land.

vi. Morphology
   
   Except for the linear example at South Elmham St Michael, core block demesne is compact in shape, but can vary in its outline, being frequently irregular as well as semi-rectangular, with gently curved and angular boundary lines.

   In twelve of the parishes a significant part of the external boundary of the core block demesne coincides with roads (Worstead, Scole, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Worlingworth, Great Henny, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham). In most of these areas the road patterns can be described as ‘ancient’ and they clearly played an important part in defining land units.

   Ten parishes have a significant part of the external boundary of the core block demesne coinciding with a parish boundary (Frenze, Thorpe Parva, Worlingworth, Great Henny, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham). In eight instances this reflects the peripheral location of a hall and demesne block within the parish. The two exceptions to this pattern, Thorpe Parva and Great Henny, both have unusually large core block demesnes compared to their parish areas (56% and 19%, respectively), so inevitably significant amounts of the parish and demesne boundaries coincide. Of the remaining four parishes, two only have small core block demesnes (Worstead and Scole) and the other two (South Elmham St Michael and Thelveton) are separated from a parish edge by, respectively, a meadow and a park.

   In terms of their internal characteristics, three of the core block demesnes (Sutton, Felsted and Ardeley) were composed mainly of medium and large fields, nine (South Elmham St Michael, Scole, Frenze, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Worlingworth, Great Henny, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows) had medium-sized fields, one had small and medium fields (Dullingham), and one (Worstead) had only small fields.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>AREA OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>1 centre</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>well drained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>4 edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>1 near centre</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>16 edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>16 near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>56 centre</td>
<td>slight slope + level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>13 near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>19 centre</td>
<td>slight + gentle slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>13 centre + edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>well drained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>21 near edge (P</td>
<td>slight-gentle slope</td>
<td>well drained (P &amp; S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S) + near centre (S)</td>
<td>&amp; S) &amp; S)</td>
<td>+ slight slope (P &amp; S) &amp; S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>13 near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>10 near edge + edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>slightly waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakhm-le-Wills (S)</td>
<td>12 near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duningham (C)</td>
<td>1 near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>slightly waterlogging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Land type 1.1, core block demesne
Chart 1  Core block demesne
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear gently curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>edge slight slope seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge + near edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>edge + near edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>edge + near edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>edge slight slope seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Land type 1.2, detached block demesne
Predominantly straight boundaries occurred at Frenze and Sutton; a mixture of gently curved and straight boundaries were found at South Elmham St Michael, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Worlingworth, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows, and mainly gently curved ones at Scole, Great Henny and Dullingham.

Only the small core block demesnes of Scole and Dullingham were not penetrated by a road.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:

**External boundaries:**
- **nil:** 2 parishes — Scole and Frenze
- **under 25%:** 8 parishes — Worstead, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham
- **25–49%:** 3 parishes — Worlingworth, Great Henny and Sutton
- **50–74%:** 1 parish — South Elmham St Michael

**Internal boundaries:**
- **under 25%:** 6 parishes — Worstead, Scole, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Ardeley and Dullingham
- **25–49%:** 6 parishes — Frenze, Great Henny, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows
- **50–74%:** 1 parish — South Elmham St Michael
- **over 75%:** 1 parish — Worlingworth

This indicates that the external boundaries survived better than the internal ones, with a majority of the areas suffering a loss of under 25% of their external boundaries, but a majority loss of over 25% of internal boundaries.

1.2. Detached block demeines (Table 4, Chart 2)

i. Definition
This land type consists of blocks of exclusively demesne land that was separated spatially from the manorial hall to which it belonged. It excludes demesne strips in common fields, as well as demesne meadow, woods and parkland. In terms of land-use, detached block demesne includes arable, pasture and farmyards. There was a tendency for areas of detached block demesne to be sub-infeudated as secondary manors, a process that can be seen at Felsted.

There is therefore often a problem in deciding whether an area should be classified as detached block demesne or as (secondary) core block demesne.

ii. Occurrence
Occurs in six parishes — South Elmham St Michael, Great Henny, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows. This indicates a much greater prevalence in the southern part of the study area than in the north.

iii. Size
Detached block demesnes varied, as a component of a parish, from a low 2% at South Elmham St Michael to 19% at Ingatestone. The southernmost examples (Felsted 13%, Ingatestone 19%, Ardeley 7%) were all consistently larger than those further north (South Elmham 2%, Great Henny 4% and Walsham 8%).

iv. Position
In all the examples this type was positioned on or near the edge of the parishes.

v. Land quality
Detached block demesne was usually situated on reasonable land for arable farming, but not always the best available. The type occurs exclusively on disadvantaged level land with seasonal waterlogging in two instances (South Elmham St Michael and Walsham-le-Willows) and partially in a further two (Felsted and Ingatestone).

vi. Morphology
In two parishes (Felsted and Walsham-le-Willows) the detached block demesne was defined as both compact and linear; in two as compact (Great Henny and Ingatestone); and linear in another two (South Elmham St Michael and Ardeley). The greater prevalence of linear units in this type contrasts with the largely compact core block demesnes. External boundary lines are a mixture of irregular, gently curved and angular. Except at South Elmham St Michael, this type is bounded significantly by both roads and parish boundaries.

Internally, this type is composed of medium and large fields in three instances (Felsted, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows); and of medium-sized fields in the remaining three (South Elmham St Michael, Great Henny and Ingatestone). In all six there was a mixture of gently curved and straight boundaries. Roads penetrated the blocks in all but two examples (South Elmham St Michael and Ingatestone).

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:

**External boundaries:**
- **under 25%:** 4 parishes — Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows
- **25–49%:** 2 parishes — South Elmham St Michael and Great Henny

**Internal boundaries:**
- **under 25%:** 1 parish — Ardeley
- **25–49%:** 4 parishes — South Elmham St Michael, Felsted, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows
- **over 75%:** 1 parish — Great Henny

This indicates that the external boundaries survived better than the internal ones, with a majority of the areas suffering a loss of under 25% of their external boundaries, but a majority loss of over 25% of internal boundaries.

2. Tenement blocks (Table 5, Chart 3)

i. Definition
This land type consists of the blocks of land that abutted or encompassed the house and yards of tenements. In this they resemble core block demesnes, but are, of course, not manorial in status. Tenement blocks can either occur individually or be part of agglomerations of several similar blocks. Scattered strips in common fields are not included in this type. In terms of land-use, tenement blocks include arable, pasture and farmyards, but exclude (where definable) meadow and woods in severalty (see types 5.2 and 7.2).

ii. Occurrence
This type occurs in all of the case studies.

iii. Size
In four parishes (South Elmham St Michael, Worlingworth, Felsted and Ingatestone) the areas of block
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>centre + dispersed</td>
<td>slight slope + well drained level</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scol (N)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>near centre + near edge</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>not + n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>centre + near edge</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>small + g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5  Land type 2, tenement blocks
tenements constitute over 50% of the parish areas, with a further two (Great Henny and Walsham-le-Willows) having 20% or more. Small areas, under 10%, were recorded in six parishes (Worstead, Swanton Morley, Frenze, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva and Dullingham), with three (Scole, Sutton and Ardeley) falling between 20% and 10%. The central and southern parts of the study area stand out as having large tenement blocks, with the smallest in the north and west.

iv. Position
In six parishes (South Elmham St Michael, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows) the blocks are widespread. In Worstead the blocks are smaller and have been described as central and dispersed. Centre or near centre locations occur in two parishes (Thelveton and Thorpe Parva). Centre and edge locations occur in three instances (Scole, Worlingworth and Dullingham); edge or near edge locations were found in two (Frenze and Great Henny). ‘Widespread’ blocks can therefore be seen as more prevalent in the central and southern parts of the study area.

v. Land quality
Tenement blocks were usually situated on land with some potential for arable farming, but not normally the best available. The type occurs exclusively on disadvantaged level land with seasonal waterlogging in five instances (South Elmham St Michael, Frenze, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva and Worlingworth) and partially in a further four (Scole, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows).

vi. Morphology
In seven parishes (Frenze, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Worlingworth, Felsted, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows) the blocks were compact in shape, with a mixture of compact and linear blocks at the remaining eight (Worstead, Swanton Morley, South Elmham St Michael, Scole, Great Henny, Sutton, Ingatestone and Dullingham). The boundaries of the blocks were a mixture of semi-rectangular and irregular, with gently curved and angular outlines. All were significantly bounded by roads and twelve out of the fifteen parishes also had blocks that were bounded by parish boundaries (the exceptions are Worstead, Thorpe Parva and Dullingham).

Most tenement blocks contained a mixture of small and medium sized fields, with only small fields being recorded in three Norfolk parishes (Worstead, Frenze, Thelveton). At Thorpe Parva the very small tenement blocks were undivided. Internal boundaries were normally a mixture of gently curved and straight, with predominantly gently curved ones occurring in one parish (Felsted) and predominantly straight in two (Frenze and Thelveton). Roads penetrated the blocks in all instances, except the very small blocks at Thorpe Parva.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External boundaries:</th>
<th>50–74%: 2 parishes — South Elmham St Michael and Great Henny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nil 1 parish — Thorpe Parva</td>
<td>Internal boundaries:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 25%: 6 parishes — Worstead, Swanton Morley, Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Felsted</td>
<td>n/a 1 parish — Thorpe Parva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–49%: 6 parishes — Worlingworth, Sutton, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham</td>
<td>under 25%: 3 parishes — Worstead, Swanton Morley and Thelveton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that the external boundaries survived better than the internal ones, with a clear majority of the areas suffering a loss of under 50% of their external boundaries, but around a quarter had lost over 50% of their internal boundaries.

3. Common fields (Table 6, Chart 4)

i. Definition
Arable land internally subdivided into unfenced strips that were held by a number of different individuals.

ii. Occurrence
Common fields occurred in all except two of the parishes, both in Essex (Felsted and Ingatestone).

iii. Size
In five instances (Worstead, Swanton Morley, Scole, Frenze and Dullingham) the common field comprised over 50% of the parish areas; in another six (Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Great Henny, Sutton, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows) the proportion of common fields was over 25%, but in the remaining two (South Elmham St Michael and Worlingworth) it fell below 25%. The greatest areas of common fields were therefore clearly in the north and extreme west of the study area, with lower amounts or a complete absence being recorded further south.

iv. Position
Common fields were widespread in six parishes (Worstead, Swanton Morley, Scole, Thelveton, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham); in two (South Elmham St Michael and Thorpe Parva) they were in an edge position; in another two (Frenze and Worlingworth) they were more central; and in a further two (Great Henny, Sutton and Ardeley) they were in both edge and centre positions.

v. Land quality
Common fields usually occupy land well-suited to arable farming and frequently have the best available land in their parishes, or a considerable share of it. At Thelveton all the parish is level and suffers from seasonal waterlogging. Parts of common fields occupy potentially disadvantaged level and seasonally waterlogged land in another six parishes (Swanton Morley, Scole, Frenze, Worlingworth, Great Henny and Walsham-le-Willows).

vi. Morphology
All examples were compact in shape. Outlines were irregular with a mixture of gently curved and angular boundaries. The fields were significantly bounded by roads in all but one case (South Elmham St Michael). In all thirteen there were common fields abutting parish boundaries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>AREA OF PARISH</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>well drained +</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elham St</td>
<td></td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>well drained +</td>
<td>compact irregular, angular +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>centre</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>compact irregular, angular +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>well drained +</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>near centre +</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>centre +</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>compact irregular, angular +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>edge</td>
<td></td>
<td>well drained +</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight slope +</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatstone (E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>some/seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td></td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>well drained + slight-waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>level to gentle slope</td>
<td>some/seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunagingham (C)</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>well drained +</td>
<td>compact irregular, angular +</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
<td>yes yes 2; 4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Land type 3, common fields
By the 1880s most of the common field areas had been enclosed and their areas were occupied by a mixture of medium-sized and large fields in six instances (Swanton Morley, Scole, Frenze, Sutton, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham); five had largely medium-sized fields (Worstead, South Elmham St Michael, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva, Worlingworth); a mixture of small to large fields were observed at Ardeley and small to medium at Great Henny. There does seem to be a relationship between large areas of common fields and larger fields after enclosure. Field boundaries were a mixture of gently curved and straight lines in most cases, but straight lines predominated at Worstead, Swanton Morley, Sutton and Dullingham, all situated on lighter spoils where the moving of boundaries was probably an easier task. Roads penetrated all the common field areas, except at South Elmham St Michael.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:
External boundaries:
under 25%: 7 parishes — Worstead, Swanton Morley (south part), Scole, Frenze, Thelveton, Ardeley and Dullingham
25–49%: 4 parishes — Swanton Morley (north part), Worlingworth, Sutton and Walsham-le-Willows
50–74%: 2 parishes – South Elmham St Michael, Thorpe Parva and Great Henny

Internal boundaries:
under 25%: 1 parish — Ardeley
25–49%: 6 parishes — Swanton Morley (south part), Scole, Frenze, Thelveton, Sutton and Dullingham
50–74%: 3 parishes — Worstead, South Elmham St Michael, Great Henny and Walsham-le-Willows
over 75%: 3 parishes — Swanton Morley (north part), Thorpe Parva and Worlingworth

This indicates that the external boundaries survived better than the internal ones, with a clear majority of the areas suffering a loss of under 50% of their external boundaries, but half have lost more than 50% of their internal boundaries.

4. Common Pasture

4.1. Droves (Table 7)

i. Definition
Droves are broad roadways that have strips of pasture flanking one or both sides of the metalled surface. The pasture was often held in common and droves frequently formed links between greens or other areas of pasture. The meaning is ‘a road on which cattle were driven’.

ii. Occurrence
Droves occur in all but four of the parishes (Swanton Morley, Scole, Thorpe Parva, and Worlingworth).

iii. Size
Droves are only small land types and therefore normally comprise less than 1% of the parish areas. The largest, proportionally, are in South Elmham St Michael (1%), Thelveton (2%) and Great Henny (1%).

iv. Position
In most cases the droves are widespread, but have centre locations in Frenze and centre and edge locations in Dullingham.

v. Land quality
Droves occupy a mixture of soils, but are present exclusively on level and seasonally waterlogged soils in three instances (South Elmham St Michael, Frenze and Thelveton) and partially so in a further four (Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows).

vi. Morphology
All the droves are linear in shape, with irregular, but gently curving outlines. By definition they all have roads running through them. They are only significantly abut parish boundaries in five parishes (Thelveton, Great Henny, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Dullingham). They are not internally subdivided.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
All the examples suffered a less than 25% loss of their external boundaries since c.1880.

4.2. Small greens (Table 8)

i. Definition
Small greens are areas of common pasture that are less than 2 hectares (5 acres) in size.

ii. Occurrence
Small greens occur in all but five of the parishes (South Elmham St Michael, Scole, Thelveton, Thorpe Parva and Worlingworth), the majority of which are in or near the Waveney valley.

iii. Size
By definition, these are small units and they comprise only a very small percentage of the parish areas, varying between 0.1% and 0.5%.

iv. Position
Centre and near centre positions were found in five instances (Worstead, Swanton Morley, Frenze, Sutton and Walsham-le-Willows); near edge positions in two (Ingatestone and Ardeley); and a mixture of central and edge positions in three (Great Henny, Felsted and Dullingham).

v. Land quality
Small greens occurred on a mixture of land quality, with the greens of one parish (Frenze) wholly on disadvantaged level ground with seasonal waterlogging and three others (Swanton Morley, Great Henny and Ingatestone) where the greens were partly on that type of land.

vi. Morphology
Small greens are commonly triangular, being formed at the junction of three roads and this form alone was found in two parishes (Swanton Morley and Sutton), in combination with linear forms in two (Worstead and Walsham-le-Willows) and with compact forms in another two (Felsted and Ardeley). Linear forms occur in Frenze, compact forms occur in Great Henny and a mixture of compact and linear forms in Dullingham.
### Table 7  Land type 4.1, droves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Area of Parish</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Inherent Attributes</th>
<th>External Attributes</th>
<th>Internal Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0.3 widespread</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>well drained</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>1 widespread</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0.5 centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetleton (N)</td>
<td>2 widespread</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>1 widespread</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0.4 widespread</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>well drained</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0.2 widespread</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0.4 widespread</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0.6 widespread</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0.5 widespread</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>0.1 centre + near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE STUDIES</td>
<td>AREA OF PARISH</td>
<td>% INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0.2 centre</td>
<td>level well drained</td>
<td>triangular</td>
<td>n/a n/a yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>0.1 centre + near centre</td>
<td>level slight/seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>triangular + linear</td>
<td>n/a yes n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0.5 centre</td>
<td>level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a no 2; 3 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetfordton (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wortingworth (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>0.2 centre + edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope seasonsal waterlogging + wet</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a yes 1.1 3 5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0.1 near centre</td>
<td>level well drained</td>
<td>triangular gently curved</td>
<td>n/a no 1.1; 2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0.2 near centre + near edge</td>
<td>level slight waterlogging</td>
<td>triangular + compact</td>
<td>n/a yes 1.2; 2 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0.3 near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope seasonal waterlogging + wet</td>
<td>triangular + rectangular irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a yes 1.2; 2 4.1; 5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0.2 near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope + slope waterlogging</td>
<td>triangular + linear g. curved</td>
<td>n/a yes 1.2; 2 4.1; 5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0.1 centre</td>
<td>level some waterlogging</td>
<td>triangular + linear + linear</td>
<td>n/a no 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>0.2 centre + near edge</td>
<td>level slight waterlogging</td>
<td>semi-rectangular + linear + irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>n/a yes 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Land type 4.2, small greens
Because these greens are commonly formed around road junctions, they are all penetrated by roads, but only one (Great Henny) is significantly bounded by a road and a parish boundary.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses of external boundaries since c.1880 were observed:

- under 25%: 8 parishes — Worstead, Swanton Morley, Great Henny, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Dullingham
- 25–49%: 2 parishes — Worlingworth and Felsted
- over 75% Walsham-le-Willows

Internal boundaries (in the three which had been enclosed by c.1880):

- 25–49%: 1 parish — Worlingworth
- 50–74%: 1 parish — Scole
- over 75%: 1 parish — Frenze

4.4. Large greens (Table 10)

i. Definition
Large greens are areas of common pasture that are greater than 20 hectares (50 acres) in size.

ii. Occurrence
Large greens occurred in five places (Thelveton, Worlingworth, Felsted, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows).

iii. Size
In actual size, these greens varied in size from around 24 hectares (60 acres) at Thelveton Green to around 50 hectares (125 acres) at Fairy Common in Felsted, however the 34 hectares (84 acres) of Allwood Green in Walsham-le-Willows were only that parish's share of this massive multi-parish green that covered some 215 hectares (530 acres). As a percentage of parish areas, however, these greens appear as relatively small land types, varying from 2% at Felsted to 13% at Thelveton.

iv. Position
All the greens had an edge or near edge position.

v. Land quality
In three of the parishes (Thelveton, Worlingworth and Walsham-le-Willows) the greens were on agriculturally disadvantaged level ground with seasonal waterlogging: the Ingatestone green was on a mixture of level and slightly sloping seasonally-waterlogged land; and that at Felsted was on level land with slight waterlogging. In overall terms, these greens were sited on the poorest available land in their parishes.

vi. Morphology
In three places (Thelveton, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows) the greens were compact in shape, with triangular or semi-triangular examples at Worlingworth and Felsted, respectively. Boundaries were semi-rectangular at Thelveton, irregular and gently curved at Ingatestone and a mixture of gently curved and straight/angular at Worlingworth, Felsted and Walsham-le-Willows. Roads formed a significant part of the boundaries at Thelveton and Walsham-le-Willows, but all were penetrated by roads. The greens significantly abutted or straddled parish boundaries in four cases (Thelveton, Felsted, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows).

Four of the greens had been enclosed by c.1880 and were infilled with small fields at Worlingworth, medium-sized fields at Thelveton, small and medium fields at...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PARISH INPOSITION</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>linear irregular, angular</td>
<td>no no 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>linear semi-rectangular</td>
<td>no yes 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>linear semi-rectangular</td>
<td>no yes 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>linear semi-rectangular</td>
<td>yes yes 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>linear semi-rectangular</td>
<td>yes yes 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>compact + irregular, angular</td>
<td>yes no 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>triangular + g. curved + semi-triangular + angular</td>
<td>no no 1; 2 4.1; 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>linear straight</td>
<td>no no 2; 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>semi-triangular + g. curved + semi-rect. + l ar + compact</td>
<td>no no 2; 4.1 4.3; 5.2 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>linear g. curved</td>
<td>no no 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level seasonal</td>
<td>linear straight</td>
<td>no no 2; 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (I)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>semi-triangular + g. curved + semi-rect. + l ar + compact</td>
<td>no no 2; 4.1 4.3; 5.2 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level some waterlogging</td>
<td>linear g. curved</td>
<td>no no 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level some waterlogging</td>
<td>linear g. curved + straight</td>
<td>no no 2; 5.1 7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9  Land type 4.3, medium greens
### Table 10  Land type 4.4, large greens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>AREA % OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Slope: level</td>
<td>Shape: compact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Soil drainage: seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>Boundary: semi-rectangular</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scote (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>13 edge</td>
<td>Shape: level</td>
<td>Boundary: compact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Soil drainage: seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>Boundary: semi-rectangular</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>3 near edge</td>
<td>Shape: level</td>
<td>Boundary: compact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Soil drainage: seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>Boundary: semi-rectangular</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>2 edge</td>
<td>Shape: level</td>
<td>Boundary: compact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>4 near edge</td>
<td>Soil drainage: level + slight waterlogging</td>
<td>Boundary: semi-rectangular</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>3 edge</td>
<td>Shape: level</td>
<td>Boundary: compact</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Soil drainage: seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>Boundary: semi-rectangular</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Land type 4.4, large greens
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Soil drainage</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11  Land type 4.5, riverside commons
vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:
External boundaries:
- under 25%: 3 parishes — Thelveton, Ingatestone and Walsham-le-Willows
- 25–49%: 1 parish — Worlingworth
- over 75%: 1 parish — Felsted

Internal boundaries (in the four which had been enclosed by c.1880):
- 25–49%: 2 parishes — Thelveton and Felsted
- 50–74%: 1 parish — Walsham-le-Willows
- over 75%: 1 parish — Worlingworth

4.5. Riverside commons (Table 11)
i. Definition
Riverside commons are extensive areas of common pasture that are located beside rivers. This land type seems to have been used for animal pasture rather than as mowing meadows. Inevitably, however, there will have been some overlap with common meadows (see 5.3).

ii. Occurrence
Riverside commons occurred exclusively in Norfolk — at Worstead, Swanton Morley, Scole and Frenze.

iii. Size
Riverside commons varied from large areas in northern Norfolk at Worstead (c.75 hectares/190 acres) and Swanton Morley (c.115 hectares/290 acres), to modest amounts at Frenze (c.6 hectares/16 acres) and Scole (c.2 hectares/6 acres) in the Waveney valley. However in terms of overall parish areas, this land type only comprised between 1% (Scole) and 8% (Swanton Morley).

iv. Position
All the commons occupied edge positions in their parishes.

v. Land quality
All the examples were on level land, two with wet soils (Swanton Morley and Thorpe Parva); four with seasonally waterlogged soils (Frenze, Thelveton, Worlingworth, Ingatestone); three with slight or some waterlogging (Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham); and two with soils described as well-drained (Great Henny and Felsted).

vi. Morphology
All the commons were linear in form, with irregular, gently curved boundaries. All except that at Swanton Morley were significantly bounded by roads, but they all abutted parish boundaries (in the form of rivers). Internally, the commons were subdivided into small fields, though often long and thin, with mainly straight boundaries in the form of drainage ditches, though Frenze had a mixture of gently curved and straight boundaries. Roads penetrated the larger commons at Worstead and Swanton Morley.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:
External boundaries:
- nil
- under 25%: 1 parish — Scole
- 25–49%: 3 parishes — Worstead, Swanton Morley and Frenze

5. Meadow
5.1. Demesne meadow (Table 12, Chart 5)
i. Definition
Demesne meadow is enclosed grassland that was owned and exclusively used by a manorial lord. It was mown for hay in the summer and was then used for pasturing animals.

ii. Occurrence
It occurs in all but four of the case studies (Worstead, South Elmham St Michael, Scole and Sutton).

iii. Size
The largest amount, proportionally, occurred in Frenze (14%), but elsewhere it comprised between 1% and 5% of the parish areas.

iv. Position
It occurred in an edge or near edge position in a majority of cases (Swanton Morley, Frenze, Thorpe Parva, Great Henny, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Dullingham). This is unsurprising as meadow is usually found in damp valley bottoms beside rivers and rivers are frequently parish boundaries. Centre and near centre locations were however recorded at Thelveton, Worlingworth and Walsham-le-Willows.

v. Land quality
All the examples were on level land, two with wet soils (Swanton Morley and Thorpe Parva); four with seasonally waterlogged soils (Frenze, Thelveton, Worlingworth, Ingatestone); three with slight or some waterlogging (Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham); and two with soils described as well-drained (Great Henny and Felsted).

vi. Morphology
All had linear shapes, though compact forms also occurred at Ardeley. Boundaries were mainly irregular and gently curved, though angular and straight forms also occurred at Swanton Morley and Dullingham. Only at Worlingworth, Felsted and Ingatestone were the meadows significantly bounded by roads. All except five (Thelveton, Worlingworth, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham) significantly abutted parish boundaries.

Medium-sized fields were recorded in three cases (Swanton Morley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham); small and medium-sized in four (Scole, Great Henny, Felsted, Ardeley); small to large at Worlingworth; and only small in the last three (Thelveton, Thorpe Parva and Ingatestone). Internal boundaries were usually gently curved, but straight ones predominated at Thorpe Parva and Worlingworth, with a mixture occurring at Frenze, Felsted and Ingatestone. Roads penetrated the meadows in only one case (Worlingworth).

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:
External boundaries:
### Table 12 Land type 5.1, demesne meadow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>AREA % OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Soil drainage</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetford (N)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>Well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Edge + near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>Well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>some waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE STUDIES</td>
<td>% OF PARISH</td>
<td>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge + near edge</td>
<td>level wet</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetleton (N)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>edge + near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level + slight-modern slope</td>
<td>well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet + well drained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>edge, near edge + near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight-some waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>centre + near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>some waterlogging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>near centre + edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>slight waterlogging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Land type 5.2, several meadow
### 5.3 COMMON MEADOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Soil drainage</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Significantly bounded</td>
<td>External boundary loss</td>
<td>Main field size c. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>centre + edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>well-drained + wet</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale (N)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>yes yes 3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>edge + near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1.1; 3 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>compact</td>
<td>irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>wet</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>near centre + edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact</td>
<td>irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>yes yes 5.2</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Land type 5.3, common meadow
5.2. Several meadow (Table 13, Chart 5)

i. Definition
Several meadow is enclosed grassland that was held by individual tenants for their own exclusive use. It was mown for hay in the summer and was then used for pasturing animals.

ii. Occurrence
Several meadow occurred in all but two of the case studies (Worstead and Thorpe Parva).

iii. Size
The greatest proportions recorded were at Great Henny (10%) and Ardeley (6%), but otherwise the amounts were 5% or less.

iv. Position
As with demesne meadow, edge or near edge positions were commonest (Swanton Morley, South Elmham St Michael, Scole, Frenze, Thelveton, Worlingworth, Great Henny, Sutton, Ingatestone and Ardeley); with a mixture of centre and edge positions being recorded at Felsted, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham.

v. Land quality
All the examples were on level land, though at Great Henny they also occurred on slight-moderate slopes. The soils were classified as wet in three cases (Swanton Morley, Scole and Frenze); seasonally waterlogged in four cases (South Elmham St Michael, Thelveton, Worlingworth, Ingatestone); slight or some waterlogging in another four (Felsted, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham); well drained at Great Henny and a mixture of wet and well-drained at Sutton.

vi. Morphology
All had linear shapes, though compact forms also occurred at Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham. Boundaries were mainly irregular and gently curved, but straight boundaries also occurred at Great Henny, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows. Only in five cases (Scole, Worlingworth, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Dullingham) were the meadows significantly bounded by roads. All except two (Thelveton, Walsham-le-Willows) did however abut parish boundaries. The majority had small fields (Swanton Morley, Scole, Frenze, Thelveton, Worlingworth, Great Henny, Felsted, Ingatestone); with a mixture of small and medium-sized fields occurring in five cases (South Elmham St Michael, Sutton, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham). Internal boundaries were mainly gently curved in three cases (Swanton Morley, South Elmham St Michael, Scole); but straight in two (Thelveton, Worlingworth); with a mixture occurring in the remaining eight (Frenze, Great Henny, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham). Roads only significantly penetrated the meadows at Worlingworth.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed: External boundaries: nil 1 parish — Swanton Morley
under 25%: 2 parishes — South Elmham St Michael and Sutton
25–49%: 9 parishes — Scole, Frenze, Thelveton, Great Henny, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham
50–74%: 1 parish — Thorpe Parva

Internal boundaries:
nil 1 parish — Swanton Morley
under 25%: 6 parishes — South Elmham St Michael, Scole, Frenze, Thelveton, Worlingworth and Great Henny
25–49%: 6 parishes — Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham
50–74%: 1 parish — Thorpe Parva

5.3. Common meadow (Table 14, Chart 5)

i. Definition
Common meadow is grassland that was divided into separately owned strips for the purpose of mowing for hay, but was otherwise subject to common grazing.

ii. Occurrence
Common meadows were recorded in only six places (Worstead, Scole, Worlingworth, Great Henny, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham).

iii. Size
The greatest amounts, proportionally, were recorded at Worstead and Great Henny (both 6%), the remainder had 4% or less, the smallest being 1% at Worlingworth.

iv. Position
Common meadow occupied edge or near edge positions in all the examples, but centre or near centre locations were also recorded at Worstead and Dullingham.

v. Land quality
All occupied level land, with soil defined as wet in three cases (Scole, Great Henny and Walsham-le-Willows); as seasonally waterlogged at Worlingworth; as suffering some waterlogging at Dullingham; and as a mixture of wet and well-drained at Worstead.

vi. Morphology
Linear forms occurred in four places (Worstead, Scole, Worlingworth and Walsham-le-Willows) and compact forms in two (Great Henny and Dullingham). Boundaries were mainly irregular and gently curved, though straight forms also occurred at Dullingham. Only at Scole, Worlingworth and Dullingham were they bounded by roads, though all abutted parish boundaries.

By c.1880 all except that at Great Henny were subdivided into fields: small fields predominated at Worstead, Scole and Worlingworth; and a mixture of small and medium-sized fields at Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham. Only at Worlingworth were they penetrated by roads.
vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:
External boundaries:
- under 25%: 4 parishes — Worstead, Great Henny, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham
- 25–49%: 1 parish — Scole
- 50–74%: 1 parish — Worlingworth
Internal boundaries:
- under 25%: 4 parishes — Worstead, Scole, Worlingworth and Walsham-le-Willows
- over 75%: 1 parish — Dullingham

6. Heath

6.1. Several heath (Table 15, Chart 6)

i. Definition
Areas of dry pasture held by individual owners (manorial lords and tenants) for their own exclusive use. Characterised by poor grassland when on chalky soils and grassland and/or heather (principally *Calluna vulgaris*) when on acidic soils. Mainly used for sheep grazing, or, if very poor, rabbit warrens. Boundaries can vary from hedges and earth banks to marker posts and soil heaps known as *dools*.

ii. Occurrence
Recorded only at Sutton and Dullingham, the former on acidic soils and the latter on chalky ones.

iii. Size
Proportionally both are similar in size: 17% at Sutton and 12% at Dullingham.

iv. Position
Both have an edge position.

v. Land quality
The heath at Sutton is located on level and slightly-sloping land that is well-drained, that at Dullingham is on a slight slope, with well drained/dry soil.

vi. Morphology
Both areas are compact in form, with boundaries that are gently curved and angular at Worstead and gently curved at Sutton. Both are significantly bounded by roads and parish boundaries.

As seen c.1880, they both contained large fields, with straight boundaries at Worstead and a mixture of gently curved and straight ones at Sutton. Both are penetrated by roads.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:
External boundaries:
- nil: 1 parish — Dullingham
- 25–49%: 4 parishes — Sutton
Internal boundaries:
- under 25%: 1 parish — Dullingham
- 25–49%: 1 parish — Sutton

6.2. Common heath (Table 16, Chart 6)

i. Definition
Areas of dry pasture as defined above, but subject to common grazing.

ii. Occurrence
Recorded only at Worstead and Sutton.

iii. Size
Proportionally both are similar in size: 17% at Worstead and 20% at Sutton.

iv. Position
Both are in an edge position.

v. Land quality
At Worstead the heath was on level land with a well-drained/dry soil, at Sutton it was on level and slightly sloping land with a well-drained soil.

vi. Morphology
Both are compact in form, with boundaries that are gently curved and angular at Worstead and gently curved at Sutton. Both are significantly bounded by roads and parish boundaries.

As seen c.1880, they both contained large fields, with straight boundaries at Worstead and a mixture of gently curved and straight ones at Sutton. Both are penetrated by roads.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:
External boundaries:
- under 25%: 1 parish — Worstead
- 25–49%: 1 parish — Sutton
Internal boundaries:
- under 25%: 1 parish — Sutton
- 25–49%: 1 parish — Worstead

7. Woodland

7.1. Demesne woodland (Table 17)

i. Definition
Woodland that was held directly by a manorial lord, for his exclusive use.

ii. Occurrence
Demesne woodland was found in all but three of the case studies (all in Norfolk — Worstead, Frenze and Thorpe Parva).

iii. Size
Demesne woodland was found in all but three of the case studies (all in Norfolk — Worstead, Frenze and Thorpe Parva).

iv. Position
Most examples were in an edge or near edge position (Swanton Morley, South Elmham St Michael, Thelveton, Worlingworth, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham); Scole was the
### Table 15 Land type 6.1, several heath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPOSITION</td>
<td>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>level + slight</td>
<td>well drained</td>
<td>large g. curved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>slope</td>
<td>compact</td>
<td>+ straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Land type 6.1, several heath
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with South Elmham St (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmswell (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feazey (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Land type 6.2, common heath
### Table 17  Land type 7.1, demesne woodland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Soil drainage</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thehteton (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henney (E)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>near centre + near edge</td>
<td>slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>well drained + wet</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>edge + near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>well drained + slight waterlogging</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>near edge + near edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>seasonal</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>near edge edge + near edge</td>
<td>level + slight gentle slope</td>
<td>waterlogging</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>slight slope + seasonal</td>
<td>waterlogging</td>
<td>compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope</td>
<td>waterlogging</td>
<td>linear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2. Several woodland (Table 18)

i. Definition
Woodland that was held by individual tenants for their own exclusive use.

ii. Occurrence
Several woodland was recorded at eight places (Worstead, Swanton Morley, Great Henny, Sutton, Felsted, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows).

v. Land quality
The woods at Walsham-le-Willows were located on agriculturally disadvantaged land that was level and seasonally waterlogged; at Ingatestone they were on similar land, but also partly on slightly sloping land; at Swanton Morley, Felsted and Ardeley they were on level land with slight seasonal waterlogging; at Worstead they were on level well-drained land; and at Sutton they were on a mixture of well-drained and wet soils that could be both level and slightly sloping.

vi. Morphology
Woodlands were compact in form at three places (Worstead, Swanton Morley and Felsted) and a mixture of compact and linear forms at the remaining five (Great Henny, Sutton, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Walsham-le-Willows). Boundaries were semi-rectangular at Swanton Morley; irregular at three places (Worstead, Ingatestone and Ardeley) and a mixture of sub-rectangular and irregular in the final three (Great Henny, Sutton and Felsted). Boundaries were a mixture of gently curved and angular. They were only significantly bounded by roads at Great Henny, but abutted parish boundaries in five cases (Thelveton, Sutton, Ingatestone, Ardeley and Dullingham).

Where subdivided into fields by c.1880, these were small at Sutton, medium-sized at Worthingworth and Walsham-le-Willows, and medium and large at Felsted. Internal boundaries were straight at Worthingworth, Sutton and Walsham-le-Willows, and a mixture of gently curved and straight at Felsted. None were penetrated by roads.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
The following losses since c.1880 were observed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Parish(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nil</td>
<td>3 parishes — Swanton Morley and Thelveton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 25%</td>
<td>7 parishes — Scolé, Worthingworth, Sutton, Ingatestone, Ardeley, Walsham-le-Willows and Dullingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–49%</td>
<td>1 parish — Great Henny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–74%</td>
<td>2 parishes — South Elmham St Michael and Felsted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal boundaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Parish(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 25%</td>
<td>2 parishes — Sutton and Felsted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 75%</td>
<td>2 parishes — Worthingworth and Walsham-le-Willows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3. Common woodland (Table 19)

i. Definition
Woodland that was held in common.

ii. Occurrence
Common woodland was only recorded at Ingatestone.
### Table 18  Land type 7.2, several woodland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level well drained</td>
<td>compact irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level slight</td>
<td>compact semi-rect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE STUDIES</td>
<td>% OF PARISH</td>
<td>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>Soil drainage</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significantly bounded by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External boundary loss since c. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main field size c. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main boundary lines c. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal boundary loss since c. 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton Morley with Worthing (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>edge level + slight seasonal slope waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>yes yes 4.1 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 Land type 7.3, common woodland
iii. Size
The single example comprised 1% of the parish area.

iv. Position
The single example had an edge position.

v. Land quality
The single example was located on seasonally waterlogged land that was both level and slightly sloping.

vi. Morphology
The single example was compact in form with an irregular gently curved boundary. It was significantly bounded by both roads and parish boundaries. It was not subdivided into fields.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
There has been a loss of under 25% of its external boundary since c. 1880.

8. Parkland (Table 20)

i. Definition
A semi-natural area of mixed grassland and woodland used, principally, for the keeping of deer. Because of the ‘climax medieval’ general date for the definition of the land types (see the introduction to this chapter) this excludes the landscape parks established in post-medieval times. There is however an overlap with block demesne, demesne woodland and meadow.

ii. Occurrence
Occurs in five places (Swanton Morley, Thelveton, Great Henny, Ardeley and Dullingham).

iii. Size
The largest area, proportionally, is at Swanton Morley (11%), though this could include some block demesne (see above). Lesser amounts were recorded at Thelveton (6%) and Ardeley (4%), with Great Henny and Dullingham both only having 1%.

iv. Position
Edge positions occurred at Swanton Morley, Thelveton and Ardeley, but centre or near centre locations occurred at Great Henny and Dullingham.

v. Land quality
The park at Thelveton was on agriculturally disadvantaged land that was level and seasonally waterlogged; that at Great Henny also had a soil that was seasonally waterlogged but was situated on a slight slope; those at Swanton Morley and Dullingham were both on slightly sloping land that suffered slight seasonal waterlogging; while that at Ardeley was also on slightly waterlogged ground, but varied from level to a slight slope.

vi. Morphology
All the parks were compact in form, with irregular boundaries that were mainly gently curved (also angular at Thelveton). Only the parks at Swanton Morley and Dullingham were significantly bounded by roads, but three (Swanton Morley, Thelveton and Ardeley) abutted parish boundaries.

vii. Survival in the modern landscape
There has been a loss of under 25% of its external boundary since c. 1880.

3. Generalities and trends in the land types

In this section the data on the land types given above is distilled into generalities and trends using the same sub-headings that were used for the individual types.

i. Occurrence
Most of the land types were generally distributed, but the following trends are discernible (the fraction in each entry is the number of case studies out of fifteen that have that particular land type):

1. Core block demesne. 14/15. Absent in one Norfolk case study (but see proviso on this).
2. Detached block demesne. 6/15. Much greater prevalence in the southern part of the study area than in the north.
3. Tenement blocks. 15/15. Present in all the case studies.
4.1. Droves. 11/15. Absent from three Norfolk parishes and one in Suffolk.
4.2. Small greens. 10/15. Largely absent from the Waveney valley case studies.
4.3. Medium greens. 10/15. Absent from northern Norfolk.
4.4. Large greens. 5/15. Absent from northern Norfolk.
4.5. Riverside commons. 4/15. All occur in Norfolk.
5.1. Demesne meadow. 11/15. Absent from one case study in Norfolk and two in Suffolk.
5.2. Several meadow. 8/15. No particular patterning apparent.
5.3. Common meadow. 1/15. Only recorded in Essex.
6.1. Several heath. 2/15. Only recorded in Cambridgeshire and Suffolk.
6.2. Common heath. 2/15. Only recorded in Norfolk and Suffolk.
7.2. Several woodland. 8/15. No particular patterning apparent.
7.3. Common woodland. 1/15. Only recorded in Essex.
8. Parkland. 5/15. No particular patterning apparent.

The data suggests that there is a different order of frequency of the types in Norfolk, at one extreme, and Essex at the other. This is explored more fully in Chapter 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDIES</th>
<th>% OF PARISH</th>
<th>INHERENT ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>EXTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>INTERNAL ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worstead (N)</td>
<td>11 edge</td>
<td>slight slope slight waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irreg, ang. + g. curved</td>
<td>medium straight + g. curved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes yes 3; 4.5 5.1</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scole (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>6 edge</td>
<td>level seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>medium g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>no yes 1.1 4.4 7.1</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenze (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelveton (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe Parva (N)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlingworth (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>1 near centre</td>
<td>slight slope seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>small + straight medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>no no 1.1; 3 7.1</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felsted (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingatestone (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardeley with Luffenhall (H)</td>
<td>4 edge</td>
<td>level + slight slope slight waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>large g. curved + straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Henny (E)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>no yes 1.1; 3 5.1</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsham-le-Willows (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dullingham (C)</td>
<td>1 centre</td>
<td>slight slope slight waterlogging</td>
<td>compact irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes no 2 3</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmham St Michael (S)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20  Land type 8, parkland
ii. Size
In general terms, the land types associated with arable farming (types 1, 2 and 3) are proportionally much larger than any of the others. Of the remainder, only the heathland types exceed 15% and they have a maximum of 20%. Some types never exceed 5% (4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 7). Regional variations in size are highlighted below, by type:

1.1. Core block demesne. The largest amount, proportionally — 56% in Thorpe Parva — is probably untypical as this is a very small parish (only 350 acres, as opposed, for instance, to Felsted’s 6,426 acres). The average for all the Scole group of parishes (including Thorpe Parva) is 16%. Figures of between 10% and 20% for block demesne are commonly found as far north as the Waveney valley, on the Norfolk/Suffolk boundary, but not in north Norfolk or in Cambridgeshire.

1.2. Detached block demesne. The largest amounts, between 10% and 20% were found in Essex and Hertfordshire. Smaller amounts, under 10%, in Suffolk and none elsewhere.

2. Tenement blocks. The largest amounts, over 50%, were in Essex and Suffolk. Hertfordshire had 20%, but Norfolk, except the Waveney valley (17% in Scole; 9% for the Scole area averaged) had under 10%, as did Cambridgeshire.

3. Common fields. The largest amounts, over 50%, were in Norfolk and Cambridgeshire, middling amounts, between 25% and 50% were recorded in north Essex and Suffolk, but the lowest amounts, nil, were found in mid/south Essex.

4.1. Droves. No particular pattern discernible.

4.2. Small greens. No particular pattern discernible.

4.3. Medium greens. Two slight peaks: one in the Waveney valley and the other at Felsted, both with around 2%.

4.4. Large greens. The peak of 13% at Thelveton in the Waveney valley drops to 5% when averaged for the whole Scole area. The latter figure is only slightly higher than other figures for Suffolk (3%) and Essex (4%).

4.5. Riverside commons. Figures of over 5% only found in north Norfolk, lesser amounts in the Waveney valley, nil elsewhere.

5.1. Demesne meadow. Peak of 14% at Frenze in the Waveney valley drops to 3% when averaged for the whole Scole area. The latter figure is comparable to figures elsewhere in the study area.

5.2. Several meadow. Peaks of 10% at Great Henny and 6% at Ardeley, but otherwise there is a general average of between 2% and 3%.

5.3. Common meadow. Peaks at Worstead (6%) and Great Henny (6%), otherwise there is a general average of between 2% and 3%.

6.1. Several heath. No particular pattern discernible.

6.2. Common heath. No particular pattern discernible.

6.3. Medium heaths. Two slight peaks: one in the Waveney valley, the other at Felsted, both with around 20%. Some types never exceed 5% (4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 7).

6.4. Large heaths. No particular pattern discernible.

6.5. Riverside commons. Figures of over 5% only found in north Norfolk, lesser amounts in the Waveney valley, nil elsewhere.

7.1. Demesne woodland. Peak of 14% at Frenze in the Waveney valley drops to 3% when averaged for the whole Scole area. The latter figure is comparable to figures elsewhere in the study area.

7.2. Several woodland. The largest amount was in Great Henny (3%), but otherwise there scattering of figures between about 0.5% and 1%, except in the Waveney valley and Cambridgeshire where nil was recorded.

7.3. Common woodland. Only one example.

8. Parkland. Peak in Swanton Morley (11%), but as discussed above, this may include some block demesne.

Otherwise there are minor peaks at Thelveton (6%; but down to 2% when averaged for the whole Scole area) and Ardeley (4%), the remaining two are both 1%.

Again, the data suggests a difference between Norfolk and the areas to the south, sometimes with the border area, the Waveney valley, showing slightly variant figures.

iii. Position (within the case studies)

1.1. Core block demesne. Predominance of edge locations is related to positions close to watercourses that are also parish boundaries.

1.2. Detached block demesne. Edge positions throughout, but infrequently related to watercourses.

2. Tenement blocks. Predominantly ‘widespread’ in the centre and south of the region, where the blocks are proportionally bigger; central locations are more prevalent where the blocks are smaller.

3. Common fields. Predominantly ‘widespread’ where the areas are largest, as in Norfolk and Cambridgeshire, elsewhere there is a mixture of edge and central locations.

4.1. Droves. Predominantly ‘widespread’ because by nature they are extended linear features.

4.2. Small greens. Central positions were commonest.

4.3. Medium greens. Mainly edge positions, except in Suffolk where central locations were found. Edge positions are infrequently related to watercourses.

4.4. Large greens. Edge positions throughout, but infrequently related to watercourses.

4.5. Riverside commons. Edge positions throughout, and, by definition, closely linked with watercourses.

5.1. Demesne meadow. Edge positions were commonest, except in Suffolk, where central locations occurred. Always a close association with watercourses.

5.2. Several meadow. Edge positions were again commonest, with a close association with watercourses.

5.3. Common meadow. Edge positions were again commonest, with a close association with watercourses.

6.1. Several heath. Edge positions throughout, but not related to watercourses.

6.2. Common heath. Edge positions throughout, but not related to watercourses.

7.1. Demesne woodland. Edge positions predominated, but infrequently related to watercourses.

7.2. Several woodland. Edge positions predominated, but infrequently related to watercourses.

7.3. Common woodland. The single example has an edge position.


An important distinction emerges between those land types that have a predominantly edge position and a close association with watercourses (1.1, 4.5 and 5), and those that do not have the association with watercourses (1.2, 4.3, 4.4, 6 and 7).

iv. Land quality


1.2. Detached block demesne. Usually sited on reasonable land for agriculture, but not always the best available; includes some seasonally waterlogged land.

2. Tenement blocks. Usually sited on land with some potential for agriculture, but not usually the best available; includes some seasonally waterlogged land.
3. Common fields. Usually on land well-suited to agriculture, frequently the best available.

4.1. Drovers. On mixed soils, but with a substantial proportion on seasonally waterlogged ones.

4.2. Small greens. On mixed soils.

4.3. Medium greens. Mainly on agriculturally disadvantaged level and seasonally waterlogged land.

4.4. Large greens. Mainly on agriculturally disadvantaged level and seasonally waterlogged land.

4.5. Riverside commons. On wet soils unsuited to arable farming.

5.1. Demesne meadow. Mainly on wet or seasonally waterlogged soils.

5.2. Several meadow. Mainly on wet or seasonally waterlogged soils.

5.3. Common meadow. Mainly on wet or seasonally waterlogged soils.

6.1. Several heath. On well-drained or dry soil.

6.2. Common heath. On well-drained or dry soil.


7.2. Several woodland. Mainly on seasonally waterlogged soils.

7.3. Common woodland. One example, on seasonally waterlogged soil.


It is clear that certain land types have definite soil 'preferences': core block demesne and common fields both have a preference for the best available land for arable crops; detached block demesne and tenement blocks tend to be on less good land that includes some that is seasonally waterlogged. Medium and large greens, woodland and parks tend to be on disadvantaged land with seasonal waterlogging; riverside commons and meadow tend to be on wet or seasonally waterlogged land; and heaths are on land tending to dryness. The existence of these 'preferences' makes it likely that land types with similar soil preferences will have a tendency to 'migrate' from one to another, e.g. woodland to a green, rather than to a type with an unrelated preference.

v. Morphology

Most land types have a mixture of gently curved and straight boundaries, so only a variation from this is listed below.

1.1. Core block demesne. Mainly compact in form, containing medium-large fields.

1.2. Detached block demesne. Compact and linear in form, containing medium-large fields.

2. Tenement blocks. Compact and linear in form, containing small-medium fields.


4.1. Drovers. Linear in form, not subdivided.

4.2. Small greens. Mainly triangular, but some linear and compact forms, not subdivided.

4.3. Medium greens. Mainly linear forms, but also some compact, triangular and semi-triangular forms. Where now subdivided, after enclosure, they contain small fields with straight boundaries.

4.4. Large greens. Mainly compact in form, but triangular and semi-triangular forms also occur. Where now subdivided, after enclosure, they contain mainly small-medium fields, though some large ones also occur, all with straight boundaries.

4.5. Riverside commons. Linear in form, containing small fields.

5.1. Demesne meadow. Mainly linear, though compact forms do occur, containing small-medium fields.

5.2. Several meadow. Mainly linear, though compact forms do occur, containing small fields.

5.3. Common meadow. Mainly linear, though compact forms do occur, containing mainly small fields.


7.1. Demesne woodland. Mainly compact in form, though linear forms also occur. Where now subdivided, the fields are mainly medium sized, but small and large examples occur.

7.2. Several woodland. Compact and linear in form. Where now subdivided, the fields are mainly small, but medium sized examples occur.

7.3. Common woodland. One example, compact in form, not subdivided.

8. Parkland. Compact in form. Where now subdivided, the fields are mainly medium sized, but small and large examples occur. Tendency for straight boundaries.

In general, arable units, demesne woodland and parkland tend to have compact forms, riverside commons and meadows have linear forms, and greens have a tendency to triangular forms. There is a majority tendency for large fields to relate to block demesne, common fields or heaths, with a minority relating to large greens, demesne woodland and parkland. It is also clear that, overall, demesne fields of all types tend to be larger than several ones. Small fields are mainly characteristic of tenement blocks and, if linear, several meadows. Straight boundaries are, as might be expected, associated particularly with the late enclosure of common fields, greens, heaths and parkland. By extension, a localised concentration of straight boundaries in the other types can be taken as suggesting late enclosure.

vi. Survival in the modern landscape

1.1. Core block demesne. Usually an under 25% loss of external boundaries, but a loss of 25–49% of internal boundaries. High losses of both recorded in Suffolk, low losses in the Waveney valley (excluding South Elmham St Michael).

1.2. Detached block demesne. Usually an under 25% loss of external boundaries, but a loss of 25–49% of internal boundaries. High losses in Essex and Suffolk, low loss in Hertfordshire.

2. Tenement blocks. Loss of external boundaries occurs equally in two bands, under 25% and 25–49%, with the internal loss mainly in the 25–49% band, but with significant showings in both bands. High losses of both recorded in Essex and Suffolk, low in Norfolk.


4.3. Medium greens. Usually an under 25% loss of external boundaries, no overall trend in the loss of internal
boundaries (range of 25%–over 75%). High losses in Suffolk, no particular trend for low losses.

4.4. Large greens. Usually an under 25% loss of external boundaries, with a slight trend for an internal loss of 25–49%. High losses in Suffolk and Essex, no particular trend for low losses.

4.5. Riverside commons. Usually an under 25% loss of external boundaries, with the internal loss falling equally in two bands, under 25% and 25–49%. Only occur in Norfolk.

5.1. Demesne meadow. Usually an under 25% loss of external boundaries, but with significant showings in the bands 25–49% and 50–74%, with the internal loss mainly in the under 25% band, but with significant showings in the 25–49% band. High losses in Essex and Hertfordshire, no particular trend for low losses.

5.2. Several meadow. Usually a loss of 25–49% of external boundaries, with the internal loss falling equally in two bands, under 25% and 25–49%. High losses widespread, no particular trend for low losses.

5.3. Common meadow. Usually a loss of under 25% of external boundaries, with the same loss of internal ones. No particular geographical trend for losses.

6.1. Several heath. Usually a loss of 25–49% of external boundaries, no overall trend in the loss of internal boundaries (range of under 25% to 25–49%). No particular geographical trend for losses.

6.2. Common heath. Losses of external boundaries fall equally into two bands, under 25% and 25–49%, as do the internal losses. No particular trend for losses.

7.1. Demesne woodland. Usually an under 25% loss of external boundaries, with the internal loss falling equally in two bands, under 25% and over 75%. High losses in Suffolk and Essex, low in Norfolk.

7.2. Several woodland. Usually a loss of 50–74% of external boundaries, but an internal loss of under 25% (reflecting a low incidence of internal boundaries). High losses widespread, no particular trend in low losses.

7.3. Common woodland. The single example has an under 25% loss of external boundaries. Not subdivided.

8. Parkland. Losses of external boundaries fall equally into two bands, nil and under 25%, as do the internal losses. High losses in Essex, no particular trend in low losses.

In general, therefore, losses of external land-type boundaries can be shown to be usually under 25%, mainly due to a high incidence of ‘hard’ boundaries, i.e. those formed by roads, watercourses and property boundaries. Higher losses of 25–49% were however noted with regard to meadows, heath and several woodland. Meadows and several woodland tend to consist of small units and were frequently eradicated in the twentieth-century arable expansion. Heaths tend to have less substantial boundaries than arable units and are therefore easier to reshape. The loss of internal boundaries was usually one band higher (25–49%) than that for external ones. This reflects a low proportion of ‘hard’ boundaries (as defined above) that were barriers to change. There is a trend towards higher internal losses where the initial units were small, as in tenement blocks. High losses, overall, were particularly marked in Suffolk and Essex, where there was a high proportion of small, often irregular fields in ‘ancient countryside’. Low losses were more frequent in Norfolk, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire where the landscape of c.1880 contained a high proportion of larger, more regular units that resulted from the enclosure of common fields.

4. Identifying land types in the modern landscape

Detailed research will always be the most reliable way of determining the land-types present in any particular landscape, however this study has shown that there is a way of arriving at the likely land-types by taking into consideration the following criteria:

- The regional farming pattern (see Chapter 6), particularly with regard to the proportional presence or absence of common fields and block holdings.
- The position of the land within its historic parish, with especial regard to its relationship to watercourses.
- The land quality, with particular regard to soil drainage.
- The morphology of the fields/units, with particular regard to their shape, size and the straightness of their boundaries. Where the modern landscape has lost a high proportion of its boundaries, this is best studied with reference to nineteenth-century maps.
- The trends identified above in Section 3.

This is not a magic formula, but it should significantly narrow the range of options and enable an informed guess to be made.

Endnotes
1. This classification was developed through a refining of that used by the Forestry Commission (Technical Note 16/95, Terrain Classification, 1996, 4).
2. Each parish had substantial areas of demesne in the medieval period. Worstead had 334½ acres in 1270 and the main manor of Dullingham had 340 acres in 1279–80. The figures are calculated from the combined totals of the moieties of the main manor of Dullingham in 1279–80 (Wright 1978, 162) and the holdings of twelve individuals who held demesnes in Worstead c.1270 (NRO, DCN, 40/5, ff. 132r–135v).
Chapter 5. The Case Studies
by Edward Martin with Max Satchell

1. Introduction

As explained in Chapter 1, twelve areas of East Anglia were selected for detailed examination as case studies (Fig. 2). These, arranged according to the settlement provinces and local regions identified by Roberts and Wrathmell, are:

The Anglia Sub-Province
1. Worstead, Norfolk (EANGL 1)
2. Swanton Morley with Worthing, Norfolk (EANGL 2)
3. South Elmham St Michael, Suffolk (EANGL 4)
4. Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva, Norfolk (EANGL 5)
5. Worlingworth, Suffolk (EANGL 6)
6. Great Henny, Essex (EANGL 9)
7. Sutton, Suffolk (EANGL 12)
8. Felsted, Essex (EANGL 13)
9. Ingatestone, Essex (EANGL 14)
10. Ardeley with Luffenhall hamlet, Hertfordshire (EANGL 15)

The Wash Sub-Provence
11. Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk (EWASH E 4)
12. Dullingham, Cambridgeshire (EWASH E 7)

In this chapter, the feudal history of each area is examined, together with the documentary, cartographic and archaeological evidence for the origin and character of the field systems that operated within that important social framework. The feudal sequence was seen as an essential tool that enabled the holdings recorded in Domesday Book to be related to later manorial and estate developments. Through this approach it was possible to gain an understanding of the late Saxon origins of the areas and of the factors that tended to either divide or amalgamate the settlement units over the subsequent centuries. The field systems, themselves, were the product of generations of interaction between farmers and their manorial lords and to fully understand the field systems it is essential that this human dimension is acknowledged. All humanly-altered landscapes are, to varying extents, unique — their particular histories, soil conditions and topography can never be exactly duplicated. Each case study therefore contains unique elements. However it was also possible to recognise recurring elements and trends that could be used to characterise the field systems and so to build towards the identification of local and sub-regional groupings.

2. The Case Studies

1. Worstead, Norfolk (EANGL 1) (Fig. 4)

Old English worth-stede ‘site of a worth’ (‘enclosure’ probably in a developed sense of ‘homestead, farm’) (Sandred 1996, 205).

Worstead lies in north-east Norfolk, about 5 miles from the coast. It is bounded on the north-east by the River Ant and on the south by one of its tributaries. The parish contains 2,631 acres (1,065 ha) and has three main soil types. In the flat-bottomed river valleys there are loamy and peaty soils with a high groundwater of the Hanworth association (871c: typical humic gley soil). Further to the south the valley of the Ant broadens out into a number of marshes and lakes (‘broads’) where peat was extracted in the Middle Ages. Most of the parish though has well-drained silty loams of the Wick 2 association (541s: typical brown earth), but on an elevated plateau in the north-west corner there are the similar but sandier and drier soils of the Wick 3 association (541t: typical brown earth). Both soils are derived from thin aeolian drift (‘coverloam’) on till or glaciofluvial sands (Wick 2) or sands and gravel (Wick 3) (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 212–14, 346–9). The land rises gently from about 10m OD beside the Ant to 30m in the west. Although the eighteenth-century historian Francis Blomefield referred to it as being ‘seatd in a flat country’, the parish does in fact have an undulating landscape, with a noticeable scarp leading to the plateau in the north-west (Blomefield 1810 XI, 87).

Before the Norman Conquest Worstead belonged to the ancient Benedictine abbey of St Benet of Holme, which lay close to the confluence of the Ant with the Bure. The monastery was originally founded around AD 800, but was destroyed by the Danes in 869/70. It was re-occupied in the next century and established as an abbey by King Cnut in 1019 (Knowles and Hadcock 1971, 75). How it acquired Worstead is not clearly recorded. A spurious charter of Edward the Confessor proports to confirm the monks’ possession of Worstead and a list of benefacors of about 1200 names Cnut as the donor, even though it is not mentioned in Cnut’s foundation charter (Register St Benet I 1931, 1–2, no.1, 3, no.2 and 33, no.62). Whatever the truth, Worstead was but one of many places in Tunstead Hundred that belonged to the abbey, including many of the parishes surrounding Worstead. In 1066 the abbey had 2.5 curacies in Worstead and this land was stated to have been ‘for the supplies of the monks’. On this there were eight villeins, thirty bordars and two churches with 28 acres. In 1086 it was held of the abbey by Robert Balistarius (‘the Crossbowman’). There was also another curate of land here belonging to the abbey which had two villeins and ten bordars (DB Norfolk, 17/43).

Two curates of land that had belonged to St Benet’s had, however, passed into the hands of Count Alan of Brittany. This land ‘always’ had four villeins but the number of bordars increased from five in 1066 to ten in 1086 (DB Norfolk 4/37). A further very small estate, only comprising 3 acres, was held by Reynold son of Ivo, which was associated with lands in Scowstow and Stoley, to the west of Worstead (DB Norfolk 21/36). These two were part of a number of Norman depredations on the estates of the abbey, which were attributed by the thirteenth-century chronicler, John de Oxenides (a monk of the abbey) to the
fact that Alfweald, the abbot in 1066, was a supporter of King Harold and had been entrusted with the defence of the coast by the king (Chronica Johannis 1859, 293).

Robert the Crossbowman was a Norman who was the Domesday tenant-in-chief of a lost place called Appethorp in Forehoe Hundred, but had also taken over a carucate of land in Hoveton that the disgraced Earl of Norfolk, Ralph de Gael, had given to St Benet’s (Keats-Rohan 1999, 370; DB Norfolk 26/5, 54/1). The family are later recorded as holding land in Earlham and Swainsthorpe of the king by serjeantry, in performing the duties of an arblaster or crossbowman (Register St Benet II 1932, 234–5). Their principal holding was however Worstead, which from about 1140 they held as a knight’s fee of the Abbey of St Benet’s (Register St Benet I 1931, 34, no.66). Not long afterwards the senior members of the family took the name of ‘de Worstead’ (Worsted(e), Worth(e)sted(e) etc.) though individuals surnamed ‘le Alblaster’ continued to be recorded in Worstead down to the sixteenth century.²

²

In the first half of the thirteenth century Sir Robert de Worstead gave the advowsons of the church of St Mary and the chapel of St Andrew, together with lands in Worstead, to Norwich Cathedral Priory. He and his family also made bequests of land to several other religious foundations in Norfolk: to Bromholm Priory, Pentney Priory, Hempton Priory, St Benet’s Abbey and Carbrooke Preceptory (Knights Hospitaller). A detailed extent of c.1270 records that the then lord, Philip de Worstead, held only 12 acres in demesne, the remainder of his 1,500 acres being held by twenty free tenants, each of whom held a unit described as a ‘tenement’ (tenementum) from Philip (NRO DCN 40/5, f. 132r–135r). Seven of the free tenants were religious foundations, the remaining thirteen were lay men. Many of these free tenants had their own villeins

Plate 5 Worstead, Norfolk. A 1781 copy, by Robert Wymer, of a late sixteenth-century original by Edmund Thurston of Norwich. Norfolk Record Office CHC 11905(a). North at the bottom
and free tenants. The extent lists 1,377.65 acres of arable land: 438.5 acres of it belonging to villeins and 939.15 acres belonging to 103 free tenants, of which the twelve largest occupied half of the area, the rest were small, with a mean size of only 4.8 acres (Campbell 1975, 333–6).

By 1316 many of these ‘tenements’ were apparently being regarded as independent manors, for the Nomina Villarum survey of that year lists no less than eighteen lords in Worstead and adjoining Westwick (Blake 1952, 277). About this time Nicholas, the son of Philip de Worstead, gave the remainder of his lands and rights in Worstead to St Benet’s. In 1536 William Repps, the last abbot of St Benet’s was appointed bishop of Norwich and the possessions of that abbey were annexed to the bishopric, making St Benet’s the only monastery in England that was not actually suppressed, though the monks had probably left it by 1539 (Page 1906, 336; Knowles and Hadcock 1971, 75).

The history of Count Alan’s holding in Worstead is not certain, but it is likely that it reappears in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries as a manor held, not as one would expect, from the honour of Richmond, but from the honour or barony of Buckenham. One possibility is that it was detached from the Richmond honour during the brief period in the 1190s when it was in the possession of Ranulph, Earl of Chester. A share of Ranulph’s lands passed in the 1230s to his sister Mabel, who married William d’Aubigny, Earl of Arundell and lord of Buckenham. Her daughter Maud, who inherited the

honor of Buckenham, married Robert de Tateshall of Tattershall in Lincolnshire. In 1273 Oliver de Ingham held a knight’s fee in Ingham (Norfolk) and Worstead of Robert de Tateshall, and in 1401–2 the same fee was said to be held of the castle of Buckenham (Cal Inq Post Mortem II, 4, no. 4; Feudal Aids III, 619). The Ingham family appear to have been in possession by the twelfth century, for a gift by Ernald de Ingham and Roger his son to St Benet’s Abbey of a part of the tithe of their demesne at Worstead, was confirmed c.1153–68 (Register St Benet I 1931, 51, no. 86). The Ingham lands were inherited, c.1350, by the Stapletons and in 1378–9 they gave a messuage and 88 acres of land in Worstead and Scot tow to their newly-founded priory at Ingham. A further 8 messuages and 247 acres of land in Worstead, Ingham, Walcot etc. were added in 1392–3 (Blomefield 1805 XI, 85–9).

Part of the Ingham holding was sub-infeudated to the le Gros family, for in 1344 Oliver le Gros held half a knight’s fee of Oliver de Ingham in Worstead and Westwick (Cal Inq Post Mortem, VIII, 375 no.529). The le Gros holdings in this area were, however, complicated. In addition to this half fee, the family also held another half fee in the adjacent parish of Sloley (where they seem to have had their main seat) of the barony of Rye. Reginald le Gros (Oliver’s father) also appears in the c.1270 survey of Worstead as a free tenant (with 124 acres) of Philip de Worstead and as a sub-tenant of two of the other free tenants (50 acres from Walter de Mauteby and 10 acres from William de Stalham) (Feudal Aids, III, 553; NRO
In the right of one or other of his manorial holdings, Reginald had a grant of free warren on his demesne lands in Worstead and Sloley in 1252 (Cal Charter Rolls I, 374). In 1336 Oliver le Gros was granted a Tuesday market at his manor in Worstead, changed to Friday in 1339 and supplemented by a Saturday one in 1340 (Cal Charter Rolls IV, 353, 463, 466). By 1336 the senior line of the de Worsteads had died out, leaving the knightly le Gros family as the major lay lords in the parish. Their creation of a market was doubtless prompted by the growing importance of the woollen cloth industry in the area, Worstead being ‘celebrated as the first seat of manufacturing of worsted stuffs, to which it gave name’ (White 1845, 492–4). ‘Worsted’ cloth was well known by 1300 and its manufacture grew in importance through the fourteenth century (Sutton 1989, 203). The 1379 poll tax return for Worstead specifically identifies forty-five of the tax payers as websteres, i.e. ‘weavers’, in addition there were three tailours and one wollemas (Poll Taxes II, 2000). Together they made up 17% of the 282 tax payers. The trade declined in the sixteenth century and by the nineteenth century Worstead had been ‘reduced to the rank of an agricultural village’ (White 1845, 492–4).

Complex land holdings, such as Reginald le Gros’s, are not uncommon in the 1270 survey, for six out of the thirteen lay men who were ‘primary’ free tenants also held land as secondary or tertiary tenants; two of the monasteries were also sub-tenants. Many of the sub-tenants also held land from more than one primary tenant. Of the 135 separate tenants listed, 36 (27%) had more than one holding. In most cases the holdings were not very large, as the following figures relating to the five tenants with the most holdings show:

- Henry de Brockele: 8 holdings totalling 17 acres with 2 messuages and 2 cottages.
- Eustace de Worstead: 6 holdings totalling 72 acres with 10 messuages and a windmill, with a further 23 acres, a messuage and 11 cottages held by his villeins and free tenants.
- Ralph le Spencer: 5 holdings totalling 11.75 acres with a messuage.
- Roger Herman: 4 holdings totalling 8.75 acres with a messuage, plus 24 acres, 4 messuages and 2 cottages held by his free tenants.
- Stephen Osmund: 4 holdings totalling 1.5 acres with a messuage and a cottage.

Eustace de Worstead, stands out from the other four by his noticeably larger holding, which is not surprising as he was probably a member of the lord’s family. These multiple holdings do however indicate that the engrossment of holdings was underway by the thirteenth century. The presence of Ralph le Spencer among the engrossers may be significant, for at the dissolution of the monasteries, two of the manors/tenements in Worstead formerly held by monasteries were acquired by a John Spencer (Blomefield 1810 XI, 85–9).

About 60% of the arable land listed in the c.1270 survey belonged to nineteen holdings that individually contained between 20 and 90 acres. These comprised 12% of the 155 holdings; 7% of the holdings were between 11 and 20 acres; 17% were between 6 and 10 acres; but a staggering 64% of the holdings were less than 5 acres in size (43% being an acre or less — 14 holdings being as small as 1 rood). Virtually all these holdings, however, belonged to free tenants. Eleven of the tenants were stated to have villeins, but their holdings were not detailed. An exception was Robert Lewene, a villein who held 16 acres of the Priory of Norwich. This suggests that some villeins may have had reasonably substantial holdings, though not all, for Eustace de Worstead’s villeins held only 6 acres and six cottages from him. Eighteen of the tenants held only a cottage and no land. This large number of tenants with small pieces of land has been suggested as one of the reasons why the cloth trade developed in this area. With many landholdings below subsistence levels, other forms of income were desperately needed (Sutton 1989, 205). The survey gives little evidence for holdings of standard sizes, though there are some hints, such as four 40-acre holdings, three 30-acre holdings, six of 12 acres, eight of 10 acres, six of 8 acres, five of 6 acres, but also four each of 7 acres and 5 acres. This leaves it very unclear what base, if any, was being used as the underlying unit.

The post-Dissolution history of the landholdings in Worstead is complicated by their number, for though Kelly’s Directory for 1933 notes that the Dean and Chapter of Norwich were ‘lords of the chief manor’, it further notes that ‘the parish includes not less than 20 manors’ (Kelly’s Directory 1933, 573). The Dean and Chapter, the successors to the Cathedral Priory, held the Rectory ‘manor’. This had been given to Norwich by Sir Robert de Worstead before 1226 (NRO DCN 40/5, f.20r–v). In a second grant he gave the chapel of St Andrew with ‘all that land by the said church called Hoddeshil and that cultura called Oldekyrkewong by the lane’ to Dilham and the adjacent meadow, lying between Hoddeshil and the chapel (NRO DCN 40/5, f.21v). In 1226 Bishop Thomas Blundeville conceded the church and all its lands to the priory, ‘saving an honest maintenance of the vicarage’. This was confirmed by Bishop Walter Suffield in 1256, when he assigned ‘to the manse of the vicarage’ an acre lying near the chapel of St Andrew (Register Norwich Cathedral 1939, 117, 137). The glebe terrier of 1627 confirms the site of the vicarage close as abutting the ‘site of the late chapel of St Andrew of the manor of Christchurch [i.e. Norwich Cathedral]’ (NRO DN/TER 168/4/1). The 1633 terrier gives the additional information that this acre contained two ponds and had an ‘hoppe-hill’ at its centre. The acre had a ‘thorn dike’ (presumably a hedge) on one side, dividing it from a ‘common footway’. More interestingly, dividing the acre into ‘weet’ [wet] and ‘drie’ halves was a ‘firre dike’. Taking this at face value, it must be one of the earliest references to a coniferous hedge in East Anglia. The vicar also had half an acre in Longe medowe that had a ‘doolestone’ [i.e. a boundary stone] on its east side, dividing it from the ‘other landes’ in the meadow (NRO DN/TER 168/4/2).

The survey of c.1270 records that Norwich Priory held the parish church of St Mary with 28 acres of land, plus 114 acres, 3 messuages and 6 cottages held by its 17 tenants. The chapel of St Andrew had 30 acres of land and 1 acre of meadow, plus 2 acres and 3 cottages held by tenants. When the lands of the Dean and Chapter were surveyed for Parliament in 1649, the rectory contained a parcel of pasture called Parsonage Yard ‘where anciently the rectory howse stood’ and a 6-acre parcel of ground called the Church Field or Parsonage Hills. The survey noted that there was ‘now no building on the premises’. 80
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Plate 7  Worstead, Norfolk. The small triangular green called Faistead Green, with the church in the background.

Plate 8  Worstead, Norfolk. View along the straight enclosure-period road across part of Sloley Common. This large riverside common was enclosed in 1827.
More substantial was the ‘mannor of Amners St Andrew in Worstead (alias Worsted Decani & Capituli)’. The survey noted that ‘It is not discoverable what was the ancient scite of the said manor, the building being wholly destroyed’. The ‘demeane’ lands ‘inclosed’ of the manor comprised the 14-acre Chappel Close (then divided into two closes), a 4-acre parcel and a 3-acre piece, all lying near ‘vicarage ground’ or the ‘vicarage house’. There were also two parcels of meadow (3 acres) ‘undivided from other lands with which they are inclosed’ in Oxford Meadow. In addition there were also fourteen pieces of arable land ‘in the fields of Worsted’. Totalling 18 acres, these varied in size between 1 rood and 1.5 acres. They were described as being in Brocklie Field, near Brocklie Street, Watchfield, Watch Close, Bulls Close, Bengate Field, Mucklie Field and Mucklie Craft. The manor also had 13 free tenants and 39 customary or copyhold tenants (Parliamentary Survey Norwich 1985, 72–5, 85–6). The enclosure award of 1827 reveals that the manor of Worstead St Andrew controlled a block of land to the east of the existing church, as well as scattered smaller parcels elsewhere (NRO C/Sca 2/342). The site of the chapel is said to lie within the block, but its precise location has not been established. This block is likely to represent, in part at least, the cultura called Oldekyrkewong of the thirteenth-century grant.

The origins and significance of these two ancient churches in close proximity (probably only about 150m apart) is unclear. Peter Warner has suggested that many of the East Anglian examples of paired churches are the result of church building by associations of freemen near to an established place of worship, as is explicitly stated in the Domesday entry for Stowmarket in Suffolk (Warner 1986, 41–3, 50–1). At Worstead the situation is considerably less clear, as Domesday records both the churches as belonging to St Benet’s and records only three sokemen in the vill. The name Oldekyrkewong suggests the St Andrew’s may have been the original church, which declined in status to a chapel after the building of St Mary. Warner’s data shows that out of thirty-eight examples of paired churches as belonging to St Benet’s and records only three sokemen in the vill. The name Oldekyrkewong suggests the St Andrew’s may have been the original church, which declined in status to a chapel after the building of St Mary. Warner has drawn attention to the fact that, as at Stowmarket, the subsidiary churches were often dedicated to St Mary. Interestingly, though he does not comment on it, Warner’s data shows that of thirty-eight examples of double churches, ten were dedicated to St Andrew (Warner 1986, 43–4).

In the seventeenth century Sir Richard Berney of Reedham, Norfolk, is said to have acquired the lordships of Bromholm and Westwick, which he left to his younger son John (Blomefield 1810 XI, 80–2). This estate descended to another John Berney, who died in 1778, when the estate appears to have been divided between his two daughters: Elizabeth, the wife of William Petre, and Julia the wife of Thomas Brograve (Rye 1913, 44, 665). The Petres inherited Westwick House and the tithe apportionment of 1844 shows Jack Petre as owning a block of land on the west side of the parish, adjoining Westwick, and another block in the south-west corner (NRO DN/TA 775). The Brograves established themselves in Worstead and Sir Berney Brograve (created a baronet in 1791) employed James Wyatt to build Worstead House for himself c.1795–1800 (Colvin 1995, 1118). This replaced an earlier house (called Mucklie Hall in the sixteenth century) which stood to the north of the Wyatt house. Faden’s Map of Norfolk of 1797 shows this house as situated at the centre of a roughly square park in the south-east corner of the parish. By 1844 the park had been extended westward and contained about 300 acres. The 1827 enclosure award reveals that his son, Sir George Berney Brograve, owned a number of the ‘mannors’ in Worstead: Worstead Hemptons, Pentons, Stapletons, Thuxtons, Wythes and Heydons (NRO C/Sca 2/342). In 1843 the estate was sold to the Hon. William Rous and the 1844 tithe apportionment shows him as owning much of the southern third of the parish, plus a block further north, centred on Bengate Farm. The estate descended in the Rous family until 1939, when Worstead House was demolished. The largest landowner in Worstead in 1844 was, however, John Postle of Holly House in Smallburgh. He owned much of the central part of the parish, as did his father, William Postle of Worstead, at the time of the 1827 enclosure award. The enclosure award cites many of William’s holdings as ‘late’ someone else’s or ‘purchased by him’, suggesting that he had built up an estate through piecemeal acquisitions, but the full genesis of his estate is unknown.

The earliest map of Worstead is a 1781 copy by Robert Wymer of a late sixteenth-century original (NRO CHC 11905(a)) (Pl. 5). This is entitled ‘Mappe of all the Arable Lands as they lie within the bounds of Worsted towneship ... with ther Survay which containe acres 1544 perches 75. By Ed. Thurston of Norwich gent.’. The original map-maker was probably Edmund Thurston, the son of Edmund Thurston, grocer of Norwich. The elder Edmund, who died in 1566, held various offices in the city, including that of surveyor (1556–7 and 1564–5) and auditor (Hawes ed. 1868, 152; Millican 1934, 71; will of Edmund Thurston [sic], grocer of Norwich proved 1566, TNA PROB11/48). The younger Edmund entered Cambridge University in 1571 and died in 1590, describing himself in his will as ‘gentleman of Norwich’ (Venn and Venn 1927, 240; will dated 13 Dec 1580, proved 15 Jan 1591, TNA PROB11/77). The style of the map suggests that it was made by the younger Edmund sometime between 1571 and 1590, but little is known of his career as a map-maker (Eden 1975–9, III, 249).

The map shows most of the parish, but with voids where there were commons, heaths and most meadows. Comparison with later maps suggests that the boundaries of the fields and roads are shown straighter than they were in reality. The pattern of roads shown on this map can be identified with reasonable ease with roads shown on later maps, indicating that they were relatively stable elements in the landscape. These narrow sinuous lanes are in fact one of the defining characteristics of the modern landscape of Worstead. The village or town of Worstead lies at a crossroad near the centre of the parish (Pl. 6). St Mary’s churchyard occupies a rectangular block on the south-west side of this crossroad. At south-east corner of the churchyard is the small former market place, now, as then, partly infilled with a row of houses. To the rear of the houses on the east side of the market place lay the site of St Andrew’s chapel. The street to the north of the crossroad leads to a triangular green (Pl. 7). In the sixteenth century this had houses on its east and west sides, but these have now disappeared and the only building now bordering the green is a nineteenth-century school on the north side. The enclosure award of 1827 identifies this green as the Fairstead. White’s Directory of 1845 records that Worstead still had ‘a large annual fair for cattle, horses etc on May 12’ (White 1845, 492–4).
Plate 9  Worstead, Norfolk. View east across an area of enclosed former common fields towards the hamlet of Bengate

Plate 10  Worstead, Norfolk. View south across a part of the former Harpley Field, with the houses of Bengate in the middle distance and Worstead church tower on the horizon
The sixteenth-century map also indicates a number of clusters of houses and some isolated buildings that can be identified from later maps. North-east of the village lies the hamlet of Withergate (Withygate 1228, Weathergate 1797, Weathergate Green 1827), to the north-east lie the hamlets of Lyngate (Langate 1844) and Bengate (Bengeate 1345). To the east of these, at the river crossing and the watermill, is the hamlet of Bridgate (Briggate 1237–51). In the north-east corner of the parish there was another small hamlet around a small triangular green in the area of Swan’s Farm (Thomas Swan was a tax payer here in 1379). Other more isolated groups of buildings or farmsteads are also shown, including Brockley Farm (Brockley 1228) in the south-west, Worstead Hall Farm (Hall Farm c.1890) in the south and the former Muckley Hall (Muclie, Mucleye c.1300) in the south-east corner (Sandred 1996, 204–8). A number of these hamlets clearly took their names from the roads (Old Norse *gata*) on which they lay. The occurrence of most of their names in medieval documents indicates that this settlement pattern of dispersed small hamlets and farmsteads is at least that old.

The sixteenth-century map also shows seven unclosed fields with irregular shapes, clockwise from the north these were Arpley Field (two areas separated by a road; Harpley Field 1844), Bengat Field (Bengeate Field 1649), Limbo Field (Limbo Marsh 1844), Brigget Field (B brigatefield 1597), Mucklie Field (two areas separated by a void in the map which was probably a meadow; Muckleyfield 1592, Mucklefield 1649), Brockley Field (campo de Brockley 1532–8, Brocklie Field 1649) and Watch Field (Watchfield 1649). With the exception of Bengat Field, they all occupied positions on the periphery of the parish and totalled about 20–25% of the overall parish area. Enclosed fields covered at least a half of the parish, with the remaining quarter being made up of the inferred commons, heaths and meadows. None of these seven field names appear to be recorded before the Tudor period, but most take their names from localities that are recorded in medieval documents (see above). Tudor documents also refer to two additional fields: campo de Estgate (1527) and campo de Langley (1534), making nine in all. Interestingly four of these fields bear Old English *-leah* names suggestive of woodland: Arple (Arpeleya c.1230, Horpeleye c.1300), Mucklie, Brocklie and Langley. This suggests that some of the fields may be the result of woodland clearance on the edges of a primary settlement area.

Medieval documents do however refer to land units called *culturae* and two are named as Oldekyrkewong (as discussed above) and Sprtilwong (c.1300) with an additional area called Wodewong. As discussed in Chapter 2, the terms *cultura* and *wong* were often used in East Anglia to refer to blocks of arable land bounded by features like roads or water-courses; these units could also be called ‘fields’. References, c.1300, to small parcels of land, some as small as 3 perches, in separate ownership in Langelye suggest that this was a common field (CUL Mm.11.20, f.79v).

However there are also references to the ‘common pasture’ (*communem pastur*) of Langley in 1534 and to Langeleye mor c.1300. The Limbo Field of the sixteenth-century map may also have been a pasture, for it is later recorded as Limbo Marsh. Similarly, a narrow northern projection of Briggate Field was Briggate Marsh in 1844. The ‘field’ of Estgate was presumably near or possibly equivalent to a large low-lying common, named Eastgate Common, which is shown on Faden’s map of 1797 as extending into the north-east corner of Worstead (Barringer ed. 1975). The hamlet of Meeting House Hill (named after a Baptist chapel built here in 1717) developed on the southern edge of this common. Parts of Arpley Field may also have been damp, because there is a mention of a turbary in Horpeleye c.1300 (CUL Mm.11.20, f.79v). To the south of Briggate hamlet there was a riverside common called Briggate Common (c.1894). These riverside commons were on the wet peaty soils soils of the Hanworth association (871c).

In the south-west corner there was another multi-parish common which is named as Sloley Common on Faden’s Map of Norfolk, 1797. Faden shows this as forming a part of a continuous series of riverside commons flanking a tributary of the Ant, and mostly on damp Hanworth soils (871c). This and the other commons in Worstead were enclosed in 1827 under an Act of 1821 (NRO C/Sc 2/342 and BR 90/40/1). Under this, 309 acres of ‘waste and common’ were enclosed (NRO C/Sc 2/342) (Pl. 8). After this a hamlet sprang up along the southern edge of the former common, which is named as Worstead Common c.1890 (now Station Road). A scatter of houses on the northern edge of the common, shown on Faden’s map, may have been the area referred to as Brockley Street in 1649.

There were much drier conditions on the plateau in the north-west corner of the parish (largely coincident with soils of the Wick 3 association: 541t), where Faden’s map shows that there was a section of a large multi-parish feature labelled Common and Walsham Heath. It was on this heath that a battle was fought in 1381 between the forces of Bishop Henry Despenser and the peasant-leader Geoffrey Litster. Stone crosses marked the parish boundaries on this open heath, some of which still survive (Norfolk HER nos 7568, 7569). The nature of the land was commemorated in field names such as Heath Piece, Purse Ground and Rough Brick [i.e. ‘breck’] in 1844. A large amount of this area was owned in 1844 by Lord Suffolk, one of the principal landowners in North Walsham.

Although the enclosure award of 1827 was mainly concerned with the enclosure of the heaths, commons and other ‘wastes’ in the parish, it did also regularise a number of exchanges within the common fields and closes (NRO C/Sca 2/342 and CHC 11905b). By 1844 most of the strips had disappeared, though a few isolated glebe strips are apparent in the former Brockley Field and Watch Field areas, a few belonging to Robert Berney in the Watch Field and Briggate Field areas and a few strips belonging to William Windham also in the Briggate Field area. Despite the virtual disappearance of its common-field strips, White’s Directory of 1845 describes the parish as ‘mostly a champaign district’ (White 1845, 492–4).

In 1649 the arable strips belonging to the demesne of Amners St Andew were not evenly distributed across all the nine ‘fields’, but were concentrated in Brockley Field (5) and Watch Field (5), with smaller amounts in Bulls Close (adjacent to Briggate Field: 1), Bengate Field (1) and Muckley Field (2). The settlement pattern of dispersed hamlets and farmsteads also suggests that holdings were not evenly spread across the fields, but were concentrated in the fields closest to the farmsteads to which they belonged. This clustering would help to
explain how the common fields here were extinguished without the need for a parliamentary act. The tendency for engrossment was probably accelerated in the sixteenth century with the decline of the worsted cloth industry. Without this additional source of income, many of the small holdings must have become unviable, leading to the sale of their strips to those with larger, more profitable holdings.

As already noted, the areas of common fields in the sixteenth century made up 20–25% of the parish. The irregular shape of these fields does, however, suggest that they were once larger. In particular, a pattern of narrow closes lying between Briggate Field and Muckley Field is suggestive of intakes from common fields. Taking all these into consideration, it is possible to suggest that perhaps 62% of the parish once lay in common fields. The irregular pattern of closes does suggest that the enclosure of these fields took place in an unorganised way and possibly over quite a period of time. By 1844 the field pattern had been considerably modified. Most obviously, the former common field areas, heaths and commons had been enclosed (Pls 9 and 10). These areas had a high percentage of straight boundaries. A block in the south-east had also been taken to create the park of Worstead House. The number of closes was reduced, but in about 50% of cases the new closes used pre-existing boundaries. These older boundaries are frequently slightly curved, in contrast the new ones are straight. The greatest loss of old close boundaries was in the north-west quarter, where there seems to have been a large-scale re-organisation on the land owned by John Postle. The post-1844 landscape was disrupted by the building of two railway line across it (one now disused) and by the upgrading of some of the lanes into the A149 road. There has also been a considerable loss of field boundaries. The pattern of roads has survived largely unchanged, but within the areas enclosed by them the survival of the field boundaries is, at best, only about 50% and, at worst, nil. It is however slightly heartening that there seems to be an above average survival of those boundaries that were in existence by the sixteenth century, perhaps because they are more substantial and because they may also mark property boundaries.

Archaeology cannot, yet, add much to this landscape history, because of a paucity of recorded finds. However the finding of two Neolithic flint axes and a Bronze Age axe-hammer and palstave do point to the early exploitation of the landscape (Norfolk HER nos 7573, 17513, 11398 and 11132).

2. Swanton Morley with Worthing, Norfolk (EANGL2) (Fig. 5)
Swanton: Old English swana-tun ‘the farm or village of the herdsmen’.
Worthing: worhting ‘an enclosure, yard, homestead’ (Sandred 2002, 143; Ekwall 1960, 536; Smith 1956, II, 277).
Swanton Morley lies centrally in the northern half of Norfolk, on the south side of the River Wensum. Until the nineteenth century, when it became a separate civil parish, the manor and parish of Swanton contained the hamlet and chapelry of Worthing. Worthing occupied only 817 acres (331ha) at the north-west end of the original parish, but it had its own little church of Norman origin. This lies in an isolated position close to the Whitemill Brook or Scarning River (a north-flowing tributary of the Wensum), about a third of a mile to the south-west of a cluster of houses around Worthing Mill. Swanton itself contains 2,753 acres (1,114ha), making 3,570 acres in all. Swanton’s medieval church lies in an elevated position above a small spur valley at a bend in the River Wensum. Below it, to the south, there is a hamlet grouped around a small triangular green that has now been partly infilled with houses. This has now coalesced with another hamlet to the south, called Greengate, to make a larger village. There are other smaller hamlets such as Woodgate (south) and Mill Street (north). An area on the flat plateau between Swanton village and Worthing was taken for the construction of an airfield in 1940, becoming RAF Swanton Morley. This finally closed in 1995.

The river terraces here (Wensum north, Whitemill Brook west, Penny Spot Beck east) have sandy peaty soils of the Isleham 2 association (861b: typical humic-sandy gley soil) on poorly-drained glacialfluvial drift deposits. In places these deposits have been exploited for sand and gravel, as in a complex of large pits north of Mill Street. Most of the parish has clayey soils of the Burlington 1 association (572n: stagnogleyic argillic brown earth) on chalky till and drift deposits. These only suffer slight seasonal waterlogging when on sloping land. On the highest land in very south of the parish there are heavier clay soils of the Beccles 1 association (711r: typical stagnogley soil), these rest on chalky till and are seasonally waterlogged (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 117–19, 132–5, 231–5).

In 1066 a large estate of eight carucates at Suaneetuna belonged to a free man called Godwin. This must have included Worthing as there is no separate mention of it, though the Swanton entry concludes with a section that starts with the phrase ‘lying to this manor’ (huic manerio jacent) that could refer to Worthing: it lists 7 sokemen who held 11 bordars, and a freeman with 12 acres. In the main holding there were 24 villeins, 54 bordars (formerly 39) and 6 slaves. By 1086 all this formed a part of the holding of Ralph de Bellofago (from Beaufour in Normandy) (DB Norfolk 20/7). Ralph bore the same surname as William de Bellofago, a royal clerk who became bishop of Thetford in 1085 (Keats-Rohan 1999, 330). The two men were very probably related and there is a possibility that Swanton originally belonged to the bishopric, as Worthing abuts North Elmham, the former seat of the East Anglian bishopric before it was moved to Thetford. It is also noticeable that many of Ralph’s lands had formerly belonged to freemen under Archbishop Stigand, who had been bishop of East Anglia in the 1040s and had retained considerable lands there. Included in Ralph’s Swanton holding was a free man with 12 acres (?at Worthing), whose soke belonged to Mileham, the caput of Stigand’s Norfolk estate. This free man had subsequently belonged to a man named Eudo and had come to Ralph through ‘the king’s gift’. Eudo, described elsewhere as the son of Clamanoc, was a predecessor of Ralph’s in several places. He was probably of mixed origin, for his father bore a name of Old Irish origin.
Ralph’s widow Agnes remarried Hubert II de Rye and in the 1090s they both made donations to the new cathedral at Norwich, including the tithes of Swanton (Charters Norwich Cathedral 1974, 13 no.20). Hubert came from Rye near Bayeux and his family provided the
Conqueror with three castellans for royal castles: Hubert himself at Norwich, his elder brother Ralph at Nottingham and his younger brother Eudo Dapifer at Colchester (Rye 1871, 33–42; 1873, 235–49; 1913, 762–4; Keats-Rohan 2002, 31, 661). Hubert took over the Bellofago estates, which became known as the barony of Rye. Even though Swanton was the largest of the manors, the caput of the barony was held to be Hockering, though Hingham, which the family held at farm from the king, was the effective caput of the Norfolk estates (Sanders 1960, 53).

On the death of Hubert IV de Rye, c. 1188, the barony was inherited jointly by his two daughters, coming eventually to the eldest, Alina, who married John le Marshal, a kinsman of the earls of Pembroke. The Marshals held the barony until the death of John, second Lord Marshal in 1316. It then passed to his daughter Hawise, who married Robert de Morley, second Lord Morley (Cokayne 1932, 526–9). It was due to the long ownership by this family that Swanton came to be known as Swanton Morley, to distinguish it from two other Swantons in Norfolk. The Morleys and their heirs, the Lovels and Parkers, held Swanton until 1570 when the estates of Henry Parker, eleventh Lord Morley were confiscated as a result of his involvement in the rebellion of the Northern Earls (Cokayne 1936, 209–27). In 1567 this Lord Morley had executed a deed of manumission in favour of John Andrews, a ‘bondsman’ of the manor of Swanton Morley, and of Elizabeth his sister and ‘other his sisters’ (NRO MS 20015, 123x3). This interesting document indicates that there were still people here who were regarded as having inherited unfree status as late as the second half of the sixteenth century.

Lord Morley’s estates were restored to his son Edward in 1578, but Swanton was sold soon after to Sir Thomas Lovel of Harling, who resold it before 1583 to Sir Henry Bedingfeld, a London alderman (Beaven 1908, 119). In 1692 Farrington commissioned Rowland Nicholson to produce a survey of the manor. In 1722 Daniel’s granddaughter, Mrs Elizabeth Phill of London, inherited manors here that had belonged to her brother Daniel: these included the manors of Swanton Morley, Hoe Harfords and Ingworth, a capital messuage in Hoe Harfords and Southerys or Sowters and land in Swanton Morley, Worthing, Scarning and Dillington to John Morbe (NRO EVL 374).

John was the son of John Hase, a grocer of East Dereham, who had married Mary Morbe. He was the heir to his uncle, the Rev. John Lombe of Great Melton, who had died in 1746, ‘worth above £100,000’ (Gentleman’s Magazine 1746, 613). Hase, who was mockingly described as ‘Young Squire Fog of Dumpling Hall’ by the contemporary satirist Richard Gardiner, changed his name to Lombe in 1762 and was created a baronet in 1784 (Gardiner 1754, 44; Carthew 1879, 404; Rye 1913, 186, 319, 490). Sir John acquired the additional estate of Bylaugh (immediately north of Swanton, on the other side of the river) in 1794, apparently in settlement of a gambling debt (NRO EVL 26). He died unmarried in 1817 and left his estates to his probable illegitimate son, Edward Beever, who immediately changed his name to Lombe.

A survey of the farms on the estate was undertaken for Edward Lombe 1817–32, this has individual maps for each farm, with list of the fields, their acreages and the total amounts of arable and pasture on each farm. In 1847 Edward died at his home at Great Melton and was succeeded by his son, another Edward. At this point the Court of Chancery apparently intervened as the family had failed to follow an instruction in Sir John Lombe’s will requiring the construction of a new mansion at Bylaugh (Carthew 1879, 401 n.5). Edward therefore commissioned a vast neo-Elizabethan pile from Charles Barry junior and Robert Banks. Built between 1849 and 1852, Bylaugh Hall had only a century of life, becoming a ruin in 1952 (Pevsner and Wilson 1997, 423–4).

Edward Lombe died in 1852 in Florence, where he appears to have lived and may never have seen his new house. His heir was his uncle Charles, another of Sir John’s probable illegitimate sons. On his death in 1860, the estate passed to his cousin, the Rev. Henry Evans-Lombe, a great-nephew of Sir John. In 1883 the Evans-Lombe estate, at 13,343 acres, was the fourth largest in Norfolk (after Holkham, Rayham and Houghton). A great deal of new building was done on the estate in the mid and late nineteenth century, with the result that none of the farm buildings shown on the 1692 map appear to have survived (Wade Martins 1991, 94, 151–2). Despite this investment, the family sold the 8,155-acre Bylaugh estate (including Swanton) in 1917 for £120,000 to a property specifier, who resold it in a fortnight for £127,000 to a company who divided the estate into lots for sale by auction (Barnes 1993, 73).

The Marshals and Morleys both had a seat at Hingham, but both seem to have preferred Great Hallingbury in Essex (inherited by the Marshals in 1313). The tenth Lord Morley rebuilt Hallingbury Place on a grand scale in the early sixteenth century. The inquisition post mortem of Robert, second Lord Morley, in 1360, records that he held two parks, with deer, at Swanton, which suggests that he also maintained some sort of seat at Swanton (Cal Inq Post Mortem X, 501 no.634). However a part, at least, of the holding was sub-infeudated, for the same inquisition records that the heirs of Henry Turnecourt held a sixth of the estate of Bylaugh into lots for sale by auction (Barnes 1993, 73).

The family continued to hold this fraction of a fee from the Morleys through to the early twentieth century. According to Blomefield, ‘Hereford or Hertford’s manor’ in Swanton had connections with land to the west in Hoe and Gressenhall, which accounts for it being referred to as ‘Hoe Harfords’ in later later documents (NRO EVL 361/27 (1723) and 371 (1693)).

In 1605/6 there is mention of the ‘manor of Harfords alias Colylves’ in Swanton Morley with Worthing (TNA...
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E178/4254). This appears to have been acquired in 1616 by Thomas Utber, who had already inherited freehold and copyhold lands in Swanton Morley, Worthing and Hoe from his father Barnard in 1606 (NRO EVL 370; will of Barnard Utber, yeoman of Hoe, dated 1605, proved 1606, TNA PROB11/107). Around 1670 Thomas’s son, also called Thomas, sold ‘manors called Horford, Colvilles, Hoebecke and Sewters’ in Hoe, Dillington, Swanton Morley and Worthing’ which then came into the hands of the Frith family of Hornchurch in Essex (NRO EVL 370 and 371). In 1693 William Frith sold them to Daniel Farrington (NRO EVL 371).

The 1693 transaction refers to ‘lands called Colvilles’ containing 110 acres in Hoe and Swanton Morley. In Daniel Farrington’s will, dated 1701, he refers to ‘the last land which my grandfather [the first Daniel Farrington] bought in the County of Norfolk of William Frith Esquire joyning upon Swanton Morley with a manner called the Manor of Heerford alias Hovalies Colvict or Colwich with a Park of a freehold dwelling house of brick and stone and one hundred and ten acres of land being in the parish of Hoe and Swanton Morley’ (will of Daniel Farrington, gent of Lincoln’s Inn, Middlesex, dated 1701, proved 1722, PROB11/584). These 110 acres can probably be identified as a group of five fields on the western edge of the parish, adjacent to Hoe parish, that all bear the name Colhourns in the 1817–32 farm survey. Together with a sixth field that must belong to this group, they cover 101 acres.

Concerning the main manor of Swanton Morley, Blomefield alleged that ‘The site of this manor was near the church, encompassed with a moat, but the most ancient site is said to be by the river, against Below [Bylaugh], now called Newcastle’ (Blomefield 1809 X, 50; 56; 1808 IX, 515). In 1692 Nicholson recorded in his survey that:

‘The lord hath more, north ye last, A farmhouse Caldwell Newcastle, wch by ye Deep Moats and high banks remaining seems to have been a place of considerable strength. Barn stables orchard within the said moats wch in the Old Field Book is said to be ye Manner house. The lord hath more north a piece of land called Heland in wch is visible the foundation of a building which we suppose to have been a chappell’.

The map of 1692 indicates a large rectangular moat containing the house, two farm buildings and an orchard. A farm survey of 1817–32, with individual farm maps, does not show the moat(s), but does record a field called Moat Close to the south of the farmstead. To the north lay The Island (between the farmstead and the river) and to the west lay Church Close. The Ordnance Survey old edition map of 1838 marks Swanton Castle here, and the first edition map of 1891 calls it Morley Castle; it is now Castle Farm. In 1879 G.A. Carthew published a plan of the ‘Island’ area and recorded some low masonry foundations of a rectangular structure, together with other ‘traces of foundations’ along edges of the ‘moat’ that defined the ‘Island’ on three sides (Carthew 1879, 416–17; Bryant 1903, 205). However in 1993 Brian Cushion could see only a shallow partial moat and no evidence of either foundations or revetments (Norfolk HER no. 3008).

It is possible that the association of a chapel or church with the moated site at Castle Farm led Blomefield to suggest, erroneously, that there was another moated manorial site near the parish church. There is, however, some sort of a site to the south-east of this church (at TG 021173). Aerial photographs seem to indicate a sub-rectangular enclosure and in the 1870s G.A. Carthew probably saw the same site. He described it as being just beyond the small stream that runs to the south of the church. ‘A kind of platform, about two hundred yards long’ rose ‘abruptly’ from the stream and on it, although nothing was visible through the turf, he found, by probing, ‘a continuous line of foundations of walls’. This ‘platform or terrace’ was approached by causeways from either end. This was ‘reputed to be the site of the manor house called Morley Hall’ (Norfolk HER no. 12300; Carthew 1879, 417; Bryant 1903, 205). However somewhere in the same area the 1692 survey recorded that:

The Rector holds in right of the church one Rushey Meadow called the Old Parsonage because (as tis reported) the Parsonage house formerly stood in that place

The same site is described in the 1635 glebe terrier as a meadow (1 acre) called Old Parsonage that lay to the south-west of the ‘common stream of Swanton Morley’, north-east of the king’s highway and north-west of the lord’s demesne (NRO DN/TER/142/4/2a). The tithe apportionment of 1847 records a field called Old Parsonage as lying immediately north-east of the church, which had a piece of glebe at its north-east end, adjoining the River Wensum (NRO MF755 (544)). This is probably the site of the old parsonage.

The other site may therefore be the site of the original hall, in what looks very like an early hall-and-church complex, perhaps the site of Godwin’s eleventh-century hall, but further developed by his Norman successors. It is possible that a junior branch of the de Rye family may have been involved in this development. This branch, probably descended from William, the younger brother of Hubert IV, were in Swanton in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. The last recorded was Johanna de Rye, who was taxed five shillings here in 1327 (Rye 1871, 247). The amount suggests that she had a substantial holding, which would be understandable if she was occupying the demesne.

The site at Castle Farm may then represent a new hall (hence the name ‘Newcastle’), perhaps developed by the Morley family in the fourteenth century. The family seem to have been taking an interest in the parish then, as is shown by a bequest towards the building of the parish church by the third Lord Morley in 1379. The existing large church certainly dates from this period. The new hall may have originated as a lodge in the deer park.

The 1692 survey records that the area close to Castle Farm (in ‘Precinct 1’), contained four pieces of land called ‘The Le Sew now called The Lizard’. These covered about 75 acres which ‘anciently lay in one large piece containing by estimation 133 acres’. This name comes from Old English læswe ‘pasture, meadow land’ (Smith 1956, II, 11). In 1817–32 two fields called Lizard Cross lay on the south side of Elsing Road, at the junction with the road that leads north to Castle Farm. Presumably the name actually refers to land immediately north of the crossroads, as the south side was in a different precinct in 1692. This area in 1817–32 contained a field called Old Park (6 acres), which suggests that this very large pasture was one of the deer parks recorded in 1360 (Pl. 11). In 1817–32, 42% of the farm consisted of pasture and it still had ample pasture in
1917 when Castle Farm was advertised as an 'excellent dairying farm'.

The position of the other deer park is indicated by the present Park Farm, immediately to the south of Castle Farm, across the Elsing Road. The 1692 survey mentions this as Swanton Parkhouse and notes that ‘Precincts’ 2 and 6 of the fields abutted north-west and east, respectively, on Swanton Park Ground. Furthermore, the 1817–32 farm survey records Old Park Meadow (5 acres) and Old Park Piece (8 acres) immediately to the west of the farmhouse.

Close by were fields called Great Bush Close (20 acres) and Little Bush Close (6 acres) — names that suggest the former presence of woodland, presumably also part of the park. In 1817–32, 28% of Park Farm was pasture. In a meadow close by (at TG 034167) there is a group of five circular banked enclosures, varying in size from 30m to 70m, which may be some sort of stock enclosures (Norfolk HER no. 12296).

The 1692 survey divides Swanton and Worthing into sixteen ‘precincts’; thirteen in Swanton and three in Worthing. These varied in size from 56 acres to 471 acres (with an average of 215 acres in Swanton and 279 acres in Worthing) and were mostly bounded by roads or rivers. As most of the roads radiate out from the Swanton village centre, so the precincts appear to form a radial pattern around it. In 1692 many of the roads had names ending in -gate: Eastgate, Westgate, Greengate, Woodgate, Goosegate, Hungate, Burgate and Lordgate, indicating a population who habitually used the Old Norse term hreð, ‘king’s gift’, though it might just have been that of a priest who served the church. A church is mentioned under Swanton in 1086, but it is unclear as to whether it was here or at Swanton proper. To the north of the church, in Church Meadow, there is the earthwork of a small moat with a rectangular platform in its north-east corner that might be the remains of a building (Norfolk HER no. 2811). The name of the meadow, the small size of the moat and its proximity to the church suggest that this might have been the site of the house of the priest that served the church.

In seven of the sixteen precincts there were, in 1692, specific references to furlongs and strips, usually as one component of the precincts, which usually also contained closes and other units. Three precincts had seven furlongs, one had six, one had four and two had two, making thirty-five in all. Within the furlongs were strips of demesne, glebe, freehold and copyhold land. The amount of ‘open field’ land in any one precinct varied from 27% to 100%, with an average of 47%. The amounts were highest on the lighter lands towards the river in the north and lowest on the heavier clay lands in the south. Most of these seven precincts bore ‘field’ names: Eastgate Field ‘now called’ The Church Field; the ‘open field’ called Mill Field; High Field (Hey Field ‘in the old book’); Goosegate Field or Burrow Field; and Burrow Field. Three of the other precincts also bore ‘field’ names: Read Field; Torne Poole Field; and Hooe Field, making ten ‘fields’ in all. The glebe terrier of 1635 mentions a piece of glebe ‘running through’ three furlongs in Redefield, but in 1692 the rector’s acre was said instead to run through three closes.

The fact that Read Field lay at the southern end of the parish on heavy clay soils of the Becles 1 association (711r) may well have been a significant factor in its early conversion to closes. The first element of the name could be Old English bero, ‘a reed, a rush’, perhaps indicating rather poorly-drained land on the clay soil. Torne Poole Field lay on the north side of Read Field and probably also had a heavy soil, for it 1692 it contained a piece of demesne woodland called Prickwood and was said to be ‘very full of croppwood and some large timber trees’. Close by, to the south-east of Read Field and extending southwards into neighbouring parishes there was an area of clay ‘moor’ called Badley Moore (see also Barringer 1994, 81). This -ey name suggests the former presence of woodland, and Read Field itself lies on the south side of the road and settlement called Woodgate. These, and the presence of the two parks to the north, suggest that there may have been an extensive band of woodland on the eastern side of the parish. It was probably in this area that the ‘woodland for 500 pigs’ recorded in Swanton in 1086 was located. This figure indicates a considerable amount of woodland, but converting this formula into acres cannot be done exactly. However, using data assembled by Oliver Rackham, it is possible to suggest that this could represent nearly 900 acres of wood (Rackham 1980, 120–1).

There were different soil problems in the north-west of the parish. Here there was an area of high flat land with Burlington I soils (572n) that probably had moisture and nutrient deficiencies. It is on the precincts here (Hooe Field, Marle Pit Field and two in Worthing) that there is mention of fold courses and shackle, indicating...
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Plate 12  Swanton Morley, Norfolk. View south-westward across the probable former common field area called Goosegate Field
sheep-grazing. On the Ordnance Survey old edition map of 1838 the area is labelled 'Swanton Brecks' (north) and 'Swanton Field' (south). The 1817–32 farm survey also records field names here containing the terms 'breck' and 'ol(d)land.' Both have a similar meaning of land that was only intermittently cultivated — 'breck' being particularly associated with this practice in the light sandy lands of the Breckland, about 11 miles to the south-west (Sandred 1996, 45, 86; Sussams 1996, 14). An area of heath on the borders of Swanton and Hoe is mentioned in a deed of 1650 (NRO EVL 361/6). At the north end of Marle Pit Field there was ‘a dool which signifies the partition of shakage between Swanton and Worthing’, i.e. a marker, probably an earthen mound, that separated two areas of post-harvest grazing.

In 1692 a demesne messuage called Fieldhouse with a ‘new’ brick barn dominated the precinct called ‘Hooe Field’. Now divided into Field House Buildings and Swanton Morley House, it was probably part of the lands that Daniel Farrington bought in 1681 from Thomas Curson. These included a foldcourse of 476.5 acres in Worthing, Swanton Morley and Hoe, together with Harvey’s tenement and ‘a tenement lately built in Worthing’ (NRO EVL 368). These were, in turn, probably part of 546 acres of land in Swanton and Worthing that were mortgaged by Thomas Utber of Hoe to Curson in 1648. These lands included Cattoway Closes and Cattoway Bottom: these must relate to the area called ‘Catway Meadow’ in the 1692 survey, which lies just to the west of Field House. Also among these lands was ‘a new tenement called Shepherds House with a foldcourse of 312 acres’, which was probably Field House itself (NRO EVL 361/5). It is likely that this foldcourse is the same as the ‘foldcourse in Worthinge or Swanton Morley’ that formed a part of the possessions of Thomas’s grandfather, Barnarde Utber, in 1605 (will of Barnarde Utber, yeoman of Hoe, dated 1605, proved 1606, TNA PROB11/107).

Although he described himself in his will as a yeoman, Barnarde was a wealthy man with a manor in Cley on the north Norfolk coast and lands in several of the adjacent parishes, as well as in Hoe, Swanton Morley, Worthing, East Dereham, Billingford and Lakenham. The family had been coopers and wrights in Norwich, with Barnarde’s grandfather, also called Barnard, serving as sheriff of the county of Norfolk, and for extinguishing the several rights of common and sheep walk over the said fields and half year closes, and over certain lands called the brecks, lying within the said manor and parishes.

In 1817–32 it contained 930 acres, of which 125 acres (13%) were pasture. By the nineteenth century this pasture was being used mainly for cattle, hence the elaborate series of farm buildings, both at the main farmstead and at outlying yard called ‘The Great Breck Buildings’. In the mid-nineteenth century the tenant farmer here, Robert Freeman, corresponded with R.N. Bacon, the author of The Report on the Agriculture of Norfolk (London 1844), from which we know that he followed a four-course system on this farm (Wade Martins 1991, 151–2).

The fields in the northern part of Field House Farm, in the former ‘Swanton Field’ and ‘Swanton Brecks’, are the most obvious pieces of late-enclosed land on the nineteenth-century maps. The large fields here with straight boundaries contrast with the smaller, more irregular fields elsewhere in the parish. The sinuous lanes that marked the old precincts largely survived the enclosure process and give an irregular appearance to the landscape. Within them it is sometimes possible to see former panels of former ‘open field’ land, but there are also indications of long-standing closes. In Precinct 1, which consisted largely of the demesne land around Castle Farm, the 1692 survey refers to the Swanton-Elsing road as running ‘through Mr Parham’s Closes’.

There is evidence of human occupation in the Swanton area that stretches back into prehistory. There are ring-ditches that probably indicate the sites of Bronze Age burial mounds to the east of Castle Farm, on the east side of the village and to the north-west of Field House Farm (Norfolk HER nos 17734, 12298, 18309, 29559 and 32197). There are also stray finds dating from the Mesolithic onwards. One of the largest concentrations of finds comes from beside the river at the northern end of the parish. Roman material has also come from the same area, associated with a first-century Roman fort, identified from cropmarks (Norfolk HER no. 17486). This fort lies on Burgh Common (Burgh Hills in the 1847 tithe apportionment), which in turn lay adjacent to Burrow Field in 1692. All these names contain Old English burh ‘a fort’, and there must be a presumption that the fort was the Roman one, still visible in the Anglo-Saxon period. The
main Roman settlement in the area, however, did not lie at Swanton but to the north of the Wensum in Billingford parish (Gurney 1995, 59, 61). There is little evidence of an early Saxon presence around Burgh Common, though a late Saxon zoomorphic object has been found there. It seems more likely that settlement shifted southwards to the present village area. The land continued though to be an important arable area for the settlement, becoming Goosegate or Burrow Field and was still being farmed in strips in 1692. In the twentieth century part of this field and most of the former ‘breck’ area between Field House Farm and Worthing was taken for Swanton Morley Airfield, which has eradicated most of the pre-existing field patterns.

3. South Elmham St Michael, Suffolk (EANGL 4) (Fig. 6)
Old English elm+ham, the ham (‘village, estate, homestead) where elms grew’ (Ekwall 1960, 164).19

South Elmham St Michael lies on the clay plateau to the south of the River Waveney in north Suffolk. Most of the parish consists of a plateau of chalky till with heavy, seasonally waterlogged, clay soils belonging to the Beccles 1 association (711r: typical stagnogley soil). However at the northern end the land slopes down to a stream called The Beck and on this slope there are better-drained clay soils of the Hanslope association (411d: typical calcareous pelosol) (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 117–19, 209–13).

Although only a small parish of 827 acres (335ha), there were six manorial holdings here in the sixteenth century, as well as numerous freeholds.20 St Michael is one of a group of parishes that share the name South Elmham and were formerly part of an ancient estate of the East Anglian bishopric (J. Campbell 1996, 19). The group, with Homersfield and Flixton, was called the ‘Ferthing’ of South Elmham, in that they constituted a quarter of a hundred and the bishops had jurisdiction over it. In the Domesday period the head of the estate was at Homersfield, beside the River Waveney. Later, probably around 1100, it was moved onto the clay plateau when an episcopal palace was established at South Elmham Hall, on the boundary between South Elmham St Cross and St Margaret.21 The gradual subdivision of this estate is the cause of the manorial complexity in St Michael. Only one of the manors arising from this subdivision was centred in the parish, the rest were centred elsewhere but several clearly inherited land rights in St Michael. This suggests that St Michael was a ‘secondary vill’, a settlement established in an area where others had prior rights. It is doubtful if any of the manorial lords were ever resident in St Michael and the demesnes (one core and one detached) can only be partially reconstructed.

The nucleus of the settlement in 1086 was probably the 40-acre manor in Almaha, with a church and a fifth of another, held in chief by Godric Dapifer (‘the steward’) (DB Suffolk 13/6). Godric had been steward to Ralph de Gael, the disgraced earl of Norfolk, and appears in Domesday Book both as a tenant in chief and as a royal steward in charge of some of the lands of his former master (DB Suffolk 1/61–5 and 13; Keats-Rohan 1999, 195). His land in South Elmham was presumably part of the spoils from the earl, for it had belonged to a Freeman, also called...
Godric, under commendation to Earl Ralph’s father. On this small manor Godric had two villeins, one border and one slave, there were also two freemen with 5 acres. The descent of this land is rather tortuous, but in outline this seems to be the story. Godric’s estate passed, probably through a marriage, to the Montchensy family of Gooderstone in Norfolk. By the twelfth century it was being held, under the Montchensys, by the Waresle family of Wenhaston in Suffolk, who may have been related to their overlords. Around 1200 Ralph de Waresle, priest, gave the church of St Michael, of which he was the parson, to the neighbouring priory of Rumburgh (Sibton Abbey Cartularies I 1985, 111–13; Bod MS Top. Suffolk d.15, f.36v–37v; Curia Regis Rolls V, 1207, 13 and 104). The church was subsequently served directly by the monks of the parish of Rumburgh (BL Add.MS 19111, Sibton Abbey Cartularies I). Ralph Werpelok or Warpullocks of Barsham, Suffolk, was the heir to the Waresle holding the church of St Michael and 14 acres ‘whereof it is endowed by the antecessors of Ralph de Worisle’. The Montchensy family held land in the South Elmhams both from the bishops of Norwich, as of their great manor of South Elmham, and from the San(d)croft family, who were among the free sokemen of their overlords. Around 1200 Ralph de Waresle, priest, gave the church of St Michael, of which he was the parson, to the neighbouring priory of Rumburgh (Sibton Abbey Cartularies I 1985, 111–13). In

One of the other substantial manorial holdings in St Michael also originated in a pre-Conquest freeman’s holding. Offa, a freeman under commendation to Archbishop Stigand (who in the 1040s had been bishop of East Anglia and had retained considerable property there) held land in Flixton, which formed a part of the Ferthing of Elmhams and they celebrated their wealth by building a large new house on the New Hall land, renaming it Flixton Hall. The family later suffered financially through being Roman Catholics and died out in the male line in the early eighteenth century. In the 1750s the Flixton estate was bought by Wiliam Adair. The Adair family enlarged the estate still further and by the nineteenth century it covered some 10,000 acres and was amongst the largest in Suffolk. The 1842 tithe apportionment of South Elmham St Michael shows Sir Robert Adair as the owner of about a quarter of the parish. The estate was broken up after its sale in 1953 and most of the Hall was demolished.

The medieval documents for South Elmham St Michael do not give a great deal of information about the layout of its landscape, but some do mention entities called culturae in this general area. A late thirteenth-early fourteenth-century extent of the lands of Rumburgh Priory mentions a 40-acre cultura called Le Prestcroft and a 50-acre ‘great’ cultura called Le Bondobotha (SRO(L) HA12 Add.741/30, f.2 and 4). The latter re-occurs in the early sixteenth century as two ‘closes’ called Grete Bombothe, containing 32 acres and Little Bombothe containing 36 acres (TNA E36/160 f.21r). In 1538 ‘two closes with ways’ called Rumbotothas, containing 67 acres, with a ‘piece’ called Est Bombothe on their east side, are mentioned (SRO(L) ES 741/HAI2 Add.1/107, f.7v). The location of this land is revealed by the 1841 tithe apportionment of South Elmham All Saints, which records fields called Bambers (3.75 acres) and Twelve Acre Bambers (12.5 acres) to the south of St James Road in the southern part of that parish (SRO(L) FDA 226/A1/1a). On the first edition Ordinance Survey map of 1884 two large fields here, both roughly square and lying beside each other, stand out from the other smaller fields around them. One was Great Field and the other contained Twelve Acre Bambers and another field of 11.25 acres. Together these cover an area of 52.25 acres (approximately 300 yards NW-SE x 750 yards SW-NE), suggesting that these are the two closes of the Tudor documents. The name means ‘the peasant booths/huts’ or the ‘booths held by bond service’ and could refer to the properties along St James Road (formerly Newegatewey) — Ash Farm, Ash Farm Cottages and Chestnuts Farm still remain, but fieldwalking suggests there were others here in the

may be the origin of the Bateman fee there (SRO(L) HA12/B2/1/53). The Richmond fee originated in the lands held at Domesday by Count Alan of Brittany, which later became a part of the earldom of Richmond. In 1086 Count Alan held the area to the south of St Michael, including Rumburgh. It thus transpires that most of these ‘manorial’ holdings originated in the holdings of a number of freemen in the Conquest period. Some of the holdings probably remained outside the manorial system, for there are references in the sixteenth century to ‘cullyer rents’, indicative of land held from the hundred rather than from a manor, in the South Elmhams, including St Michael (SRO(L) HA12/B1/2/70 and HA12/B1/4/2).

By 1509 the manor of Boys had passed to the Tasburgh family of South Elmham St Peter. The family increased their lands by acquiring the estates of Flixton Priory in 1544, by purchasing the manor of New Hall in Flixton from the Batemans in 1607 and finally by buying the former episcopal manor of South Elmham from the North family in 1617–18 (Evans 1980, 269–80). This made the Tasburghs the most important landowners in the South Elmhams and they celebrated their wealth by building a large new house on the New Hall land, renaming it Flixton Hall. The family later suffered financially through being Roman Catholics and died out in the male line in the late eighteenth century. In the 1750s the Flixton estate was bought by Wiliam Adair. The Adair family enlarged the estate still further and by the nineteenth century it covered some 10,000 acres and was amongst the largest in Suffolk. The 1842 tithe apportionment of South Elmham St Michael shows Sir Robert Adair as the owner of about a quarter of the parish. The estate was broken up after its sale in 1953 and most of the Hall was demolished.

The medieval documents for South Elmham St Michael do not give a great deal of information about the layout of its landscape, but some do mention entities called culturae in this general area. A late thirteenth-early fourteenth-century extent of the lands of Rumburgh Priory mentions a 40-acre cultura called Le Prestcroft and a 50-acre ‘great’ cultura called Le Bondobotha (SRO(L) HA12 Add.741/30, f.2 and 4). The latter re-occurs in the early sixteenth century as two ‘closes’ called Grete Bombothe, containing 32 acres and Little Bombothe containing 36 acres (TNA E36/160 f.21r). In 1538 ‘two closes with ways’ called Rumbotothas, containing 67 acres, with a ‘piece’ called Est Bombothe on their east side, are mentioned (SRO(L) ES 741/HAI2 Add.1/107, f.7v). The location of this land is revealed by the 1841 tithe apportionment of South Elmham All Saints, which records fields called Bambers (3.75 acres) and Twelve Acre Bambers (12.5 acres) to the south of St James Road in the southern part of that parish (SRO(L) FDA 226/A1/1a). On the first edition Ordinance Survey map of 1884 two large fields here, both roughly square and lying beside each other, stand out from the other smaller fields around them. One was Great Field and the other contained Twelve Acre Bambers and another field of 11.25 acres. Together these cover an area of 52.25 acres (approximately 300 yards NW-SE x 750 yards SW-NE), suggesting that these are the two closes of the Tudor documents. The name means ‘the peasant booths/huts’ or the ‘booths held by bond service’ and could refer to the properties along St James Road (formerly Newegatewey) — Ash Farm, Ash Farm Cottages and Chestnuts Farm still remain, but fieldwalking suggests there were others here in the
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Plate 14 South Elmham St Michael, Suffolk. This sloping area bordering The Beck in the northern part of the parish was the best available arable land and was used for both demesne and common fields.

Plate 15 South Elmham St Michael, Suffolk. St Michael’s Green is situated on the highest and flattest part of the parish. Poor natural drainage made it a natural choice for an area of common pasture.
thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (Hardy and Martin 1987a, 232, 234–5). In the late thirteenth century Rumburgh Priory held ‘in villeinage’ (i.e. bond tenure), from the bishop of Norwich’s manor of South Elmham, 75 acres which its villeins held from it, together with their houses (SRO(I) HA12/C1/1). This is very likely to be Bondebathes. Despite its position on heavy clay, there may have been some arable potential here as its position on a slight slope on the north side of the stream called The Beck (named as Le Mikelbeck — ‘the big stream’ — in the medieval extent) would have helped with drainage.

The medieval cultura called Le Prestcroft also lay in South Elmham All Saints. This re-occurs in a survey of c.1500, where it is noted that the ‘Prior of Rumburgh has in his hand Monkfield formerly Priestcloses, 36 acres’ (Bod MS Top. Suffolk d.15,f.21r). This too can be identified on the 1841 tithe apportionment, which lists four fields, together with a house and yard, as tithe-free and called ‘Monks lands’. Their combined acreage was 36.75 acres. The four fields form a roughly square block, with sides that measure approximately 470 yards NW-SE x 370 yards SW-NE, on the north side of St James Road. The farmhouse is named as Monk’s Cottage on the Ordnance Survey first edition map, now Monks Farm.

A series of sixteenth-century surveys show that most of the land in St Michael was then arranged in tenements, with frequent mentions of pightles, closes and crofts.2 Some are specifically said to be ‘separately enclosed’ and one tenement, Baldewynnyn, was said, c.1580, to be ‘enclosed with great ditches’ (magnis fossatis). At least twenty-six of these tenements bear the names of people recorded in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century documents relating to the area, indicating that they were long-standing entities.25 There were however two ‘fields’ (Borreells otherwise Hudds Field and Cockfield) in the northern part of the parish which still seem to have been in some form of divided ownership.26 These lay to the east of the demesne fields of Warpulocks and, like them, were situated on the more permeable Hankslope soils (411d) (Pl. 14). The clearest indication that they were in subdivided ownership comes from an abuttal of c.1580, which mentions ‘lands of divers men in Hudds Field’. Traces of the subdivisions can still be seen on the 1842 tithe map, which shows a number of narrow strips belonging to the Feoffees of St Michael (i.e. the charity lands of the parish) in this area, their institutional ownership having made them more resistant to exchange or amalgamation than the other strips (SRO(I) FDA 228/A1/1A). It is only this slight clustering of very narrow fields that sets this area apart from the general pattern of linear fields in the parish. Two field names, Short and Long Shearwoods, recorded in 1842 close to Borreells suggest that this was the location of the two culturae ‘by Schirrew[ode]’ that are recorded in the late thirteenth–early fourteenth-century Rumburgh extent (SRO(L) HA12 Add.741/30, f.2).

The sixteenth-century documents are not consistent in their terminology for Borreells is recorded both as a close and as a furlong. There are also scattered indications of other closes being in divided ownership, with mentions of separate parcels of land being ‘in the same close’. Where identifiable, most of these subdivided closes were also in the northern part of the parish. The former extent of the common arable fields can therefore only be estimated, but is unlikely to have exceeded about 14% of the parish. There was, however, no sign of any communal cropping or folding arrangements and there was no parliamentary enclosure. The only substantial communal feature seems to have been St Michael’s Green, a common pasture of 20.5 acres which was in existence by 1321, when it was recorded as Hushaghgrene (Bod MS Top. Suffolk d.15, f.67r) (Pl. 15).

This green lies on the highest part of the clay plateau. In Suffolk, names incorporating Old English haga (or Old Norse hagi — the two are largely indistinguishable) meaning, in origin, ‘a hedge, an enclosure’ are frequently indicative of woods, as in Depperhaugh Wood in Hoxne.28 This suggests that the area of the green was originally a wood.28 There are a number of other greens in Suffolk with wood names, indicating that the creation of greens out of woodland was not uncommon.29 In St Michael there were a number of other medieval haga names — Bordeghagh, Skulnehagh and Fyrthagh — suggesting perhaps a larger area of woodland on the clay plateau (SRO(L) HA12 Add.741/30, f.2 and 5). In Domesday Book all the South Elmham parishes are simply called ‘Elmham’, which makes their differentiation difficult, but the probable entry for St Michael only mentions ‘wood for four pigs’ (DB Suffolk 13, 6). Converting this formula into acres cannot be done exactly, but using data assembled by Oliver Rackham, it is possible to suggest that there was probably only a smallish wood of between about 8 and 50 acres (Rackham 1980, 120–1). But the entry for the bishop’s head manor in the South Elmhams, at Homersfield, contains the surprising information that it contained woodland for 600 pigs in 1066, reduced to 200 by 1086. This suggests something like 1000 acres of woodland in 1066, yet Homersfield (now a parish of only 1,005 acres) also contained at least 720 acres of farmland! (DB Suffolk 18, 4 and 19, 13). The only explanation can be that this woodland was more generally distributed through the bishop’s South Elmham estate. The bishop was one of the manorial lords in St Michael and some of that woodland could well have been there. The sizeable drop in the swine assessment (600 to 200) between 1066 and 1086 further suggests that woodland was being actively cleared in this period.

The field pattern in the South Elmhams is well-known for its strongly co-axial character (Pl. 16). The suggested dates for this range from the Bronze Age through to the Saxon period (Bigmore 1973; Rackham 1986, 156; Williamson 1988, 428–9; Martin 1999b, 57). In St Michael the co-axial character is strongest on the clay plateau in the southern part of the parish, the main axis running approximately north-south, at right-angles to The Beck. This stream initially flows west-east along Eastgate Way in an almost imperceptible valley, and then out of the parish, returning to flow east-west in a much more marked valley at the northern end of the parish. In this southern area there were two of the ‘wood’ names — Bordeghagh and Fyrthagh — suggesting that this poorly-drained clayland was woodland in the Saxon period. A survey of c.1580 describes Bordeghagh as formerly part of the demesne of Flixton and notes that at its north end, abutting Eastgate Way, there was a grove of underwood (survey of the manor of Flixton c.1580, SRO(L) HA12/E1/2/23, f.36r). This suggests that this was a piece of manorial woodland that had been converted into an area of detached demesne. The same survey records a number of other groves in the tenements adjoining Eastgate Way (SRO(L) HA12/E1/2/23, f. 36–7 and 40). Taking into account the
evidence discussed above for active woodland clearance in the South Elmhams between 1066 and 1086, it suggests that the co-axial field pattern is not prehistoric but early medieval.

The relatively small size of the fields recorded here in the nineteenth century has meant that there has been a high twentieth-century loss of field boundaries through field amalgamations (Tithe Map of 1842, SRO(I) FDA228/A1/1a). A survey in 1995 showed that this was one of three areas in the county where the ratio between the number of fields now and in the 1840s was close to 1:5 (Podd 1995, sample strip 4 (out of ten): ratio 1:4.71). This has led to a substantial loss of the original field pattern. This destruction is graphically depicted in an aerial photograph, taken in 1973 of an area on the eastern side of St Michael, that shows a whole grid of recently bulldozed hedges (Pl. 68).

Most of St Michael was fieldwalked by Mike Hardy in the 1980s (Hardy and Martin 1988, 315–17). This evidence, together with the existing houses, shows that medieval settlement was distributed around St Michael’s Green and along a number of lanes that ran across the predominant long axis of the co-axial field system. The most important of these was Eastgate Way (Estegatewey 1538) that runs in a curve from the southern end of the green eastward to the parish boundary. Hulver Farm and Boundary Farm are existing farmsteads on this, but the fieldwalking indicates that there were a least six others. Two ‘waste messuages’ on Eastgate Way are also mentioned in a survey of c. 1580 (SRO(L) HA12/E1/2/23, f.36–7). To the north of this, and extending east of the green were two other lanes, one being the existing Shub Lane (formerly Rudding’s Lane) and the other being the track that leads to The Poplars. Rutlands Lane led off from the south-west corner of St Michael’s Green towards All Saints Green. Farmsteads of medieval origin or pottery scatters are associated with all these lanes and tracks. The lands associated with these farmsteads consisted of narrow co-axial groups of closes and pightles lying at right-angles to the lanes.

The location of the original manorial hall associated with Warpullocks is not totally clear. In 1842 this land formed a narrow strip that stretched from the north edge of St Michael’s Green down to the parish boundary beside The Beck. The farmhouse (then Townland Farm, now Brook Farm House) lies in an isolated position at the north end of the holding, on the meadow beside The Beck. St Michael’s Green forms an extension of the co-axial ‘unit’ that contains Warpullocks, suggesting that they have some linked history. This impression is reinforced by the fact that Warpullocks is exactly three furlongs long (660 yards) from green-edge to parish boundary. Although the southern end of this strip lies close to the church, it does not actually abut it.

There is, however, a suggestion of a manorial site adjoining the north and east sides of the church in what was Middle Church Meadow in 1842. The layout with the churchyard forming about one quarter of the field area is highly suggestive of a hall-and-church complex. Fieldwalking has revealed a medieval pottery scatter here,
suggested that it was indeed once a house site. There was also an entity called Duffhouseyard in this area in 1538, which is a further clue as to the status of the site, for the right to have a dovecote was usually limited to manorial lords and parish priests (McCann 1998, 18). Although precise documentation seems to be lacking, the likelihood is that this was, in fact, the site of the parsonage that was given to Rumburgh Priory c.1200. A late thirteenth/early fourteenth-century extent of the lands of Rumburgh Priory, under the land pertaining to the church of St Michael, lists one rood of land lying between the ‘grange’ (barn) of the priory and the house of William le Newman (SRO(L) HA12 Add. 741/30, f.1). The Tudor surveys show that a tenement called Newmans lay immediately to the south of this putative parsonage. The 14 acres that are mentioned c.1260–80 as the endowment of the rectory, presumably lay to the north of this site, adjacent to the Warpullocks strip on the prized sloping land leading to The Beck. The Tudor surveys indicate that this area contained a piece of land described as the Gretelcose and 1842 tithe map does indicate the fields here are larger and squarer than those to the east that were formerly common fields (SRO(L) HA12/1B/1/4, f.5). The position of these fields adjacent to Warpullocks strongly suggest that they were once all part of one block demesne and, further, that the parsonage may have grown out of, or replaced, the original manorial hall.

By about 1500, however, the parsonage ‘grange’ had moved across to the west side of St Michael’s Green, to the area of the moated Ash Farm. A Rumburgh survey of c.1500 refers to a half rood of copyhold land called Tithberneyard (Bod MS Top. Suffolk d.15, f.11). This reappears in 1538 as a half rod pightle called Tithberneyard, which was said to abut north (actually east-north-east) on the ‘common pasture of St Michael’ (SRO(L) ES 741/HA12 Add/107, f.3). It abutted west on a 10-acre area called Michael Tyth, which was then held by Peter Spycer. The impropriated glebe of St Michael’s was sold off after the dissolution of Rumburgh Priory, with the result that by 1813 there was said to be ‘no [parsonage] house or glebe land’ in St Michael (SRO(L) 151/C11/1).

The rectorial endowment of 14 acres, recorded c.1260–80, equals the 8 acres and 6 acres that belonged in 1086 to the church and fifth of a church, respectively, that Godric’s holding originated as one of five in St Peter’s, but that it became a separate entity when settlement was expanded onto the clay hinterland. It could be that Godric’s hall was the original hus ‘house’ by the ktheg ‘wood’ of Hushaghgrene (St Michael’s Green).

The term hus is most commonly found in Danelaw areas and there are other place-names here which point to a Norse element in the population (Smith 1956, I, 270). The Norse terms gata and stigr for a way or lane occur in Eastgate and Newegatewy (as above) and le Castelstey; bekker ‘a stream’ occurs in The Beck; sik ‘a small stream or ditch’ in Wrongsyke; kraka ‘a crow’ in Craks close; and thvert ‘across, athat’ in Whartonle.29 The adjacent parish of South Elmham St Peter was called Yolthorp or Yolthorhph in the early fourteenth century; South Elmham St Nicholas was formerly called Storthe (Norse for ‘a young wood or land growing with brushwood’); and to the east the South Elmhams abut a block of four parishes all with the name Ilketshall, embodying the Scandinavian personal name Ulfketill.30 These names are part of a larger concentration of Scandinavian names in north-west Suffolk and adjoining areas of Norfolk (Martin 1999a, 50–1; Williamson 1993b, 44–5). This influence may help to explain the large number (96) of freemen recorded in the South Elmhams in Domesday Book.

The earliest evidence for medieval occupation in St Michael consists of Early Medieval Ware (eleventh–twelfth centuries) from sites north and east of St Michael’s Green (including the probable parsonage/hall site) and medieval coarse ware (twelfth–thirteenth centuries) from a site near the southern parish boundary and a site adjacent to Eastgate Way. The last two sites indicate that settlement, and perhaps associated fields of co-axial character, had been established in the southern part of the parish by the twelfth–thirteenth centuries. Although a church was recorded here in Domesday Book (with a strong suggestion of a hall near it) no Saxo-Norman Thetford-type ware was found, nor any earlier Saxon pottery. However, this is consistent with the findings from the adjacent parishes. Despite the fieldwalking of c.15,000 acres in the South Elmhams and adjacent parishes by Mike Hardy, only seven sites have yielded Thetford-type ware.31 This contrasts with the large quantities of this pottery found by the programme of fieldwalking and excavation conducted by Peter Wade-Martins in the Launditch Hundred of Norfolk (Wade-Martins 1980). This suggests that Thetford-type ware is not a reliable indicator of Conquest-period settlement in the South Elmhams. This leaves the foundation date of St Michael’s Green uncertain. The existence of a hall-and-church complex can be plausibly inferred by 1086, but it is by no means clear whether they were accompanied by a green at that stage. The green could have been developed a hundred years or more later.

Notwithstanding the argument rehearsed above about the relationship between St Michael and St Peter, the fact that the latter was also known as Yolthorp raises the possibility that it too was a secondary settlement. The Scandinavian term thorh raises the possibility that it too was a secondary settlement. The Scandinavian term thorh was frequently used with the sense of ‘a secondary settlement, a dependent outlying farmstead or hamlet’ (Smith 1956, II, 205). As in St Michael, fieldwalking has located Early Medieval Ware in the vicinity of the church, but no earlier Saxon material...
(Hardy and Martin 1988, 315–17). The combined areas of St Michael and St Peter do, however, form the southern end of a 7km-long strip which has the parish of Flixton at its northern end. The village of Flixton lies on the gravel terrace beside the River Waveney and Domesday Book reveals it to have been a much more substantial place than either St Michael or St Peter. There were five holdings in Flixtuna, including one of two carucates with ten villeins, fourteen bordars and two slaves (DB Suffolk 53/5). Within the Ferthing this was second only to the bishop’s head manor at Homersfield (Hombresfelda), which had sixteen villeins, twelve bordars and four slaves on a manor of five carucates (DB Suffolk 18/4).32 Fieldwalking by Mike Hardy has shown that this was one of the rare places in this area to have produced Thetford-type ware, from a location near the church (Hardy and Martin 1989, 66–9). Recent work in Flixton Park Quarry has, however, dramatically increased the Saxon evidence by revealing an early Saxon settlement on the gravel terrace with a nearby sixth-century pagan cemetery (Boulter 1999, 373–4; 2002, 222–5; 2000/21 and 2000/94; Selkirk and Boulter 2003, 280–5). The progressive division of an original large unit would provide an explanation for the lands belonging to Flixton in St Michael. A model can now be suggested which would see an original settlement on the gravel terrace at Flixton with a clayland hinterland rich in woodland. As that woodland area was colonised, daughter settlements grew up which established their own churches and settlements, yet the original settlement retained rights to a share of this former woodland. This is perhaps most clearly seen in the block of detached demesne belonging to Flixton that lay in Bordeshagh. The first element of this name, Old English bord, could either mean ‘a board or plank’ or a ‘border’ (Parsons et al. 1997, 127). Either sense would suit a wood that probably contained large trees abutting the southern boundary of the original territory.

The excavations in Flixton Park Quarry have actually revealed a long history of occupation on the gravel terrace that certainly dates back to the Neolithic. The excavations have also revealed field boundaries of Iron Age and Roman date. These have still to be fully studied, but they seem to be part of rectangular blocks that are probably between 1ha and 2.5ha in size (2.5 to 3.5 acres). The Roman occupation on the terrace, as revealed so far, seems to have been more industrially orientated. Pottery kilns have been found, together with an extraordinary timber building with numerous internal posts, presumably to bear a heavy weight on an upper floor (Boulter 2002, 222–5; Boulter 2001, 95–6).

There is also, however, evidence for Roman settlement in St Michael. Two sites were located, 0.5km apart. The larger of the two was situated just above the crest of the south-facing slope and was probably about half a mile apart (800m), often in paired positions on either side of streams (Hardy and Martin 1987b, 233–4).

4. Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva, Norfolk (EANGL 5) (Fig. 7)

Scole: Old Norse skáli ‘hut, shed’
Osmundeston: Old English Osmund’s or Old Norse Asmundr’s tun (‘homestead, village’) Pendragon: possibly Old English Frea’s people
Frenze: Old English or Old Scandinavian/English hybrid, Thialfi’s tun
Thelveton: Old Scandinavian thorp ‘outlying dependent farm or minor settlement’

This study differs from the others in that it encompasses four separate parishes. Together, however, they form a roughly square block of 2,620 acres on the north side of the River Waveney, which forms the border between Norfolk and Suffolk. All four lay within the Hundred of Diss. Scole (821 acres; 332ha) lies in the centre of the two-mile (c.3.5km) wide river frontage, flanked by the smaller parishes of Frenze (to the west; 399 acres; 161ha) and Thorpe Parva (to the east; 350 acres; 142ha); Thelveton (1,050 acres; 425ha) lies to the north of them all. On the river flood plain there are deep peaty and clayey soils, with a high groundwater, that belong to the Mendham association (1025: earthy sulphuric peat soil). On the gently sloping land to the north there are well-drained sandy and loamy soils (on glaciofluvial sands and localised patches of till) of the Newport 3 association (551f: typical brown sand), which extend up the valley of the River Frenze (or Shimpling), a south-flowing tributary of the Waveney. The higher ground of the three riverside parishes, and the whole of Thelveton, has heavy clay soils, seasonally waterlogged, of theBeccles 1 association (711r; typical stagnogley soil) that are derived from chalky glacial till (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales 1983; Hodge et al. 1984, 117–19, 247–9 and 274–7). A notable feature of the area is the Pye Road, a Roman road that crosses Scole and Thelveton diagonally on its way to Norwich. Until the recent construction of the Scole bypass, the A140 road followed the course of the Roman road.

In Domesday Book Scole is referred to as Osmundestuna and it is as Osmundeston that it was known throughout the Middle Ages.34 The name Scole, which is documented from the twelfth century, seems originally to have referred to the hamlet at the bridging point of the Waveney. In 1066 there were two estates in Osmundestuna, both of half a carucate. One was held by Algar Trec (from Fougères in Ille-et-Vilaine) (DB Norfolk 9/48 and 41/1; Keats-Rohan 1999, 332–3 and 396–7). Bigod’s tenant at Scole was Hugh de Corbun, who had also annexed a moiety of one free man with 10 acres and a part of a hege (this word is normally taken to mean ‘a close’ but here probably means ‘a wood’) that had belonged to Ralph de Grael, Earl of Norfolk (DB Norfolk 66/83). This may refer to the free man and half that are mentioned in the main entry as having ‘been delivered to make up this manor’.
Ralph de Felgeres had only two East Anglian estates: Scole and Stuston in Suffolk, on the south side of the Waveney, opposite Scole (DB Suffolk 50/1). His Scole estate also had four freemen with 40 acres attached to it.

The Bigod holding was probably among the ten 'knights' fees in Norfolk that Roger Bigod gave as a dowry to his daughter Maud when she married William d'Aubigny, for by the thirteenth century it was held by the d'Aubigny family, then earls of Arundel (Blomefield 1805 I, 370). It became a part of their barony of Buckenham, which later passed by inheritance to the Tatteshall family of Lincolnshire. By the 1270s the tenants of this estate were the knightly Shelton family and they retained possession of the manor of Osmundeston and the advowson of the church until the mid-sixteenth century (Cal Inq Post Mortem I, 247, no.762; Visitations Norfolk II 1893, 342–406). Their main seat was at Shelton Hall, some 9 miles to the north-east, but they also had a hall at Scole, which was being repaired in 1288 (SRO(I) HA 411, Box 47 no. 8). Osmondston Hall is marked on a late sixteenth-century map of Scole and it still exists as an isolated seventeenth-century farmstead, now called Old Hall Farm, in the northern half of the parish, positioned on its central axis, some 600m north of the church (SRO(I) HD 417/61 4074/47). There are the remains of a possible moat around the farmstead (Norfolk HER no. 7970).

In 1553 the manor was acquired by the Aldham family, who resold it in 1561 to Sir Thomas Cornwallis of Brome Hall in Suffolk. It remained with them until 1823 when it was sold to Matthias Kerrison of Oakley Park in Suffolk, whose descendants held it down to the twentieth century.

Ralph of Fougères's estate in Scole and Stuston passed by escheat to the king in the early thirteenth century. It was then granted to various nobles for life, culminating in a grant in the 1270s to a judge, Sir Richard de Boyland of Bristingham, Norfolk (Foss 1870, 111). His son Sir John, conveyed what became known as the manor of Boylands to John de Loudham before 1346. Loudham already held the adjacent manor of Frenze and the two manors were held by his family until the early fifteenth century, when the last John Loudham divided the manor of Boylands into two parts: one part descended with Frenze to his daughter Joan, who married Ralph Blennerhassett; the other moiety was sold to John Woodhouse. In 1561 Joan's descendant, John Blennerhassett sold his hall to Sir Thomas Cornwallis, whose family later acquired the other half as well (Blomefield 1805 I, 130–6). The Cornwallis family continued to hold all the manors of Scole. No evidence has been found for a hall linked to this manor, though a hall (adunla) was recorded on this holding in 1086. The amount of demesne land, as opposed to tenanted land, attached to the manor is also unclear.

In 1066 a carucate of land in Frenze (Frise) was held by Edric, under Edric of Laxfield and in 1086 this was held by Hubert under Robert Malot, the lord of Eye in Suffolk, who had acquired most of Edric of Laxfield's lands (DB Norfolk 7/11; Sanders 1960, 43–4; Keats-Rohan 1999, 389–90). There was also a small holding of 16 acres that two sokemen held of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds (DB Norfolk 14/28). Around 1200 Frenze was held by the descendants of another of Malot's tenants, Walter de Caen, as part of their barony of Horsford (Book of Fees I, 236 and 240). By the thirteenth century the manor was held by the knightly Loudham family, as tenants of the Honour of Eye (Blomefield 1805 I, 140–8). This family also continued to hold their ancestral seat at Loudham in Pettistree, Suffolk. As noted above, this family also acquired the manor of Boylands in Scole, which would appear to have functioned as an adjunct to the manor of Frenze. The Loudham's heirs, the Blennerhassets, maintained houses at both Loudham and Frenze. They sold the Frenze estate in 1636 to the Nixon family, who in turn sold it to Sir Robert Kemp of Gissing Hall, c.1709 (NRO MC92/18, 536x8 and MC92/41, 536x9). By the early nineteenth century it had passed to the Smiths, who were owner-occupiers, but by the end of the century it was owned by non-residents.

Kelly's Directory for 1892 records that 'Frenze Hall, an ancient mansion formerly standing here, on the bank of the River Frenze, was some time since demolished and new farm buildings erected on the site by Francis Taylor esq.' (Kelly's Directory 1892, 401). However the Listed Buildings register (Dept. of the Environment 1986), records the existing Hall as an early-seventeenth-century timber structure, refaced in late-nineteenth-century brick and with later additions. It lies next to the parish church in an isolated hall-and-church complex that is surrounded on two sides by the river. In its positioning, Frenze Hall is different to the other manorial halls in this study area, which are positioned at the head of sloping land, at or just above the 40m contour.

Thorpe Parva appears to have had a near identical Domestacy-period ownership sequence as Frenze: a free man, Edric, holding 80 acres under Edric of Laxfield in Torp was followed by Hubert under Robert Malet (DB Norfolk 7/9; Keats-Rohan 1999, 256–7). Hubert can in this case be identified as Hubert de Montchensy, whose descendants were mesne lords here in the thirteenth century, holding the manor of the Honour of Eye. In 1256 it was held by Daniel de Becles of William de Montchensy. In 1308 Daniel's daughter Lucy granted the manor to John de Neketon and Katherine his wife. The Neketons remained as owners down to the early years of the fifteenth century. By 1469 it belonged to William White, an owner-occupier. With a brief break, 1492–c.1510, caused by the attainder of Richard White for high treason, the estate remained with the White family and their heirs, the Doylys of Shottesham Hall, until about 1700 (Blomefield 1805 I, 136–40). However the hall and the demesne were being leased out as early as 1543 (NRO Fel 275, 551x3). It continued to be leased out to farmers after its acquisition by the Holt family of Redgrave Hall in Suffolk around 1720. Their heirs, the Holt-Wilsons, continued to hold it into the twentieth century. Thorpe Hall is an isolated farmstead lying within a large rectangular moat, some 500m north of the isolated and ruined parish church (Norfolk HER no. 7958).

Thelveton in 1066 consisted of two main estates, both of two carucates, one held by the Abbey of Ely and the other by a man called Alsi under King Edward. Ely’s estate in Telvetuna was still held by the abbey in 1086, but Alsi’s holding had been granted to Gilbert the crossbowman (DB Norfolk 15/26 and 52/4). There were also six freemen with 60 acres attached to Alsi’s holding. A further two freemen, with 8 acres, who had been under Edric of Laxfield in 1066, belonged to Walter, a tenant of Robert Malet in 1086 (DB Norfolk 7/13). Domesday Book mentions a hall on Gilbert’s land, but by the twelfth
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>% of Parish</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Position in Parish</th>
<th>Inherent Attributes</th>
<th>Externally Significant</th>
<th>External Boundary Loss Since c. 1880</th>
<th>Main Field Size c. 1880</th>
<th>Main Boundary Lines c. 1880</th>
<th>Internal Boundary Loss Since c. 1880</th>
<th>Internal Boundary Lines c. 1880</th>
<th>Internal Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Core block demesne</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact, rounded</td>
<td>yes no</td>
<td>2 4.4 5.1 8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>gently curved</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tenement blocks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact, semi-rectangular + irregular, angular</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>1 1.1 3 4.1 4.3 4.4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>small straight</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Common fields</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact, irregular, angular + gently curved</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>2 4.1 4.4 5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>gently curved</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Droves</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>widespread</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear, irregular, gently curved</td>
<td>no yes</td>
<td>2 3 5.2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Medium greens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact, semi-rectangular</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Large greens</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact, semi-rectangular</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>1.12 8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>medium straight</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Demesne meadow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near centre</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear, irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td>1.1 2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>gently curved</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Several meadow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>linear, irregular, g. curved</td>
<td>no yes</td>
<td>3 5.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>small straight</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Demesne woodland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>near edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact, semi-rectangular</td>
<td>no yes</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>seasonal waterlogging</td>
<td>compact, irregular, g. curved + angular</td>
<td>no yes</td>
<td>1.1 4.4 7.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>medium</td>
<td>gently curved</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26  Land types in Thelveton
century his holding seems to have been absorbed by that of Ely. By the mid-twelfth century the Ely estate had been subinfeudated to the Norman baron, Henry de Rye. In the next century, the Scalers family appear as tenants of the Marshals, barons of Hingham and Hockering, who were the heirs to the Rye barony (see the Swanton Morley case study, above, for more details of this barony). The Scalers family continued to hold Thelveton, together with Whaddon in Cambridgeshire until at least the middle of the fifteenth century. There is then a gap in the documentation until the early sixteenth century, when there was a succession of owners, all probably non-resident (Blomefield 1805 I, 148–53). In 1592 the manor was purchased by Thomas Havers of Winfarthing, steward to the dukes of Norfolk, and his family continued to own it until 1864 when it was sold to Thomas Mann, a wealthy brewer.

Thelveton Hall is a fine E-plan brick mansion of c.1600 and was almost certainly built by Thomas Havers. It lies 500m south-east of the totally isolated parish church. There is no direct evidence that the Hall is on the site of the medieval manor house, but it lies at the centre of a large block of demesne land. The church lies on the north-western edge of this block. The Hall is positioned on the junction between two different types of demesne land: to the south there is evidence for a wooded park, but to the north was farmland. Thelton Park is specifically mentioned in 1479, but is likely to have been in existence by 1404, when Parkfeld is mentioned in a survey of Scole (NRO MC92/52, 536x9; SRO(I) HA 411, Box 45, no. 4). A late fifteenth-century version of the survey specifies that Parkefeld abutted north on Thelveton Park (SRO(I) HA 411, Box 45, no. 5). The location of the park just to the north of the Scole/Thelveton boundary is confirmed by a late sixteenth-century map of Scole, that marks Thelton Perke in that position (SRO(I) HD417/61 4074/47). The field pattern in 1839 suggests a park of about 120 acres (NRO DN/TA 387, tithe award 1839). Big Wood (Thelton Wood 1839, Thelton Great Wood 1864, 15.5 acres) is the surviving part of this park, but there is place-name evidence for further woods on the high ground around the Scole/Thelveton boundary. The element haga, which in this region indicates woodland, occurs (in 1404) in Tharmondes hagge, which is described as a pasture in both Scole and Thelveton; Ulpeshaghe which lay in Parkefeld. To the south of Osmundeston Hall there was a linear demesne wood, referred to in 1404 as ‘the wood by the hall’ (Hallewode, c.1475–1501) which covered 7 acres. At the north end of Scole, to the east of the Roman road there was another demesne wood called Esthagh (also called Eswode; 8 acres) which occurs as Polled Esthagh (the prefix presumably indicating felling) in the late fifteenth century and is probably the area called Stubbings on the the sixteenth-century map, the wood having been felled. Nearby was Harvyeswode, recorded from 1404 through to the sixteenth century. The hege that was mentioned in 1086 probably lay in this area (DB Norfolk 66/83). Domesday Book otherwise records a modest amount of woodland in Scole (the Bigod holding having wood for 15 pigs and that of Fougères having 10), more in Thelveton (Ely having had wood for 60 pigs, but reduced ‘now’ to 30 and Gilbert having 30 as well), but none in either Frenze or Thorpe Parva. These figures suggest something like 250–300 acres of wood in Thelveton and a bit under 200 acres in Scole. That there were really pigs in this area is indicated by the name Swynkote croft (1404), which was given to a piece of land in or near Parkfeld.

This woodland must reflect the presence of poorly-drained clay soils in the ‘upland’ parts of these parishes. The presence of two large greens or commons at the southern end of Thelveton is a further indication of...
disappeared and the most prominent feature of the area allotments. Most of those subdivisions have now the greatest loss being on the south-west and east sides, external shape of the green survived the enclosure process, to the west of Thelveton Park and Thelton Green Faden’s Map of Norfolk difficult soils.

Hillgreencommon in the mid-sixteenth-century extent of Thelveton and as Hyll Greene on the late sixteenth-century map of Scole. Blomefield called it Hill Green and said it contained about 80 acres. Faden’s map indicates that it was enclosed by 1797, without a formal award. There is some evidence, however, to suggest that piecemeal enclosure was taking place around 1780 (NRO MS 1895, 2 B.7). Again, the shape of the green is identifiable on the 1839 tithe map by the contrast between the more sinuous external boundaries and the straight, new, boundaries within (Pl. 17). It was sub-rectangular and covered about 60 acres, with two farmsteads and the rectory arranged along its northern edge. The external boundary is still largely intact, but some of the subdivisions have been removed.

Thelveton Common, lying to the east of the Roman road and abutting the parishes of Scole and Thorpe Parva to the south and Billingford to the east, is mentioned as the ‘common of Thelveton’ in the 1404 survey of Scole. It is named as Hillgreencommon in the mid-sixteenth-century extent of Thelveton and as Hyll Greene on the late sixteenth-century map of Scole. Blomefield called it Hill Green and said it contained about 80 acres. Modern maps show that the external edge of this green has also survived well, with some loss on the south-west side, but that many of the subdivisions have been removed. In 1839 there were some cottages on the edge abutting the Roman road, but no houses on the other edges.

A third much smaller green, appropriately called Lytlygrene in the mid-sixteenth century, lay on the west side of the Roman road at the north end of the parish. In the sixteenth century it consisted of two parts, connected at right-angles: Great Green of 6 acres and The Green of 4 acres. There were about five houses around the latter, but only three on the former, which adjoined Dickleburgh to the north.

To the south of Thelveton Green lay another sub-rectangular green, covering about 40 acres, called Scole Common. It referred to as the common of Osmundeston in the 1404 survey and on Faden’s map it is Scole Green. The western quarter of the green lay in Frenze parish, the rest in Scole, though at its north-east corner it abutted on Thelveton and Blomefield recorded that Thelveton had intercommon rights on the green in 1736. This green was enclosed under a Parliamentary Act of 1812 (award 1814). In the sixteenth century there were four or five farmsteads dotted about on all sides of the green, together with some cottages on the south edge that look very much like encroachments on the green. The parsonages of Frenze and Scole were also on the green, the former at the west end and the latter at the east end, where the existing seventeenth-century house stands within the remains of a small moat. About two-thirds of the external shape of the green survived the enclosure process, the greatest loss being on the south-west and east sides, with the interior being subdivided into straight-sided allotments. Most of those subdivisions have now disappeared and the most prominent feature of the area still called Scole Common is the very straight road that was put through the length of the common in 1814 (Pl. 18).

The regular shapes of the greens in Scole and Thelveton suggests that they had a planned genesis as a result of the re-allocation of former manorial waste and woodland. The area between the two greens was called Netherlorde and Le Knot in 1404, with Thurmondes heage and Thelveton Park being close by — names that suggest waste and woodland. The location of the parsonages on these greens is an interesting feature and is perhaps another indication of their planned origins. There is no direct dating evidence for the establishment of these greens, other than that they were in existence by 1404. Evidence from elsewhere would suggest a twelfth- or thirteenth-century origin.

There was also a small linear common of about 15 acres of marsh or meadow close to the River Waveney. This too was shared between Frenze and Scole and was called Twyford in 1404 — the ‘two fords’ being presumably on the two roads that flanked this common. It was probably also known as West grene (c. 1475–1501) and appears as Frenze Common on Faden’s map. It too was enclosed in 1814.

In addition to the green-side settlements in Scole and Thelveton, there were also street settlements on the Roman road. In Scole they were concentrated just to the north of the river crossing, at the junction of the north-south Roman road with another ‘king’s highway’ that ran east-west, parallel with the river. This was Le Brygrove (‘the bridge row’) in 1404 and Skole Streete on the sixteenth-century map, and formed the nucleus of the hamlet of Scole. There were also, however, a number of houses with associated tofts and crofts on both sides of the Roman road to the north of the hamlet. Some of these tenements are identifiable in the fifteenth-century surveys and on the sixteenth-century map: e.g. Carrows, Waven (with Warynnes croft), Wrightes, Hallegates, Barnards, Cobalds (with Cobaldescroft), Cranes (with Cranescroft) and Savages (with Savagescroft). The fifteenth-century surveys associate Hallegates with ‘a certain William Hallegate’, who is almost certainly identifiable as William de Hallegate, the reeve of the manor of Osmundeston in 1288 (SRO(I) HA 411, Box 47 no. 8). A William Cobald is also recorded in 1288, which suggests that many of these tenements were in existence by the late thirteenth century. In Thelveton there were similar tenements bordering the Roman road (here called Thelveton Street in the sixteenth century) to the south of Lytlygrene, including one now deserted but marked by the remains of a small moat, probably indicating a freehold. As already noted, Frenze had a share of Scole Green, but apart from that there was very little other settlement beside the manorial hall. In Thorpe Parva settlement was similarly sparse. Thorpygrene wey is mentioned in the 1404 survey of Scole (on the sixteenth-century map) but no direct evidence has been found for the location of such a green. It could be related to a small detached portion of Thorpe parish, containing a house, that is shown on both the tithe map and the sixteenth-century map as lying in Scole on the north-west edge of Heye Oke Furlong, close to the junction of two roads, one of which was Thorpe grene waie. Blomefield recorded that in 1736 Frenze was ‘a small village, having only 6 houses and about 60 inhabitants’, while Thorpe ‘only had 4 houses in it’ (Blomefield 1805 I, 148 and 136). Both parishes had
under ten inhabitants in 1428 (Feudal Aids III, 610). In 1086 there were two villeins and two bordars in the Malet part of Frenze and two sokemen in the Bury Abbey part; Thorpe had three villeins and three bordars. All this suggests long-term low populations, with the demesne farms taking up most of the land of these two small parishes. The 1709 globe terrier of Frenze notes a mansion house with two pieces of land on each side, containing 2–3 acres, both abutting north on Scole Green. But it also notes, rather despairingly, that ‘we find further by a copy of an old survey booke of the the said parish made in Queen Elizabeth Reigne about eight acres in severall pieces which did belong to the said Rectory but since lost but how longe we cannot say.’ (NRO DN/TER 69/2/1).

Scole and Thelveton, however, were larger. Blomefield records ‘20 houses and about 100 inhabitants’ in Thelveton in 1736; he does not give a figure for Scole, but in 1881 it had a population of 720, when Thelveton had 160 (Blomefield 1805 I, 153; Kelly’s Directory 1883, 486 and 517). In 1086 there were two villeins, two bordars and two free men in the Bigod part of Scole, while the Fougères part had two villeins, six bordars, one slave and four free men. In Thelveton, Ely had six villeins and one bordar, and Gilbert the crossbowman had four villeins, two bordars and six free men, in addition, Malet had two free men (who are probably the same two mentioned under Thorpe as being in Thelveton). Blomefield records that the inheritance custom in Frenze was primogeniture, but that on the copyhold lands in Thelveton the custom was Borough English (ultimogeniture) (Blomefield 1805 I, 148 and 150).

The principal tools for reconstructing the medieval and Tudor landscape of Scole are a late sixteenth-century map of the eastern half of the parish (Pl. 19), a survey of the demesne lands of Osmondeston manor in 1404 and a revised version of the same survey, dating from c.1475–1501 (SRO(I) HA 411, Box 45 nos 4; HA 411, Box 45 nos 5). There are also two rentals of Boyland’s manor of 1508 and 1562, but these are largely just lists of names and rents with little topographical information (SRO(I) HA 411, Box 49 nos 5 and 6). These show that Scole was divided into three basic zones: in the south, beside the river on the peat and alluvium soils (1025) there were meadows; on the sloping land above these, on both brown sand (551f) and clay soils (711r), there were arable fields (Pl. 20); finally, at the flatter north end, all on clay, there was a mixture of arable, pasture, greens and woodland.

The 1404 survey indicates that the demesne meadow was intermingled with that of the tenants. It lists various pieces, totalling 33 acres, in the mowing meadows, starting at the east end in Dokcroft and then moving westward through Heygate, Bryggemedowes, Brandestoncloes, West Fen, Blahyl medewe, Restrebygge, Dodmedewe, Grotonhyl, Hardhew and finishing in Le West Medwe. The sixteenth-century map confirms the presence of numerous narrow strips in these fields. The arable land appears to fall into two rectangles of virtually identical width that are divided by the north-south lane now called Low Road, but formerly Le Bek or Le Becke Lane, which leads from Scole village to Osmondeston Hall. This lane is almost at right-angles to the river and the divisions of the fields seem to be mainly parallel or at right-angles to it. The position of Osmondeston Hall on the centre line between these two halves looks significant and it is tempting to see in this twofold division a reference to the two half-carucates estates that existed here in 1086. The situation is, however, not as clear-cut as that, though there are some intriguing suggestions. Firstly, an examinations of the abuttals in the c.1475–1501 version of the survey reveals that while abuttals on land of Frenzehalle (Boyland was by this period united with Frenze) are common in the land units that lie in the western half, they are infrequent in the eastern half (mainly in some of the crofts by the Roman road and in the cultura of Bergh), that lies just to the east of the Roman road. Added to this, there is the mystery as to why the sixteenth-century map only shows the eastern half of the parish. Together, there is perhaps enough to suggest that the apparent twofold division may have some meaning, though the details are not yet clear. Moreover, the division is something that may date back to the eleventh century.

The two fifteenth-century surveys progress around the fields in a same direction: they start near the centre, close to Osmondeston Hall, and then set off westwards in a roughly clockwise perambulation of the fields. Of some 58 units of land listed, nine are specifically called culturae in 1404 (Brymylond, Lound, Heyok, Dokcroft, Heygate, Blohil, Bergh, Dalmere and Wodlond) and a further thirteen in 1475–1501 (Aldefeld, Millehyll, Mille Shortlond, Shortlond, Twywordtrench, Rosebygge, Harecroft, Gores, Le Knol, Stonlond, Hervyeswoode, Blakelond and Ansmyk) making twenty-two in all. In addition, the later survey also refers to three of the culturae (Lound, Twyfordtrench and Dokcroft) as quarentinae and four are denoted as iuga (Harecroft, Stonlond, Wodlond and Ansmyk). Four of the units have ‘field’ names (Aldefeld, Neheralfeld, Overwalfeld and Parkfeld), eighteen have ‘croft’ names (Hallecroft, Kylllecroft, Calwacroft, Middlecroft, Harecroft, Swynkote, Goodwynescroft, Cranescroft, Cobaldescroft, Savagecroft, Oldcroft, Chyrchecriof, Bullescroft, Dokcroft, Smethyscroft, Warennesscroft and Bukkscoft) and six are ‘lands’ (Brymylond, Wodlond, Mille Shortlond, Shortlond, Stonlond and Blakelond). The terminology is further confused by the sixteenth-century map which names one furlong (Heye Oke Furlonge), four fields (Aspelonde fyld, Wrooffylde, Churche filde and Thorpe fyld) and three closes (Cranes, Churche and Heye Gate). This suggests that there was no organised system of fields and furlongs, but merely a number of units that contained strips, but could be called by a variety of names, with no implied hierarchy. There is also only a very rough balance between the number of units in the two halves of the parish: approximately twelve to the west and ten to the east.

The layout of the sixteenth-century map, though distorted in its projection (squashed north-south and stretched east-west) can be readily related to that shown on the 1839 tithe map, which suggests that many of the nineteenth-century boundaries were rooted in the medieval and Tudor units. From this it can be deduced that Wrooffylde was about 20 acres in size, but subdivided into about five smaller units, which were further divided into strips; Heye Oke Furlonge was a similar size and also subdivided. Many of the other units were even smaller.
Plate 18  Scole, Norfolk. The west end of the former Scole Common. The straight road and the flanking hedges were introduced after its enclosure in 1814.
In 1404 the demesne arable consisted of 227 acres and in 1475–1501, 240 acres, mostly in pieces of 1 to 2 acres, but also some larger pieces, such as 13 acres in Hallecroft, 20 acres in one piece in Stonland, 9 acres in Goodwynescroft, 12 acres in Chyrchecroft, 29 acres in six pieces at Widlond (38 acres in two pieces, 1475–1501). In total, this represents about 35–45% of the 500–600 acres available in the arable fields. The demesne appears to have been fairly evenly spread around the different parts of the parish, with a small core of about 25 acres around the hall itself. A glebe terrier of 1677 shows that the glebe consisted of twenty-four separate pieces in a number of different locations and that these ranged in size from 4 acres to 1 rod (NRO DN/TER 129/2/1).

Visually, the sixteenth-century map suggests a contrast between the land to the south of the ‘king’s highway to Beccles’ (the old course of the A143) and that to the north. To the south (mainly on 551f soil) numerous narrow strips are shown, but to the north (on 711r soil) the strips are both less frequent and wider. Further analysis reveals that the former were still shared by numerous tenants, as in Hey Oke Furlong, where about 17 acres in fourteen strips were shared by eight tenants. Similarly, in Dale Meare, about 14 acres in fourteen strips were shared by seven tenants. To the north, however, Aspelonde Fylde contained about 7 acres in four pieces, all of which belonged to one tenant, as did all five pieces in an adjacent section of Wroofylde. In addition, this area contained a number of closes in single occupancy, such as Church Close (12 acres). These were most numerous towards the north and on both sides of the Roman road. Some of these may represent consolidation of former common-field strips, but others probably had a more ancient origin. The high incidence of ‘croft’ names associated with them suggests that many are old enclosures adjacent to farmsteads situated on the Roman road. The overall impression however is that to the north of the road there was a growing tendency towards farming in severalty, whilst to the south the land was still mainly being farmed in common. By 1838 virtually all of it was being farmed in severalty, enclosure having been achieved without any parliamentary act or formal award. The only surviving arable strip belonged to a smallholder, Mary Nichols. It lay in the middle of a field at the south-east corner of the parish and can be identified as one of the strips shown in Heye Oke Furlong on the sixteenth-century map. She also retained an unenclosed strip in a meadow nearby, which accords with strips shown in Heygate meadow on the early map; another landowner, George Mayhew, also retained a strip in another section of the same meadow. A few small dog-legs in some of the boundaries in 1838 do, however, hint at the former presence of strips.

For Thelveton, the main source of information about the early fields is a mid-sixteenth-century written survey (NRO MC 1732/6 item 8). Used in conjunction with the tithe map of 1839 (the apportionment of which, like that of Scole, is unhelpful in not giving field names) and sales particulars of the Thelveton Hall Estate dated 1864 (which does give field names) it is possible to recreate parts of the earlier landscape (NRO DN/TA 387 and 137a 12 (13)).

The main area of fields lay on the sloping land that lay between Thelveton Hall and the settlement on the Roman road, at the south-west end, and the Frenze (or Shimpling) River at the north-west end.

Adjoining the north side of the Hall there appears to have been a large, roughly oval, block demesne of about 130 acres, which included areas called Heyfield and Longlonds (Pl. 21). The remainder of the farmland of the parish was arranged into twenty-seven units variously called (in order of frequency) stadia, furlongs, quartermeads or wents, and four meadows. Some, but not all the stadia are named: Littlecroft, Balsham Furlong, Sondelonde, Silkemedewe furlong, Sallow busse furlong, Faken[mer] furlong, Overbergh alias Erbsellpit furlong, [?]Hipenmer Went, Netherberger, Nethergrove furlong, Caldwell furlong, Wysemere furlong, Whartmer furlong, Northoverelle furlong, Southerwells furlong, Millemounte furlong with Gravefurlong, Langside, Barrefarlong with Morecroft, and Redyng. Within these, the tenants held various freehold and copyhold pieces, each belonging to a particular named tenement. The pieces varied in number between two and fifty-one, with an average of fifteen. Most of the pieces were between about half an acre and 2 acres, though larger pieces of 4, 6 or even 10 acres do occur. The pieces are sometimes specifically noted as being enclosed. This is particularly apparent in the stadia called Redyng, the only one on the flatter land to the east of the Roman road, where virtually all the pieces are called pightles, closes or crofts. The name Redyng probably comes from Old English rylding meaning ‘a clearing or an assart’, which accords with its position beside Thelveton Common on what was probably once poorly-drained clayland (Smith 1956, II, 90–1). Redyng, at about 43 acres, was one of the larger stadia, others, such as Whartmer, appear to have been as small as an acre. Although most of the stadia contained pieces belonging to several tenants, about half also contained enclosures, some of which could be quite large. For instance, Margaret Shardlowe had 26 acres at the end of one furlong and a close containing 12 acres (described as pasture) at the end of another.44 The latter was an outlying piece of demesne and several others do occur.

A glebe terrier of 1635 lists twenty-eight pieces of land varying in size from 1 rod to 2 acres (NRO DN/TER 145/4/1). These totalled 17.5 acres, not including the ‘old parsonage’ and ‘40 foote of meadow in C[a]llidwell in the went called Shorthead’. Some of the pieces are described as lying ‘in the same furlong’ as other pieces, which suggests unenclosed land. One, however, is described as a 2-acre ‘pightle of arable enclosed’, followed by two other pieces ‘in the same furlong’, with a third piece (of 1 rod) being described as ‘Goodwins new close’. Other pieces lay in units with ‘close’ names: Great Home Close, Wrangland Close, Little Bridge Close, Cominge Close and the ‘close by The Pool Bridge’.

By 1839 all the strips, except those of the glebe, had disappeared, again without any formal enclosure award (Pl. 22). Hints of former strips are indicated by small dog-legs on some of the boundaries. By 1864 the glebe strips had been rationalised into blocks and virtually all the land had been organised into five large farms, all belonging to Thelveton Hall: Thelveton Manor (295 acres), The Grange (268 acres), Tollgate Farm (222 acres), Wells Farm (183 acres) and Calvers Farm (66 acres).

Although the map evidence is late, it is possible to identify features of the landscape mentioned in the sixteenth-century survey. In particular the roads and tracks appear to have survived without major changes and it is also possible to see a number of long slightly sinuous
Plate 19 Scole, Norfolk. Late sixteenth-century map of the eastern half of the parish.
Suffolk Record Office (Ipswich) HD417/61. North at the left

Plate 20 Scole, Norfolk. View south across the former common field called Dokcroft towards the meadows bordering the River Waveney
boundaries, often flanked by trackways, that are probably derived from the boundaries of the *stadia*. These boundaries suggest a series of long units that ran roughly at right-angles to the settlement on the Roman road, with another shorter set at right-angles to Thelveton Green.

The alignments of field boundaries in the Scole-Dickleburgh area have, of course, been studied by Tom Williamson in a series of papers that have raised important questions about the date of the field systems in this part of East Anglia (Williamson 1987, 1998). Williamson used what he termed ‘topographic analysis’ to put landscape features ‘in relative chronological order on grounds of horizontal stratigraphy’. He then used this ‘landscape stratigraphy’ to remove ‘stratigraphically recent features’ to reveal the oldest landscape features. One of his major conclusions, put simply, was that the Roman road here runs diagonally across a set of co-axial boundaries that are aligned north-south, a circumstance that led him to suggest that the co-axial boundaries (which cover some 35sq.km) were part of a field system that pre-dated the Roman road and could be Iron Age in date.

It is possible to challenge the detail of what Williamson chose to include in his ‘earliest’ layer, for in this study area it appears that he has included some patently ‘late’ features, such as fields created through the enclosure of Thelveton Green, fields created from Thelveton Park and numerous very straight field boundaries that appear to be late subdivisions of large units (as is clearly the case immediately to the south of Thelveton Green). This certainly weakens the visual impression of the co-axial boundaries, but there still remains a very fundamental truth, which is that there is an unconformity between the Roman road and the basic structure of the landscape.

As already noted, a major feature of the landscape of Scole is the two rectangular blocks of fields, each about 800m wide, that are divided by the north-south axis of Low Road. In fact there are four such blocks, side by side, for Frenze and Thorpe are also about 800m wide. All these blocks lie on the sloping land that drains southwards towards the River Waveney. This surely is the key to the preferment for a north-south axis for the boundaries within the blocks: they are so designed so that surplus water can drain away effectively. It is a purely practical thing. Hedges aligned north-south also have the advantage of casting only minimal shade on growing crops. The Roman road, however, lies at an angle to the natural drainage, so that although it is a prominent feature, it offered no particular advantages, in purely agricultural terms, as a basis for the alignment of a field system. Its use was for long distance travellers not for farmers.

Examination of the triangular area that lies in the angle between Low Road and the Roman road shows that few of the field alignments in the areas on either side are continued into the triangle, suggesting that this is not a simple case of later roads cutting across a pre-existing fieldscape. The triangle was used to accommodate the demesne complex of Osmundeston Hall at its north-west end and for a series of crofts with associated houses along the east side. These crofts mirror a similar group to the east of the road. Finally, on what was probably the best land at the southern point of the triangle, there was a group of arable strips. This suggests that the triangle posed no particular problem for the farmers and was successfully incorporated into their farming landscape.

What is more difficult to understand is the way that the road running eastward from Scole village, as shown on the sixteenth-century map, cuts across numbered strips in *Heye Oke Furlonge* in a clear case of unconformity between road and field. The fifteenth-century surveys make it clear that this was not a mere field track, but ‘the king’s highway to Beecles’. As the principal route along the north side of the Waveney valley, this was very likely a road of some antiquity. Yet it was ignored in the laying out of the furlong. One can only suppose that the road presented less of a challenge to the farmers of these interrupted strips than we would imagine. And this highway was not alone in cutting across strips, for the map shows that the road branching off it to the north (probably what was called *Thorpegrene wey*), also crossed the ends of strips. In addition, the track called *Seewaye* that ran eastward from Scole village, but further south, diagonally crossed the strips of *Bergh and Dale Meare* furlongs on its way towards *Heye Oke*.

The co-axial pattern does however seem to fade out at the southern end of Thelveton, in the area of the various greens and the parish highway. The dominant axis of the fields further north relates not to the drainage of the River Waveney, but to the Frenze River, which flows along the north-west boundary of the parish. Interestingly, in this area the direction of drainage does run more or less at right-angles to the Roman road and therefore the principal axes of the field boundaries also run at or near right-angles to the road. The inescapable conclusion is that the co-axial patterns observed in Scole and the adjacent parishes are not part of one vast system, but consist of a number of separate ‘panels’ that relate to particular drainage catchments. The other important point is that an unconformity with a Roman road does not necessarily provide a valid method of dating. There is a need, therefore, to re-assess the possibilities for dating the field system at Scole.

Recent work on deposits from a palaeochannel of the River Waveney, immediately to the south of Scole in Oakley, has provided one of the best-dated pollen sequences in the region (Wiltshire and Murphy 1999, 141–8; Wiltshire forthcoming). The deposits start in the earlier Bronze Age, around 1980–1750 cal. BC, when the area was thickly wooded, with lime, oak and hazel as the dominant species, but also with a good representation of birch and pine. Subsequently there was a decline in the amount of lime, birch and pine and an increase in oak and hazel. Birch and pine are characteristic of acidic light soils (which in the local context would mean the brown sand soils of 551f on the lower slopes of the Waveney valley) and their decline may indicate the creation of clearings in those areas.

A major change took place, probably in the late Bronze Age or early Iron Age (certainly post 1520–1350 cal. BC), when the lime woodland all but disappeared and the amount of oak was also reduced. Herb-rich grassland became abundant. Cereal pollen was frequent though not abundant and there was evidence for arable crop weeds. These conditions continued down to 550–380 cal. BC. Subsequently, in the middle–late Iron Age there was an increase in tree pollen though grassland continued to be abundant, cereal pollen was present, but in quantities no higher than previously. There was also cannabis-type pollen indicating either hemp (*Cannabis sativa*) or hops (*Humulus*) — if hemp it would be the earliest record of it
Plate 21  Thelveton, Norfolk. View southward across Heyfield, a part of the core block demesne

Plate 22  Thelveton, Norfolk. View north-westward across an area of former common fields towards Caldwell Furlong
in Britain (the earliest certain record is Roman, from London). In the late Iron Age, beginning 250–60 cal. BC, there was a further decline in tree pollen, though it was still present (including evidence, for the first time, of hornbeam), cereal pollen increased together with that for crop weeds. The latter included cornflower (*Centaurea cyanus*) previously regarded as a Roman introduction and particularly associated with the cultivation of rye.

A further major change came at the beginning of the Roman period with the establishment of a small town at Scole, centred on the point where the Roman road crosses the Waveney. The road is likely to have been built as part of the expansion of the Roman province after the suppression of the Boudican revolt in AD 61 and the settlement presumably sprang up shortly afterwards. This settlement is generally reckoned to be the *Villa Faustina* of *Jerv V* of the Antonine Itinerary, though the identification is by no means certain (Rivet and Smith 1979, 499). Although there is evidence of human occupation stretching back to Mesolithic times in the Waveney valley, excavations at Scole have revealed little evidence for a substantial prehistoric settlement underlying the Roman one (Rogerson 1977; Ashwin and Tester forthcoming). There is a round-house and a few ditches and gullies of Iron Age date but nothing more. The Roman settlement lay on both banks of the Waveney (in Scole to the north, and in Stuston and Oakley to the south) and it continued to be active until the last decades of the fourth century, the coinage showing a marked decline after AD 378. There is very little Anglo-Saxon material from Scole, although an intriguing burial of a woman wearing a fifth-century equal-armed brooch was found in the top of a disused fourth-century tanning pit (Ashwin and Tester forthcoming, burial 18077). This was on the west side of the Roman road and another brooch and a silver Frankish *denier* of AD 843–77 are recorded from the east side of the road (Norfolk HER nos 1088 and 22538). However, just to the south of the river, in Oakley, there is a scatter of finds that probably indicate an Anglo-Saxon cemetery of sixth- to early seventh-century date. The finds include a gold Merovingian coin of c. AD 605 and fragments of a lyre, which are possibly indicative of a high-status burial (West 1998, 86, fig. 118, pls VI.4 and 5). These finds, though scattered, do indicate that the area continued to be inhabited through the Saxon period. The cross-river linkages seen in the Roman and Saxon periods are interesting in view of the medieval tenurial links between Scole and Stuston.

The pollen evidence from the palaeochannel indicates that after 100 cal. BC–cal. AD 60 the channel must have been fringed by willow and elder, with some oaks still in the area, but possibly further away than previously. Alder and hazel show a decline, while elm, lime and ash disappear towards the end of the Roman period. Evidence for herb-rich pasture and cereal-growing continues, though the pollen evidence does not suggest an increase in the scale of the latter from that observed in the Iron Age. However excavation in the Stuston part of the Roman settlement has produced evidence of the large-scale processing of spelt wheat.

In the post-Roman period there is continuing evidence of some woodland, but, surprisingly, a marked increase in cereal pollen, suggesting an intensification rather than a decline in arable farming. Around cal. AD 670–820, in the middle Saxon period, there is some evidence of oak and hazel, but alder, elm and lime are low. High percentages of cereal pollen indicate arable farming on a larger scale than before. Cannabis-type pollen is present and there is also evidence for vine growing. There is some evidence for vines from the Roman settlement, but this is the clearest indication for their cultivation here. Herb-rich grassland continued to be important as before. In the late Saxon–early medieval period the evidence suggests that though there were still trees in the pollen catchment area, there were very few growing beside the channel. Cereal-type pollen continued to be present, but the percentage fell slightly and there is some evidence for increasing wetness.

Excavations in 1993–4 immediately to the east and west of the palaeochannel revealed groups of plough furrows that post-dated all the features on the site, cutting through a ‘Dark Earth’ layer of late Roman date, but sealed by a layer of alluvial clay/silt, probably after an episode of flooding. Their orientations suggest ploughing both parallel and at right-angles to the river. Minor variations suggest at least four ploughing episodes. The plough-lines were 20–45 cm apart and up to 28 cm deep. Although the palaeochannel was silted up by this time, it was probably still a very damp area, so the plough-marks could relate to two separate fields (Gill and Tester forthcoming). The excavators suggest a date in the middle Saxon period, to coincide with the pollen record for increased cereal production, however the marks lie in a very low-lying and poorly-drained area (marked as ‘liable to floods’ on Ordnance maps), which suggests that they relate not to arable fields but to attempts to improve riverside meadows.

In 1994 the monitoring of contractors’ soil-stripping for the Scole bypass gave an opportunity to investigate two parallel ditches to the west of the Roman road, in Stuston. These had previously been seen as cropmarks and one (60392) had been claimed as a part of a Roman marching camp (Edwards 1977, 236–7, pls XXIX–XXX; Webster 1978, plate 9). Excavation revealed that the ditches contained mixed fills of sand and peat but no artefacts. A peat layer in the middle of 60392 yielded a radiocarbon date of 390–100 cal.BC, while the basal peat in 60390 gave a date of 790–400 cal.BC (Tester forthcoming). The dates indicate that these ditches are in fact late Bronze Age or Iron Age land divisions. Cropmarks suggest that the ditches belong to two slightly overlapping enclosures. Ditch 60392 runs more or less parallel to the Waveney for some 160 m and then, at its west end, curves southward and disappears under an existing ditch that runs at right-angles to the river. Ditch 60390 runs parallel to the river for some 45 m and then, at its west end, it curves northward towards the river, crossing ditch 60392. At its east end, 60390 appears to stop in line with the end of 60392 and then makes a right-angled turn to the south and becomes part of three square enclosures, each with sides of about 30 m. They run across low-lying land that is also ‘liable to floods’ (hence the peat deposits) and therefore are more likely to have been pasture enclosures than arable fields. However they do indicate the parcelling out of land here in the first millennium BC on lines that lay either parallel to the river or at right-angles to it.

The environmental and archaeological evidence in this part of the Waveney valley suggests that the lighter areas of woodland were being cleared for agriculture as early as the Bronze Age, and that by the Iron Age cereal crops were...
certainly being grown in the vicinity. Cereal-growing continued unabated through the Roman and Saxon periods and must, of necessity, have involved the creation of arable fields. With no evidence of a break in the history of cultivation between the prehistoric, Roman, Saxon or medieval periods, it follows that the medieval fields are highly likely to have evolved from the prehistoric ones. The likelihood is that the brown sand soils (551f) formed the core arable areas and that cultivation then expanded up the slope onto the clay soils (711r). The use of the clay for arable crops probably fluctuated with time and with the pressure of population, but there was probably always a tendency for the higher, flatter and less well-drained areas to be used for pasture rather than arable.

The rectangular panels of arable land that lie on the slopes above the Waveney may therefore be of Iron Age origin, but the subdivisions within them are likely to have evolved over time. There may be a whole series of similar panels along the river valley, but they are unlikely to be part of large, planned, co-axial field systems that extended beyond the valley. The Thelveton field system, situated in another valley, is likely to have had a separate origin. At present it is harder to date, but its less-favoured position, situated all on clay, suggests a later date.

5. Worlingworth, Suffolk (EANGL 6) (Fig. 8)
Old English, ‘the worth (enclosure) possibly in a developed sense of ‘homestead, farm’ of Wilhere’s people’ (Ekwall 1960, 534).

Worlingworth, in north-central Suffolk, is a clayland parish (2,473 acres or 1,001ha), with all its soil being classified as belonging to the Beccecs 1 association (711r: typical stagnogley soil) — in other words a heavy clay soil, seasonally waterlogged, resting on chalky till (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 117–19). A north-flowing stream that is a tributary of the Gold Brook (and eventually of the River Waveney) runs through the eastern half of the parish, forming parts of the parish boundary at its northern and southern ends. A north-flowing stream that is a tributary of the Gold Brook (and eventually of the River Waveney) runs through the eastern half of the parish, forming parts of the parish boundary at its northern and southern ends. A north-flowing stream that is a tributary of the Gold Brook (and eventually of the River Waveney) runs through the eastern half of the parish, forming parts of the parish boundary at its northern and southern ends.

This stream rises just to the south in Tannington and is joined, to the west of Worlingworth Hall, by a small east-flowing tributary, referred to in medieval documents as Le Brok. Most of the eastern half of the parish consists of a clay plateau.

Worlingworth’s manorial situation was simple, for there was just one manor, which belonged to the great Benedictine abbey at Bury St Edmunds. Wirringawertha was willied to Bury by Bishop Ælfric II of Elmham in the late 1030s, who had received it from King Cnut (Hart 1966, 65, no. 88). At Domesday the abbey held six carucates here as a manor, together with sixteen villeins, fourteen bordars and one slave. There was also a sokeman with 20 acres and a church with 10 acres (DB Suffolk 14/103). The rectory of Worlingworth later included the chapelry of Southolt. This formed a separate small parish (821 acres) on the west side of Worlingworth. Southolt is not mentioned in Domesday Book, so it must be assumed that it was included in the entry for Worlingworth. In 1086 Bury Abbey also held land in the adjacent parishes of Monk Soham (four carucates as a manor) and Bedingfield (ten free men with half a carucate) (DB Suffolk 14/102 and 104). Worlingworth therefore lay in a large block of land controlled by the abbey.

After the Dissolution, the manor of Worlingworth was granted in 1539 to Sir Anthony Rous of nearby Dennington. It was sold on to the Thurston family in 1565 and by them to John Gardener and Robert Morse around 1613, passing to James Clarke before 1689. By 1710 it belonged to Edward Barker and passed from him to John Major c.1757. Major was created a baronet in 1765, described as ‘of Worlingworth Hall’. His son-in-law John Henkker succeeded in 1781, but the centre of the estate moved to Thornham Hall. Worlingworth remained a part of the very large Henkker-Major estate down to the twentieth century (Copinger 1904–11, IV, 117).

John Ridgard’s study of a sequence of manorial surveys from 1250 and a map of 1605/6 (Pl. 23) shows that there was a large block demesne that is recorded as being made up of some 233 acres of arable and 15 acres of meadow. The arable was arranged into eleven units (including five ‘crofts’ and two ‘wents’) that varied in size from 12 acres to 40 acres, but with an average of 21 acres (Ridgard 1983; 1988, 70–1). These units can be located and comparison with the Ordnance Survey first edition map of 1885 indicates that there is a reasonable correspondence between the sizes stated in the medieval documents and the acreages of fields or small groups of fields shown on that map:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1250</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1250 size as percentage of 1885 size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alwinescroft 32 acres</td>
<td>6 fields, 38 acres</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benecroft 12 acres</td>
<td>1 field, 14 acres</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyneneswent 14 acres</td>
<td>5 fields, 21 acres</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenescroft 14 acres</td>
<td>4 fields (and a part), 46 acres</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallecroft 18 acres</td>
<td>2 fields, 23 acres</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longewithes 25 acres</td>
<td>3 fields, 23 acres</td>
<td>109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchethern 16 acres</td>
<td>2 fields, 19 acres</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestescroft 15 acres</td>
<td>2 fields, 17 acres</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Redingg 32 acres</td>
<td>4 fields, 41 acres</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ty(wall)went 15 acres</td>
<td>2 fields, 19 acres</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walwortes 40 acres</td>
<td>5 fields, 52 acres</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall there is a 78% correspondence between the 1250 units and those of 1885, which rises to 83% if the largest error (that for Grenescroft) is omitted. This strongly suggests that the land units of 1885 are rooted in those of 1250, but have mostly undergone some subdivision since then — on average, three fields in 1885 to one in 1250. The 1250 surveyors mostly underestimated the size of the fields, so that the actual size of the block demesne, with meadows and the hall site included, was probably more like 345 acres or 14% of the parish area. This land mainly lay in the valley of the stream and was probably the best land in the parish, consisting of meadows close to the stream and arable fields on the sloping land on the valley sides (Pl. 24). Although the slopes here are gentle, they were presumably enough to give drainage to the clay soil, making them suitable for arable crops.

Worlingworth Hall lies towards the centre of this block demesne, enclosed by a moat (Pl. 25). The house incorporates a timber-framed ailed hall of the c.1300, probably contemporary with the moat. The ailed hall, which has a close parallel nearby at The Woodlands, Brundish, was converted into a raised-ailed hall c.1400 (Aitkens et al 1991, 288; Aitkens, pers. comm.). The hall
lies on the north side of the former Church Green (c.6 acres; called Elmesgrene in the fourteenth century). It shares this edge with the parish guildhall, which lies within an enclosure of about an acre that looks very much like an intake from the green. On the south side lie the church, the parsonage and one customary tenement. Most of this green has now been infilled with housing. On the higher ground to the north of the hall there was a small wood, which had probably been progressively reduced in size, as it was abutted on the west side by a close called Le Redingg (Old English rydding ‘a clearing’, usually in the sense of an assart). This formed an extension of a piece of woodland further to the north called Stanhaugh.

A possible Roman burial found near the Rectory in 1827 hints at the possibility of early settlement in the vicinity of the hall complex (Suffolk HER no. WGW 005). The only other Roman finds from the parish are some pottery sherds from the northern end of the demesne fields (Suffolk HER no. WGW 007).

Ridgard’s study also shows that there were three areas of ‘common fields’ — Crouchefeld, Suddonfeld and Carrfeld — which together covered about 15% of the parish. These fields mainly form extensions to the area covered by the block demesne and, like it, were sited to take advantage of the prized sloping land that had adequate drainage for successful arable crops, as can be most clearly seen in the case of Crouchefeld. Although there were strips in these fields, Ridgard found little evidence for communal cropping and in most cases these strips formed a minority part of any individual holding. Holdings were also not distributed evenly across these three fields, but were all, as far can be judged, in the field nearest to the farmstead. Most of the lands of the tenements, however, lay adjacent to the farmhouses to which they belonged (Ridgard 1983, 171–3). Crouchefeld was one of the largest ‘fields’ and probably covered about 100 acres, but it may have been divided into hedged sub-units from an early date — it was certainly subdivided in this way by 1686 and Carrfeld was similarly divided by 1674 (see below) (Pl. 26).

As at South Elmham St Michael, the strongest evidence for communal activity was the existence of a large common pasture, variously called the Great Green, Worlingworth Common or Worlingworth Green (Pl. 27). This large triangular green covered some 80 acres (32ha) at the west end of the parish. The narrowest part of the green lies on the Souholt boundary, but the green then widens again to become Souholt Green, suggesting that both communities had a share in its genesis. Ridgard was able to show that there were few of the ‘older’ twelve or six

Plate 23 Worlingworth, Suffolk. Map of 1605/6, endorsed ‘The Old Mapp of the Mannor of Worlingworth’.
Suffolk Record Office (Ipswich) HD417/33. North at the top left corner
acre tenements on the green, but instead a high proportion of ‘later’ molland tenements. The ‘early’ date of the former is indicated by higher labour services, holdings defined in ware acres and a total number (sixteen) that tallies with the number of villeins and bordars in 1086, whereas the latter had few labour services and higher rents, suggesting that they were later creations (Ridgard 1983, 15–17, 54–5). Ridgard deduced from this that the green was likely to have been created in the twelfth or thirteenth century out of former waste. That waste is likely to have been wood or wood-pasture. Domesday Book records woodland for a hundred pigs in Worlingworth and two of the areas adjoining the green bore ‘wood’ names — Horshawe and Oxfrith — and in both Ridgard found evidence of assarts up to the fourteenth century (Ridgard 1983, 21–2). That the creation of the green was an organised event is suggested by the regular dimensions of the tenements on its east side. These appear to be based on a length of 5 furlongs and a width of half a furlong. These green-edge tenements were mostly self-contained, with little, if any, land elsewhere.

Domesday Book only records one sokeman in Worlingworth, but by 1302 there were 49 attached to the manor, as well as 99 customary tenants. Many of these freehold tenements appear to be associated with assarting, as in the case of a group clustered in the Oxfrith area (Ridgard 1983, 56 and 34). Another group clusters around Stanway Green, a smaller green of some 12 acres on the north side of the formerly wooded Stanhaugh area. Here the freehold farmsteads appear to have been enclosed by small moats. Another small moat is associated with an isolated freehold farmstead in the north of the parish called Honeypots.
Plate 26 Worlingworth, Suffolk. View across part of the former common field area of Crowchfield

Plate 27 Worlingworth, Suffolk. Detail of the 1605/6 map, showing the area of Great Green, here called Worlingworth Green. Suffolk Record Office (Ipswich) HD417/33. North at the top
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Farm. This took its name from John Honipot, a tax-payer in 1327 (Suffolk Subsidy Return 1906, 57). His payment of 2s 6d indicates that he had a substantial free holding. By 1686 this had become a small gentleman’s seat complete with a straight avenue leading to the house. In that year it was mapped by Thomas Hornebye for William Godbold, gentleman, and named as Godbolds in the Wood (SRO(L) 741/HA 12/D4/17). The map shows that Godbold held the northern end of the former Crouchefeld, which was then divided by hedges into square or rectangular closes.

An earlier map by Hornebye, dated 1674, shows another isolated freehold farm in Worlingworth. This is now called Chandos Farm and lies close to the southern boundary of the parish. The map shows this ‘farme’ as containing two closes (with the house) on the north side of the road and a further nine to the south of the road (three in the adjoining parishes of Bedfield and Tannington), all surrounded by hedges (SRO(I) HD 417/34). Six of these southern closes lay in the area of the former Carrfeld and probably comprised about two-thirds of the former ‘field’. One close is specifically labelled as customary land and another as free land. One narrow close is labelled as belonging to Tannington, though situated in Worlingworth, indicating that Tannington had had rights in Carrfeld. One of the close boundaries is made up of two rows of trees, suggesting a thin linear wood. In 1710 Edward Baker commissioned three maps of parts of his estate in Worlingworth from William Lewin. One of these shows another freeholding to the west of Chandos Farm with a similar landscape of closes, one named as The Neat House Close (SRO(I) HD 417/35–37). An outlying group of closes belonging to this holding, adjacent to the Swan Inn, are all labelled Breek Yard and three are shown as having rows or clumps of trees within them.

Sir John Major commissioned more maps in 1758. These also show the landscape divided into closes. This pattern of closes is still identifiable on the Ordnance Survey first edition map of 1885, but there had been additions and subtractions of some boundaries in the intervening years. Long boundaries were the most stable, but shorter boundaries subdividing units were the most prone to change. These maps demonstrate the very regular appearance of properties adjoining the Great Green (SRO(I) HD417/39–41). The Great Green was enclosed 1831–2, but without the need for a parliamentary act (White 1855, 404). The green was not, however, converted to arable, but has remained as pasture. The sense of an open space, though, has been lost by the insertion of hedged subdivisions (Pl. 28). Straight roads and straight hedges are now the dominant visual features. A windmill stood near the centre of the green in 1783 and another was added later, but both have now been demolished. Instead a group of houses have sprung up on and adjacent to the old mill sites. Over the rest of the parish there has been a substantial reduction in the number of field boundaries in the twentieth century. A sample area in the south-east corner of the parish revealed a 57% loss of field boundaries between 1885 and the present day. The same or greater loss occurred over most of the parish.

Plate 28 Worlingworth, Suffolk. Part of the former Great Green, enclosed and subdivided in 1831–2
6. Great Henny, Essex (EANGL 9) (Fig 9)

Old English, (æt thæm) hean ege ‘at the high island of land’ (Reaney 1935, 443).

Great Henny lies on the Essex/Suffolk border, abutting the west bank of the River Stour. Its church stands on top of a spur overlooking the Stour valley, flanked north and south by the smaller valleys of two tributaries of the Stour. This spur, with slopes on three sides, must be the ‘high island’ of the name Henny. The spur and the land to the west have clay loam soils (with some aeolian silt), seasonally waterlogged, of the Oak 2 (714c: paleo-argillic stagnogley soil) and Hornbeam 3 associations (582d: stagnogleyic paleo-argillic brown earth), overlying chalky till. Both suffer from seasonal waterlogging, but the Hornbeam soils are better drained than the Oak ones. On the sloping ground running eastward towards the river, however, there are well-drained brown earths of the Ludford association (571x: typical argillic brown earth) on glaciofluvial drift. The flat terrace beside the river has a wet alluvium-based soil of the Thames association (814a: pelo-calcareous alluvial gley soil) (SSSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 221–2, 237–41, 281–4 and 328–30). Great Henny contains 1,034 acres (418ha) and lies to the south of Little Henny, which contains 419 acres (170ha).

Great and Little Henny, together, formed a larger settlement unit that was recorded just as Heni in Domesday Book. In 1086 three tenants-in-chief — Ranulf Peverel, John son of Waleran and Roger Bigod — had holdings here (DB Essex, 43/5 and note, 34/21–2, 40/4). Peverel had 2.5 hides that Wulfwin, a freeman, had held in 1066 and which were now held by Peverel’s tenant, Thorold (Turol). John son of Waleran also had 2.5 hides, these had belonged to a tenant-in-chief in 1066 and were now held by John’s tenant, Roger. Bigod had just under 1.5 hides that had belonged to five freemen in 1066 and were now held by Bigod’s tenant, Robert de Vaux. Peverel and John had also added to their estate by annexations: Ranulf Peverel and his tenant Thorold had added 20.5 acres from twelve freemen and 18 acres from four freemen; while John son of Waleran added another half hide and 10.5 acres from seven freemen (DB Essex, 90/13, 44 and 46).

In addition to his land in Henny, Ranulf Peverel had five hides in the adjacent villa of Lamarch, which were also sub-infeudated to his tenant Thorold (DB Essex, 43/22.49) Peverel’s ‘s extensive lands in eastern England reverted to the Crown on the death of his son William c.1129/30, but continued to be known as the Honour of Peverel of London (or of Hatfield Peverel) (Sanders 1960, 120; Keats-Rohan 1999, 355–6). Not long afterwards there is evidence of the Beauchamp family holding land of this honour at Lamarch and Great Henny. On the death of Stephen II de Beauchamp in 1216, his lands were divided amongst his four sisters. One of the sisters, Matilda, married William de Wastail (Wascoil) and inherited the Great Henny lands (Farrer 1924, 48–50). In 1257 Ralph de Wascoyl and Sir Philip Basset of Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, who had acquired the Lamarch part of the Beauchamp estate, quitclaimed to each other the advowsons of the churches of Great Henny and Lamarch (TNA E40/544).50 In 1303 John Wastoil held half a knight’s fee in Great Henny, as a dependency of Lamarch (Feudal Aids II, 142).51 A year later John settled the succession to the manor of Great Henny on William Fitz-Ralph of nearby Pebmarsh, Maud his wife and their heirs (Feet of Fines Essex II, 96 no.725). The Fitz-Ralphs and their descendants, the Chamberlains, continued to be lords of the manor down to the late sixteenth century, when Fitzralph Chamberlain of Gedding Hall in Suffolk sold the manor. Not long after it was bought by Roger Gwynn, a London apothecary (ERO D/DIV/VC55). It was for Gwynn that William Sands made two maps of the manor and a written survey in 1600 (PI. 29).52 The maps and survey include parcels of land in detached portions of the parish, as well as in several nearby parishes, but this study focuses on those actually in Great Henny.

The eighteenth-century historian Philip Morant records that there was only one ‘capital manor’ in Little Henny, which was called ‘Rye or Ryeshall’ (Morant 1768, II, 274). It takes its name from John de Ry, who first appears in association with Little Henny in 1269. In that year he and his wife Matilda were sued for ‘reasonable dower’ out of the manor by Joan, the widow of John Mauduit (Foot of Fines Essex I, 268 no.1598). This John was named as the son and heir of Gilbert Mauduit in 1261. Gilbert’s inquisition post mortem states that he held a knight’s fee in Henny, with the advowson of the church, which was held of the heir of Simon de Cantilupe (Cal Inq Post Mortem I, 136 no.481). Gilbert was holding land in Little Henny as early as 1229, probably in succession to John and Hubert de Bovill, who were holding half a knight’s fee in Henny in 1202 (Cal Patent Rolls Henry III, 302–3, no.1229; Feet of Fines Essex I, 28 no.103). A Herbert de Bovill was being sued for dower along with John de Ry in 1269, suggesting that there was probably a family succession from the Bovills to the Mauduits and then to the Rys.

The descent of this manor in Little Henny is made clear by the inquisition post mortem of John de Vallibus (Vaux) in 1287. This states that John le Ry held a knight’s fee in Little Henny, as one of the 31.75 fees that John de Vallibus held of Roger Bigod, Earl of Norfolk (Cal Inq Post Mortem II, 402 no.853). This John was a descendant of the Robert de Vaux who was the Bigod tenant in Henny in 1086 (Keats-Rohan 1999, 382, 396–7). This Robert had also held nearby Belchamp Otten as a Bigod tenant (DB Essex, 43/4). The Cantilupe connection is not totally clear, but the heir of Simon de Cantilou is named as the holder of a knight’s fee nearby at Weston (in Foxearth) in the inquisition post mortem of Roger Bigod, Earl of Norfolk in 1307 (Cal Inq Post Mortem II, 298 no.434). The family also held the manor of Smeeton in Bulmer of the Honour of Bouligne (Feet of Fines Essex I, 32 no.145; Red Book Exchequer II, 500). The most likely explanation is that the Vaux family had sub-infeudated their holding in Henny to the Cantilupes, who in turn sub-infeudated to the Bovills and their successors.

The holding of John son of Waleran is difficult to trace.53 His daughter Juliana (living 1129–30) married William of Hastings; but there seems to have been no ongoing connection with Henny (Keats-Rohan 1999, 283–4). Locally, at Aveley, Little Ongar and Bures, John seems to have been succeeded by Sir Gilbert de Tani (fl. 1213–24) who held them as of his barony of Tani, but is no trace of de Tani at Henny (Morant 1768, I, 77, 130; Stoke Cartulary I, 103–4 no.130; II, 261–2 no. 388). The assumption must be that John’s holding at Henny was somehow absorbed by the other two manors.

There is little indication that any of the medieval lords of Great Henny were resident here. Extant accounts dated...
1341/2 and 1342/3 for another of the Fitz-Ralph manors, that of Punt or Pontes in Bulmer (Punts & Bonnets in the 1600 survey), do however indicate that Sir Ralph Fitz-Ralph was involved in directly farming his scattered demesnes at Pebmarsh (where he lived), Great Henny and Pontes. In Great Henny the operations were supervised by his reeve, Robert Dous (Britnell 1980, 4, 7).

Morant records that ‘for many years past the site of this manor of Great Henny was in a family of note called Gebelon’ and that ‘about the reign’ of Edward IV it was acquired by a John Sewell, through his marriage with Margery Gibelon (Morant 1768, II, 273). In 1589 their descendant, John Sewall, was admitted to a copyhold tenement that included the site of the manor and part of the former demesne. The survey of 1600 records the site thus (translated from Latin):

The site of the Manor of Great Henny aforesaid with one croft adjacent called Hallfeyld (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.40).

Morant recorded the site is similar terms:

Henny hall, the mansion house of this manor, stood in a field near the church, called Hall-field to this day. Scarce any remains of this ancient structure are left, except a pit where it is said the cellars and vaults were. Here was formerly a park (Morant 1768, II, 273).

Morant does however note that a small property immediately to the south of the church, called Church-house, was a ‘capital messuage [that] belonged ancietly to the Fitz-Ralphs and Chamberlains’ and that Fitzralph Chamberlain sold it, before 1585, to Richard Golding. His son George was holding ‘one tenement building called Churche house’ with half an acre as a freeholding of new feoffment in 1600 (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.3). The existence of a manor site beside the church indicates that there was originally a hall-and-church complex here, possibly originally that of Wulfwin, the freeman who was Thorold’s predecessor at Henny in 1066. No church is mentioned here in Domesday Book, but churches rarely seem to have been included in the Essex section of Domesday (Darby 1971, 249–51). A church was certainly in existence by 1256 (TNA E/40/544). A similar complex existed in Little Henny, where the remains of the medieval church lie close to Ryes Hall (Fairweather 1933).

The Great Henny demesne is difficult to determine from the map because by that stage it only consisted of a 12.5-acre coppice wood called Parck Spring and Henny Mill (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.55 and 23; Sharneford Mill alias Henny Mill was a freehold in the lord’s hands). However, as already indicated, at least part of the demesne had been converted into a customary tenement, for John Sewall was tenant not only of the croft called Hallfeyld (7 acres), but also of crofts called Le Parck (11 acres), Muckfen (14 acres), Parckecroft (2 acres), which together made up a compact block beside the church and must have formed the nucleus of a block demesne (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.40). However, in addition to demesne, glebe, freehold and copyholds, the map further distinguishes a sizeable group labelled as ‘landes of new feoffment’. The survey details two principal new-feoffment holdings, both then classed as freeholdings: one of 90 acres belonging to George Golding and another of 165 acres belonging to Robert Golding (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.28). In one there is a reference to a charter given to Robert Golding by
Fitzralph Chamberlain and four of the smaller new-foeoffment holdings have explicit references to charters from Fitzralph Chamberlain dated 1581 (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.5, 16, 19 and 21). Chamberlain appears to have been a spendthrift who encumbered his estates with complicated debts before eventually selling them (BL Lansdowne MS 106, no. 40; TNA C2/Eliz/C24/34). He also appears to have been less than honest in his dealings, as his own mother complained in her will when he sold some of her estates in Lincolnshire but failed to pass on the money! (Will of Lady Elizabeth Chamberlain of Gedding, Suffolk, dated 1579, proved 1586/7, TNA PROB11/70, f. 4). With this background it is quite possible that, at Henny, Fitzralph sold off the demesne land before eventually selling the manor itself.

Much of the new-foeoffment lands lay in blocks immediately to the north, west and south of the site of the manor house. This suggests that they were originally part of a large block of demesne. The existence of a piece of new-foeoffment land called the Conveyer (i.e. ‘the rabbit warren’) further supports a derivation from demesne, especially as it lay just to the south of the Park Spring (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.5). Most of this land had the better Ludford (571x) soil, but included land with heavier Hornbeam (582d) soil as well. New foeoffment lands in the west of the parish probably represent assarts from former woodland (see the discussion on Highefeilde, below).

The glebe consisted mainly of a compact block in the north-west of the parish (straddling soils 582d and 571x), but also included a few smaller parcels on the sloping Ludford (571x) soil in the eastern half of the parish, in Holcroft and Portewayfield. Altonfield, Portwayfield, Holcroft and Stowerfield form a series of oblong blocks on the 571x soil between the church and the river. All had numerous small parcels of irregular co-axial form within them, indicative of common fields. Numerous ‘croft’ names (Catscroft, Parkecroft, Peasecroft etc) in these ‘fields’, suggest however that there were long-standing enclosed lands as well. There were a few ‘went’ names too (Lashmerwrent, Sheeplondwrent and Sheeplondoverwrent) and one ‘furlong’ (Foreland furlong), but not enough to suggest any formal organisation of the fields into furlongs, and one in Portewayfield, confusingly, had a field suffix: Parkewrentfield. The southernmost block, Hag(h)bashfield, contained larger fields that were mainly new-foeoffment land, suggesting that they had been demesne land. There were however a group of smaller cophold fields on the north side of the block, in an area called Little Hagbushfeilde, and an area called Stampits containing narrow strips in mixed ownership at the extreme eastern end, which suggest a common element in this block too. Most of these subdivisions have now disappeared, but the deeply-cut lanes ascending the slope remain as prominent features of the landscape (PI 30).

In the Altonfield area there were seven freehold and customary fields with names that incorporated the term ‘hide’: Le Great Hide, Le Hide, Shepecothide alias Le Hide and Le Brookhede alias Brode hide. They, together with a close called Homestallond and a piece of glebe, formed a compact block of 30 acres adjacent to a tributary of the River Stour called the Hidebrook (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.12, 41). The implications of the name are not clear — the land was clearly not a unit of 120 acres, as the term ‘hide’ would suggest, however 30 acres is a quarter of hide, so it is likely that this block represents an old entity that was rated in terms of a hide. Hide farms are recorded elsewhere in England, where they seem to represent distinct holdings of some antiquity (Faith 1997, 137–40; 1998). It is possible that this unit at Great Henny owes its origin to one or other of the smaller freemen holdings recorded here at Domedday. The 1600 map also shows two large fields to the west of Great Henny called Butlers Hide and Barrowes Hide that presumably represent similar units (see below).

In a southern tongue of the parish extending into Twinstead there are further references to ‘fields’. The free tenement called Sparrowes abutted to the south on an area in Twinstead called Oldefyeldes (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.16). South-west of this, and abutting south on Ancells brooke, was a 6-acre ‘field’ of pasture called Westfield which was a freehold of new foeoffment (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.30). Within this was a small piece called Westfield acre belonging to the manor of Lamarsh. North-west of this was an area called Merfield (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.16). However there were also a number of -croft names (Hennycroft alias Great Laie, Longcroft, Barncrofte and Uddlescrofte) suggesting a long history of enclosures (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.16). To the west of the church, towards the head of the valley of the small tributary of the River Stour called Le Brooke and straddling the 582d and 571x soils, was a 25-acre field called Pariefield (Purieflede or Perryfield). The 1600 survey describes this as ‘one field … now in six separate pieces with a grovett on the west part’, and it was then all in one customary holding (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.39). Except for the name, there is little otherwise to suggest a common field. The landform here is challenging, with numerous steep-sided short ‘valleys’ at right-angles to the main valley of Le Brooke. Cultivation difficulties were probably important factors leading to the recent transformation of the area into a new ‘community woodland’ called Clay Hill Woodland. The former existence of a ‘grovett’ here suggests that earlier farmers also found it difficult to cultivate.

Just beyond the head of this valley, on the clay plateau (582d soil) straddling the Great Henny/Twinstead parish boundary, there was another ‘field’. This was Great Hennyfeilde alias Highfeild, a 17-acre field which the survey describes as ‘lying in various parcels and in various furlongs’, but was then a single freehold of new foeoffment (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.2). To the west there was a 7-acre field called Little Hennyfeilda alias Highfeild, described as ‘one enclosure … sometime in divers parcels’, though then also a freehold of new foeoffment (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.1). In the adjacent area of Twinstead, to the south, there was obviously a continuation of these fields, for the survey also records parcels of arable land ‘lying in the field lately called Highfeild’, one of which was described as abutting ‘land of divers men in Highfeild’ (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.54). In this area there were also two fields called Piperswent. The map also appears to show subdivisions in the area called Ramsey Valley, that abutted the east side of Highfeilde (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.2). This was again a single freehold of new foeoffment and must have included some land of dubious agricultural worth as the Ordnance Survey map of 1876 indicates a strip of marsh in the centre of this area. Cobidden Hill, immediately to the east is described as being ‘barren land’ (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.39). To the north-west, and also a freehold, was a 14-acre field of ‘land, pasture and wood’ called Coopishill, described as ‘lying there in divers
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Plate 30  Great Henny, Essex. View westward up the slope across former tenement lands and common fields towards the church. The sunken lane cutting into the slope is a prominent feature.

Plate 31  Great Henny, Essex. The Highfield area on the Great Henny/Twinstead boundary. This is flat land with a heavy clay soil.
furlongs’ (ERO/D/DU332/1A, p.2).6 The position of these ‘fields’ on the higher, seasonally waterlogged, clay soils on the western fringe of the parish, fringed by woods (Brownes Wood, Cospeshill Grove, Ramsey valley grove and some unnamed pieces) suggests that they may have originated as communal assarts — areas of communal ‘waste’ being replaced by communal arable, either as a result of population pressure or through improvements in drainage methods (Pl. 31). Adjoining these on the west was an 8.5-acre glebe close called Southfield. Further north there was a 14-acre area of block glebe called Petfeildes (noted as one close now divided into two parts) (ERO/D/DU332/1A, p.55). These glebe ‘fields’, despite their names, probably have a long history as individually-owned closes.

The fields of Little Henny are poorly recorded, but abutting the north side of the Great Henny block glebe there was an area called Castlefield and to the west of Petfeildes there was an area variously called Heltons, Helhounds or Heltonsfield that belonged to the manor of Pemmarsh (though in Little Henny) (ERO/D/DU332/1A, p.57). At the east end of the parish and forming a small salient into Great Henny there was an area called East Field (ERO/D/DU332/1A, p.8). This forms an extension to the area in Great Henny called The Hide and Sheepcotes and was probably the best land in Little Henny being situated on the well-drained 571x soil and bounded on either side by streams.

The area with clay loam soils of the Hornbeam 3 (582d) and Oak 2 (714c) associations on the west side of Great and Little Henny, and adjacent areas of Twinstead and Bulmer, is shown on the 1876 Ordnance map as containing some very large fields and some zigzagging straight parish boundaries. Part of this is the area of Highfield already discussed, but there were clearly other large units here. The 1600 survey does not cover this area comprehensively, but it does include a former detached part of Great Henny (now included in Twinstead) together with a detached piece of Bulmer parish that lay in an area called Butlers Hide. The name commemorates a holding of 120 acres (i.e. a hide) that the Botiller family had in the two Hennys and Bulmer in the fourteenth century.67 Butlers Hide lay adjacent to Waldegrave Wood and looks as if it originated as an assart. Another similar unit called Barrowes Hide lay to the south. Punts and Bonnets, Peaches, Gentrys and Harwardes appear to have been similar individually owned units in the same area.68 There were also two greens: to the south, in Twinstead, there was a small rectangular green called Twinstead Tye (which is now known as Twinstead Green) and to the west, in Bulmer, there was the larger Bulmer Tye. A long ‘tail’ extending southwards from the latter abutted on Colledge woodde (now Birch Wood), underlining the often close correlation between clayland greens and woods noted elsewhere. The maps suggest that originally there was a large block of woodland here that was shared by several parishes, of which Birch Wood, Butlers Wood and Waldegrave Wood were fragments.

Domesday Book records that in 1066 there was woodland for 170 pigs in the three Henny holdings, which, using Rackham’s correlation graph, might suggest something like 450 acres of wood (Rackham 1980, 121). By 1086 it had been reduced to wood for 130 pigs, which may suggest that assarting was underway by then.69 It had certainly begun before the early fourteenth century and it led to the creation of a mixture of individually owned ‘hides’, subdivided fields (in addition to Highfield, there was an area called Tiefeld to the south of Twinstead Tye, an area called Cadleyfield to the south-west and Great Pariefeld beside Bulmer Tye) and greens. Closes named Muche and Litle Stubbins lying between Bulmer Tye and a piece of woodland bear witness to the assarting.

There is little information about how any of these fields were farmed, but the overall lack of organisation suggests Type 3 common fields. These common fields disappeared without the need for parliamentary enclosure, as is normal for Type 3. But there was some parliamentary enclosure in a few of the adjacent parishes. In 1836 there were acts for the enclosing of land that was mainly common-field arable in the adjacent parish of Middleton and in the parishes of Belchamp Otten and Walter, a bit to the north. The Middleton land comprised about 30% of the parish area, but the land in the Belchamps was only 4% of their area. The demand for a share of the fertile and well-drained brown earths on the slopes towards the river may well have encouraged the creation of common fields in the Stour Valley and contributed to their longer survival. In this, the Stour Valley shared some of the characteristics of the area to the west, in south-west Suffolk and north-west Essex, where common fields were more prevalent and survived longer.

The only named green in Great Henny was a very small area, called le poundgreene, that lay near the church, however the map indicates another small green beside Henny Mill. The latter was really just the northermmost extremity of a large common meadow that occupied most of the low-lying land between Henny Street and the River Stour. In 1600 this was called Dagfen and as Henny Common Meadow it was still in subdivided ownership at the time of the tithe award in 1840 (ERO/D/CT 177B). The extreme south-east corner of this was called Lamanse Common and belonged to Lamarch parish (ERO/D/DU332/1A, p.22). There were also strips belonging to the manors of Lamarch, Twinstead and Bulmer in the main part of Dagfen. Bordering the tributary of the Stour that forms the southern boundary of Great Henny there were extensive meadows in several ownership. At the western head of the valley the land appears to have poorly drained and there are references here to land called Cobiden fen alias Alderfen, also called Perry Fen, and to a ‘marsh or alder wood’ (ERO/D/DU332/1A, p.1, 39 and 57).

The majority of the inhabitants of Great Henny appear to have lived in houses on both sides of Henny Street, which runs parallel to the River Stour.66 These houses mostly had linear crofts associated with them that run at right-angles to the road. These were a mixture of freeholds and copyholds and included some belonging to the manor of Lamarch. These tenement blocks mostly bore names derived from former tenants. One, called Dowses crofte, which lay between Dagfen and Henny Street, may even take its name from the fourteenth-century reeve named Robert Dous (ERO/D/DU332/1A, p.22).

The overall view of the two Hennys suggests that there were two large block demesnes occupying the higher ground, but with a share of the better-drained land sloping down to the river and streams. Other parts of the good sloping land was given over to common fields shared by villagers who had a line of block tenements on Henny Street, at the base of the slope. Later assarting gave additional land in the west of the parishes.
7. Sutton, Suffolk (EANGL 12) (Fig. 10)

Old English, *suth+tun* ‘the south tun (‘homestead, village’)’ (Ekwall 1960, 454).

Sutton, situated beside the estuary of the River Deben in south-east Suffolk is best known for the rich Anglo-Saxon burials that were discovered at Sutton Hoo on the north-west edge of the parish (Bruce-Mitford and Care-Evans 1975–83; Carver 2005). Sutton is also one of the largest parishes in Suffolk (5,445 acres; 2,203ha), but this included a sizeable amount of heathland. In 1855 it was said to include ‘nearly a thousand acres of open sandy heath, called Sutton Walks’ (White 1855, 269), but this has been much reduced in the twentieth century (Pl. 32). In having a predominantly sandy soil, Sutton differs significantly from the other three Suffolk case studies, which have mainly clay soils. The southern part of the parish mainly has deep, well-drained, loamy sand soils, belonging to the Newport 2 association (551e; typical brown sand), that overlie Crag (shelly sand). Over the rest of the parish well-drained sandy soils of the Newport 4 association (551g: typical brown sand), overlying sandy glaciofluvial drift, predominate (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 272–3 and 277–9). At the extreme southern end of the parish, bordering a small tributary of the Deben, there is a thin strip of wet soils of the Wallasea 1 association (813f: pelo-alluvial gley soil).

Domesday Book records seventeen separate holdings in *Suttuna (Suthtuna)*, relating to 581 acres held by no less than 57 freemen (DB Suffolk, 3/22, 6/149, 155, 165, 169–70, 178, 184, 248, 252, 254, 21/71 and 67/21). There were a further three freemen with 60 acres in the subsidiary vill of Stokerland (Stokerlanda), and seven more with 58 acres in the lost vill of Lacebur(c)/h) and Hundesthoft which may also have been in Sutton (DB Suffolk, 6/151, 173, 236, 250 and 21/82). Five holdings were specifically called manors, but these were all small — 80 acres, 60 acres (two) and 12 acres (two but see below). Twelve of the holdings belonged to Robert Malet, the powerful lord of Eye (3 manors, 52 freemen and 481 acres); two belonged to the Abbey of St Etheldreda at Ely (9 freeman with 40 acres and a ‘half’ freeman with a manor of 12 acres); two to Hervey of Bourges (60 acres as a manor and 1 freeman with 6 acres); and one to Count Alan of Brittany (3 freemen with 34 acres). The Ely holding had belonged to a certain Godric of Sutton, described as a ‘half’ freeman but was then in the hands of Robert Malet. Malet clearly disputed that he was just a sub-tenant for the same lands appear in the Malet listing, but with no mention of Ely. This is followed by a note saying that Maynard (a tenant of Count Alan’s) claimed that this Godwin belonged to Earl Ralph de Gael ‘one year before he forfeited’ and that the Hundred testified that Malet ‘was in possession of him’ (DB Suffolk, 6/165, 169 and 21/71). There is also a note at the end of the description of Hervey’s holding stating that ‘of this William Malet [Robert’s father] was in possession on the day he died’.

Malet’s holding was divided between at least six sub-tenants: Walter of Caen, Ralph, Hubert and Gilbert Blund, with Gilbert de Coleville holding in Stokerland and William in Hundesthoft. Hervey’s under-tenant was Erchenbald. By 1302–3 all these holdings appear to have coalesced into three, all belonging to the Honour of Eye.
Both were only taxed twelve pence, which does not from the Suffolk parish of Pettistree, who was taxed two holders of the first can probably identified in the 1327 Lay substantial free holdings that were later regarded as been the tenant of ‘the site of the manor of Stokerland, holding in Sutton became the manor of Fen Hall. The Joan Charles’s holding and that of Campsey Ashe were both said to be held of the manor of Benhall. This indicates a shared descent from the lands of the Glanville family, who were Malet tenants in Benhall and elsewhere. The Domesday-period progenitor of the family, Robert de Glanville, does not appear amongst the sub-tenants who held lands in Sutton, so the exact line of descent is not clear. Rannulf de Glanville, Justiciar of England (died 1190) held Benhall manor, amongst others, and his wife’s nieces were the founders of Campsey Ashe Priory. In 1290 Rannulf’s descendant, Sir Nicholas de Criel of Albury, Herts, sold Benhall to Sir Guy Ferre (d. 1323) an important royal official under Edward I and Edward II (Mortimer 1979, 126). The Sutton holding, however, seems to have passed to another royal official, Sir William Charles (d. c.1271/2). He was a close companion of the Lord Edward (later King Edward I) and in 1262 he was granted extensive lands in East Anglia on his marriage to Joan de Valle Viridi, a lady-in-waiting to Edward’s wife, Eleanor of Castile (Harper-Bill 1998, 20). The Charles holding in Sutton became the manor of Fen Hall. The Campsey Ashe holding apparently became the manor of Wood Hall. By the early fifteenth century the manor of Sutton Hall had passed to the Wingfield family of Letheringham. Sir Robert Wingfield was in possession of it by the time of his death in 1409 and Sir John Wingfield had the ‘tenement of Wodhall’ in 1481–2. In 1541 Sir Anthony Wingfield sold their Sutton lands to William Ferneley, citizen and mercer of London. Fen Hall descended to Joan Charles’s descendants by her other husband, Sir John Tuddenham. The Tuddenham estates were inherited by the Bedingfeld family of Oxburgh in Norfolk and were then sold, c.1585, by Alexander Bedingfeld to William Burwell (Copinger 1904–11, VII, 269–74).

Little is recorded about Stokerland, on the river’s edge in the north-west part of the parish, between 1086 and its re-appearance as a manor in the sixteenth century. Along with Sutton Hall, it came into the possession of William Ferneley in 1541 (Copinger 1904–11, VII, 271). A rental of the combined manors of Sutton Hall, Stokerland and Woodhall, dated 1552, states that Geoffrey Myles had been the tenant of ‘the site of the manor of Stokerland, formerly Jennys’ since 1528 (SRO (I) HB10:427/4 (3)).

The manor of Sutton Hall also contained two substantial free holdings that were later regarded as separate manors: Pettistree Hall and Osmond’s. The holders of the first can probably identified in the 1327 Lay Subsidy list for Sutton as William de Petrestre (probably from the Suffolk parish of Pettistree), who was taxed two shillings. Although two Osmonds appear in the same list, both were only taxed twelve pence, which does not suggest a major holding. However another two-shilling tax payer was Ranulph Chaunpeneys and the 1629 map of Sutton (described below) marks a field called Chamlets adjacent to the site of Osmond’s, which was reached by a road called Chumpneys wyw. This raises the possibility that this free holding originally belonged to the Chumpneys family. In 1589 William Burwell added the ‘manors’ of Osmond’s and Pettistree Hall to his existing Fen Hall estate.

In addition, two manors in adjacent parishes extended into Sutton: these were the manor of Hollesley and the manor of Talvas in Sottisham. Hollesley was also a Malet possession and in the first half of the thirteenth century it was held by a family surnamed de Hoole, who also seem to have been the holders of the Sutton Hall manor. There was a complex relationship between the two manors and the Hollesley manor is often referred to in later documents as the manor of Hollesley with Sutton. The manor of Talvas takes its name from the Talvaz/Talevaz family who were tenants of the Honour of Eye in the fourteenth century. The inheritance custom on the manors of Sutton Hall, Talvas, Stokerland and Campsey was to the youngest son (Borough English). The custom of Fen Hall and Hollesley with Sutton was primogeniture. The Ferneleys sold Sutton Hall to Sir Nicolas Bacon in 1675 and it was resold by the Rev. Nicholas Bacon c.1789 to William Waller of Sutton. The Wallers held the manor for about a hundred years and built a new house called Sutton Hall in the early nineteenth century on a site 1.3km to the south of the medieval Sutton Hall. Thomas Waller, William’s son, was one of the ‘improving’ farmers who corresponded with Arthur Young (Young 1813, 407–8). Wood Hall, which had for a time been in the separate ownership of the Edwards family, was re-united with the Sutton Hall estate c.1879. Around 1900 both were sold to Sir William Cuthbert Quilter of Bawdsay Manor. On the sale of Bawdsay Manor to the RAF for a radar station in 1936 the Quillers moved first to Methersgate Hall in Sutton and then to Sutton Hall, which is the current head of the Quilter estate in Sutton. Fen Hall and Pettistree Hall remained with the Burwell family down to the death of Charles Burwell in 1741. They were subsequently held by his son-in-law William Edgar, who died in 1770. A Burwell Edwards was the owner in 1791 and 1826; in 1841 a Mary Hunt, widow, offered both up for sale. In 1855 and 1900 the lord was Charles Austin of Brandeston Hall. By 1925 they belonged to Sir Cuthbert Quilter. A separate estate grew up in the nineteenth century centred on Broxtead House on the eastern side of the parish. A farm of 717 acres at Broxtead, together with the 473 acres of the Great Common Heath (Sutton Common), with the exclusive sheepwalk rights, belonged to Henry Edwards of Wood Hall in 1826 (Rushen 1902). This later belonged to Lord Rendlesham (1883) and to James Alexander Burness of Melton Lodge (1888 and 1908). Around 1916 it was acquired by the brothers Robert Harold Paul and Russell Paul. The Broxtead estate still belongs to the Paul family.

The main source of information about the early layout of Sutton is a detailed map of 1629 by William Haiward (Pl. 33). By this time most of the parish belonged to two men — Miles Ferneley, who had the manors of Sutton Hall, Wood Hall and Stokerland, and Francis Burwell who had the manors of Fen Hall and Pettistree Hall. The map shows the ‘site of the manor of Sutton’ as being located beside the church in a half-and-church complex of Saxon
Plate 33  Sutton, Suffolk. Map of 1629 by William Haiward, probably for Miles Ferneley and Francis Burwell.  
(c) British Library Board. All Rights Reserved. British Library Maps Deposit 1794. North to the left

Plate 34  Sutton, Suffolk. Detail of the 1629 map showing the church and former hall site.  
(c) British Library Board. All Rights Reserved. British Library Maps Deposit 1794. North to the left
origin, but was then no longer the seat of the manorial lord, though still in his hands (Pl. 34). Miles Ferneley instead occupied a larger complex of buildings with a large orchard at Wood Hall. The Saxon origins of the church-and-hall complex are shown by scatters of Middle and Late Saxon pottery (Ipswich ware and Tethford-type ware), as well as metalwork (Suffolk HER nos SUT 028, 029, 042). The ‘site of the manor of Fen Hall’ is shown a short distance to the south-west of Sutton Hall, but by then it had been reduced to a tenanted farmstead. The lord of Fen Hall, Francis Burwell, occupied a moated house at Pettistree Hall.

The map shows a large number of fields of varying sizes, some clearly subdivided into strips and others undivided, and larger open areas labelled as several [sheep] walks or common heaths. Haivard divided the area up into 130 numbered ‘furlongs’, but these, like the west at Walsham-le-Willows, were very variable in size and shape and were largely determined by the pattern of roads and tracks. It is however possible to see some patterning in this apparent jumble. In the south there is a dense profusion of smallish fields, many with ‘close’ names. These correspond closely with the distribution of soils classified as belonging to the Newport 2 association (551e) (Hodge et al 1984, 272–3). These are described as ‘deep well drained sandy soils’, however they are clayier than this description suggests, as is shown by the former presence of a moat at Pettistree Hall. Also many of the fields have deep ditches around them, indicating a need for drainage (Pl. 35). This probably indicates that there is only a thin layer of Crag separating them from the underlying London Clay. There is a considerable amount of grassland here today and the small size of the fields in 1629 suggests that they too were mainly pastures.

Both Wood Hall and Pettistree Hall are situated on soil type 551e and were surrounded by clusters of their own fields, suggesting that these small manors/free tenements were block holdings. The site of the manor of Fen Hall also lay on this soil type, within a small cluster of its own fields. The site of the manor of Sutton Hall however straddled the boundary between 551e and the ‘deep well drained sandy soils’ of the Newport 4 association (551g). The latter overlie sandy glaciofluvial drift and cover most of the remainder of the parish (Hodge et al 1984, 277–9). Adjoing to the site of the manor were several large fields, mostly on soil type 551g, that appear to have been exclusively demesne (Pl. 36). The jagged northern end of these, abutting the lord’s several heath, suggests that boundary between the fields and the heath fluctuated with the intermittent cultivation of the more marginal sandy areas, much like the ‘brecks’ of Breckland. The occurrence of a field called White Alland on the heath edge near Broxtead is a further indication of this practice, for the term olde(d)land has the meaning of land that was only intermittently cultivated. Another White Allands is on the heath edge to the east of Stokerland. The additional term ‘white’ in both cases may refer to its use as dry pasture, for there are examples elsewhere of ‘white’ in this sense, as a distinction from ‘blackland’ or heath (Smith 1956, I, 273).

To the west and south of these demesne fields there was an irregular block of subdivided fields, all also on soil type 551g. The roads through these fields radiated fanwise from a small green named as Sandgrene (Pl. 37). A customary tenement there called Sandgrenehouse was occupied by William Burwell and he owned many of the strips in the adjacent fields. Most of the rest belonged to the two manorial lords (Miles Ferneley and Francis Burwell), but with a few glebe strips and other tenants’ strips amongst them. Despite its name, Sandgrene appears to overlie clay deposits, for the Ordnance Survey first edition map of 1881 names the settlement as Brickkiln, with several ‘old clay pits’ (and, presumably, a brick kiln) nearby.

To the east of the manor sites there was a larger block of subdivided fields, arranged in relatively large linear fields. This again was on soil type 551g and adjoined the common heath on its east side. The soil in these fields cannot have been very good as part of the area had become heathland by the nineteenth century. An earthwork survey in 1995 found no evidence for ridge-and-furrow in the surviving areas of heathland, which suggests that stetch ploughing was the traditional method of cultivation here (Podd 1995, sample strip 8). Though numerous, the strips belonged to only ten individuals, plus the glebe. There were numerous strips belonging to ‘Mr Burwell’, presumably indicating demesne land of the manor of Fen Hall, but apparently none belonging to the demesne of Sutton Hall. A large number also belonged to Robert Bourne, the holder of a tenement on the site of the present Vale Farm, the remainder belonged to tenants who had small tenement blocks on the 551e soil to the west of the strip fields and to the south of the sites of the manors. It is difficult to see any patterning in the arrangement of the strips, other than that there was a tendency for a tenant’s strips to be concentrated in the fields nearest to their house. In origin, this whole area may be the result of a relatively late expansion into what had been common heath; the common pasturage rights being replaced by an allotment of arable strips.

Along the north-western edge of the parish, adjoining the River Deben, there is a narrow strip of soil type 551e and on it there were several sizeable block holdings: one group around Methersgate (now Methersgate) another at Stokerland (now Ferry Farm) and a final one in the north of the parish at The Howe (now Sutton Hoo Farm). The fact that all the owners were styled ‘Mr’ suggests that these were substantial farms. A spur of soil 551g, projecting into this strip, was the site of a further irregular area of subdivided fields. All the strips in the fields closest to Ferry Farm belonged to William Wiseman, the tenant of Stokerland, while those nearer to Methersgate belonged to the small group of tenement holders in that area. As noted above, Stokerland was recognised as a separate manor, with the alias of Jennys by 1552. Confusingly, the 1629 map shows two groups of buildings, both belonging to William Wiseman, one labelled Stockerlands and the other Jennys. Jennys has now disappeared, but Stockerland survives as Ferry Farm. Stokerland was a Domedays vill and its pre-Norman origins are confirmed by a scatter of middle and late Saxon pottery in an adjacent field (DB Suffolk 6, 236; Newman pers. comm.). Margaret Gelling has suggested that the name is of Old Norse origin, with the meaning of ‘newly-cultivated land where there are tree stumps’ (Gelling 1992, 63). A Scandinavian influence is also shown in the name of the lost Domedays vill of Hundesthoft (containing Old Danish toft ‘a building site, a cutilage’), in the name of the adjacent parish of Eyke (Old Norse eik ‘an oak’) and in the lost Domedays vill of Clachestorp in Eyke.
Plate 35  Sutton, Suffolk. View across the more enclosed landscape at the southern end of the parish near Wood Hall

Plate 36  Sutton, Suffolk. View northwards across the former demesne and common fields north of the church. The hedges are indicative of late enclosure
The northern part of the parish has a dry sandy soil (though still classed as 551g) and was divided up into a number of several sheepwalks (individually-owned sheep pastures). The owners of The Howe and Stokerland had one each, as did two of the tenement holders at Mathersgate. The two manor lords also had a several walk each; the remainder was labelled as ‘the common heath of the manor of Sutton Hall’ and this extended along the eastern side of the parish. As with the foldcourses of Breckland, one of the primary purposes of these sheepwalks was to provide grazing for sheep that were then folded overnight on the arable lands, to enrich them with their dung. By this method, seemingly marginal soils could be kept in arable production.

Rabbits were also kept on Sutton Walks. To the north of Broxtead House there is an embanked circular enclosure (3 acres) which contains a long warren mound. This is shown on the first edition Ordnance Survey map of 1881. A pair of smaller mounds (without a visible enclosure) lie 280m the north and 240m to the west there is a rectangular embanked enclosure that formerly contained a cottage, reputed to have been occupied by a gamekeeper. In January 1828 a young man called Jacob Clarke was killed when a rabbit burrow on the Walks caved in, so that only his legs and backside were visible. About half a cartload of sand was said to have covered his body. The large warren mound is probably nineteenth-century in date and this fatal incident may even have taken place during its construction (SRO(I) Coroner’s Reports HB10:50/20/9.56).

No woodland is recorded at Sutton in Domesday Book, but in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries a number of coniferous plantations and belts were established on the heaths and other areas of poor soil. Henry Edwards owned (and had probably planted) a number of plantations around his farm at Broxtead by 1826 (Rushen 1902). These are shown on the Ordnance Survey old edition map of 1837. Also on this map are the more extensive plantations (including the large ‘Tangham Forest’) that had been planted by Lord Rendlesham in the early nineteenth century on the heaths in the adjacent parishes of Eyke and Capel St Andrew (Simper 1972, 19). This was part of a wider phenomenon noted in White’s Directory for 1855: ‘During the last sixty years, large Plantations have been made in various parts of the county, especially in the sand districts ... where many extensive tracts have been converted from warren and sheep-walks into productive enclosures’ (White 1855, 46). A later Lord Rendlesham sold 2,544 acres at Tangham to the Forestry Commission in 1920 and this now forms the core of Rendlesham Forest (Backhouse 1972, 16). On the west side of the parish in the early twentieth century a number of plantations were established, mainly as game cover, by Sir George Manners around Little Haddon Hall, which he had built overlooking the Deben in 1914 (Arnott 1946, 73, 76–7).

In 1942 part of the new Rendlesham Forest, together with an adjacent area of Sutton Common, was taken for the construction of an emergency airfield or ‘crash–drome’ which later became RAF Woodbridge (Freeman 1999, 188). Anti-glider ditches had already been dug across the open areas of the heath and in 1942 it was requisitioned by the army as a training area. After the war much of the former heathland was reclaimed for agriculture: 116 acres at Sutton Hoo, 240 acres at Methersgate, 160 acres of Sutton Common in 1952–55 and a further 174 acres on Ferry Farm and 133 acres on the Broxtead estate in 1955–64 (Trist 1971, 121).

Thus although subdivided fields were present at Sutton in 1629 they do not seem to have been part of any overall communal system. There is no surviving information on communal cropping and the terminology of the fields is confused. Some of the subdivided fields did indeed have ‘went’ names (Milwent, Thornwent, Oldhurdingswent), but so did two of the demesne fields (Netherdolewent and Upperdolewent), and several of the subdivided fields had ‘croft’ names (e.g. Thorncrofte, Wiscofte). A glebe terrier of 1613 records that the glebe was then in 69 pieces, varying in size from 1 rod to 6 acres and totalling 31 acres. Some of it lay in units with went names (Bernhill Went, Thorncrofte Went, Heathbridge Went, Swynstie Went, Acre Went and Coltswent) but some lay in crofts or closes (Thorncrofte, Lodhamclose and Alborough Close) (SRO(I) FFA 2701:19/108). Some of these are identifiable on the 1629 map, which shows a small group near the church and then a scatter in the subdivided fields north of Sandygrove and to the east of the main manor sites. There were also a couple of strips just north of Pettistree Hall, where most of the land was in closes.

The antiquity of some of the crofts and closes is suggested by the field-name The Inhams, which occurs on the 1629 map just to the east of the site of Fen Hall. This is derived from Old English innam meaning ‘a piece of land taken in or enclosed’ or ‘enclosed ground’ (Smith 1956, I, 303; Reaney 1935, 583). This was still an active term in fourteenth-century Felsted (see below), but even such a relatively ‘late’ date at Sutton would still have considerable implications for the date of enclosure here.

The land of the tenants was arranged in tenements, some of which were stated, in the sixteenth century, to be villicin tenements with acreware land while others were stated to be molland (‘rent-land’) tenements. This suggests that there were different categories of tenements, as at Worlingworth, the acreware ones probably being older. The names of the tenements can be matched with the surnames of tax-payers in the parish in 1327, e.g. Brokes (a molland tenent) with Amicia del Brok, and Cordeys (an acreware tenement) with Ralph Corde (Suffolk Subsidy Return 1906, 113–14). Several of the tenements included small pieces of land described either, in Latin, as a can(n)abarius or, in English, as a hempland (e.g. Cordis hempland and Caldwell Hempland).

The occurrence of the subdivided fields on the poorer soils suggests that they may have been more in the nature of ”outfields” to the tenement blocks beside them. The small number of holders of strips, together with the tendency for the strips to be concentrated in the fields closest to the farmsteads that they belonged to, must have made the extinction of the subdivided fields relatively easy. There was no parliamentary enclosure here and the strips had disappeared by the nineteenth century. Very little of the pattern of fields and tracks shown on the 1629 map in the northern half of the parish survived to re-appear on the tithe map of 1844, other than some general trends (SRO(I) FDA 247/Al/1a). But there was a higher survival rate in the southern half, on the 551e soil. This differential survival was probably linked to the nature of the field boundaries. An 1815 lease of Ferry Farm stipulated that all the hedges and fences were to be maintained, ‘except
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the fences on the walklands … which [he] … will not be obliged to keep up like the fences on the other lands … but … may have leave and liberty at all times … to sow a row of furze or whins [gorse] in lieu thereof which shall be deemed a sufficient fence on such walklands’ (SRO(I) HB17:52/15/3; Warner 1985, 45). This suggests that the boundaries in the north were probably considerably less substantial than those in the south. In both areas the eighteenth- or early nineteenth-century rationalisation of the landscape into large rectangular fields has meant less of a loss post-1950 than in many clayland areas of Suffolk. The ratio between the number of fields now and in the 1840s in the Sutton area is 1:2.7, whereas in the South Elmham ratios of 1:4.93 and 1:4.71 are to be found (Podd 1995, sample strip 8, contrasted with strip 3 and 4).

Except for a small cluster of houses around Sandgrene and along the road to the south of this small green, the settlement pattern shown on the 1629 map was predominantly one of dispersed farmsteads. The majority lay in the southern third of the parish, with a scattering along the river frontage to the north, but the large areas of heathland to the north and north-east were devoid of settlement. The modern pattern is similar, but there have been some significant changes. The Sandgrene settlement, which had been renamed ‘Brickkiln’ by the nineteenth century, survived until the early part of the twentieth century, but it is now deserted, its site being marked just by a triangular plot at the junction of some farm tracks. The houses on the road to the south, with one exception, have also gone. Their disappearance may have been connected with the rise of the new Sutton Hall, a short distance to the east. In compensation, lines of houses have sprung up on the straightened road (Woodbridge or Main Road) south of the church and the lane (Old Post Office Lane) at right-angles to it. Since at least the early nineteenth century there has also been a small cluster of houses on the lane between Wood Hall and Pettistree Hall, which is rather grandly called Sutton Street. Yet, despite the modern changes, Sutton still retains something of the character that W.G. Arnott noted in 1950: ‘Sutton is a curious spot, seemingly dead and lost in its sandy tracks which lead all over the place to lonely cottages and outlying farms’ (Arnott 1950, 105).

A large proportion of Sutton was fieldwalked by John Newman in the 1980s as part of the South-East Suffolk Survey (Newman 1989, 17–19; 1992, 25–38). The results from this, together with the series of excavations at Sutton Hoo and individual discoveries, have demonstrated a long history of occupation in this area, stretching back to the Neolithic period (Longworth and Kinnes 1980; Hummler 1993, 20–3; Carver 1998, 94–100). There is a group of Bronze Age round barrows on the heathland on the east side of the parish and ring-ditches, indicating flattened barrows, to the east of Sutton Hoo and on either side of Saxtead Bottom, a small valley to the east of Methersgate (Suffolk HER nos SUT 001, 058, 060–1, 064, 067, 124–6). An early Bronze Age round house was found underlying one of the famous Anglo-Saxon burial mounds (Mound 2) at Sutton Hoo. Also beneath Mound 2 was a series of parallel grooves that could be the result of early ploughing. Similar, but criss-crossing, grooves found under Mound 5 suggest cross-ploughing with an ard

Plate 38  Sutton, Suffolk. Detail of the 1629 map showing the Howhilles, now better known as the Sutton Hoo burial mounds. (c) British Library Board. All Rights Reserved. British Library Maps Deposit 1794. North to the left
Suffolk HER no. SUT 046. Excavations in 2000, about 500m to the north, in advance of the new Sutton Hoo Visitor Centre, revealed a bit more of this field system (Martin et al 2001, 87–8). A radiocarbon date (at 1 sigma) of cal AD 262–427 (cal AD 242–535 at 2 sigma, AA-43641 (GU-9470)) was obtained from hedera charcoal at the base of a re-cut of one of the ditches. This indicates that the system continued in use into the Roman period. The ‘fields’ are mainly square or oblong, and of two major sizes: the larger ones are about 1ha to 1.25ha (2.5–3 acres) in size, whilst the smaller ones contain about 0.25ha (0.6 acre). The smaller ones resemble prehistoric ‘Celtic fields’ recorded elsewhere in England, but the larger ones exceed the normal range for ‘Celtic fields’, which is usually between 0.2 to 0.5ha (C. Taylor 1975, 27). The larger fields do however resemble those recorded from Flixton (see South Elmham St Michael, above). In 1629 the area of this field system lay partly on the open sheepwalk belonging to the farm called The Howe, and partly on some of its fields, however there seems to be no correlation between the layout of the early fields and those of 1629. The boundary between the two soil types, 551e and 551g, runs through this area, but most of the fields appear to be on 551g.

Environmental studies suggest woodland clearance in the late Neolithic or early Bronze Age, followed by evidence for episodic cultivation for cereals and pasture. The soil became progressively more infertile and was podsolised by the time the burial mounds were constructed. Grazing predominated in the Middle Ages, followed by reversion to heath in the sixteenth or seventeenth century (Dimbleby 1975, 48–77; Carver 1993, 27; 1998, 67–8).

The most significant Roman site in the parish lay on a spur a kilometre to the south of the site of Sutton Hall, overlooking lower land to the south and east.99 Here there is a profusion of cropmarks of linear ditches and also of a probable villa. The site probably originated in the late Iron Age, and may have continued late, for there is also early Saxon material here (Suffolk HER no. SUT 022). Like Sutton Hall, this site straddles the boundary between soils 551e and 551g. The fieldwalking also showed up a light scatter of Roman pottery sherds in the area to the north-west of the site. This light Roman scatter could be interpreted as the result of using household waste to manure arable fields. Interestingly, this is one of the areas where there were subdivided fields in 1629. There were also light Roman scatters around Stokerland and on the southern edge of the prehistoric field system at Sutton Hoo, discussed above. There was less sign of activity in the southern part of the parish, around Pettistree Hall and Wood Hall, where later evidence indicates a greater amount of pasture (Newman pers. comm.).

In the early Saxon period, the Roman villa site may still have been occupied, but the royal burial mounds at Sutton Hoo are very much at the northern periphery of its likely territory. They straddle the boundary of the 551e and 551g soils and, in 1629, lay partly on the funnel entrance to Robert Mather’s sheepwalk and partly on his fields (Pl. 38). The 1629 map indicates four mounds here (out of the eighteen now known) and labels them as Howhilles — a name that probably stems from Old English hoh ‘a heel, a spur of land’, rather than Old Norse haugar ‘a burial mound’ (Gelling 1992, 61). The spur that the mounds stand on overlooks the Deben estuary and it is perhaps more likely that the mounds relate to a settlement on the western side of the River Deben, underlying the present-day town of Woodbridge. There is indeed a place called Kingston (Kyggestuna in 1086) on the southern outskirts of the town. The mounds would have been visible from that settlement, but not from the area of the villa. The landscape that the mounds were built on clearly had a long farming history and probably presented an open aspect, so that the mounds would have stood out on the skyline when viewed from Woodbridge. When the middle Saxon settlement on the site of Sutton Hall was established, it was probably named Sutton, ‘the south settlement’, because it lay to the south-east of Woodbridge.

8. Felsted, Essex (EANGL 13) (Fig. 11)

Old English, fledh+stede ‘the place/site in the field (‘open country’)’ (Reaney 1935, 421).

Felsted is a large parish, covering 6,426 acres (2,600ha) in the Chelmer valley in mid-north Essex. On the western and southern edges of the parish, drained by the River Chelmer, the Stebbing Brook and the River Ter, there are well-drained brown earths of the Ludford association (571x: typical argillic brown earth) on glaciofluvial drift, but the majority of the parish consists of clay loam soils of the Hanslope association (411d: typical calcareous pelosol) overlying chalky till. The latter, though heavier, are seldom seriously waterlogged. In the south-east corner of the parish there is also a small area with clay soils of the Hornbeam 3 association (582d: stagnogleyic paleo-argillic brown earth), these also overly chalky till and suffer seasonal waterlogging (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 209–12, 221–2, 237–41).

Domesday Book records that there was woodland for 630 pigs in Felsted in 1086 (DB Essex 15/1). This implies a substantial amount of woodland, perhaps around 1,000 acres. Much of the flat clayland area to the east of the River Ter was originally part of the Forest of Blackley (Blacholleheie c.1170 — Old English blæc hoh ‘black hollow wood’) otherwise called the Forest of Felsted, which in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was reckoned to be an outlier of the Royal Forest of Essex (French 1921, 235–8). In 1398 the ‘common right of feeding and pasture in the king’s forest of Blakehoeley’ belonged to the manor of Felsted, together ‘with all underwood and timber therein being sufficient cartebote and ploughbote’ (Cal Inq Miscellaneous VI, 85, no.183). By 1576 the wood in Blakeley had been reduced to a coppice-wood of 8 acres (ERO M158/1, f.134ii). Bordering the west side of this forest were a string of interconnected medium-sized greens: Thistley Green (called Fystye Grene in 1576 and then contained 12 acres), Willows Green (Woodende Grene 1576, 20 acres), Milch Hill (Mylyce Hyll grene 1576, size not stated), 140
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Bartholowem Green (Bawdewyns Grene 1576, 6 acres) and culminating at the northern end in the former large common called Fairy or Vairy Common. This was called La Farhaie c.1170 and Varye common alias fayriere Common in 1576, when it was said to contain 80 acres. The common rights were then stated to belong to:

such of the tenants of the said manor as be Inhabitants and dwellers in and upon the same have onelie common of pasture for there catell and no other tenants of the saide manor … Upon which common or waste grounde there are growing certen trees comonlie called hussbandes and other okes ashes and suche like trees which the lord may fell and carre awaie frome thense at his libertie and pleasure.

The name is derived from Old English fearh (ge)heag ‘pig enclosure/wood’. This derivation is supported by a manorial survey of c.1170 which refers to the pasturage here that was held by the swineherd (Herbagium de Faihaie ii sol’ quod porcarius tenet) (Charters and Custumals 1982, 44). A survey of 1223/4 records that the swineherd held a virgate of land — one half for the care of the woods and the other for the custody of the pigs. It further records that the swineherd had made five hedges or enclosures (hesias) around Farheie and that his pigs had pannage in Blaccuolheie (Charters and Custumals 1982, 94). The common was enclosed in 1822, its area being given in the award as 125 acres (Tate and Turner 1978, 111).

There also seems to have been woodland on the west side of the River Ter. A promontory towards the south there bears three inter-connected greens: Pye’s Green (or Lynders Grene alias Molehill grene in 1576, 2 acres), Whelpstones Green (or Lynders Grene alias Molehill grene in 1576, 20 acres; the prefix micel means ‘great’) and Whelpestones Green (Whelpston Green 1576, 3 acres). In 1576 Molehill Green lay adjacent to a demesne grove of the manor of Helpston’s called Roberts grove, which was probably part of the original lime wood (Old English lind hyrst) that gave rise to the green names (ERO M158/1, f.49). Further north, to the west of Graunt Courts, a sizeable wood called Grand Court Wood is shown on Chapman and André’s Map of Essex, 1777. This appears as Grauntcours park, containing 34 acres, in 1576. Nearby, in 1576, was Chapmans woode, containing 24 acres, which was said to be ‘parcel of the manor of Grandcourts’ (ERO M158/1, f.231 and 134ii). These probably originated in the park called Rugeheie and Barheie recorded c.1170 (Charters and Custumals 1982, 44).

Before 1066 Felsted had been a five-hide estate of Earl Ælfgar of Mercia (died 1062x65) (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1965, 217). After the Norman Conquest Queen Matilda, wife of William I, granted four hides of the estate to Holy Trinity Abbey in Caen, Normandy (DB Essex 15/1; Hart 1957, 10 no. 90; Charters and Custumals 1982, xxv). The remaining hide was divided between the curiously-named Roger God-Save-Ladies (Deus salvet dominas) and Gilbert son of Saloman (DB Essex 72/2, 73/1; Keats-Rohan 1999, 213, 407). The former held, as manor, half a hide and 30 acres, which had belonged to a man named Wulfsi under Ælfgar; while the latter held 30 acres that had belonged to an unnamed free man.

The main manor, often called Felsted Bury, remained with Caen Abbey until 1338, when as the holding of an alien abbey, it was seized by the Crown. Around 1420 it was granted to Syon Abbey in Middlesex. At the dissolution of that abbey it passed, in 1538, into the avaricious hands of Sir Richard Rich, Chancellor of the Court of Augmentations (later created Lord Rich) (Letter and Papers XIII(1), 245 no.646 (42); Morant 1768, II, 417). Rich also acquired Leez (or Leighs) Priory, which lay on the boundary between Felsted and Little Leighs (the parish to the south) which became his chief seat (Letter and Papers X, 420 no.1015 (33)). By the time of his death in 1567 Rich had added most of the other manors and sub-manors in Felsted to his estate. He also had Littley Park, a medieval deer park of some 648 acres (262ha) to the south-west of Leez Priory in Great Waltham parish. The Rich family extended this to include a part of Felsted. They also created two new and contiguous deer parks on the north and west sides of Leez Priory. The larger of these (c.471 acres or 190ha) was called Pond Park and it lay wholly in Felsted; the smaller park (c.140 acres or 57ha), apparently nameless, lay partly in Felsted and partly in Little Leighs (Hunter 1994a and b).

There are three medieval surveys of this manor: one of c.1106–1113, another of c.1170 and a third of 1223/4, which exists in two copies (Charters and Custumals 1982, surveys A, B, D and E). These give details of the tenants and their holdings, but very little about their locations. There is also a large and detailed written survey by Edward Worsely for the second Lord Rich in 1576 (ERO M158/1). This does give abuttals for the various holdings, but it is not always clear to which of the various manors or sub-manors they belonged, for by the time this survey was made nearly all of them belonged to Lord Rich and their lands had been amalgamated into one large estate. Map evidence is more scarce: there are five individual farm maps made by James Cradock in 1725 and one by Thomas Skynner dated 1736, but otherwise the first overall map is the tithe map of 1837.

The site of the manor is now Bury Farm and this lies adjacent to the church in a roughly rectangular hall-and-church complex. The name Bury Farm is an example of the developed, Middle English, usage of Old English burh to mean ‘a manor house or estate’ (see Chapter 3, 1.ii) (Smith 1956, I, 59; Parsons and Styles 2000, 77–8). The term also occurs in some of the lands belonging to this manor in 1576: Berrye Langelande, Littleberrye Langlande, Boughoue Lande and Oldberrye, as well as Felsted Burie itself. The 1576 survey indicates that the manor place was surrounded by the fields of a block demesne that then covered 345 acres of arable, pasture and meadow. These fields varied in size from about an acre to 35 acres, with an average of 14 acres. A repetition of names suggests, however, that some of the units were originally larger, for instance there were five pieces called Redinge, suggesting an original demesne field of at least 96 acres. The overall size of the demesne also seems to have been reduced by 1576. The survey of c.1106–13 states that the farmer of the demesne was to maintain 300 acres sown with corn, which, allowing for fallows, might suggest a cultivated area of between 450 and 600 acres. In 1298 468 acres of corn were being weeded and in 1324 the demesne was said to contain 600 acres of arable, of which 60 acres were poor land (Charters and Custumals 1982, 1–1i). In 1398 there were 610 acres of arable, 34 acres of meadow and 30 acres of pasture (Cal Inq Miscellaneous (Chancery) VI, 85 no.183). All this suggests a core block...
demesne that covered about 11% of the parish, but was concentrated on the best soils — the brown soils on the sloping land beside the River Chelmer and the Stebbing Brook (Pl. 39). The occurrence of the field-name Redinge in this core block demesne is at first sight surprising as this is derived from Old English rydling meaning ‘a clearing or an assart’, a name more usually associated with marginal areas brought into cultivation at a late stage (Smith 1956, II, 90–1). However the answer must be that the field took its name from a localised area of poor ground, for the 1576 survey records a small demesne wood called Redinge Grove here, lying adjacent to Le Moor. The ‘moor … in the field of Redyng’ (mora … in campo de Redyng) referred to in the 1223/4 survey was probably this moor (Charters and Custumals 1982, 96). The Ordnance Survey map of 1881 also shows a group of very small fields, rich in trees, in this grove/moor area, suggesting that it continued to be a problem area. Generally, however, this was an area of substantial arable fields. By 1837 the larger fields had been subdivided into smaller units that averaged about 15 acres, but the overall pattern was probably little different to that of 1576. In 1576 there was also an area of detached block demesne called Blakeley at the eastern end of the parish, that arose through medieval assarting in the former Forest of Blackley. The fields here, in 1837, were mostly rectangular and averaged about 15 to 20 acres in size.

The church of Felsted and its glebe land was impropriated by Caen Abbey from an early date. In 1539 the rectory was acquired by Sir Richard Rich, together with a 6-acre field called ‘the Rydeing’ (Morant 1768, II, 421). The 1576 survey merely notes that the rectory was impropriated and was then in the hands of the lord. The glebe field called Rydeing was presumably then one of the pieces of demesne land called Redinge (see above). This suggests a former small block glebe formed out of demesne land and then merged back with it. In 1576 the vicarage glebe consisted just of a house, garden and little orchard in Churche Ende (ERO M158/1, ff.47 and 134). It was called Endvilles Garden, which suggests that it was formed out of land that had belonged to Enfields manor (see below).

The seven or eight small manors or sub-manors in Felsted have complex histories. At least two were formed by sub-infeudation from the main manor. In the twelfth century Simon de Felsted was the farmer of the main manor, under the abbey of Caen, but appears to have sub-infeudated parts of it to himself, leading to complaints from the abbey and a survey of his deprivations c. 1170 (Charters and Custumals 1982, 39–46). Simon had had control of all the English estates of Caen Abbey in the reign of Stephen and he had used his position to enrich himself (Charters and Custumals 1982, xi–xii; Walmsley 1991, 99). A proportion of these lands, at least, descended to his son, William de Felsted. Margery, William’s daughter and co-heiress, married Walter de Grandcourt and their part of the inheritance became the small manor of Grant Courts, centred on the existing large house of that name in the northern part of the parish (Charters and Custumals 1982, xii–xiii). The manor is situated beside the River Ter, but it is otherwise on not very favoured flat clayland. It seems, in fact, to have been more suited to woodland. Among Simon’s holdings was a park called Rugheheie and Barheheie (both names incorporating the element (ge)hæg meaning ‘a wood’) and it is likely that they formed the core of this manor, parts surviving into the sixteenth century and beyond as Grand Court Wood (Grauntcourts park in 1576) and Chapman’s Wood. The large rectangular fields around Grant Courts are probably the result of woodland clearance and disparking. Earlier attrition of the wood probably produced the linear green called Grand Court Wood, which adjoined the west side of Grand Court Wood. This green’s name is well suited to an area of ancient woodland, for it was originally Grendesmeretye — ‘the mere or pool of Grendel’; the most famous Grendel of course being the man-eating monster of the Anglo-Saxon poem Beowulf. It was a tye or small green (Grendesmeretye) by the early fifteenth century (Reaney 1935, 422). By 1537 both the main manor and Grant Courts were in the tenure of Roger Wentworth, under the abbey of Syon, and both were granted to Sir Richard Rich (Morant 1768, II, 417).

According to the eighteenth-century historian Philip Morant, the manor of Havering(es) was also dependent on that of Felsted Bury, but noted that its mansion house stood in Rayne, a village on the north-western boundary of Felsted. Presumably this is the later Havering’s Farm which lies on the north side of the Roman road called Stane Street, which forms the boundary between Felsted and Rayne. The 1576 survey states that it abutted south, west and east on Varye Grene (Fairy Common) (ERO M158/1, f.2). The land here must have been poorly-drained clay and this manor was probably originated as a freeman’s assart. There is nothing to distinguish the fields of this manor from the humbler holdings beside it. The manor possibly takes its name from the family of Robert Willame of Havering, whose mother was holding land in dower in Felsted and Havering in 1332 (Cal Inq Miscellaneous (Chancery) II, 314–15, no.1290). Morant states that the manor was sold by Roger Wentworth to Sir Richard Rich in 1539 (Morant 1768, II, 417).

The Domesday estate of Roger God-Save-Ladies passed by descent, c.1311–3, to a branch of the Glanville family and became known as Glanvills manor (Round 1904–5, 231–2; Craig 1996). It later passed to the Naylinghurst and Herlyng families and, according to Morant, was finally sold by Robert Tirrel to Lord Rich in 1540. At the death of John de Naylinghurst in 1362 the holding consisted of a messuage, 60 acres of land, 5 acres of meadow and 3 acres of wood, held in chief ‘by service of finding a stable for a horse when the king shall pass through the countryside’ (Cal Inq Post Mortem XI, 304–5 no.395). After that it was integrated with the rest of Felsted, its manor house becoming Glandfield’s Farm. The lands of this manor form a continuation of those of the Felsted Bury demesne, sharing the same brown soils on the sloping land beside the River Chelmer. The fields, in 1387, were also similar in size to the Felsted Bury fields to the north. Domesday Book records that Roger received three virgates of land, suggesting that it was already in some recognisable organisation (DB Essex 15/1). There is a suggestion of a co-axial layout at right angles to the River Chelmer that is probably rooted in the divisions of the original demesne fields.

Enfields manor is named after a family of that name. A Richard de Enefeld appears in a survey of Felsted Bury of 1223/4 as holding some freehold intakes of that manor’s land, although the manor itself, according to Morant, was not dependent on Felsted Bury (Charters and Custumals 1982, 103; Morant 1768, II, 417). John de Enefeld of
Plate 39  Felsted, Essex. View southward across former demesne land of Felsted Bury, situated on the good quality sloping land beside the River Chelmer. The building in the distance is the manorial watermill, Abechilde Mill.

Plate 40  Felsted, Essex. View southward across the long-enclosed land between Banister Green and Frenches Green.
Felsted died in 1342 holding 40 acres of arable, 1 acre of meadow and 6 acres of wood from the king in chief and 3 acres held of the manor of Felsted (Cal Inq Post Mortem VIII, 245, no.368). According to Morant, his daughter married Robert de Wells of Rayne. The manor was sold, together with Glanvills, by Robert Tirrell to Sir Richard Rich in 1540. In the 1576 survey the lands of Enfields and Glanvills are often referred to jointly, suggesting that they were close together, and this is further suggested by some of the abutments (for example ERO M158/1, f.120i). This suggests that this manor may represent the Domeday estate of Gilbert son of Salomon, which took its name from the de Kemesek family.

The other four small manors have more uncertain origins, but one possibility is that they evolved out of the holdings of the four unnamed sokemen (increased to five by 1106–13) who, though belonging to the main manor, were separately listed as holding 55 acres in Felsted in 1086 (DB Essex 15/1; Chinnibull ed. 1982, 34). Helpestons Manor, a moated house in the centre of Felsted, was the site of Helpestons alias Whelpstone manor. It takes its name from the Helpston family, who held an eighth of a knight's fee in Felsted in 1346–50. This was a half of a quarter fee that had belonged to Walter de Hernestede in 1303, but its origin is otherwise unknown (Feudal Aids II, 142, 165). The status of the owners was not particularly high, for Edmund Helpstone was described merely as a franklin in the Poll Tax of 1381 (Poll Taxes I 1998, 208). In 1540 it was sold by Edward Bury to Lord Rich (Morant 1768, II, 418). The manor lies on the north side of the River Ter, adjacent to Molehill Green. The indications of woodland here suggest that this manor originated as a freeman's assart. Its fields, in 1837, were similar to the freeman's assart. Its fields, in 1837, were similar to the

Concerning Frenches manor, Morant states that 'the manor-house is situated in Felsted on the great common, and is now called Frenches at the Fairy, near the Windmill, where the court was formerly held in a gravel-pit'. This indicates that it was situated on Fairy Common and can be identified as Drapers Farm, on the western edge of the former common (French 1916). Morant further states that, prior to its acquisition by Lord Rich, it was held by Roger Wentworth, in free socage from the manor of Rayne (Morant 1768, II, 418). Quite how it came to belong to Rayne is unclear, but as (according to Morant) the Welles family of Rayne married the heiress of the Kemesesks family (see Camsix manor below) it is possible that they inherited this holding from them. In 1204/5 Geoffrey le Frances acquired 10 acres in Felsted and Rayne from William fitz-Herbert and in 1223/4 a William Francus held half a virgate and an assart freely from the abbey of Caen (Charters and Custumals 1982, 101). Its location beside Fairy Common suggests that it had a poorly-drained clay soil and, like Haveringes manor on the north side of the common, it probably originated as a freeman's assart.

In the south-west corner of the parish, adjoining Hertford End, is Camsix Farm. This was the site of a manor that took its name from the de Kemesek family. The family came from Kemesese in Flanders and first appear in England in the mid-twelfth century as knights of the counts of Boulone, holding land under them at Exning in Suffolk (Farrer 1920, 137–9, 142; Calendarium Genealogicum, 58). The earliest record of them in the Felsted area is in 1227, when Henry de Kemesek witnessed a charter of the prior of Leez relating to land in Felsted (Charters and Custumals 1982, 20). In 1236–7 the same Henry quitclaimed to Humphrey de Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex, 100 acres of land in the adjoining parish of Great Waltham (Feet of Fines Essex I, 116, no.549). Henry's grandson, Edmund de Kemesek, died in 1288, holding (in addition to 3.5 knights' fees elsewhere) a messuage, 106 acres of arable, 6 acres of meadow and 8 acres of pasture in Felsted from John de Belencumbre and his partners, at a yearly rent of 6 marks and 2 shillings (Cal Inq Post Mortem II, 413, no.677). The Belencumbre interest seems to stem from the acquisition by Robert de Belencumbre, together with Richard de Estone, John le Keu and Reginald de Selverle, of 6 marks rent in Felsted from Ranulph de Monte Caniiso (Montchensy) in 1285–6 (Feet of Fines Essex II, 52 no.330). There were two Ranulph de Montchensys living at this time, but neither has a known connection with Felsted (Fowler 1938, 4–6, 9–10). In the early fourteenth century the heiress of the Kemesesks married into the Welles family of Rayne. However the manor later belonged to Leez Priory and passed to Sir Richard Rich at the dissolution (Morant 1768, II, 100–1).

The holding included the site of a free chapel, in existence by 1329, dedicated to St Margaret called the 'Chapel of Camseke or Camsey's alias Hertford Chapel', the patronage of which also belonged to Leez Priory (Morant 1768, II, 421). Quite how this estate came to the de Kemeses family is not clear. The lands of this manor occupy the southern end of a band of good, well-drained soils that, further north, were utilised for the demesnes of Felsted Bury, Enfields and Glanvills. As such it was clearly an important holding, but its origin remains obscure. When mapped in 1725 it formed a self-contained block covering 281 acres (ERO D/DCW, PS Chamzhes Farm).

Leez Priory occupies a peculiar position straddling the Felsted/Little Leighs parish boundary. It was founded c.1220 by Ralph Gernon, a knight and marshal of King John, who held land at Theydon Gurnon, Great Birch and other places in Essex (Farrer 1925, 202–7). At his death in 1247 he held a manor in Leigs of the heirs of Ongar by service of a third of a knight's fee (Cal Inq Post Mortem I, 292, no. 850). The Honour of Ongar had complex origins, but included some lands that had belonged in 1086 to Eudo Daiifer ('the steward') (Round 1900; Farrer 1925, 207). This suggests that the Geron holding in Little Leighs originated in the two-guard manor that Richard de Sackville held from Eudo in Lega in 1086 (DB Essex 25/21). The Gernons also inherited an interest in the Sackville holding in Rockland, Norfolk (Farrer 1925, 206). Shortly after its foundation, Leez Priory acquired half-a-virgate of land in Felsted from the monastery of Caen (Charters and Custumals 1982, 19–20, charter dated 1227). This lay near a wood called Prestehay and an unnamed mill that must have been Hertfordend Mill. This was probably the area to the west of the priory that was later added to Littley Park.

On the north-west boundary of the the parish, adjoining Stebbing and Great Dunmow, there is an area that appears as a separate vill in Domesday Book. There it is called Horstedafort and it belonged to a certain Adam as the tenant of Durand Malzor (DB Essex 63/2). P.H. Reaney suggested that Horstedafort was the ford where Stane...
Street crossed the Stebbing Brook — a place now called Stebbingford Bridge. He further suggested that the surrounding area was called ‘Horsted’ (probably Old English *hōrh steðe* ‘muddy place’), giving rise to lost places called Great and Little Horsted in Great Dunmow (Reaney 1937; 1935, 423, 459, 476). Nearby in Felsted there is a farm now called Horstages, but formerly called Horstedes. A John de Horstede held, freely, 3 acres in Alkeresfeld, of the manor of Felsted Bury in 1223/4 (Charters and Custumals 1982, 100). While in 1303 the tenants of the land that was John de Horstede’s held an eighth of a knight’s fee in Felsted (Feudal Aids II, 142).

The use of a genitive in the name Horstages/Horstedes makes it likely that this farm takes its name from a family that originated at Horsted in Dunmow, though it is close to Stebbingford. In the tax list of 1381 Walter Horstede was described as a free tenant (*Poll Taxes* I 1998, 208). In the 1576 survey, *Horsteds* is described as a free tenement, surrounded by its six fields containing 22 acres. The name of one field, *Dovehouse croft*, indicates that the holders of the tenement had a dovecote, which was usually a manorial right.

Recent excavations about 150m to the south-east of Stebbingford Farm have revealed the site of a farmstead with mid-twelfth-century origins. The site seems to have been deserted in the mid-fourteenth century, perhaps as a result of the Black Death (Medlycott 1996). This cannot be identified with certainty in the manorial surveys, but either it or the existing Stebbingford Farm is likely to be *Colmans Yarde Lande*, which in 1576 abutted west on the Stebbing Brook, north on the road from Dunmow to Braintree (Stane Street, now the A120) and east on the road from Felsted to Stebbing. Colmans was in existence by c.1170 and is likely to represent one of the villein holdings recorded in Domesday Book, though nothing of this date was found in the excavations.

Domesday Book records that the main manor of Felsted had 22 villeins in 1066, which were reduced to 20 in 1086, 23 bordars in 1066 and 33 in 1086, and 11 slaves (*DB Essex* 15/1). In 1106–13 there were 25 virgate holders (representing the villeins of Domesday), 19 bordars holding 4 virgates of demesne and 20 other bordars, together with 11 serfs and 3 ancillae (Charters and Custumals 1982, 33–4). The survey of c.1170 lists 113 holdings, of which 8 were described as being of one virgate, 29 were of half a virgate and one was of three-quarters of a virgate, representing 23.25 ‘full’ virgates. The 1223/4 survey lists 136 holdings, of which 8 were of one virgate, 26 were of half a virgate and one was of a quarter of a virgate, making 21.25 ‘full’ virgates. This figure includes two half-virgates held by sokemen; a third sokeman holding, described as *Terra Child*, was said ‘to defend itself’ for 5 acres (*defendet se pro v acriis*). The ‘defends itself’ formula was frequently used for ware acres, which suggests that *Terra Child* is identical to the half-virgate holding of Adric the child (*Adricus infans*) in the c.1170 survey, which was rated at 5 ware acres (*pro dimidia virgata, pro v acriis de war[a]*). Ware is only mentioned three times in the c.1170 survey so its particular significance here is hard to judge (for further discussion of ware acres see Chapter 3, 1.vii). Collectively the virgate-holders seem to have been called *gavelmanni* ‘rent-payers’. There were also 38 smallholders, 14 described as *cottomanni* cot-men and 24 as *smalemanni* ‘smallmen’, who represent the bordars of the earlier surveys. There were also 8 *acermanni* ‘ploughmen’ belonging to the manor, descendants of the earlier serfs and slaves. The 1576 survey mentions *Acreman Lane*, which appears to be the lane that runs between Garnetts and Causeway End, a short distance to the east of the village. This may be where the ploughmen’s holdings were located. The 1223/4 survey concludes with a list of 56 holdings of demesne parcels, assarts, meadows, woods and ways ‘taken from the court of Felsted’ (*subtracta a curia de Felsted*). The implication is that these were now freeholdings.

The survey of 1576 begins its section on the customary lands with the holdings called ‘le halfe yarde’ [i.e. half-virgate] tenements (*ERO M158/1, f.61–83*). This lists 22 half-yard lands and one quarter-yard land. The names of half of these are derived from the names of holders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries — Wades (*Herebert Wad c.1170*), Aylewyns (*Ailwin 1223–4*), Reingoldes *x2* (*Reinald holding a full virgate c.1170*), Ravons (*Corvi 1223–4*), Levinges (*Living 1223–4*), Bridge house (*Henry de Ponte c.1170*), Mores (*More c.1170*), Sawardes (*Saward 1223–4*), Algor alias Frences alias Fages (*Algor Colle c.1170*), Harvies (*Hervi c.1170*), Swaynes alias Swynes (*Hosbert porcarius c.1170*), and Colmans (*Virun Coleman c.1170*). This suggests that the holdings were substantially the same as those of the twelfth century. The survey also reveals a large number of freeholders (folios 1–50) and customary tenants called ‘le auciente custumarie tenants’ (folios 84–115), together with a smaller number of customary tenants of land that was formerly part of the demesnes of Felsted and Grauntcourt manors (folios 116–120).

The abuttals given in the survey indicate that the majority of the holdings were of block type, each farmstead having its own cluster of fields around or near it, often using the phrase *lacet in simill* ‘lying together’ (Pl. 40). Enough of the holdings can be identified, either precisely or approximately, to indicate that the dispersed settlement pattern shown on nineteenth-century maps must have existed in 1567 and in the twelfth century (French 1916). Many of the farms are clustered around the twenty or so small- to medium-sized greens that are dotted about the parish, giving the appearance of a polyfocal settlement (Hunter 1995, 142) (Pl. 41). Many of the greens are linked by roads with wide verges that probably functioned as ‘droves’ for moving livestock between pastures, and for providing some additional feeding (Pl. 42). As already mentioned, some of these greens lie adjacent to former wooded areas and probably represent intakes from the woods, but others are no more than small triangles of ‘waste’ at the junctions of roads. The earliest recorded green is Bannister Green, which occurs as *Bernestey* (Beorn’s tye or green) in 1225 (Reaney 1935, 421). About two-thirds of the locatable yard-land holdings are sited on or near the greens:

- Pye’s Green: Reingoldes, Raymondes, Levinges
- Frenches Green: Jacobbes
- Cock Green: Colmans quarter-yard land
- Bannister Green: Ravens, Aylewyns, Reingoldes, Harvies
- Gransmores Green: Lutcocks, Wades
- Fairy Common: Swaynes
- Beles Green: Beles and Hurtelinges
- Watchhouse Green: Smythes
- Bartholomew Green: Gatewardes
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Of these, only eight have names that tie in with twelfth- and thirteenth-century tenants. The other third of the locatable half-yard lands are not located on greens: Colmans, Sawardes, Redes, Algoris, Mores, Bridgehouse, Chritchurche and Morises. Of these, five commemorate twelfth- and thirteenth-century tenants. This suggests that the earliest half-yard lands belong to a phase of dispersed settlement that pre-dates the greens, but that they then developed in tandem with the greens from perhaps the twelfth century.

None of the half-yard lands has a moated farmstead. Moats in Suffolk are closely linked with manorial sites or freehold farms, the moat being largely an indicator of social status (Martin 1999a, 60–1). The same seems to be largely true of Felsted too, for moats occur at Helpestons Manor, Chaffix Farm (free tenement of Chabbocks 1576; John Chabbac, free tenant 1381, Walter Chabbot 1327), Common Farm (?free tenement of Yardsles 1576) and Seabrooks Farm (?)free tenement of Frenches or Allen’s 1576). The moat at Steven’s Farm seems to be anomalous in that Stevens in 1576 was an ‘ancient customary tenement’, but John Stevenson, after whom it is probably named, occurs as a free tenant in 1381 (ERO M158/1/f.25, 10–11, 30, 32, 92, 93; Poll Taxes I 1998, 208). There is also a doubtful moat at Woods Farm, which was the customary tenement of Lyonslye in 1576. The moats at Greenfields Farm, Poplars, Little Grandcourts Farm and Potash Farm have not yet been linked with a holding.82

The 1576 survey mentions forty-seven entities that bear the suffix ‘-field’ (e.g. Cotefielde, Ryefielde, Brodefielde etc) representing twenty-nine separate names. Described variously as fields, closes or crofts, they varied in size from 2 acres to 30 acres, with an average of about 11 acres. The survey does however state that some of the fields were originally larger and these need to be carefully considered as to their origins and nature. Forefield, to the east of the Camsix land, is described as a close of arable and pasture containing 60 acres, ‘now divided into five parcels’ (ERO M158/1/f.84). It belonged to John Drane and although described as customary land, it contained a demesne fishpond. This is likely to be the 60 acres of arable land, held by John Drane the Hunter, that Sir Richard Rich acquired from the Abbey of Syon in 1537 (Letter and Papers XII (1), 606, no.1330 (54)). The hunting connection is interesting because in 1576 this land lay adjacent to another area of customary land described as Le Conynger, i.e. ‘the rabbit warren’ (ERO M158/1, f.100ii). Hunting and warren rights were usually aspects of lordship, which suggests that this area was formerly demesne land. It may therefore be significant that both Forefield and Le Conynger later lay within the area of Pond Park. On its east side Forefield adjoined closes described as Perynothing grove (3 acres) and Peryfield (5 acres) (ERO M158/1/f.84). Both were described as closes of pasture, but in the former the rights were limited to herbage and pannage, suggesting that it was in fact a wood pasture. It was probably the Perynagh ‘perry hedge’ mentioned in the c.1170 survey (Charters and Customals 1982, 43). Lands called parvum Pirifeld and Pirifeld (‘perry field’) were among those described as ‘subtracted from the court’ in the 1223/4 survey. In 1240–1 the latter was described as a holding of 25 acres, formerly held by Master John de Warlemont, proctor and steward of Felsted from at least 1230 to his death in 1240/1 (Charters and Customals 1982, 25 and xliv).

Further to the north, on the west side of Acreman Lane, there was an area called Levinges feldes, containing 20 acres of arable ‘divided into divers parcels’. This is listed among the ‘ancient customary’ lands and was held in 1576 by Thomas Wyseman, gent., ‘by divers copies of court rolls’ (ERO M158/1/f.112ii). Wyseman appears to have been one of the major tenants, holding both free and customary lands, and his holding evolved into the ‘farm called the Place’ that was mapped in 1736 (ERO D/DHt/P7). Wyseman’s customary tenement called Pyes, together with a 12ft x 40ft purpresture or encroachment onto Felsted Street and a freehold called Maskyns garden, became the house and yards of Felsted Place and Levinges feldes became three fields, called Dovehouse Field, Pale Pond Field and Dool Field. The use of the term ‘dool’ is interesting in view of the earlier reference to ‘divers parcels’, for a dool was an East Anglian dialect term for ‘a boundary marker in an unenclosed field’, though it could also be used in the sense of a grassy strip (see Chapter 3, 4.x) (Forby 1830, I, 96). Together they suggest the presence of a common field here, but other evidence suggests a more complicated story.

The name implies that this land once belonged to someone called Leving (Old English Leofing) and the name is indeed recorded in the c.1170 and the 1223/4 surveys. In the c.1170 survey, Aimer Living is recorded as holding 8 acres and an assart (Charters and Customals 1982, 41). In the 1223/4 survey the name occurs in three places: firstly, a Living occurs as the tenant of a half-virgate holding (Charters and Customals 1982, 93). Secondly, among the cotmanni there is a Leyving. The survey notes that ‘in the time of William of Rodborough the said Leyving released to the lady abbess [i.e. of Caen] one moor that he held in the field of Redyng and that croft called Polcroft’ (Charters and Customals 1982, 96). Thirdly, in the section devoted to former demesne parcels, assarts etc ‘subtracted from the court of Felsted’, there is a reference to an ‘R. Living’. This states that Roger the bailiff took one piece of land and enclosed it, afterwards, by means of William of Rodborough, Roger Auude and the council of the vill, it was handed over to R. Living at a rent of 12d per annum (Charters and Customals 1982, 103). The first transaction is only roughly datable, by the reference to William of Rodborough, to the period 1192–1223/4; the second one, by the involvement of the Roger Auude, would appear to date to c.1219–23/4.86

Some of these lands can be located. The 1576 survey indicates the lands of a customary half-yardland holding called Levinges were located to the north of the road linking Pye’s Green and Cricks Green, but that a free tenement also called Levinges was situated on the south side of the same road. There was also another free tenement called Levinges on the north-east side of Bannister Green (ERO M158/1/f.77, 44 and 32). As already noted, the moor in Redyng field was probably situated to the west of Felsted village, but the location of Polcroft is otherwise unrecorded. The name indicates a croft containing a pool and it may be significant that part of Levinges feldes was later called Pale Pond Field and a large pond is indicated on the 1881 Ordnance map.

What is perhaps significant is the hint that some of Leyng/Living’s holding had formerly been demesne land. It is possible it includes some of the lands that are recorded among the lesser encroachments on the Felsted demesne in the survey of c.1170. In addition to Simon de
Plate 41  Felsted, Essex. Frenches Green, one of a number of small greens in the parish. The building on the left belongs to Frenches Farm

Plate 42  Felsted, Essex. Broad drove road between Willows Green and Thistley Green
Felsted’s major depredations, his brother-in-law Robert held two ‘pieces’ and a ‘moor’, the same Robert and his brother Eilwin son of Sewulf held another piece, and Seman the reeve held two pieces of the cultura of the abbess and one small field (unam parvum campum) (Charters and Custumals 1982, 45). These lands are not clearly identifiable in the 1223/4 survey and it is more than possible that some had passed into the hands of Living.

Close to Levinges Fieldes, but on the east side of Acreman Lane, was another area with larger fields. This was called Martens Lande and is mentioned twice in the 1576 survey. The first entry refers to 24 acres of arable and pasture here that was formerly demesne land ‘divided in divers parcels’ (ERO M158/1, f.116i). The heading to the section containing this entry refers to customary land that was formerly part of the demesne land of the manor of Felsted cum Grauntcorters ‘formerly parcel of the waste of the lord now demised by copyhold’. The second entry is for Martens Lande et Vanne Lande alias Vallande and refers to 30 acres of arable and pasture, divided into four parcels (ERO M158/1, f.88i). The former demesne origin is explicitly stated in the one entry, but not in the other. This land may also owe its origins to the depredations on the Felsted demesne by Simon de Felsted, for in 1200–01 a certain Martin the Clerk, the brother and heil of William de Felsted, granted half a virgate of land in Felsted to Sabelina de Hadfeld, who was probably his sister (Feet of Fines Essex I, 22 no.34). The pasture of this holding was presumably in the part called Vanne Lande, for this is an example of the Middle English term ven, specific to Essex, which means ‘fen, marsh’ and must refer to land flanking the south-flowing small tributary of the Ter that adjoins the east side of Martens Lande (Smith 1956, I, 170).

A common thread in these rather complicated field histories is a link with demesne land and it does appear that all these larger fields originated as pieces of marginal demesne land, some of it actually classified as ‘waste’. From the twelfth century onwards there seems to have been a tendency for these to be let out to or acquired by favoured individuals who were often officials of the manor. In the case of Levinges Fieldes and Martens Lande there does seem to have been an element of subdivision or perhaps sub-letting into smaller parcels, but probably not as actual ‘common fields’. Both areas are close to Acreman Lane (Martens Land actually adjoins it) and it is possible that the history of subdivision stems from an early use as the location for the smallholdings of the ploughmen (acermanni) who were located on the demesne. It may also be significant that Levinges Fieldes lies immediately to the south of the small crofts associated with the houses in the village and it may be that the subdivisions were something akin to allotments for tradesmen in the village.

The only other hints of possible common fields come from the north-east corner of the parish. In that area there are three references in the 1576 survey to ‘shots’, a term usually thought to refer to furlongs in common fields (see Chapter 3, 4.ii) (ERO M158/1, ff.75, 85i, 105i and 108i). One, called Bramble Shottw, was described as a ‘parcel’ containing 12 acres and formed one of a group of parcels that ‘lay together’ forming Gatewarde Half-Yard Land on the west side of Bartholomews Green. Another, called Grauntcorte Shott, was described as a parcel of arable land containing 3 acres. This was associated with a parcel of ‘waste land’ belonging to the vill of Felsted and both lay ‘near’ a copyhold tenement to the south of Bartholomew Green called Bolles, to which they belonged. Finally, actually in the adjacent parish of Rayne, there was Rayneshott. This was a customary close containing 10 acres of arable land, described as being formerly a part of 30 acres of customary arable and pasture called Goldinge Land that abutted south on the Roman road. Interestingly, in view of the Essex evidence for the use of ‘shot’ on demesne land (see Chapter 3, 4.ii) all three of these examples lay adjacent to demesne lands: Bramble Shott abutted the demesne of Frenches manor, Grauntcorte Shott adjoined Blackleys Wood (and bears the name of a manor) and Rayneshott abutted the land of Henry Capell (presumably the demesne of his manor of Rayne). A more convincing case could therefore be made to suggest that these ‘shots’ were originally parts of demesne fields rather than common fields.

The 1576 survey also contained seventy-nine land units that bore the suffix ‘-croft’, derived from an Old English term meaning ‘a small enclosed field’ (e.g. Catescroft, Longcroft, Barnewcroft, Chalescroft etc) (Smith 1956, I, 113; Field 1993, 20–1). Described normally as ‘croft’, they were also called closes or fields and varied in size from 16 perches to 11 acres, with an average of just over 3 acres. These, together with the -fields discussed above, give a picture of the 1576 landscape as being one of predominantly small- to medium-sized fields, a picture that accords well with the fields shown on the tithe map of 1837, suggesting that there had been little change in the intervening period. The mainly random pattern of fields is also likely to be of ancient origin. The evidence further suggests that the fields belonged to dispersed block holdings that were in existence by the eleventh century. The yardlands of the sixteenth century show clear links back to holdings of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and these in turn show links with the vellin holdings of 1086. Interestingly, there is evidence in Felsted for the use of another Old English term for ‘a piece of land taken in or enclosed’ — this is innam and P.H. Reaney noted it as ‘a living element’ in Felsted in 1367, when there were four references to payments of rent near Blackley pro uno (alio) innome, presumably referring to intakes from the forest (Reaney 1935, 583; Smith 1956, I, 303). The Old English term edisc ‘an enclosure, an enclosed park’ also occurs here in Edysef Fieldes.

The 1576 survey also contains a number of references to smaller acts of enclosure, termed purprestures, on the edges of the greens or other areas of manorial ‘waste’. An example on the edge of Felsted Street has already been mentioned; in another example on Bartholomew Green, the encroachment was sixteen rods long and three rods wide (80m x 15m) and was ‘now enclosed with pales from the rest of the green’ (ERO M158/1, 117). At Gransmore Green, two purprestures, each of half an acre are noted: on one ‘divers buildings’ had now been erected, belonging to Frenches tenement (ERO M158/1, 118 i).

Altogether, the evidence suggests a long history of enclosed land in Felsted. No Saxon material is recorded from Felsted, but a ditch and two pits containing Roman pottery were found in the excavations at Stebbingford Farm in 1993 (Essex HER no. 16856). This of course lies close to the Roman road called Staney Street that forms the northern border of the parish. Work on the line of the new A120 road immediately south of Stane Street, in 1990, revealed scattered indications of prehistoric activity.
while the southern, more linear, segment contained 1,227 roughly quadrangular in shape, contained 1,510 acres, Fryerning lying between them. The northern block, consisted of two separate blocks, with the parish of dwellers’ (Smith 1956, I, 196–7).

suffix, would give the meaning as ‘district -ingas English term. However A.H. Smith preferred to see it containing the Old Giga meaning ‘the people of Round 1918). E. Ekwall suggested that these names may derive from an Old English folk name (Reaney 1935, 159, 161, 253–4, 258–62; Christy 1913; 1373 — named after the two maidens who held it in 1066) Rochester) and Fouchers in East Horndon (Ginge Rauf 1243 — named after Tobias, first prior) and Buttsbury with Stock Harward (Ginges Jordani and Laundry 1230–2 — named after various owners: Goisbert de Inge and Jordan son of Landri). Further south, separated by the parish of Hutton originally one unit (see Chapter 3, 2.i for the importance of the fact that Ingatestone and Fryerning had a combined hidage of five-hide units).

9. Ingatestone, Essex (EANGL 14) (Fig. 12)

Old English, ‘Ginges (see the discussion below) at the stone’ (Reaney 1935, 253–4).

Ingatestone lies in mid-south Essex, its markedly linear settlement lying on the old Roman road from London to Chelmsford (the A12 before the bypass was built). It forms part of a group of places that are referred to as Inga or Ginga in Domessday Book. The largest group lies in a block beside the River Wid in Chelmsford Hundred and comprises Margaretting (Ginges See Margar’ 1285 — named after its church); Ingatestone (Ginges ad Petram 1254, Gingas Atteston 1283 — named after a prominent stone, perhaps a Roman milestone or a large glacial erratic, like the sarsen boulder outside the church); Fryerning (Ginges Hospital 1341, Gingas Freerien 1542 — named after its owners, the Knights Hospitallers of St John of Jerusalem, who were also called freres ‘brothers’); Mountnessing (Ginge Munteny 1238–61, Mounteneye Ginge 1363 — named after its owners, the de Munteni or Mouteney family); Thoby Priory in Mountnessing (Ginge tobyhe 1243 — named after Tobias, its first prior) and Buttsbury with Stock Harward (Ginges Joberti, Jordani and Lauderdale 1320–2 — named after various owners: Goisbert de Inge and Jordan son of Landri). Further south, separated by the parish of Hutton and lying in Barstable Hundred, is a smaller group, comprising Ingrave (Ginge Rad’ 1248, Inge Rauf 1332 — named after its Domessday tenant, Ralf son of Turold of Rochester) and Fouchers in East Horndon (Ginge puelle 1373 — named after the two maidens who held it in 1066) (Reaney 1935, 159, 161, 253–4, 258–62; Christy 1913; Round 1918). E. Ekwall suggested that these names may derive from an Old English folk name Giggings, meaning ‘the people of Giga’ (Ekwall 1960, 263). However A.H. Smith preferred to see it containing the Old English term gie ‘district, region’, this, coupled with the -ingas suffix, would give the meaning as ‘district dwellers’ (Smith 1956, I, 196–7).

The historic parish of Ingatestone is peculiar in that it consisted of two separate blocks, with the parish of Fryerning lying between them. The northern block, roughly quadrangular in shape, contained 1,510 acres, while the southern, more linear, segment contained 1,227 acres, making 2,737 acres in all (1,108ha). The town of Ingatestone lay partly in Fryerning and partly in Ingatestone, the two parts separated by the Roman road. In 1888 the linear parish of Fryerning, with its 1,394 acres, was combined with Ingatestone. The shapes of these parishes makes it likely that they once formed a unit, or at least a sub-unit of the greater Inga/Ginga block.

There are four different soils in this area. Most of the southern half of Ingatestone and the eastern halves of the northern part and Fryerning have clay loams of the Windsor association (712c: pelo-stagnogley soil), derived from the heavy London Clay. Seasonal waterlogging on these soils can be a problem unless there is a slope to ensure drainage. On the higher ground at the west end of the southern half of Ingatestone (Woodbarns area) there are heavy stony clay soils, of the Ragdale association (712g: pelo-stagnogley soil). In the northern part of the same area, and extending into the far west end of Fryerning are loamy clay soils of the Oak 2 association (714c: paleo-argillic stagnogley soil). Both of these soils are derived from chalky till and both suffer seasonal waterlogging. The rest of the higher and flatter land in the west part of Fryerning and the western part of the northern half of Ingatestone (Mill Green area) has stony loamy clay soils of the Essendon association (714d: paleo-argillic stagnogley soil) on Pebbly Clay Drift derived from the Claygate and Bagshot Beds. These are generally poor soils which are seasonally waterlogged (SSWE 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 184–6, 281–4, 293–6, 358–61). This area still retains much woodland, so much so that John Hunter has termed this landscape the ‘Wooded Hills’ (Hunter 1999a, 24–32; Hunter 1999b, 8).

In 1086 Ingatestone belonged to St Mary’s Abbey at Barking, Essex, which was said to have ‘always’ held it (hence its later alternative name of Gynghe Abbesse). Ingatestone is not mentioned in a seventh-century charter confirming the possessions of that abbey, which suggests that it was probably acquired after the re-foundation of the abbey by King Edgar c.965 (Hart 1966, 122–3; Knowles and Haddock 1971, 256). The estate in 1086 consisted of three-and-a-half hides plus 10 acres, together with 30 acres held by an unnamed sokeman (DB Essex 9/11). Robert Geron was the Domessday tenant-in-chief of Fryerning. His holding consisted of three parts: firstly, three hides that he held himself; secondly, one hide and 33 acres held by his sub-tenant Ilger; and thirdly, two-and-a-half hides and 61 acres held by his sub-tenant William. All three parts had different holders in 1066 (Siward, Edwin Grut, and Selva and Topi), which indicates that the division was of some age (DB Essex 32/30, 31, 34). The fact that Ingatestone and Fryerning had a combined hidage total of ten further reinforces the notion that they were originally one unit (see Chapter 3, 2.i for the importance of five-hide units).

In the late twelfth century Gilbert de Montefichet, the successor of Robert Geron, gave half of his manor of Ginghes [Fryerning] to the Knights Hospitallers of St John. This gift was confirmed in 1199 by Gilbert’s son Richard, who appears to have given the other half of the manor and the church to the Knights (Monasticon Anglicanum, VI(ii), 807 no.XIII and 808 no.XVIII). In 1289 the Knights had a grant of a market and a yearly fair at their manor of Ginge Atteston (Cal Charter Rolls, II, 340). There was clearly a bit of confusion here, for although the market was indeed set up on the Knights’ side.
of the street at Ingatestone, it was not in the manor of Ingatestone. The manor remained with the Knights until the dissolution in 1536, when it was acquired first by the earl of Hertford and then by William Berners. It was later acquired by Sir Nicholas Wadham, whose widow endowed Wadham College, Oxford, with land in Fryerning.

Barking Abbey’s holding in Ingatestone consisted of three parts: a block demesne in the southern half or segment of the parish; a detached piece of demesne or grange at the west end of this half called Woodbarns; and another grange in the northern half called Handley Barns. At the dissolution of Barking Abbey in 1539, these three elements were divided into separate ‘manors’. Sir William Petre, Secretary of State to Henry VIII purchased the main manor; John Smith, one of the king’s servants acquired Woodbarns; and Elizabeth Hill, widow of Richard Hill, servant to the king, received Handley Barns. Petre later acquired all three ‘manors’ (Morant 1768, II, 46–7). He built himself a great house here that was described as being ‘very fair, large and stately, made of brick and embattled’, having found the existing manor house ‘scant mete for a fermor to dwell upon’ (Medlycott 2000, 5, 10).

Ingatestone has a wealth of medieval and Tudor documentation, but this study has only had time to make rather superficial use of these sources; in particular the so-called ‘Ingatestone Domesday’, a rental of c. 1275, and some excellent maps (ERO D/DPM150). The two principal maps were produced by the two John Walkers, father and son, for Sir John Petre (Edwards and Newton 1984, 56–9, pls XV–XVII). The first dates from 1600–1 and covers the whole parish, with the exception of the largely demesne area in the south-east corner (ERO D/DP/P8) (Pl. 43). The second map, of 1605, covers the missing part of the parish and some adjoining areas (original in Ingatestone Hall; photograph in ERO T/M 1/1) (Pl. 44).
The Domesday record reveals a landscape well-stocked with woods. There was woodland for 500 pigs in Ingatestone and for 540 pigs in Fryerning. This suggests something in the region of 1500 acres of woodland (based on the graph in Rackham 1980, 121). Some of this woodland still exists — Well Wood, Box Wood, Stonemore Wood and Mill Green Common in the Handley Barns area; Fryerning Wood, College Wood and Bell Grove in the west of Fryerning; and Portsmoorhall Wood and Woodbarns Spring in the Woodbarns area. The distribution of these woods is closely linked to the occurrences of soils 712g, 714c and 714d. The maps of c.1600 show a landscape with a few more smallish woods, but the same basic pattern. The name Handley means ‘the high woodland or clearing’ and on the 1600–1 map what is now Mill Green Common and Stonemore Wood is named as Handley common woods and springs. Stonemore Wood was specified as ‘The great copiced spring in Handley wood’, while the common itself was shown as a less densely wooded area (Reaney 1935, 254; ERO D/DPM150; Poll Taxes I 1998, 231). The 1600–1 map marks a group of houses called Potter Row on the east side of the common, with kilns on the common in front of them, and also a property called the Tilehouse at the north end of the common belonging to John Finch the elder, tilemaker. There was a tile kell [kiln] here, giving rise to Tilekell Streate, and ‘workehowses late John Finch his fathers’.

The Woodbarns area lies at the western end of Ingatestone and has a distinct ‘D’ shape that is apparent on both modern maps and that of 1600–1. The latter map shows the D as having a narrow belt of woodland around most of its perimeter. In this it closely resembles an area of eighteenth-century parkland enclosed within shelter-belt plantations, but this is a trap for the unwary landscape historian, for here their existence in 1600–1, plus the name and shape, leave little doubt that this was originally a more solid area of woodland. Two blocks of woodland within the parish of Writtle that was part of the medieval Royal Forest of Writtle (Rackham 1980, 187, 189). The Redindyke (Writeldich 1297; Ridden Dyke 1600–1) separated the woodland of Ingatestone from that of the royal forest (Reaney 1935, 255). The combination of abundant clay and wood led to the development of an important medieval and Tudor pottery- and tile-making industry at Mill Green (Christy and Reader 1918; Pearce et al 1982). There were several men surnamed ‘le Potter’ in Ingatestone c.1275 and others surnamed ‘Tiler’ there in 1381 (ERO D/DPM150; Poll Taxes I 1998, 231). The 1600–1 map marks a group of houses called Potter Rowe on the east side of the common, with kilns on the common in front of them, and also a property called the Tilehouse at the north end of the common belonging to John Finch the elder, tilemaker. There was a tile kell [kiln] here, giving rise to Tilekell Streate, and ‘workehowses late John Finch his fathers’. 
this D-shape, now called Portsmoorhall Wood and Woodbarns Spring, are probably relics of this larger wood. The linear woods on the perimeter, and also along internal field boundaries, are all described as ‘springs’ and could also be remnants of the original wood, though John Hunter has drawn attention to a general prevalence of linear ‘springs’ (also called ‘shaws’ in south Essex) on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century maps of Essex. Nearly always on demesne land, these narrow woods, some fenced and some unfenced, were perhaps a development of that period (Hunter 1996, 283–94; see also section 6 in the annex to Chapter 8 for linear woods). The 1600–1 map does indeed show a number of other linear springs on demesne land in other parts of Ingatestone and one of those at Woodbarns is actually called the new springe.

To the south, Woodbarns adjoins further woods: Blackmore Wood and Thoby Wood. These are adjacent to the site of Thoby Priory. When founded, c. 1150, this was said to lie in the wood [nemore] of Ginges (Monasticon Anglicanum VII, 554 no.1; Fisher 1942–5, 79). The overall impression is that around this time there was a continuous area of woodland that stretched right across the western ends of Ingatestone and Fryerning. Demesne assarting was certainly taking place in the early part of the thirteenth century, for Morant quotes a fine of 1228–9 relating to the inclosing of 62 acres of assart-lands in this parish by Barking Abbey (Morant 1768, II, 47).

In 1600 the Ingatestone demesne consisted of a core block of about 400 acres that occupied virtually all of the area that lay between the Roman road and the River Wid (Pl. 46). This was doubtless the best available land in the parish. Sir William Petre’s Ingatestone Hall of 1540–55 (Pl. 46). This was doubtless the best available land in the area that lay between the Roman road and the River Wid. Nearby was the Woodbarns area of about 300 acres and 135 acres in the centre of the Handleby Barns block, to the east of Mill Green. As already discussed, the whole Woodbarns area was probably, originally, a demesne wood. The same is probably true of Handleby Barns. The block demesne there contained four woods in 1600–01: Boxsell Wood (now Box Wood), Apsfield Wood (now Well Wood), Langer Spring and Bushey Wood. Interestingly, this area contains also clearly a demesne assart. The other, Mill crofts (or Mill fieldes), lay to the south of Mill Green and consisted of six crofts containing 28 acres. The map states that these were the Inheritance of Sir John Petre, which suggests that they may have been added to the demesne. They lay adjacent to four fields lying in Ingatestone that were rather confusingly said to be ‘freehold land [par]cell of the Demesnes’ of Fryerning Hall and called ‘Barking land alias Saint Johns land’, but were held of the manor of Ingatestone.

In 1600–1 the lands of the tenants of the manor consisted of groups of small- to medium-sized fields, with hedges, clustered around the individual farmhouses, giving the impression of a long-enclosed landscape. One group lay along Grenenstreate, the road linking Woodbarns with the Roman road (Pl. 47). The western end of this road broadens out into a narrow linear green that presumably gave the road its name. The majority of the farmsteads lie on the northern side of the road, with meadows predominating on the south side, beside the stream that forms the parish boundary. There is a hint of planning here in that the distance between the road and Fryerning boundary is consistently very close to two furlongs.80 There were a couple of similar tenement blocks on the west side of the Roman road, but smaller properties, presumably burgage plots, in what was then called the town.

Further tenement blocks were in the Handleby Barns area, surrounding the central demesne block. Some were said to be ‘lying about Beggars Hill against Handleby wood and nere about the windmill grene’, in other words lying between Fryerning and the southern side of Mill Green. Others were ‘about Potter Rowe and Tilekell Strete’ on the east sides of Mill Green. Another group was situated along a road at the north end of the parish called Handley Strete. The east end of this terminated in a narrow linear green now called Handley Green (Pl. 48).
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Plate 45  Ingatestone, Essex. One of the small unwooded parts of the large Mill Green Common

Plate 46  Ingatestone, Essex. View westward across the River Wid and the demesne land of Ingatestone Hall towards Ingatestone village
Plate 47  Ingatestone, Essex. View eastward along Green Street

Plate 48  Ingatestone, Essex. The northern part of the linear green called Handley Green
This green was central to a sub-rectangular block which could represent a phase of assarting. There are certainly records of assarting in this area, for instance Thomas Elys had 7 acres of assart in the wood of Henlyh, c.1275 (ERO D/DPM150, f.1v). Included in this group was a 7-acre demesne field called Little Charles croft. The final group was said to lie ‘nere and aboute Hyde’ in the south-east corner of the Handley Barns area. This included a couple of small triangular greens or areas of ‘waste’ called Upper Hyde and Lower Hyde. Several of the properties here contained the word ‘ Hyde’ in their names: Osburnes at Hyde, Hyde alias Bakers, Edmond at Hyde and Hickes at Hyde. Part of this area later became the park of a small country house called The Hyde, built in 1721 (Morant 1768, II, 47). As discussed in Chapter 3, there is evidence to suggest that the term ‘hide’ was used to denote a particular type of block holding that was probably of some antiquity (Faith 1997, 137–40; 1998). In this case it is possible that this is the area of the holding of the unnamed sokeman in the Domesday record, though he is said to have held 30 acres — a quarter of a hide — rather than a full hide of 120 acres. The special nature of the area is further suggested by the fact that William att Hyde and Richard Osebern, who both probably had holdings here, were two of the largest tax-payers in Ingatestone in 1327 (Medieval Essex Community 1983, 77; William paid 2s 9d and Richard 4s 2½d).

At least half of the named tenements in 1600–1 bore the names of people who occur in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century documents relating to the parish (e.g. Reasons from Thomas Rayson c.1275; Makerons from William and Emma Mokeron c.1275 and Osburnes from William Osebern c.1275). This suggests that the landholdings associated with them were also in existence by that period. There is no direct evidence for any common fields or for holdings of standard sizes. There are scattered mentions of the term acerware in the survey of c.1275, but insufficient to clarify its use here (for ware acres in general, see Chapter 3, 1.vii) (ERO D/DPM150).

This survey also has several references to the small units of land called ‘daywerke lands’ (for further details of this term, see under ‘acre’ in Chapter 3, 2.iv). These were a fortieth of an acre and were frequently used as house plots and some of the Ingatestone references are to a ‘daywerke land built’.

In 1086 there were only a small number of tenants here: 2 villeins, 7 bordars (6 in 1066), one slave and one sokeman with 30 acres. Fryerings similarly only had 2 villeins, 24 bordars (18 in 1066) and one slave. The most likely location of the villein holdings is in the Greenstreet area, where there is some regularity to the land units. The fields called Bordlandes point to some former inland here that may have been the location of some of the bordars and the slave. As noted above, the sokeman may perhaps have been in the area called The Hyde.

The modern landscape of Ingatestone is cut diagonally by the double lines of the railway and the Ingatestone bypass (A12 trunk road). There has also been a loss of field boundaries. In the former demesne area near Ingatestone Hall the loss is around 39%, but in the area south of Handley Green the loss is about 22%. This goes against the usual trend where demesne fields, being larger, suffer less loss than the smaller fields of the tenanted land, though, in part, the loss in the demesne area was of boundaries that appeared between 1605 and 1839. What is noticeable, however, across most of this district is the increasing ‘suburbanisation’ of the landscape, most noticeably through the larger number of modern walls and ornamental hedges around rural properties, but also through a ‘neatening’ of the landscape through the close mowing of roadside verges.

10. Ardeley with Luffenhall hamlet, Hertfordshire (EANGL 15) (Fig. 13)

Old English, Earda’s leah (‘grove, clearing’) and Lufia’s halh (‘corner of land, meadow or hollow’) (Gover et al 1938, 151, 156; Smith 1956, I, 223).

Ardeley lies in north-east Hertfordshire, at the south end of the great East Anglian boulder-clay plateau. The outcrop of clay here forms part of the watershed between the rivers Rib (east) and Beane (west). The parish (2,424 acres; 981ha) is oblong in form and its two short sides are bounded by watercourses: the River Beane on the north-west and The Old Bourne (a tributary of the Beane) on the south-east. On its long north-east side it is bounded by Stane Street (locally known as Hare Street), the Roman road (Margary 1973, 228) running from Baldock to Braughing (Margary 1973, 272–3) (Pl. 49). Luffenhall is a hamlet on the north-west side of the parish, which lies partly in Ardeley and partly in Clothall, the adjacent parish (the Clothall part containing about 400 acres). From about the fourteenth century, all of Luffenhall formed a part of the manor of Ardeley.

Most of the parish has clay loam soils that belong to the Henslope association (411d: typical calcareous pelosol). Although these overlie chalky till they are seldom seriously waterlogged. At the north-west end, however, there is a thin band of loamy clay soil of the Hornbeam 2 association (582c: stagnogleyic paleo-arglilic brown earth) on clay-with-flints plateau drift beside the River Beane (HSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 209–13, 220–1). This bulges further into the parish in the valley of the Ardeley Brook, a tributary of the Beane. This soil type suffers periodic waterlogging in the winter. Finally, to the west of this, there is a small area with a well-drained soil of the Swaffham Prior association (511e: typical brown calcareous earth). Sir Henry Chauncy, the county historian and a major landowner in Ardeley, described the parish in 1700 in these terms: ‘The East part is much enclos’d, very woody, and the Soil heavy, but the West End was heretofore Champion, it consists of Clay, in some Parts there is a Mixture of Gravel, in others of Chalk, and at the West End it abounds with Flint.’ (Chauncy 1700, 131).

In 1086 Erdelei was held by the canons of St Paul’s Cathedral in London as a six-hide estate (DB Herts 13/3). They had held it in 1066 and later claimed to have received it from King Athelstan in the tenth century, and although the charter claiming this appears to be a forgery, it may be substantially true (Sawyer 1968, 180 no. 453). The charter linked the gift of Ardeley with that of Luffenhall. In 1086 the canons held two hides in Luffenelle, but the Bishop of Bayeux also had two-and-a-half hides there and Hardwin de Scalers had half-a-hide (both of these also held land in Clothall — the bishop holding seven hides and three-and-a-half virgates, while Hardwin had one virgate) (DB Herts 5/13–4, 13/4, 37/2–3).

Except for a brief period under the Commonwealth, 1649–60, the manor has remained in the possession of St Paul’s and is now vested in the Ecclesiastical
Commissioners. However, from as early as 1141 the manor house and demesne were let out on lease to a succession of ‘farmers’, many of whom were canons of St Paul’s. For much of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the lessees were the Chauncy family and their heirs. The demesne and manor house were finally sold in 1808 (Page 1912, 194–5).

The manor of Ardeley or Ardeley Bury has some excellent documents. The principal sources used for this study were the ‘Domesday of St Paul’s’, a detailed survey of their manors in 1222; a survey of 1297; an estreat book of manorial courts 1475–1572; the Parliamentary survey of their manors in 1222; a survey of 1297; an estreat book (Domesday St Paul’s, 1912, 195; RCHME 1910, 36; Hertfordshire HER no. 391). The 1744 map shows that there was a large courtyard on the north-east side of the moat that contained numerous farm buildings, flanking the road that led out of the park to the church. Several fishponds lay on the outer bounds of this courtyard. The barns here are described in some detail in leases of 1141 and 1148x62 (Domesday St Paul’s, 135–8; Horn and Born 1979). By 1884 these farm buildings had largely been removed, having been replaced by a new farmstead a short distance away called Bury Grange (Ordnance Survey first edition map).

In 1086 there were said to be three hides in demesne (notionally 360 acres) (DB Herts 13/3). In 1222 the demesne consisted of 472 acres of arable and 27 acres of meadow, making 499 acres in all. In 1297 the demesne consisted of 703 acres of arable, 19 acres of meadow and 35 acres of pasture, a total of 757 acres. Of the arable, 409 acres lay in eleven several fields (campi non seperabili) and 294 acres lay in seven ‘non-several fields’ (campi non seperabili), i.e. common fields. Six of the several fields had -feld names and were large, varying from 41 to 96 acres, with an average size of 61.6 acres; four of the remaining five fields had -croft names and were noticeably smaller, ranging in size from 14 to 3 acres, with an average of 7.8 acres. All except half-an-acre of meadow and one acre of pasture was in several.

Some of the field-names can be identified on later surveys, making it clear that the demesne in 1297 was in two distinct areas. The first, as expected, was centred around Ardeley Bury and its park, but the other was at the eastern end of the parish and involved land later belonging to Coates Manor Farm. Ardeley Bury and its park lay on a hill with clay soils (411d). Its farmland lay partly on the tongue of loamy soils (582c) beside the Ardeley Brook and partly on the sloping land with 411d soils that are drained by the same brook. The area of detached demesne at Coates Manor Farm also has 411d soils, but here they are on east-facing slopes that drain towards The Old Bourne. In both areas there were large fields which, though later subdivided, are still apparent on the 1744 map and the Ordnance Survey first edition map of 1884. However modern hedge losses on the intervening areas with smaller, random-pattern, fields has tended to obscure the pattern.

The sizeable increase of the demesne from around 500 acres in 1222 to around 750 acres in 1297 would most logically be associated with the development of the detached demesne. In 1649 the Ardeley Bury holding contained 384 acres and in 1744, 404 acres; Coates in 1649 was 231 acres and 284 acres in 1744. Their totals, 615 acres in 1649 and 688 in 1744, suggest that the 1297 figure is a combined one for these two areas of demesne. However, although the detached demesne may have been enlarged in the thirteenth century, there was clearly...
something there as early as the mid-twelfth century, for a
lease of 1148x62 makes specific reference to two barns at
the court (i.e. at Ardeley Bury) and the barn of the
berewick (orreum de berewica) (Domesday St Paul’s
1858, 136–7; Horn and Born 1979, 373). The name is first
recorded in 1535, when the value of ‘Cots within the
manor of Ardeley’ represented 19% (£7 6s 8d) of the
temporalities of the canons in Ardeley (Valor
Ecclesiasticus IV, 278b). The name is Middle English
cotes, the plural of cot ‘a cottage, hut, shelter or den’,
perhaps most likely in the sense of sheds for storage of
materials or shelter of livestock (Smith 1956, I, 108–9).
As such, the name gives an insight into the original set-up on
the site of the later farmstead.

What the detached demesne was created from is not
completely clear, though the fact that Coates lies at the
eastern end of the hamlet called Wood End (recorded as
Wodend in 1474) does suggest that it originated through
the assarting of woodland or wood-pasture (Gover et al
1938, 152). Domesday records that there was woodland
for 200 pigs in Ardeley in 1086, which could indicate
something like 500 acres of woodland (Rackham 1980,
idem 121). The 1222 survey only mentions the demesne as
having 40 acres of non-coppice wood that was used for
pasture (bosco forinseco n[on] vestito) and 10 acres of
inclosed coppice wood (bosco incluso vestito). The
pasture wood may have been the park, for in 1297 the 96
acres of the ‘park by the manor’ made up one of the two
woods of the demesne. The other was Le Frith ‘by the
park of Walkerne’, which contained 36 acres. By 1649
Frith Wood had been reduced to a coppice-wood of 15
acres. In 1744 this was Thrift Wood, still of 15 acres, but
with four parcels of land beside it called Culvers, totalling
18 acres, that look as if they may be the missing parts of the
original wood. Thrift Wood still survives, though reduced,
and is situated in the area of the detached demesne, to
the south of Coates Manor farm. The 1744 survey reveals two
other woods of similar size, which also survive: Lord’s
Wood of 17 acres, belonging to William Woolball and
hence, presumably, its name, and Moor Hall Wood (now
Great Wood) of 14 acres belonging to Moor Hall. Lord’s
Wood lies against the southern boundary of the parish to
the west of Wood End and Great Wood lies close to the
northern parish boundary. The 1744 survey also lists quite
a number of ‘springs’ — small woods of one or two acres
or less.

More explicit evidence of assarting is provided by the
1222 survey, which has a whole section devoted to those
who held old assarts (tenent de essarto veteri). This lists
54 tenants holding one or more smallish plots of land (the
average size being about 3 acres), but including two
half-virgate holdings. The overall amount of land was
about 230 acres (not including six messuages or curtilages
for which no size was given). The full chronology of these
assarts is not known, but some had plainly taken place in
the last fifty years or so. Two of the assarts were stated to
be per (presumably in the sense of authorised by) Nicholas
de Sigillum, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, who was farmer
of the manor in the 1180s; seven were per Richard de
Stapleford, who must have been the farmer shortly before
1222, for he appears in that survey as the farmer of the St
Paul’s manor at Wickham St Paul’s in north Essex; and
one holding was described as being ‘of new assart’ (de
novo assarto) (Domesday St Paul’s 1858, 23–6, 33–6). Assarts, both of demesne and tenanted land, are recorded
on most of the manors of St Paul’s surveyed in 1222 (Faith
1994, 662).

Ardeley Bury was the principal manor in Ardeley, but
there were also three sub-manors, all held in socage from
Ardeley Bury: Cromer, Lite’s Manor and Moor Hall. The
compilers of the Victoria County History asserted that the
manor of Cromer originated in assart land, equating it with
the ‘place next Ardeley Park’ (und[m] placia[m] juxta
parcæ[m]) that Ralph son of William de Cruame held as an
‘old assart’ in 1222, by service of three capons yearly
(Page 1912, 195; Domesday St Paul’s 1858, 24). However
this could well be the half acre of demesne that Ralph was
given in exchange for the site of the manorial windmill
(Domesday St Paul’s 1858, 21).106 Cromer Hall lies in the
linear hamlet of Cromer at the west end of the parish,
surrounded by former common fields. The original ‘crow
mere’ is probably the large pond on the east side of the
road, opposite Cromer Hall. Its setting is therefore very
different to that of Coates Manor Farm, which can be more
plausibly as seen as resulting from assarting. It must be
doubtful whether Ralph actually held a manor in any
sense, for his main holding was a standard half-virgate of
work land, implying that he was a villein (Domesday St
Paul’s 1858, 27). There is some evidence that a manor of
Cromer was being claimed in the sixteenth century, but
was dismembered not long after (Chauncy 1700, 109–10;
Page 1912, 196).

Lite’s Manor appears to take its name from a Robert
Lit living in 1294 (Gover et al 1938, 152). However the
holding is identifiable with the one-and-a-half
virgates that Simon Cultreweg, a freeholder, held at rent (ad
censum) in 1222. Simon also held 9 acres of assart that his
father had held by the ‘toleration’ of the archdeacon (per
tolerancia[m] archid’) — presumably Nicholas,
Archdeacon of Huntingdon, the farmer in the 1180s
(Domesday St Paul’s 1858, 23. The terra de Coltewyg
belonged to the Harewedon family in 1297 and later, as the
manor of Lites, it belonged to the Chauncy family
(Guildhall MS 25516, f.113r; Chauncy 1700, 110–11;
Page 1912, 196–7). In 1744 the holding contained 59
acres, all of it in enclosed fields. It is now Lite’s Farm and
it lies at the west end of Wood End (Pl. 53).

The manor of Moor Hall would seem to have originated in
the substantial free holding that Walter de Mora held in 1222. This consisted of half a hide, one and a
half virgates (all ad censum), half a virgate of old assart
and a number of smaller parcels of land (Domesday St
Paul’s 1858, 22, 25, 26). In 1284 John de la More was the
second wealthiest inhabitant of Ardeley (after the farmer
of the main manor) and in 1297 a John Attemore (probably
the same person) held one carucate of land there. In 1324
the ‘little manor’ (manerettum) of Moor Hall belonged to
Robert de Munden (Page 1912, 197; Guildhall MS 25516,
113r). The manor was acquired by the Spence family in
the seventeenth century and in 1744 Luke Spence had two
large adjacent holdings in Ardeley: Moor Hall (196 acres)
and Garners End (now known as Gardners; 61 acres).
Most of Moor Hall consisted of enclosed land, but 12% lay
in two nearby common fields: four pieces in Church Field
and one piece in Moon Field. Garners End was similarly
mainly enclosed, but 15% lay in in the same two common
fields: three pieces in Church Field and one in Moon Field.
Moor Hall lies on the east side of Moor Green, which, at
nearly 27 acres, is the largest green in the parish (Pls 54
and 55). This clay pasture occupies some of the highest
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Plate 52  Ardeley, Hertfordshire. Part of the parkland surrounding Ardeley Bury

Plate 53  Ardeley, Hertfordshire. Enclosed land between Lites Manor and Parker’s Green
and flattest land in the parish and its several large ponds suggest that it was poorly drained. In origin, this was probably the 'moor' that gave name to the place. Gardners lies at the east end of a small green called Gardners End (just over 2 acres) — both take their name from William le Gardiner, recorded here in 1278; Garnars or Gardyners ende being documented in the 1490s (Gover et al 1938, 152). At both places there are the remains of moats around the houses, reflecting their status as manors or freeholdings (Hertfordshire HER nos 1686, 392). Moor Hall lies close to Great Wood and the collection of small fields around it, many with “croft” names, are suggestive of an origin as assarts.

The settlement pattern of Ardeley is a polyfocal one, the houses being grouped in a number of hamlets or around several greens rather than being more generally dispersed. At the west end there are the hamlets of Luffenhall, Cromer, Church End and Hare Street, while in the eastern half there are the green settlements of Gardners End, Moor Green, Muncher’s Green (now desert), Wood End, Parker’s Green, Canons Green and Bodgers Green. The greens are linked by a number of broad, drovelike roads and fall into two main groups: Moor Green and Muncher’s Green interconnect, while Wood End, Parker’s Green, Canons Green and Bodgers Green form another interconnected group of small greens in the south-east corner of the parish.

Luffenhall, as noted above, has a complex history. It was a separate vill in 1086 and was then in divided ownership. It was later divided between the parishes of Ardeley and Clothall. The holding of the canons of St Paul’s was initially attached to their manor of Sandon (6km to the north). In the survey of 1222 ‘the manor of Luffenhall’ forms a sub-section of the Sandon entry. It consisted of two hides and in its demesne there were 52 acres of arable and 4 acres of meadow (Domesday St Paul’s 1858, 19–20). It was still linked with Sandon in 1297, but was later included within the manor of Ardeley Bury. Chauncy dismissed Luffenhall ‘because it is no Mannor of itself, only consists of Farms holden of other Mannors’ (Chauncy 1700, 132). Luffenhall is included in the 1744 survey of Ardeley, which reveals that much of its farmland lay in a number of common fields, many of which were still uncenclosed in 1912 and are still named as ‘commons’ (Page 1912, 194) (Pls 56 and 57).

In 1744, to the west of the road running from Walkern to Rushden (the B1037 in part) there were two large common fields (Brook Field and Luffenhall Field) subdivided into a number of furlongs or ‘shots’, two other smaller common fields (Kibbal Field and Pyebush Field, the latter also subdivided into shots) and two furlongs that were presumably relics of another field (Newhill Hill Furlong and Cromer Hill Furlong). All except the last two lie in Clothall parish; Newhill Hill Furlong was partly in Ardeley and Cromer Hill Furlong was wholly in Ardeley.

Brook Field (Brokefeld 1551–2) (Gray 1915, 374), now Brookfield Common, to the south of Luffenhall, was divided into Bromans Valley Shot, Honey Lane Shot, Ban Hill Shot (?Banbery feld 1551–2), Struts End Piece, Valley Shot and Stow Furlong. Luffenhall Field (now Luffenhall Common), to the west of the hamlet, was subdivided into Langdon Shot, Sheepwall Shot (Depewellshot 1551–2), Bradlow Shot, Lodley Gate Shot (Lodley feld 1551–2), Snakes Dell Shot (Snaylsdell 1551–2), Hickwrights Shot, Stumpkin and Nether (or Netherman) Valley Shot, with High Brade at its northern end.197 Kibbal Field (Kibwellfeld 1551–2, now Kipple Field) lay at the north end of Luffenhall. Pyebush Field (now Dolls Field) lay adjacent to Kibbal Field and was subdivided into Hickendell Shot, Bath Pitt Shot and Quamstead Shot. Quamstead Shot (now Swasmay Common) lies on the northern edge of the manor and takes its name from the Qualmstowe (1335) or ‘execution place’ (Old English cwealm stow) that lay at the northern entrance to the manor (Gover et al 1938, 156). The field name Gallows Hill on the eastern side of the road commemorates the same feature. Newhill Hill Furlong (Newwellfeld 1551–2, now Newell Common) and Cromer Hill Furlong (now Cromerhill Common) lie between the hamlets of Luffenhall and Cromer. The apparent interchangeability of the terms ‘field’ and ‘furlong’ or ‘shot’ suggests that this was not a rigidly administered system.

Interestingly, the meadows that lie between these common fields at Luffenhall include an area named as The Boughry in 1744. This is derived from Old French bouverie/medieval Latin bovariua ‘cattle-shed’, but also ‘measure of land, cattle-pasture’ (Parsons et al 1997, 138). In the context of its position between the common fields, there is a possibility that it was the grazing area for the oxen that pulled the ploughs.

To the east of the road, wholly in Ardeley parish, there were further common fields: Cromer Field (subdivided into Great and Little) and Collingdon Hill (now Cromerfield Common and Cornhill Common) and smaller units called Holm Shot, Gallows Hill and Here Field. Collingdon Hill lay between the road and Ardeley Park, being referred to as ‘Cotindon by the manor’ in 1297 (Guildhall MS 25516, f.112v). It, with the adjacent piece called Holm Shot (Holmsht furlong 1551–2), seem once to have been part of Brook Field, for there are references in the sixteenth century and seventeenth centuries to land ‘in Brokefelde on Collingdon Hill’ and ‘on Collingdon hill in Brekefeld’ (Guildhall MS 25312, f.7r and MS 25631, f.99v). Cromer Field (Craumerfeld 1297) lay to the north-east of the park and to the west of the hamlet of Cromer. Here Field lay on the northern boundary of the parish, adjacent to the hamlet of Hare Street and both extended into the adjacent parish of Cottered. Gallows Hill lay close by and was probably part of the same field.

Further towards the middle of the parish there were common fields called Church Field, Moon Field and Little Field. Church Field (Cherchefeld 1297, now Churchfeld Common) as its name suggests, lay just to the north of the church. Little Field (Little feld 1520–1) lay a bit further north and was indeed little; it was probably once part of Church Field. Moon Field (Monefeld 1297) lay to the south of Church Field, between Church End and Moor Green.

Finally, there were three very small common fields in the eastern half of the parish: Squittmore Field, Brapshons Field and Browns Field. Squittmore Field (?Scwitmorefeld 1297, Squittmore 1649) lay close to the southern boundary of the parish, midway between the park and Wood End. Brapshons Field also lay close to the southern boundary, just south of Parker’s Green. Browns Field, slightly bigger than the other two, lay a short distance north-west of Wood End.

The holders of 5 acres or more of land at the time of the 1744 survey were analysed to determine a) where they lived; b) the size of their holdings; c) the percentage of common-field land they held; and d) the names of those...
Plate 54  Ardeley, Hertfordshire. Map of 1744 by ‘P.J.’ for William Woolball. Detail of the Moor Green and Wood Green areas. Hertfordshire Archives and Local Studies DZ/110/P1/2. North at the top left corner

Plate 55  Ardeley, Hertfordshire. View eastward across Moor Green
common fields. This revealed that the fourteen landholders with houses in Luffenhall, Cromer Street and Cromer Hill, all at the western end of the parish, had holdings that varied in size from 5 acres to 225 acres, but with an average size of 62.2 acres. The common-field component varied from 11.2% to 85%, with an average of 50.8%. The location of the common fields involved is given in Table 34.

The twelve landholders with houses further east in Ardeley Bury, Church End, Moor Green, Gardners End and Hare Street had holdings that varied in size from 7 acres to 404 acres, with an average size of 89.5 acres (but if Ardeley Bury is excluded, 60.9 acres). The common-field component (detailed in Table 35) varied from 0% to 35.8%, with an average of 13.4%. Two holdings (16.7%) had no common-field land.

The fifteen landholders with houses in Muncher’s Green, Parker’s Green, Wood End and Bodgers Green, at the eastern end of the parish, had holdings that varied in size from 7 acres to 284 acres, but with an average size of 48.7 acres (or, excluding Coates Farm, 31.9%). The common-field component varied from 0% to 21.2%, with an average of 2.8%. The location of these common fields is given in Table 36. Ten holdings (66.7%) had no common-field land.

This analysis demonstrates significant differences in the farming regimes in the three parts of the manor. So far as size goes, the two western parts were similar, with farms averaging 60 acres in size, but in the east they were only between a half and two-thirds of that size. The most dramatic difference, however, was in the percentage of common-field land in the holdings. At the western end most (over 50%) of the land of the farms lay in the common fields and no farm was without some. In the central area the common-field component dropped to around 13% and a sixth of the farms had none at all. At the eastern end the common-field element was negligible (2.8%) and two-thirds of the farms had no common-field land at all. The analysis also shows that particular common fields were used by the farmers who lived closest to them. The Luffenhall fields were only used by the farmers based at the western end. There was a slight

| 1744 Survey of Ardeley: 14 landholdings of 5 acres plus, based in Luffenhall, Cromer Street and Cromer Hill |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Common fields, west of the road | Number of pieces |
| Luffenhall Field | 87 |
| Brook Field | 39 |
| Pyebush Field | 31 |
| Kibbal Field | 20 |
| Newhill Hill Furlong | 13 |
| ransad15281359 Cromer Hill Furlong | 3 |
| Cold Croft Corner | 1 |
| Skeys hedges piece | 1 |
| **Total** | **215** |
| Common fields, east of the road | |
| Collingdon Hill | 7 |
| Holm Shot | 5 |
| Little Cromer Field | 7 |
| Great Cromer Field | 1 |
| Cromer Nook | 1 |
| Gallows Hill | 4 |
| Church Field | 4 |
| **Total** | **29** |
| **Grand total** | **244** |

Table 34 1744 Survey of Ardeley: landholdings based in Luffenhall, Cromer Street and Cromer Hill

| 1744 Survey of Ardeley: 12 landholdings of 5 acres plus, based in Ardeley Bury, Church End, Moor Green, Gardners End and Hare Street |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Common fields | Number of pieces |
| Collingdon Hill | 9 |
| (Great) Cromer Field | 14 |
| Little Cromer Field | 1 |
| Church Field | 29 |
| Church End Green | 1 |
| Little Field | 4 |
| Here Field | 1 |
| Moon Field | 12 |
| **Total** | **71** |

Table 35 1744 Survey of Ardeley: landholdings based in Ardeley Bury, Church End, Moor Green, Gardners End and Hare Street

Plate 57  Ardeley, Hertfordshire. Part of Brookfield Common, a former common field area in the Beane valley at the southern end of Luffenhall.
overlap between the farmers of the west and the centre in the use of Collingdon Hill, Cromer Field and Church Field, but the majority of the pieces in those fields belonged to the farmers of the centre and they had exclusive use of Moon Field and Little Field. The farmers at the east end had exclusive use of their three small common fields.

The implication of this must be that Ardeley never had an integrated, overall, common-field farming regime. Luffenhall, to all intents and purposes, was a separate entity and its existence as a separate villa in 1086 indicates that this was of ancient origin. The eastern end of Ardeley was likewise virtually a separate entity — the farms here probably originating in assarts of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, their farmers having virtually no share in the original villein lands of the manor. This is reflected in the list of holders of ‘old assarts’ in 1222, for only four of the fifty-four holders of assarts were also holders of work lands.

In 1222 there were nineteen holders of half virgates of work land (ad operat[ionem] in Ardeley (Domesday St Paul’s 1858, 26–7). These, together with a further five half virgates at rent, make a total of twelve full virgates, which equals the number of villeins recorded here in 1086 (DB Herts 13/3). These villein holdings are likely to have been in the common fields of the central area, where, perhaps coincidentally, the number of major holdings in 1744 was also twelve (though this does include the demesne farm of Ardeley Bury). In 1086 there were also six bordars, two cottars and four slaves here, presumably all located on or near the demesne. In 1222 four cottar (cotarii) holdings, each originally of three acres, are listed but were clearly then in decay: two acres of one were then in demesne and an acre of another had been enclosed in the park.

At Luffenhall, in 1086, the canons of St Paul’s had one villein, two bordars and one slave; the bishop of Bayeux had three villeins, three bordars, four cottars and four slaves; and Hardwin de Scalers had two bordars (DB Herts 13/4, 5/13, 37/2). In 1222 the canons’ manor of Luffenhall had fifteen holdings, of which only one was half a virgate, the rest were made up of irregular small numbers of acres (between one and eight and a half). In 1086 the canons held one and a half of the two hides here in demesne. The 1222 survey records that Odo, their farmer at Luffenhall, had ‘assized’ or granted to tenants a further hide of land, leaving only 52 acres of arable and 4 acres of meadow in demesne, which is close to the expected half a hide (60 acres). Six tenants held parts of this hide (tenent de hida assisi per Odonem): two had half virgates, two had 10-acre holdings, one had a 5-acre holding and one had both a 10-acre and a 5-acre holding. These 10- and 5-acre holdings reflect the situation at the ‘mother manor’ of Sandon, where groups with similar sized holdings occur (Domesday St Paul’s 1858, 17–19). Part of the common

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common fields</th>
<th>Number of pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Browns Field</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squitmore Field</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brapshons Field</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 1744 Survey of Ardeley: landholdings based in Muncher’s Green, Parker’s Green, Wood End and Bodgers Green

fields at Luffenhall therefore result from this late twelfth/early thirteenth-century conversion of demesne into tenanted land.

On the Ordnance Survey first edition map of 1884 the common fields, former demesne fields and former park at the western end of the parish are immediately apparent as areas of large fields often with dog-leg boundaries. There is little sign of ridge-and-furrow, though some has been claimed from an area 100m to the east of Ardeley Bury (Hertfordshire HER no. 4501). However this area was in pasture in 1744 and was also within the park, which suggests that the evidence should be re-examined. To the east of Muncher’s Green the pattern changes to one of smaller fields with a random patterning. In this it echoes Sir Henry Chauncy’s description of the west end as ‘heretofore Champion’ and the east as ‘much enclos’d, very woody’ (Chauncy 1700, 131). In the extreme east there are once again larger fields in the area of the former detached demesne of Coates. These patterns can still be seen on modern maps, though there has been some loss of boundaries in the small field area.

Although there is strong evidence for assarting at the east end of Ardeley, it would be a mistake to see this as completely virgin land, for one of the few recorded archaeological sites in the parish lies near Leycroft at the east end, just to the north of Coates. Here pottery of the later Bronze Age or early Iron Age has been found, indicating a human presence in the area in the first millennium BC (Hertfordshire HER no. 6174).

11. Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk (EWASH E 4) (Fig. 14)

Old English, perhaps Walh’s or Wael’s ham (‘homestead, estate, village’) (Ekwall 1960, 494).

Walsham-le-Willows lies towards the western edge of the clayland in north Suffolk. Walsham has the form of a long shallow valley, with a west-flowing stream (a tributary of The Black Bourn) running down its centre. On the higher ground to the north and east, seasonally-waterlogged clay soils of the Beccles association (711r: typical stagnogley soil) predominate, but in the valley sides and bottoms there are loamy clay soils belonging to the Ashley association (572q: stagnogleyic argillic brown earth) which are generally better drained, although they also suffer some seasonal waterlogging. In its lowest part the stream is bordered by damp soils of the Mildeney association (813a: pelo-alluvial gley soil) consisting of clayey alluvium overlying peat (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 96–8, 117–19). The epithet ‘le Willows’ is recorded from the early sixteenth century and presumably refers to a former preponderance of willows beside the central stream; the main purpose of the addition was probably to distinguish
this place from North and South Walsham in Norfolk. The parish contains 2,817 acres (1,140ha).

Here there was a principal manor of Walsham, a smaller manor called High Hall (or Esthall) and a small ecclesiastical manor called Walsham Churchhouse. The two larger manors seem to have resulted from a division of the lands of the Blund family in the thirteenth century, though this rather glibly hides the complexity of the original Blund holding. In Domesday Book Robert Blund appears as the tenant-in-chief of a number of estates in this part of Suffolk, largely as the successor of a man with the Danish name of Aki. These later formed a part of the barony of Blund or Ashfield (named after the family’s small castle at Great Ashfield, to the south of Walsham) (Sanders 1960, 3–4; Keats-Rohan 1999, 370). At Walsham, Blund had three holdings in Walsam in chief and one as a sub-tenant of Bury Abbey (DB Suffolk 66/2, 14/92). In all they made up a sizeable estate of six carucates, but it included no less than 33 and a half freemen. It is likely that the thirteenth-century division reflected some of these earlier units.

The manor of Walsham Churchhouse belonged to Ixworth Priory, which was founded by the Blund family in the twelfth century. Unfortunately there is little early documentation for this priory, so the details of its acquisition of this manor and the church of Walsham is unknown. An endowment by the Blund family must have taken place, for the only church recorded in Domesday Book is a half share belonging to Robert Blund and in the fourteenth century the prior owed fealty to the lord of Walsham for lands here (Field Book 1974, 18). But a thirteenth-century survey shows that the priory also held land in Walsham from Bury Abbey, which must represent the carucate held by 20 freemen under Bury Abbey in 1086 (Pinchebeck Register II 1925, 202). Presumably the unrecorded other half of the church also belonged to Bury. The manors of Walsham and High Hall were amalgamated by 1390 and Churchhouse was added in 1559. The amalgamation of the manors before the first overall survey (the ‘field book’) in 1577 makes the detailed reconstruction of the lands of each manor difficult. An added complication, revealed by the field book, is that a number of people held their lands not from the manor(s) but from the Hundred of Blackbourne, owing suit to both the general hundred court and to one of five local hallimote courts that dealt with rentals. The ancestors of these holders from the hundred are likely to have been among the large number of freemen recorded here in Domesday Book.

The two larger manors both seem to have had substantial core block demesnes around their halls, but also areas of detached block demesne and shares of common fields. The manor of Walsham’s core block lay on the north-west side of the village, but by 1577 the site of this manor was said to be ‘nowe decayed and no mension thereof remaining’ (Field Book 1974, 142). High Hall’s core block lay around its moated hall in the east of the parish. When surveyed in 1327, the demesne of High Hall lay in fifteen pieces that covered some 200 acres (SRO(B) HA504/5/1, m.1). These varied in size from 3 roods to 48 acres. Nine of the pieces were described as culturae and three were described as crofts. Varying between 5 acres and 48 acres, the size of these culturae indicates that they were not individual strips in common-field, but were more substantial units. A certain laxness in the terminology is suggested by the fact that one cultura has a ‘croft’ name and another has a ‘field’ name — cultura vocat Hordisawecroft and cultura vocat ... Hangerhalefeld. The crofts tended to overlap in the lower part of the culturae size range, varying in size from 6 acres to 12 acres.

Churchhouse manor was clearly rooted in the glebe, for its house was sited beside the church and was explicitly described in 1577 as the ‘parsonage house or seate of the manor of the Church House’ (Field Book 1974, 78). However its holding in that area was limited to the yards around the house and a couple of small customary holdings, which together were just over two acres. The rest of its 132 acres of land was distributed in numerous parcels across the whole length of the parish (West and McLoughlin 1998, fig. 44).

There were also a number of free holdings. Some of the most important were in the hands of Sir Alexander de Walsham when he died in 1335 (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 186). Sir Alexander was the kinsman of Nicholas de Walsham, the holder of High Hall manor, and was a manorial lord elsewhere in his own right. But in Walsham he had three free holdings, each of about 20 acres. One is described as formerly his father’s and can probably be identified with the block of free land around the moated site at Crownland Hall in the south of the parish (West and McLoughlin 1998, figs 42–3). Another of his holdings had belonged to his kinsman Master John de Walsham and this can be identified as another block of free land, this time to the east of the village, part of which was recorded as ‘a close called Master Johns’ in 1577 (Field Book 1974, 100). Block free holdings like these may well have originated in the holdings of some of the freemen recorded at Domesday.

The medieval court rolls and the sixteenth-century surveys indicate that the lands of the customary tenants were frequently in small parcels and this has led previous commentators to reconstruct the medieval landscape as one of ‘open fields’ (Dymond 1974, 204; West and McLoughlin 1998, 20–2, 107, fig. 44). The early fourteenth-century manor court rolls mention no less than nineteen entities that bear the name ‘field’, but there is no sign of any regular organisation (Court Rolls Walsham 1998). The rolls also reveal no less than thirty-six units called ‘crofts’, implying an element, at least, of enclosed lands, especially as one of them, Strondescroft, also appears as Strondesclose. The commentators agree that by the time of the survey in 1577 the common fields had virtually disappeared. Even more certainly, no common-field arable was included in the land enclosed under a parliamentary act of 1818, which was concerned with the Llamas (or Great) Meadow, Cranmer Green and a portion of Allwood Green (SRO(B) Q/R1 41). The earliest maps of the parish are two versions of a map of 1817, which show an enclosed landscape consisting of about thirty blocks, each defined by roads and containing varying numbers of predominantly rectangular fields, but with a degree of co-axiality in their arrangement (Pl. 58). It is important that these maps are kept in mind while using the reconstructed maps provided by Stanley West and Audrey McLoughlin, which are much influenced by common-field preconceptions. These road-defined blocks are recognisable in the 1577 field book, where they are described as ‘divisions’ or ‘wents’ and provide the basis for the description of the lands. Although at least thirteen units called ‘fields’ are mentioned in the
Plate 58  Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk. Map of 1817 by R. Payne
Suffolk Record Office (Bury St Edmunds) FL646/1/7. North to the right
Plate 59  Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk. Map of 1817 by R.Payne. Detail, showing the Lammas Meadow and the main village area. Suffolk Record Office (Bury St Edmunds) FL646/1/7. North to the right
Plate 60 Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk. Map of 1817 by R. Payne. Detail, showing the Cranmer Green and High Hall area. Suffolk Record Office (Bury St Edmunds) FL646/1/7. North to the right
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Plate 61 Finningham, Suffolk. View north from Walsham Road over part of the former Allwood Green. This large green was enclosed in several tranches from 1804 to 1819.

Plate 62 Walsham-le-Willows, Suffolk. View southward from Finningham Road towards Hartshall Lane, across probable former common fields.
field book, it is clear that these units were subordinate to the twenty-eight-wards (plus some extra-parochial areas). In one of the wards at the western end of the parish there is a very full description of a ‘close… sometime a common or open feld and called Westreat Feld but now devided into sondry partes with hedges and dykes’. In all, this particular ‘feld’ contained about 19 acres, and was divided into eight holdings belonging to four people by 1577 (Field Book 1974, 88–9).

Kenneth Dodd has analysed the land-usage in twelve of the wards in 1577. In six wards situated on the flat clay plateau at the eastern end of the parish, all on Becles 1 soils (711r), the land-usage was: 7.5% arable, 53% pasture and 29% unsted unstated use. But in six wards on the valley-side in the north-west part of the parish, partly on better-drained Ashley soils (572q), the land-usage was: arable 18%, pasture 34% and unsted unstated use 24%. One of these last six wards contained the site of the manor of Walsham and had formerly been mainly demesne land; in this particular ward the land-usage was arable 35%, pasture 27%, woodland 15%, messuages 1% and unsted unstated use 19% (Field Book 1974, 34–6). These figures underline the importance of sloping land on clay soils for arable crops and also the tendency for the demesnes of primary manors to be situated on the best available land. A went beside High Hall, however, contained 6% arable, 7% arable and pasture, 4% arable and mowing ground, 57% pasture, 1% wood, 6% messuages and 20% unstated uses. This suggests that the block demesne around this secondary manor was less good and although being used for arable crops in the Middle Ages, had been largely put down to pasture by 1577.

Dodd makes the point that ‘most wards were held by relatively few tenants’. He also noted a tendency for the pieces of the holdings to be adjacent to each other, giving the example of Robert Ludman who had a 12-acre tenement which lay in seven pieces which ‘were either adjacent to his messuage and acre or contiguous to one another’. Where the pieces were separated from one another he noted that it was typical ‘for them to be situated in one part of the parish rather than scattered throughout the entire area.’ Dodd failed to find much evidence of communal farming practices, leading him to conclude that ‘there is every indication that the tenants had complete and absolute control of the use of their lands with few if any restrictions by village regulations’. In overall terms he was confident that there was ‘no evidence that the ‘classic’ Midland open-field system … existed in Walsham at any time’ (Field Book 1974, 37, 43–4).

The fourteenth-century court rolls of Walsham and High Hall manors suggest that the holdings of the tenants were conceived in the form of named tenements. The term occurs by 1316 and in 1328 four named tenements are mentioned, but none of the names correspond with their then owners, indicating that they were already old names (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 37, 106). Significantly, a Walsham court of 1317 recorded that ‘the tenements are to be equally divided and parted amongst all his sons, according to the law of gavelkind’ (Field Book 1974, 49).14 This division amongst heirs is graphically illustrated by an entry in the Walsham court roll for 1329:

William, Peter, Ralph, Nicholas and John Hawys, chaplains, sons and heirs of William Hawys, were summoned to this court to receive their inheritance, because they are of full age. Nicholas and John say in open court that they claim nothing from the lord of the inheritance; William, Peter and Ralph seek to be admitted, and seisin is delivered to them. A division is made between them, and William says that he will take as his share a toft called the Eastyard [Estyerd] 10a 3r of arable land, of which 3a lie at the Eastyard, 4a in Theidiscoft, 1½a at Middlewent, 1a at Musewell, ½a at Marlehalfacre, and ½a at Bluntishawe, and ½a of meadow in the Micklemeadow. He concedes the remainder to Peter and Ralph. Upon this Ralph grants all his right and claim in inheritance to Peter, who will pay to him annually therefor, for his lifetime, 1 quarter of wheat, 1 quarter of barley and 1 quarter of beans and peas at Michaelmas and Easter, in equal parts. … The lord granted that Peter should hold the said tenement… they [William and Peter] swore servile fealty’ (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 122).

This type of division could account for the numerous mentions of parts of tenements, as at the 1337 Walsham court, where there was mention of 3 roods of the tenement Kebbils, half an acre of the tenement Springgeld, and half an acre of the tenement Robhood (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 212). The actual process of subdivision is illustrated in a document of 1407 which details how seven men who shared a holding of pasture in Hordsawebrook [near Hartshall in the east of the parish] agreed to partition it ‘so that each would know and have his own part separated from the others by a hedge and not by a ditch’ (Dymond 1974, 207). The cumulative effect of partible inheritance would probably be subdivided lands looking very much like common fields. That there was an element of commonality in the farming is shown by an entry in the Walsham court roll for 1351: ‘Also they present that the common fold was not raised [communis falda non levabatur] this year by the default of Geoffrey Rath the reeve’ (Court Rolls Walsham 2002, 29).15 But there is also evidence that many of the tenants opted out of this system by paying to have their own folds, as is shown by this sample entry from the Walsham court roll for 1359: ‘John Lene pays 3s for having a fold of 120 sheep until next Michaelmas; John Lester pays 18d for a fold of 100 sheep, and no more because he is allowed 40 sheep by his liberty of fold; John Spileman pays 12d for a fold of 40 sheep, and William Typetot and Robert Typetot 9d for a fold of 30 sheep’ (Court Rolls Walsham 2002, 55). Some of these private folds could be quite small, for in 1333 the High Hall court ordered an enquiry concerning an acre of land that John of Foxley held ‘in a certain pightle, which his fold manures’ (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 158).

The last-surviving elements of commonality were the two greens and the Great Meadow (also known as Mickle Meadow or the Lammes Meadow), which were all subject to parliamentary enclosure in 1818 (Pl. 59). Crammer Green was a medium-sized linear green in the valley floor (Pl. 60), perhaps originating in poorly-drained land beside an eponymous ‘crane-mere’; but Allwood Green was a massive intercommon shared by five parishes. In the eighteenth century Allwood Green covered some 530 acres (215ha), but may originally have been bigger. The Walsham part of Allwood Green, covering some 83.5 acres (34ha), lay on the high clay plateau at the eastern end...
of the parish (Pl. 61). As with the green at South Elmham St Michael, its name indicates that it originated as an area of woodland, but had become a green by 1318.116

A custumal of 1577 records that ‘in Hallowd Greene all our lords tenants doe say that our lord of this manor [all three of the manors were combined by this date] is lord of the soyle soe far as our lands go, and that the tenants of the said manor by old and auntient custom time without mind of man have had therein and upon the whole common of Hallowd Greene feeding by the months of their cattell and cowthings as intercommons with other towns’ (Field Book 1974, 49).

The block demesne of High Hall lay adjacent to Allwood Green and it may well have originated as a manorial assart out of the primevally-named ‘old wood’, with perhaps the remainder becoming a common at around the same time. Some of the field names of the demesne in 1327 support the idea that assarting had taken place. There was a croft of 12 acres called bercar de aldewode [sheepcote of Allwood], and a cultura of 48 acres with a haga/hagi name — Netherhawe (elsewhere Netherhaghe) — which was said to abut on the wood of the manor (SRO(B) HA504/5/1, m.2; Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 40, 65). An origin as an assart would provide an explanation for the less favourable soil of this demesne.

The medieval landscape of Walsham emerges as one of great complexity. There were block holdings interspersed between subdivided areas that may have been a mixture of true common fields and former block holdings that had been subdivided through partible inheritance (Pl. 62).117 The number of named ‘fields’ and ‘crofts’ suggests that this was not an open landscape as might have been found in the Midlands. Instead it likely that there were numerous hedged enclosures, some in divided ownership and others held in severalty, but probably not looking very different. Hedge-dating at Walsham suggests that many of the hedges that divide the ‘wents’ (nominally the equivalents of common-field furlongs) there are likely to be medieval in date (West and McLoughlin 1998, 14). This is supported by some references to substantial hedges in 1577, as for instance in the ‘customary close called Hawes Hatchmere [to the north-west of Cranmer Green] parte whereof is pasture and parte arrable and devided into iij partes with stoutie hedges’ (Field Book 1974, 98). This suggests that the pattern of numerous fields shown on the maps of 1817 is firmly rooted in the medieval pattern, though as Dodd has pointed out, ‘there were more pieces within the wents in 1817 than in 1577’ (Field Book 1974, 32).

As well as hedges, there was also a surprising number of small woods or groves dotted across this landscape in 1577. Some of the locatable ones are shown on the map, but others were perhaps more in the way of ‘fields with trees’, as in this description of a free tenement on the north side of Cranmer Green which had ‘one grove upon the ye back syde of the same house all of good yonge timber of elme and oke and sondrye verye good timber trees of oke growing dispersed in the yders ther’ (Field Book 1974, 132). Others could best be described as ‘decayed woods’, as in the case of ‘Sares Pasture alias Sares Wood ... now beyinge good pasture ground hath bene or the greatest part thereof hath been in tymes past a wood and yett hath good store of bouldinges or poullardes [pollarded trees] growynge thereupon’ (Field Book 1974, 99).

Approximately 80% of Walsham was fieldwalked in the 1980s, with results that are broadly similar to those from South Elmham St Michael. Evidence for Saxon occupation was very sparse: a few sherds of middle Saxon Ipswich ware in the village area and one late Saxon Thetford-type ware sherd to the east of the village. The evidence for medieval occupation really starts with Early Medieval Ware pottery of the eleventh–twelfth century. But again there is evidence for Roman settlement, with about twenty individual scatters that fall into about six clusters (West and McLoughlin 1998, 5–11). These lie within about 600m of the stream and are situated near the crests of the slopes in the higher eastern half of the parish and closer to the stream in the western half. The spacing of the clusters in the west is about a kilometre, increasing to about 1.5km in the east. Similar findings were made in the more ‘upland’ parts of the South Elmhams, where the distance from the watercourse increased to about 800m and the settlements became further apart (Hardy and Martin 1987a). As in the South Elmhams, the Roman sites in Walsham show some evidence of being in paired groups on either side of the valley. The minor place-names here betray some Scandinavian influence in the use of mickle (Old Norse mikill ‘big, great’), thwet (Old Norse thræt ‘a clearing’), toft (Old Danish tof ‘a building site, a curtilage’) and probably haugh (Old Norse hagi in the suggested sense of ‘a wood’).

12. Dullingham, Cambridgeshire (EWASH E 7) (Fig. 15)

Old English, the ham (‘homestead, estate, village’) of Dulta’s people (Reaney 1943, 118).

Dullingham lies on the eastern edge of Cambridgeshire, one of eight long, thin, parishes that stretch diagonally between the Icknield Way (now the A1304) and the south-west corner of Suffolk.118 The Icknield Way does not actually form the parish boundary, but crosses the extreme north-west tip of the parish. The parish is approximately 9.5km long, but only about 1.75km wide near the Icknield Way and 0.3km wide near the county boundary. It contains 3,387 acres (1,371ha). At its north-west tip, mainly to the north of the Icknield Way, there are shallow, well-drained, calcareous loams of the Newmarket 2 association (343g: brown rendzina) overlying chalk. Between the Icknield Way and Dullingham Station there is a band of deeper loamy soils of the Moulton association (571k: typical argillic brown earth) derived from chalky drift; in Cambridgeshire these are called ‘Redlands’. To the east of the station, and covering almost two-thirds of the parish, are heavier clay soils of the Hanslope association (41d: typical calcareous pelosol) derived from chalky till. Though clayey, the slope ensures that they are seldom seriously waterlogged. On the south-eastern edge of the parish there is a patch of loamy clay soil of the Ashley association (572q: stagnogleyic argillic brown earth) also on chalky till (SSEW 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales; Hodge et al 1984, 96–8, 209–13, 261–3, 268–9). Here the terrain is flatter and seasonal waterlogging is likely.

The land rises some 80m between the Icknield Way and the county boundary, but the slope is broken at the junction of soils 571k and 41d by the transverse valley of the north-flowing River Snail which rises in the parish. There is another transverse valley at the south-east end of
the parish, caused by the south-flowing headwaters of the River Stour.

In the tenth and eleventh centuries Dullingham formed a part of the extensive possessions of an important family of Ælfgar. As well as Dullingham, Oswi, his wife Leoflæd (the daughter of Ealdorman Brihtnoth of Essex), his son-in-law Lustwine and his grandson Thurstan owned estates in the surrounding parishes of Stetchworth, Kirtling, Burrough Green, Westley Waterless, Weston Colville, Balsham, Bottisham and Swaffham. Oswi was killed by the Danes at the Battle of Ringmere in 1010, Lustwine died between 1017 and 1049 and Thurstan died in the 1040s. The family made many gifts to the abbey of Ely. Among these was the gift by Oswi of an estate (unspecified) in Dullingham. However the family clearly retained land there, for Thurstan willed (1043x49) a hide of land at Dullingham to his servant Viking (an Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1935, 271.70; Hart 1966, 46 no. 62, 48–9 nos 68 and 69, 50–1 no. 72, Liber Eliensis 1962, 139 no. 167; Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 83). The Oslac who made a gift of a farm (predium) and a third of a wood at Dullingham to Ely around 975 may have been an earlier member of this family (Liber Eliensis 1962, 95 no.19; Hart 1966, 219 no. 210).

Immediately before the Norman Conquest most of Dullingham belonged to Earl Ælfgar of Mercia, who died 1062x65. He was the son of Leofric, Earl of Mercia and had also been Earl of East Anglia in the 1050s (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1965, 217). By 1086 six of the hides that Ælfgar held in Dullingham belonged to the abbey of St Wandrille in Normandy; two hides and 10 acres that had belonged to three sokemen were held by two knights (milites) under Count Alan of Brittany; two hides less 20 acres that had belonged to sixteen sokemen was held by Count Alan’s predecessors: Horwulf the man of that name to whom Thurstan willed a hide of land under Ediva (with half a hide and 10 acres) and Viking (Wichin) the man of Earl Harold (with one hide). Viking is very likely the man of that name to whom Thurstan willed a hide of land in the 1040s. Horwulf also held land under Ediva nearby at Cheveley (DB Cambs 14/62). Ediva the Fair (or ‘the Rich’) was a major landholder in East Anglia in 1066 and most of her lands were taken by Count Alan. It has been suggested that she was Ealdgyth, the daughter of Earl Ælfgar and the wife of King Harold, but this has been disputed (Salzman 1938, 354–5; DB Cambs n.1/12). However in one place in the Suffolk Domesday Someday practice of the old Domesday Book, as here, of calling Harold an earl rather than a king (DB Suffolk n.1/61). Orlaer is likely to be the man of that name who was described as ‘King Edward’s Sheriff’ (DB Cambs 22/6). Hardwin de Scalers’s predecessors were two groups of sokemen: eight sokemen with one hide less 20 acres and another eight who had held a hide from Earl Ælfgar. The lands of Countess Judith in Cambridgeshire had mostly belonged to King Harold and his brother Guthr (Salzman 1938, 357).

The subsequent manorial history is well covered in the Victoria County History, so only an outline will be given here (Wright 1978). By the early twelfth century the manor held by the abbey of St Wandrille had passed to the Malet family of Somerset, who apparently held it of the abbey free of all feudal service. On the death, c.1263, of Alice, the widow of William Malet, the manor was divided equally by the heirs of her two daughters. One moiety went to Cecily, the wife of John Beauchamp of Somerset and became known as Beauchamps Hall or manor. The other moiety went to Nicholas Poyntz, also of Somerset, and was called Poyntz Hall or manor. In the second half of the fourteenth century the two halves were re-united by Sir Aubrey de Vere, later Earl of Oxford. He purchased the Beauchamp moiety in 1368 and the Poyntz half in c.1374. The manor remained with the Vere family (with some short term confiscations in the fifteenth century) until the death of John Vere in 1526. It was then divided again between the families of his sisters, before being re-united by Sir Robert Wingfield of Letheringham in Suffolk (the heir to one of the parts) in 1580. Excepted from the re-unification were the woods called Dullingham Park and Ashbeds, which were sold in 1609 to Edmund Milesen, the owner of the Rectory estate (see below). In 1656 Richard Wingfield sold the manor to John Jeaffreson, who had acquired a fortune as a settler on the island of St Kitts in the Caribbean. The Jeaffreson family and their heirs remained in possession until about 1947.

The original site of the manor house is not known, but it was probably on its present site by c.1656, when it was described as ‘a fine dry and pleasant seat, stciuate on ye Champagne’ with two pieces of wood and pasture containing 40 acres adjoining it (CUL Doc 1429). The existing Dullingham House was built by Christopher Jeaffreson in the early eighteenth century, though it may encase an earlier building (Wright 1978, 161). The house lies on the north side of the village street formerly known as Stony Street (now Station Road and Stetchworth Road), which has clearly been bowed slightly to take it further from the house. There was a park of 38 acres here c.1800 when it was landscaped by Humphrey Repton. After parliamentary enclosure in 1810 the grounds were extended northwards with a 41-acre triangle of former common-field land.

An earlier park is mentioned in an extent of Beauchamp’s manor in 1283, when its underwater and pasture was valued at 15s 6d (TNA C133/40/3 no.2). In 1582 the herbage of ‘closes’ called Dullingham Park (84 acres) and Ashbedwood (55 acres) was leased out (CUL Doc. 3967). The survey of c.1656 refers to ‘woods lying in Dullingham Park’ which amounted to about 77 acres. By 1807 this former park had become Dullingham Park or Widgeham Great Wood, a large rectangular block of woodland covering 83 acres, and Ashbedwood had become The Rectory or Widgeham Little Wood, an adjacent rectangular block of 32 acres (CRO Q/RDc14 and Q/RDz 6, 291–329). These woods still exist and dominate the high clayland (411d soil) at the extreme eastern end of the parish. Similar large woods exist at the eastern ends of the adjacent parishes. In 1086 there had been wood for 104 pigs in Dullingham, which, following Oliver Rackham’s calculations, could indicate something like 350 acres of woodland (Rackham 1980, 121). By 1279 there were 120 acres of several woodland belonging to the two halves of the main demesne and 7 acres held by...
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two other manors (TNA SC5/ Cambs/Tower/15, rot. 1). An extent of Beauchamp Hall in 1304 records 60 acres of woodland, and an extent of Poyntz Hall in 1307 records 80 acres (TNA C133/11/17 no.3 and C134/2/19 no.5). The combined total of 140 acres is very close to the 139 acres recorded in 1582. At the west end of Great Widgham Wood there is a small green called Widgham Green which has a small number of houses associated with it. This may be the same as Wodgem pasture, recorded in 1548 (Wright 1978, 163).

In 1086 there were said to be 3 hides (360 acres) in demesne belonging to the main manor. The Inquisition gives the additional information that there was also pasture for 2 head of oxen, 68 sheep, 60 pigs and 4 horses (Salzman 1938, 404). In 1279 the two halves of the recently-divided manor contained a total of 340 acres of arable land, 4 acres of mowing meadow and 16 acres of several pasture, plus 120 acres of common pasture, out of a total of 1,425 acres of arable and 444 acres of grassland (including 300 acres of common heath) in the parish (TNA SC5/Cambs/Tower/15, rot. 1). Although this accords very well with the Domesday figure, the amount of demesne arable does seem to have varied. In 1304–7 the two halves of the demesne each had 240 acres of arable, making 480 acres in all, but in 1321 the Beauchamp half only had 100 acres, 120 acres in 1340, yet had 400 acres in 1421 when the Poyntz moiety only had 100 acres (making 500 acres in all) (TNA C134/67/3 no.5; TNA C135/70/7 no.13; Wright 1978, 163). In 1655 there were 432 acres of arable on the demesne and in 1656 there were 274 acres ‘in tillage’ (Wright 1978, 164; CUL Doc. 1429). The 1656 figure is two-thirds of the 1655 total, indicating that there was a three-course rotation with a third in fallow. In 1656 there was also 70 acres ‘more in the fields called Beast Fields (late pasture now broken up …)’ and about 36 acres of pasture in several meadows and the common fields. The demesne land lay both in the numerous common fields that lay in the western two-thirds of the parish (discussed in more detail below) and c. 552 acres in severalty, most of which lay either in the heath at the extreme western end or in ‘old inclosures’ in the easternmost third. When the parish was enclosed under a private Act of Parliament of 1806 (award dated 1810) Christopher Jeaffreson, as lord of the manors of Dullingham and Dullingham Rectory, received c. 1,275 acres of the 1,745 acres of common field land and pasture and 460 acres of heath that were enclosed (Acts of Parliament 46 Geo. III (1806), cap. 48; CRO Q/RDe14 (map of 1807) and Q/RD6, 291–329 (award of 1810); Wright 1978, 164). Around 1870 the Jeaffreson estate was divided into six major farms: Rectory Farm (587 acres), Hill House Farm (newly built on the former common fields) and two other farms of c. 240 acres, Cables Farm (182 acres) and Widgham Wood Farm (133 acres) (Wright 1978, 166).

As already noted, the manor also had a share of the common grazing on the heath that lay on the shallow chalky soil (343g) at the western end of the parish. Around 1656 the lord of the manor had a sheep-walk for 600 wethers on the common heath (CUL Doc. 1429). By 1810 most of the 460 acres of heath were held in severalty by the lord, but Clare College (see below) also had a several holding there of 62 acres. A farmstead had been built on the lord’s several heath before 1807, which later became Lordship Farm (now a stud for horses). Nearby, an establishment called Lower Hare Park had been built by a training groom c. 1800 on heathland leased from the Jeaffresons. It was enlarged in the nineteenth century, but demolished in the twentieth (Wright 1978, 158–9). In 1810 the perambulation of the parish boundary was started at the ‘north corner of the several heath’ belonging to Jeaffreson, where a ‘dole or boundary mark’ at ‘a place called Garlick’ marked the meeting point of the parishes of Dullingham, Swaffham Bulbeck, Swaffham Prior and Stechworth. The boundary then progressed eastward across the heath, being marked by ‘ancient doles or boundary marks’ — doles being earthen mounds that were erected as boundary markers in open, featureless land (CRO Q/RDz26, 292; for doles or dools see also Chapter 3, 4.x).

The Domesday estate of 2 hides less 20 acres (220 acres) held by Hardwijn de Scalers became known as the manor of Chalers and it remained in the hands of the Scalers family until the late thirteenth century, when John de Scalers gave it to his daughter Maud, on her marriage to Andrew de Mohun of Brinkley (a parish a short distance to the south of Dullingham). In 1383 their descendant, another Andrew de Mohun, sold the manor to Sir Aubrey de Vere, who combined it with his other Dullingham manors. The advowson of the church belonged to this manor and was given in the early twelfth century by Robert de Scalers to Thetford Priory in Norfolk. By 1245 the living, with 100 acres of glebe, had been appropriated by the priory. At the Dissolution, the Rectory estate was acquired, along with much of Thetford Priory’s estates, by the Howard family, dukes of Norfolk. In 1608 it was sold by them to Edmund Milesen of Bury St Edmunds in Suffolk. Around 1733 his descendants, the Edgars, sold the estate to the Jeaffresons. The Scalers family, around 1200, also granted land from their Dullingham estate to Warden Abbey in Bedfordshire and to Anglesey Abbey in Cambridgeshire.

In 1810 the Rectory manor was centred on a farmhouse lying in a block of land lying between Stetchworth Road and the church. The layout is suggestive of an early hall-and-church complex and it may be that this was the original site of Chalers manor, but later given to the church. On the west side of the block there is a rectangular ‘village green’ of 2 acres that was the Camping Close, a gaming place that belonged to the parish in 1558 (Wright 1978, 159). Cables Farm lies on the west side of the Camping Close and the late fifteenth-century former guildhall of St James’s Guild lies just to the north, by the crossroad, in a grouping that formed the core of the village (Dept. of the Environment 1984, 39). The rectory manor also had a sheepwalk on the heath, referred to as the grangie prioris de Tyfford in 1285 (Raney 1943, 118).

In 1279 Sir John de Scalers held 180 acres in demesne, together with 3 acres of wood and 4 acres of meadow, for a quarter of a knight’s fee. In the first half of the fourteenth century his heirs, the Mohuns, leased an estate amounting to 200 acres in Dullingham and Stetchworth to the Burdene family of Dullingham. A new lease to Simon Burdene in 1354 required him to maintain a grange and sheep- pen on the heath (CRO 604/T6). This may well be the Burden Grange that lay adjacent to Middle Field (next to the former heath) in 1477 (Clare Safe B, Shelf 49/2). An unlocated Burghden Grange is also recorded in Burrough Green, the parish that adjoins the south side of Dullingham. This belonged to Warden Abbey and had 60 acres attached to it in 1368 (Keeling 1978, 143). As the...
Scalers family had previously given land to Warden Abbey, the ‘two’ granges could be parts of the same thing. Baldwin de Scalers, c.1200–25, gave 19 acres to the abbey in three gifts, and in the same period Theobald de Scalers confirmed a gift of a half virgate of land with liberty of fold (Cartulary Old Warden 1930, 175–8, nos 225–7, 231). In 1279 Warden Abbey’s holding in Dullingham consisted of 20 acres held in fee alms from John de Scalers, 30 acres from Henry Madfrey and a half acre from each of the two main lords (TNA SC5/5/Cambs/Tower/15, rot. 1). The abbey’s lands in Dullingham were apparently sold c.1390 (Wright 1978, 162, quoting Cal. Close, 1389–92, 157).

The Burdene holding probably reappears in the guise of an estate held by John Valentine in 1477. He had a messuage and a croft abutting on Stanstrete and on land of the Prior of Thetford (i.e. on Stetchworth Road near the land of the rectory), together with eighteen pieces of arable land in seven different common fields in Dullingham and two pieces in Stetchworth (Clare Safe B, Shelf 49/2).\(^{122}\) Around 1500 this was an estate of 200 acres with 100 acres of heath (on which there was ‘sheep-gate and foldage’ for 300 sheep) held by William Barton. In 1579 Stephen Barton sold it to John Hasylly who resold it in 1580 to Clare College in Cambridge. In 1797 the college owned 327 acres of land here, made up of 208 acres of arable land in fourteen common fields in Dullingham and 2 acres in Stetchworth, 5 acres in the Lamsmas meadow, 48 acres of enclosed pasture and 62 acres of several sheep walk on the heath which ‘with other parts of the parish will support 2,360 sheep’ (Clare 1985/5/3:13 and Safe B, Shelf 49/3).\(^{123}\) It was stated to be a mixture of freehold and copyhold land held of the manor of Dullingham (Clare Safe B, Shelf 49/66). In the nineteenth century the land was farmed from Clare Hall Farm (now Clare House Stables) which lies on the north side of Stetchworth Road, a short distance from the land of the rectory, much as described in 1477. Clare College sold the farm in 1914.

The Domesday holding of Count Alan had come into the possession of the Madfrey family by the thirteenth century and came to be called Madfreys manor.\(^{124}\) The Inquisitio of c.1086 states that Count Alan’s holding of 2 hides and 10 acres (250 acres) had meadow for 2 oxen, 11 head of cattle, 200 sheep and 30 pigs (Salzman 1938, 404–5). In 1279 Henry Maddefry held 80 acres in demesne of the Honour of Richmond, together with 12 acres held of the Knights Templar, 3 acres as a free tenant of the Poyntz manor and 4 acres of wood held of the Beauchamp manor. His only tenant appears to have been the Abbot of Warden, who held 30 acres of the Richmond fee. By 1525 Madfreys had passed to the Hildersham family of the neighbouring parish of Stetchworth. In 1573 they sold all their estate to Roger, Lord North and it hence forward became part of the Stetchworth estate. In 1810 Richard Eaton of Stetchworth Park held c.210 acres in severality, of which c.180 acres lay in old enclosures centred on Grange Farm, on the south side of Dullingham Ley in the east of the parish; in addition he was awarded c.255 acres of former common field land, including some on the Dullingham/Stetchworth parish boundary, and the former Lamsmas meadow (9 acres) to the south-east of Dullingham Ley (Wright 1978, 162, 164; CRO Q/RDz 6, 305). The Lamsmas meadow was in existence by 1308–9, when it was said to lie at Dimmingsdale, which must be the old name for the little valley here and possibly for the settlement at Dullingham Ley, for a John de Dimmingsdale was a free tenant (with 5 acres) of John de Scalers in 1279 (Placitorum Abbreviatio, 306). The deserted moated site known as The Moats lying close to the Dullingham/Stetchworth parish boundary to the north of Dullingham Ley may well be the site of Madfreys manor (Cambridgeshire HER no.01158).\(^{125}\) In 1086 the abbey of St Wandrille had 17 villeins, 10 bordars and 2 slaves in Dullingham; Count Alan had 2 villeins, 9 bordars and 2 slaves; while Hardwin de Scalers had 7 villeins and 1 bordar. In 1279 there were 21 free tenants with 187 acres belonging to the main manor (13 with 124 acres in the Beauchamp half and 8 with 62 acres in the Poyntz half), 32 customary tenants with 333 acres (18 with 180 acres in the Beauchamp share and 14 with 153 acres in the Poyntz share) and 4 cottars with 4 acres (all in the Poyntz share). At the same time Chalers manor had 8 free tenants with 90 acres, but no customary tenants; Madfreys manor only had one free tenant with 30 acres. The holdings of the customary tenants in 1279 were divided into four with 20 acres each, one with 15 acres and one with 13 acres, nineteen with 10 acres and seven with 5 acres. If these are regarded as either whole or subdivisions of original 20-acre holdings, they would total 16.65, which is almost exactly the number of villeins belonging to St Wandrille in 1086. Their total holding of 333 acres is also very close to the three non-demesne hides (360 acres) that belonged to St Wandrille.

The holdings of the free tenants in 1279 were much more variable. Simon Avered held 61 acres from the Beauchamp manor for a quarter of a knight’s fee, Simon de Dullingham held 82 acres from six different lords (25a, 20a, 12a x 3 and 1a), the Abbot of Warden held 51 acres from four different lords (0.5a x 2, 20a and 30a), two tenants together held 37 acres, one held 25 acres, one held 20 acres, three held 10 acres each, five had 5 acres each and the rest held smaller amounts ranging from 1 rood to 3 acres. An argument could be put forward that Hardwin de Scalers’s seven villeins and one bordar metamorphosed into the eight free tenants that Sir John de Scalers held in 1279, however the origin of the other free holdings is difficult to determine. Some may have arisen through post-1086 assarting in the more wooded clay-soil areas in the east of the parish. One of the free tenants of the Beauchamp manor was William ‘on the moor’ (supra moram) who held 10 acres. He must have been located on what is now called Harlock’s Moor (just west of Dullingham Ley) (Pl. 63). In 1810 this presumably poorly-drained clay moor (on 572q soil) covered 48 acres and was held by the lord in severalty.\(^{126}\) One of the largest free tenants, Simon Avered, held 4 acres of wood of the Beauchamp manor, which also suggests that his holding was at the east end.

By 1800 the majority of the tenants were located in the 33 houses in the main village, though there were three smaller settlements at Cross Green, Dullingham Ley and Widgham Green. Cross Green, recorded from the seventeenth century, was only a thin strip of land with a few houses at the crossroad to the east of the village.\(^{127}\) Dullingham Ley, recorded from 1444, was a thin linear green surrounded by fourteen houses that was enclosed in 1810.\(^{128}\) In 1810 most of the properties on the green were copyholds of Dullingham manor, with Richard Eaton owning some on the south side, presumably in right of the manor of Madfreys, and a few possible freeholds. As
Plate 63  Dullingham, Cambridgeshire. Part of the area of Harlock’s Moor on the southern boundary of the parish

Plate 64  Dullingham, Cambridgeshire. View westward across a former common field, called Middle Field, that was enclosed in 1810
noted above, the settlement may have been in existence by the early fourteenth century, when it was called Dimmingdale. The term ‘ley’, used both here and in adjacent Stetchworth for a green-edge settlement, must be Old English leah in its mainly post-Conquest sense of a ‘piece of open land, a meadow’ (Smith 1956, II, 20). In 1810 the parish boundary to the north of Dullingham Ley was said to run ‘along the ancient boundary fences of the old inclosures’ (CRO Q/RDz26, 292). At the west end of Great Widgham Wood there was another small green with few houses called Widgham Green (as previously mentioned).

The common fields of Dullingham were numerous and variable in size. Around 1800 they fell into two main groups: a large area of about 1,645 acres in the western two-thirds of the parish where common fields predominated and scattered smaller fields in the eastern part, containing only about 80 acres. In the western part there were twelve fields, which are dividable into two parts. Between the Icknield Way and the railway line (which follows the course of the River Snail) there were five fields: Heath Field, West Field, Limepit Field, Crop ley (Road) Field and Middle Field (Pl. 64). These had a roughly co-axial arrangement with slightly sinuous long boundaries that ran more-or-less at right-angles to the Icknield Way and reflected the overall long axis of the parish (as also in the neighbouring parish of Stetchworth). All these fields lay on the loamy soils of the Moulton association (571k). Further east, between the railway line and a line just to the west of Dullingham Ley there were seven fields: Great Crouch Field, Stetchworth Mill Field, Hall Field, Mill Field, Ran ner (or Rannewe) Field, Stonehouse Field and Field next Burrough Green (or Stony Hill). These had a much less organised appearance, some being triangular and other were roughly rectangular, but with no predominant axes. Some longer, slightly sinuous boundaries were present, most notably on the east side of Hall Field and Mill Field, which seems to mark the edge of this block of fields, giving way to the former unenclosed waste of Harlock’s Moor. All these fields lay on the reasonably well-drained clay soils of the Hanslope association (411d). At the eastern end of the parish there were two small common fields: Little Crouch Field and Ratfield (or Radfield), both on the less well-drained clay soil of the Ashley association (572q) (Clare 1985/5/3:13; CRO Q/RDz 6, 291–329).

Some of the fields are identifiable in medieval documents, such as Middelfeld, which is mentioned in the early thirteenth century, and Coplesfeld (Coplowfeld in 1615) and Crowc hfeld 1477 (TNA E40/14500 and E40/14469; Clare Safe B, Shelf 49/2). Others have clearly changed their names: Field next Burrough Green or Stony Hill contained a piece called Gosmerfeld that is mentioned in Domesday Book and was divided into seventeen furlongs. It was one of the lands of Clare College in Dullingham indicates that these were fairly evenly spread around the parish, with no more than 15% in any one field (Clare 1985/5/3:13). The 1615 glebe terrier also suggests a more-or-less even distribution of strips in the various fields (CUL EDR H/3 D–G).

Despite the clear evidence here for common fields, there is very little evidence for ridge-and-furrow. An aerial photograph of Dullingham Park shows some possible signs to the north-west of the house at TL66266 5807, however these lie in an area rather close to the house that appears to have lain in the park/garden before its expansion into Great Crouch Field (Cambridge University Aerial Photographic Unit, RC8 EG223 1982). These marks therefore need further investigation before they can be accepted as clear evidence for ridge-and-furrow.

The Ordnance Survey first edition map of 1890 shows the post-enclosure landscape, but the general disposition and arrangement of the former common fields is still discernible, though modified by the straightening of some

English synonym dæl in Dimmingdale (TNA E315/51 no.86; E315/52 no.105; Reaney 1943, xxii).

The most interesting, historically, of the fields was Radfield, for its seems to have given name to the Hundred of Radfield. It occurs as Radele (Domesday Book) and as Radesfeld and Radesfelda in the contemporary Inquisitio. The Dullingham Radfield (covering only 44 acres in 1810) was only part of a larger common field of that name in the adjacent parish of Burrough Green (Pl. 65). The latter field, c.1790, had a total area of 217 acres and was divided into seventeen furlongs. It was one of seven large fields in Burrough Green that covered 1,009 acres, divided into 60 furlongs (CRO R51.25.29). It has been suggested that the name means the ‘red field’, the suggestion being ‘that patches of gravel on the chalk make the soil look rather reddish’, however this area has a clay soil of the Ashley association (572q) rather than a chalky one and does not appear particularly red today (Reaney 1943, 114; Wright 1978, 125). In view of the fact that it was probably the meeting place of Radfield Hundred, the first element may be Old English ræd ‘advice’ (Smith 1956, II, 79). The really significant point, however, is that this field was in existence by 1086, and that it was clearly regarded as a suitable place for the hundred court to meet, just possibly because it contained a sizeable grassland component. The fact that Radfield lay in two parishes also suggests that the laying out of the field pre-dates the establishment of that boundary. A similar overlap occurs on the north side of the parish, where Stetchworth Mill Field was intercommunal with Stetchworth, being called Interbait Field in 1783 (Wright 1978, 163). At enclosure, the parish boundary on the north was straightened through this ‘disputed or interbait’ land, with 48 acres being ceded to Stetchworth. On the south side a 50-acre square of similar ‘disputed or interbait’ land was ceded to Burrough Green, resulting in a rectangular kink in the boundary near Underwood Hall. There are similar mentions of ‘interbait’ land shared by Burrough Green and Westley Waterless c.1790 (CRO R51.25.29).

In 1309 and in 1655 (as detailed above) there are indications of a triennial rotation being practised in Dullingham, and a rotation of three ‘shifts’ was still in use in the 1790s (Wright 1978, 163–4). It is unclear, however, whether the numerous fields were grouped in a permanent arrangement or whether the allocation of fields to particular shifts was changeable. The 1797 survey of the lands of Clare College in Dullingham indicates that these were fairly evenly spread around the parish, with no more than 15% in any one field (Clare 1985/5/3:13). The 1615 glebe terrier also suggests a more-or-less even distribution of strips in the various fields (CUL EDR H/3 D–G).

The Ordnance Survey first edition map of 1890 shows some possible signs to the north-west of the house at TL66266 5807, however these lie in an area rather close to the house that appears to have lain in the park/garden before its expansion into Great Crouch Field (Cambridge University Aerial Photographic Unit, RC8 EG223 1982). These marks therefore need further investigation before they can be accepted as clear evidence for ridge-and-furrow.
of the boundaries and the insertion of new, straight, subdivisions of the larger units. The co-axial layout of the common fields between the Icknield Way and the railway line is still apparent, as are some of the slightly sinuous boundaries of the more easterly block of common fields. The straightening of boundaries and the insertion of new straight ones (as in Radfield) can also be seen at the east end of the parish, though to a lesser extent than in the western parts of the parish. Since 1890 the landscape has changed again, mainly due to the proximity of Newmarket and its heavy involvement with the world of horse-racing. Grids of rectangular horse paddocks are now apparent in several areas: on the former heath, around Dullingham village and around Dullingham Ley.

Endnotes
1. For a discussion about Westwick, on the west side of Worstead, as a possible area where the community of Worstead had pasturing rights, see Chapter 2, under ‘berewick’.
2. Brass to John Alblastyr, 1520, in Worstead church.
3. The name Amners suggests that it was held by the almoner of the priory.
4. Norfolk HER no. 8208; money was apparently left for its repair in 1529.
6. The son, John Seaman Postle (d.1892), was lord of the manor of Smallburgh Catts with Prisbutts and the principal landowner in Smallburgh. He and his brother William Seaman Postle (d.1887) owned extensive estates in Smallburgh, Tunstead, Catfield, Felmingham, Worstead etc.
7. The survey is NRO EVL 441; the map that accompanied this survey is NRO EVL 442, free 11/1, but cannot be seen due to water damage sustained by the NRO during a fire in the mid-1990s. It is still awaiting conservation. Tracings of a few sections of the map are in the files of the Norfolk Farm Buildings Survey held at the University of East Anglia and in NRO MC 1775/1 and PD 539/93.
9. Copies in the files of the Norfolk Farm Buildings Survey held at the University of East Anglia. The Swanton Morley farms are named thus: 
   Freeman’s Farm [now Field House Buildings and Swanton Morley House; 930 acres], 
   Rt. Freeman’s Farm [Castle Farm; 385 acres], 
   Mack’s Farm [Park Farm; 217 acres], 
   Tho. Fox late Leeder’s Farm [Darby’s Farm; 50 acres], 
   Rump’s Farm [Waterfall Farm; 72 acres] and 
   Large’s Farm [Little Haze; 74 acres].
10. Carthew however has several wrong dates and ascribes the building to the Evans-Lombe family post 1861.
11. This erroneously states that it was built for the Revd. Henry Evans-Lombe, that branch of family having studiously ignored the prior inheritance by the illegitimate line.
12. Tracing in the files of the Norfolk Farm Buildings Survey, University of East Anglia.
13. Files of the Norfolk Farm Buildings Survey, University of East Anglia.
14. Files of the Norfolk Farm Buildings Survey, University of East Anglia.
15. A *Huncatefield* is also mentioned in 1487 (NRO EVL 362).
16. *Broom Breck, Colseed Breck, Delfts Breck, Great Breck, First and Further Double Furlong Breck, First and Further Old Ollands*.
The 1814 enclosure award for Worthling also names *Further Old Olland, Colseed Breck and Cages Breck*.
17. Acts of Parliament 28 Geo. III (1755), cap. 21. No enclosure award or map has been located in either the NRO or the TNA, and although Tate and Turner (1978, 178) refer to an ‘undated map in Shirehall, Norwich’, this too has not been found.
18. The Parhams appear to have been the tenants of Castle Farm for much of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries (Bryant 1903, 210).
19. More recently, a suggestion has been made, based on the frequent appearance of an initial H in early spellings, that the first element might be the personal name Helm — Newton 1993, 134. Newton further suggests that the name could have royal significance as Helm is named as the ruler of the Scandinavian Wulfings in the epic poem *Widsith* and there could be a link between the Wulfings and the Wulfings, the East Anglian royal dynasty.
20. Manors or fees of Bateman’s, Boys, Flixton, Richmond, Rumburgh and South Elmham.
21. The earliest parts of the existing house within the large moated site dates from the late thirteenth century, however the move to the Hall site was probably initiated by Bishop Herbert Losinga (1091–1119) who ‘bought’ the property from William de Noers, otherwise Osmundeston.
23. e.g. *Falpes* (Adam Folpe), *Kyndels* (Thomas and William Kindel), *Menegop* (Richard del Menegop), *Noloth* (Agnes Noloth), *Normans* (Adam and William Norman), *Osleketes* (Cecily and Benedict Osleket) and *Patrick* (William Perrik) — the names in brackets being tenants recorded in a survey of the bishop’s barony of South Elmham c.1260–80, SRO(L) HA12/C1/1. A Thomas Kindel and a William Northman also occur South Elmham in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century (SRO(L) HA30/367/177).
24. Individuals surnamed Burel and Hude are recorded in South Elmham in the thirteenth century, SRO(L) HA12/C1/1.
25. There is an explicit mention in Domesday Book (52, 8) of a *grovettae* of South Elmham, see Warner 1987, 18–23. For an explanation of the terms *cultarae, quarantinae, iuga* etc, see Chapter 3, 4.ii.
26. A number of grovetae ‘small groves’ are recorded in 1538 on the east side of the green, SRO(L) ES 741/HA12 Add/107, f.3.
27. For other greens with wood names see Martin 1995, 172.
28. Suffolk HER nos SEL 005, 007, 010, 021. I am grateful to Sue Anderson for re-examining the pottery from these sites.
29. SRO(L) HA12/B1/1/4 and HA12 Add. 741/30. For a discussion of these Norse terms see Sandred 1979, 98–122.
30. For *Ylthorpe/ Jolthorp* see SR (L) HA12 add. 741/30 m.4 and BL Stowe Charter 405; for *Storte/Scorthe* see SRO(T) HD 1538/210/7 (thirteenth century), SRO(L) ES 742/HA 12 Add/107, ff 9r, 9v, 10v (1538) and Register William Bateman I (1996, 48). Ironically, the Ulfekeil commemorated here may be the earl of East Anglia of that name who was defeated in battles against the Vikings in 1004 and 1010.
31. Suffolk HER nos FLN 041, MDM 012, MDM 037, MTF 020, MTF 128, SEM 007, SEM 008. Mendham, Metfield and Ilketshall St Margaret have been fieldwalked in addition to all the parishes in the Fethang.
and a microfilm and typed translation of the survey still held in the Essex Record Office.

53. John was the son of Waleran and grandson of Ranulf, the moneyer of Vains in Normandy, see Cokayne 1959, opp. B, 7–11; Keats-Rohan 1999, 283–4.

54. The survey states it was 23 acres ‘by estimation’, but 17 acres ‘by measurement’. The map indicates two adjacent fields called Great Hennyfields, both belonging to George Golding, one of 17 acres and one of 10 acres, but only the first seems to be mentioned in the survey.

55. 8 acres by estimation, 7 acres by measurement.

56. Described as 8 acres by estimation, but 14 acres by measurement.

57. In 1330 Edmund de Botiller had a messuage, 120 acres of land, 3 acres of meadow, 20 acres of pasture and 20 acres of wood (Feet of Fines Essex III, 9, no.90).

58. A William Gentri is recorded in Little Henny in 1349/50 (Feet of Fines Essex III, 90, no.862).

59. Bigod’s woodland reduced from 30 to 20 pigs, John’s reduced from 60 to 30, but Peverel’s stayed at 80 pigs.

60. One of these, called Gibbes barne, on the west side of the street, is described as ‘one barn now used as a dwelling house’ (ERO D/DU332/1A, p.47).

61. For the Honour of Eye see Sanders 1960, 43–4.

62. Described as 8 acres by estimation, but 14 acres by measurement.

63. There is a reference to the ‘manor of Campsey otherwise Whitton’ which lay on a now-lost map of about half of Sutton by Isaac HI. This refers to a now-lost map of about half of Sutton by Isaac HI. However, it was not possible to locate the surveys.

64. Aldewood Forest has been renamed Sandlings Forest and Rendlesham Forest is one of its three parts — Turnstall and Dunwich Forests being the other two.

65. In 1315 Margaret Talevatz held land in Shottisham, Bawdsey, with reference back to 1652.

66. SRO(I) HB 10:427/4 (6) recorded in the eighteenth century, but

67. Elizabeth Estlaw was a free tenant on the abbey of Caen’s Hennyfeild, which became the family’s main seat (Visitation of Suffolk 1982, 118–21).

68. In 1315 Maragaret Talevatz held land in Shottisham, Bawdsey, with reference back to 1652.

69. In 1330 Edmund le Botiller had a messuage, 120 acres of land, 3 acres of meadow, 20 acres of pasture and 20 acres of wood (Feet of Fines Essex III, 9, no.90).

70. In 1937 the manor of Hollesley with Sutton belonged to H.W.

71. This is also the opinion of John Newman, who carried out fieldwalking here for the South-East Suffolk Survey in the 1980s.

72. A series of Felsted documents from the Syon Abbey period are in the archives of King’s College, Cambridge (KCAR/6/2/057).

73. Presumably named after Thomas Mather, a tenant here in 1629.

74. Suffolk HER no. SUT 020. The mound measures 44.5m long x 13.5m wide x 1.74m high. It was formerly thought to be Neolithic long barrow.

75. Suffolk HER no. SUT 096 and 097 — the mounds are about 26m and 36m long and about 1.2m high.

76. Aldewood Forest has been renamed Sandlings Forest and Rendlesham Forest is one of its three parts — Turnstall and Dunwich Forests being the other two.


78. SRO(I) HB10:427/4 (3) — Sutton Hall 1552; SRO(I) HB10:427/12:1 — Fen Hall 1616.

79. Interestingly, this lease also stipulated different sized ditches on the arable land (4.5ft wide, 3ft deep and 20in wide at the bottom) and on the meadows (6ft wide, 3ft deep and 4ft wide at the bottom).

80. Confusingly, the nineteenth-century Sutton Hall lies to the south of this site, but all references in the text are to the site of the medieval Sutton Hall, beside the church.

81. The act of 1821 estimated the area as 130 acres.

82. A series of Felsted documents from the Syon Abbey period are in the archives of King’s College, Cambridge (KCAR/6/2/057).

83. Also two later translations: M158/3 and D/DVF2, see also Clark 1912; French 1913.

84. The Cradock maps are: ERO D/DCW, P2 (Draper’s Farm and Blacklys), P3 (Little Grand Courts), P4 (Nun’s Farm), P5 (Chamzhes Farm) and P6 (Water Miln Farm); D/CT 138B; the Skynner map is: ERO D/DH/P7 (Farm called the Place).

85. This includes an adjacent close of pasture (then divided into two called Redinges, containing 19 acres, that was described as former demesne, having only recently been alienated.

86. The house was described as ‘a conveniente mansion howse bute balte of tymber and consisteth of an hawle a pretie pare of v v upper chambers a kitchen a buttir and other necessarie buildinges’.

87. Named as Barcheia and Rucheia in a charter of Henry II permitting Simon to make them into a park (Charters and Custumals 1982, xii).

88. In 1451 Sir Thomas Tyrell is recorded as the fermor (farmer or rector) of Felsted manor — King’s College, Cambridge KCAR/6/2/057/2, FEL/4.

89. Gilbert was a minor tenant-in-chief in Bedfordshire and neighbouring counties. At Felmersham and Mepppershall in Bedfordshire he appears to have been succeeded by an unrelated family surnamed de Maperteshale, however there is no record of them in Felsted (Farrer 1924, 30–1).

90. Morant 1768, II, 418 erroneously identified Camisax as the Domesday vill of Keventuna, an error repeated by French (1909, 31–2). But Reaney showed that this was in fact Coton Hall in Springfield.

91. A half-virgate holding called Presteshai or Prestcheie is named in the surveys of c.1170 and 1223–4 (Charters and Custumals 1982, 43 and 93).

92. For all these moats (in the order named) see Essex HER nos 6271, 1252, 6274, 1269, 1352, 1257, 1274, 1272, 9562 and 0889.

93. Aimerus Living’ pro viii acris viitid et opus ad placitum abatissae et pro sarto 1d.

94. Text from version E: tempore Willelmi de Radebergh’ dictus Levyng relaxavit domine abbatissae unam morum quam tenuit in campo de Redyng et quantum crofam vocatum polcrof; version D has a less full text and names Levyng as Living and gives the place-names as Redinges and Polcrof.

95. Rogerus Ballivus cepit unam periculum terre et classati postea per Willemum de Redebergh’ et Rogerum Aude et consilium ville tradita fuit R. Living’ pro xid per annum.

96. William of Rodborough was a free tenant on the abbey of Caen’s manor of Minchinhampton in Gloucestershire and appears to have acted as a bailiff or attorney for the abbey in the period between 1192 (when the abbey regained control of its estate from William
de Felsted) and 1223/4 (the date of the survey). Master Roger Auade succeeded Master David as steward of Felsted by 1219. See Charters and Customs (1982, xiati–iv).

97. Martin was presumably heir male to William, for William, as noted above, had two daughters.

98. Gilbert’s grant specifically refers to the fratres ‘brothers’ of the Hospital.


100. Sir William Petre’s desire to acquire Ingatestone was probably influenced by the similarity of the Latin version of the name, Ing ad Petram, to his own surname, so it is no surprise to see that the map is grandly headed ‘The Manor of Inge Petre alias Ingatestone’.

101. The common covered 104 acres in 1839 — ERO D/CT 192B. The map of 1600–1 clearly shows a post mill on the south-west margin of the green, hence its name.

102. I am grateful to Max Satchell for observations on the three-furlong pattern.

103. I am grateful to Max Satchell for observations on this two-furlong pattern.

104. It is recorded as Harestrete in 1498, the derivation being Old English here + stræt ‘the army street’ (Gower et al 1938, 151).

105. Campi separales: Suthfeld 96a, Middelfeld 42.75a, Madfeld 41a, Hygefled 57.25a, Medelfeld by the manor 80a, Monefeld by the manor 53a, Bedewellhilf 14a, Presscroft 7a, Baldewynescroft 4.5a, Rosscroft 3a, Boliferescroft 10.5a; campi non separabili: Cherchefeld 58a, Cotingdon by the manor 66a, Craumerfeld 44a, [?]Scwimerfeld 51a, Mormadfeld 4a, Aldkirkes 24a, Monefeld 47.5a.

106. The windmill was built by Richard de Stapleford.

107. Brade comes from Old English bræadu ‘breath’, used in Middle English to denote broad strips in the common field (Parsons and Styles 2000, 9–10).

108. Robert Bland was Sheriff of Norfolk in 1086.

109. There was also a 60-acre holding held by Hubert as a tenant of Robert Malet (DB Suffolk 6/299), but this is difficult to identify in the later documents.

110. The tenants in Walsham owed suit to the hallimote court in Langham, as detailed in a survey of 1569, SRO(I) 1538/93, f.1. But it is remarkable that there were no sons.

111. This is identified as ‘Spilmans otherwise Lacy’s otherwise Crowland’ in 1756–9 (SRO(B) HBS50/B/28/2). The Domus Spelman is listed among the Libere tenenentes of Walsham in 1283 (Powell 1910, 91). See Auude succeeded Master David as steward of Felsted by 1219. See Charters and Customs (1982, xiati–iv).


113. SRO(B) 373/26 (with a key in 2110) and FL646/1/7, which is accompanied by a survey book of 1818 (FL646/1/8). Both maps are by R. Payne, the first is more detailed, with minor place-names and is partly coloured; the second only has parcel numbers and major names.

114. The inheritance custom on Walsham Churchhouse was however to the eldest son, but to be equally divided amongst daughters if there were no sons.

115. The reason the fold was not raised was because the Black Death had come to Walsham.

116. The name is recorded as Aldewraude (Old English ‘old wood’) c.1220 (Eye Priory Cartulary I 1992, 67, no. 63); by 1318 it was ‘Allwoodgreen’ (Court Rolls Walsham 1998, 74).

117. For an account of some surviving strips in the adjacent parish of Westhorpe, see Chapter 3, 4.ix.

118. For a recent landscape study of the parishes to the south of Dullingham, see Harrison 2002.

119. Stanestret c.1200–25 (TNA E315/52, no. 105); Stony Street 1734 (SRO(B) 339/73).

120. An apparent leap to 360 acres in 1421 (Wright 1978, 158) is difficult to account for, as it would imply a 150% increase over the previous century, followed by a similar decrease in the next. The figure must therefore be suspect.

121. For further information on the game of camping see Dymond 1990, 165–92.

122. Pieces in Crowchefeld, 2 in Cotefield, 1 in Rechehey, 2 in Myddelfeld, 2 in Gamserfeld, 2 in Turhorne and 3 in Copiesfeld.

123. 1a in Ratfield, 4a in Little Crouch Field, 25a in Mill Field, 18a in Hall Field, 19a in Stetchworth Mill Field, 27a in Great Crouch Field, 4a in Limesip Field, 14a in West Field, 13a in Cropley Road Field, 7a in Heath Field, 2a in Rammer Field, 2a in Stonehouse Field, 33a in Field next Burrough Green and 25a in Middle Field.

124. The originator of this name may be the man called Mathfrid who is likely to be the same as the ‘Mathfrid’ who was one of the jurors for the Hundred of Radfield, in which Dullingham lies, for the Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis, c.1086 (Salzman 1938, 404).

125. In 1807 this lay in a field called New Close or Milking Ground, abutting Maltrigge Lane (CRO Q/RDc14).

126. In the 1890s the clay deposits in this area were being exploited by a number of brick works.

127. Crossgrene meadow 1634, Cross Green 1669 (CRO RS1/25/1 no.1).

128. Dullinghamleye 1444 (Reaney 1943, 118); Dullingham Ley 1605, (CUL Doc. 885); Ley Green 1734, (SRO(B) 339/73).

129. Map of Newmarket Heath c.1788, Bod., Rawlinson 17499, f.68v, copy in CRO TR274/P3.
Part III
Regionality, Origins and Future Management
Figure 16  The pie-charts of the land types in each case study, arranged geographically. Yellow represents the percentage of common fields, red is block demesne and blue is tenement blocks (for the other colours, refer to the detailed pie-charts in Chapter 5)
Chapter 6. Regionality in East Anglian field systems

by Edward Martin

It is so that, our soil being divided into champaign ground and woodland, the houses of the first lie uniformly builded in every town together, with streets and lanes, whereas in the woodland countries (except here and there in great market towns) they stand scattered abroad, each one dwelling in the midst of his own occupying. William Harrison, Description of England, 1587 (Edelen ed. 1994, 217).

1. Introduction

With those perceptive words William Harrison (1535–93) foreshadowed twentieth-century work on the classification of the landscape of England. He not only identified two fundamental farming systems, one of common fields and the other of enclosed lands, but also linked them with settlement patterns, one with nucleated villages and the other with dispersed farmsteads. H.L. Gray gave form to this in 1915 by mapping a broad swathe across the Midlands of England where common fields predominated (Gray 1915, map in frontispiece). The boundary of this Midlands area passes close to Radwinter in north-west Essex, where Harrison served as rector, perhaps explaining why he was so attuned to these landscape differences. Harrison’s two categories re-appear as Oliver Rackham’s ‘planned’ and ‘ancient’ countryside (Rackham 1986, 4–5), and, in a more complex way, in Professor Brian Roberts and Stuart Wrathmell’s definition of major settlement provinces, where ‘champaign’ landscapes are most characteristic of their Central Province (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000).

This study has been concerned with the understanding of an area to the east of that Central Province, a region where Harrison’s ‘woodland’ landscapes are strongly represented. However the situation in East Anglia is not a simple one. Harrison’s ‘woodland’ landscapes are certainly there, but there is much else that complicates the picture.

In Chapter 4 a system of interpreting the landscape by dividing it into eighteen landholding types was explained. The twelve case studies were interpreted in this way and the results presented in table and pie-chart forms (see the individual case studies in Chapter 5). In Fig. 16 the case study pie-charts are arranged geographically so that regional trends are more apparent. Clearly, one of the most significant factors is the percentage of common fields in each of the study areas (see also Chart 4). High percentages were recorded in Swanton Morley (67%), Dullingham (63%), Worstead (62%), and Scole with Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva (56%); moderate amounts in Ardeley (48%), Walsham-le-Willows (38%), Sutton (25%) and Great Henny (23%); but low amounts in Worlingworth (15%) and South Elmham St Michael (11%) and none in Felsted and Ingatestone. When viewed spatially (Fig. 17), it can be seen that there is significant patterning to this data. The areas that had large amounts of common fields can be seen to lie principally to the north and west of a diagonal line that runs through the middle of the study area from the south-west to the north-east, taking in Dullingham, Walsham-le-Willows, Scole, Swanton Morley and Worstead. Common fields were actually absent in the southermmost part of the study area, as at Ingatestone and Worstead. The area in between is not, however, just a gradual change between these two extremes, instead there seems to be a more complicated semi-inversion, with more common fields in a belt along the Essex-Suffolk border than in north-east Suffolk.

Conversely, indicators of land held in severity, and normally enclosed, are the two types of block demesne holdings and the block tenements. When amalgamated as a general class of ‘block holdings’, their percentages in the case studies are revealing (Chart 19). Low percentages occurred at Worstead (6%), Swanton Morley (7%) and Dullingham (8%); moderate amounts in Scole (25%), Sutton (30%), Ardeley (34%), Walsham-le-Willows (44%) and Great Henny (46%); and large amounts in Worlingworth (76%), South Elmham St Michael (83%), Ingatestone (84%) and Felsted (86%). When mapped (Fig. 18), this gives a reverse pattern to that seen for common fields.

The data from the other land-types is less immediately revealing, though again there are trends that seem to indicate that there are differences between the northern and southern parts of the region (see Chapter 4, 3). Overall, therefore, the case studies do seem to be showing significant regional patterning. Each study was chosen to be representative of a local region, as defined by Roberts and Wrathmell, and therefore the spot data provided by the case studies could be extrapolated to these larger areas, as is shown in Figs 16 and 17. Bearing in mind Roberts and Wrathmell’s own warning that their boundary lines were, perforce, compromises based on complex and often imprecise data, but also to avoid circularities of argument, linkages with other data sets were sought to confirm and refine the patterning (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000, 15–17).

As noted in Chapter 1, one of the stated aims of the project was to ‘utilise and interact with the East of England Historic Landscape Characterisation Project’ and therefore this was the most obvious starting point for the wider studies. This English Heritage-supported Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) project is planned to cover Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Norfolk and Suffolk, but at the time of writing only Suffolk had been completed, with Hertfordshire and Essex nearing completion and Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire in progress. As the Suffolk data was the most complete, this was the main source used to explore the possibilities of this approach, but with some use also of the Essex and Hertfordshire mapping (see Fig. 19).
Figure 17  The percentage of common fields in the case studies extended to their Roberts and Wrathmell local regions

Figure 18  The percentage of block holdings in the case studies extended to their Roberts and Wrathmell local regions
2. Constructing regional groupings using the case-study evidence in conjunction with Historic Landscape Characterisation mapping and other data sets: the Suffolk example

The HLC mapping of Suffolk identified thirteen major landscape character types, which were further subdivided into fifty-five sub-types. Of these, two types are of especial significance: fields resulting from ‘pre-eighteenth-century enclosure’ and fields resulting from ‘eighteenth-century and later enclosure’. A third type, defined as ‘post-1950 agricultural landscape’ is also significant as its sub-types are related to the original character of the fields. For the accompanying map (Fig. 19) the following landscape character types were selected:

1.1 pre-eighteenth-century enclosure: random fields
1.2 pre-eighteenth-century enclosure: rectilinear fields
1.3 pre-eighteenth-century enclosure: long co-axial fields
1.4 pre-eighteenth-century enclosure: irregular co-axial fields
2.1 eighteenth-century and later enclosure: former common arable or heathland
3.1 post-1950 agricultural landscape: boundary loss from random fields
3.2 post-1950 agricultural landscape: boundary loss from rectilinear fields
3.3 post-1950 agricultural landscape: boundary loss from long co-axial fields
3.4 post-1950 agricultural landscape: boundary loss from irregular co-axial fields
3.5 post-1950 agricultural landscape: boundary loss from post-1700 fields

Taking this raw data a step further, lines were drawn around the major trend changes to facilitate further comparative work (Fig. 20). These boundaries vary in their precision because some trends are more strongly marked than others. It should be stressed that the HLC mapping is still very new and as refinements are made to it, the derived boundaries may need revising in the future. However the maps do seem to indicate significant landscape trends.

Not unexpectedly, fields defined as resulting from ‘eighteenth-century and later enclosure’ show a clear correlation in west Suffolk with the distribution of common fields enclosed by parliamentary acts (Fig. 21). However no such correlation is seen in south-east Suffolk, where similarly-defined fields are not reflected by parliamentary enclosure, except in a very limited way in the Orford area. Although other evidence, as indicated in the Sutton case study, points to the former existence of common fields in this area, they were largely enclosed without the need for parliamentary acts and before the eighteenth century. However what was present in large quantities in this area were extensive heaths, as can seen on Joseph Hodkinson’s map of 1783 (County of Suffolk Surveyed) and even on the Land Utilisation Map of 1936. The close correspondence between the heaths and the areas of ‘eighteenth-century and later enclosure’ on the HLC map makes it clear that it is mainly the enclosure of these heaths that is giving this area its late enclosure character.

Two other smaller areas of non-correlation are apparent in the extreme south-west of Suffolk and in a tongue extending into the north-centre of the county, where parliamentary enclosure is recorded, but the HLC mapping indicates a ‘pre-eighteenth-century’ field pattern. A closer examination of the data shows that in both cases the parliamentary awards are in fact for relatively small areas of common fields, suggesting that the local significance of the common fields may have been different.
Figure 19 The East Anglian Historic Landscape Characterisation map (as completed for Suffolk, Essex and Hertfordshire in 2003)

Figure 20 Map delineating the major trends (blue line) of the East Anglian Historic Landscape Characterisation map
As more fully discussed in Chapter 3, there were considerable differences in the farming systems that were described as having ‘common fields’. I therefore suggested that common fields should be subdivided into at least three types:

• Type 1, the standard Midlands type.

• Type 2, a variant of the Midlands type with multiple fields and a lack of ridge-and-furrow. Two sub-types are discernible, depending on the way the strips of any one holding are distributed:
  Type 2A, mainly an equal distribution of the strips in the various fields.
  Type 2B, mainly clustered in one area.

• Type 3, very variable as to the size and number of the units and little consistency in what they were called, poorly developed communal cropping and folding arrangements, clustered holdings, usually enclosed early and without the aid of parliamentary acts, ridge-and-furrow virtually never occurs.

The evidence from the four Suffolk case studies — South Elmham St Michael, Worlingworth, Sutton and Walsham-le-Willows — suggests that their medieval farming systems had some broad similarities. In all four there were subdivided fields, but only limited evidence for truly communal farming practices and strong indications that these subdivided fields formed only a part of the farmland in each community; in all this suggests common fields of Type 3. In each place there was also evidence for medieval block holdings, both of demesnes and tenements.

The term ‘block’ has been preferred to ‘consolidated’, because the latter carries the implication that they resulted from the amalgamation of formerly separate pieces, in other words that they were once pieces of common fields. There has been a tendency for agricultural historians to assume that common fields were universal in lowland England, and that Harrison’s ‘woodland’ areas were the result of the early enclosure of previously existing common fields. Such a view seems to underpin J.R. Wordie’s study of the ‘chronology of enclosure’ and led B.A. Holderness to state authoritatively that ‘in the woodland clays medieval field systems had been extinguished before 1650’ (Wordie 1983; Holderness 1984, 205). But the case studies demonstrate that much did survive from the medieval layouts and that the subdivided fields were only one part of these farming systems. Their disappearance did not, therefore, necessarily mean that the farming systems were radically altered.

In much of Essex and south Suffolk the situation seems to be even more extreme, for in that area there is even less evidence for a phase of common fields pre-dating the block holdings. Here there was a tendency for the agricultural holdings to consist wholly or mainly of blocks of land in individual ownership or occupation (severalty). These blocks could be demesne land, glebe or ordinary tenements, with the demesne blocks standing out by being noticeably bigger and situated on the best available land.

The large fields of block demesnes can provide a challenge for the unwary because they can look uncannily like common fields. At Hitcham, for instance, the demesne fields in the mid-thirteenth century were very

Figure 21 The distribution of parliamentary enclosure acts that specified common field arable, overlain by the HLC trend boundary. (Source: derived from Tate and Turner 1978)
large, ranging between 20 acres and 170 acres (8 to 69 ha), and all were described as being either a campus or a feld. With one exception, these were presumably ‘open’, in the sense of not having substantial internal subdivisions (the exception is the campus called Partepol, which was described as being in three parts: 63 acres, 22 acres and 20 acres) (CUL EDR G/3/27, f.171v). Yet they were not part of any common farming system, they were exclusively demesne. Though now subdivided, the area of these fields is still recognisable today as having larger fields than the local average.

The areas characterised in the HLC mapping as ‘pre-eighteenth-century enclosure’ must, on the evidence of the case studies, contain areas with Type 3 or quasi-common fields, but must also include the areas with predominantly block holdings as well. There is a close correspondence between the boundary of the ‘pre-eighteenth-century enclosure’ areas and the distribution of clay soils derived from boulder clay or till (Fig. 22), indicating that both landholding systems are related to clay soils. The question therefore must be, can the HLC mapping be used to distinguish them? Interestingly, the HLC data does suggest two groups are present, which have largely, but not completely, complementary distributions. Occupying most of south Suffolk up to a line just north of the River Gipping, and then swinging eastward in a narrow band towards the River Alde, are field systems that were mainly defined as ‘random’, i.e. they had no obvious patterning. To the north of this line, running up to the county boundary in the north, were fields that were mainly defined as ‘long co-axial’, or ‘irregular co-axial’ (see Chapter 3, 6.vi for a definition of co-axial field systems).

By themselves, the two groups do not have clear-cut links to either quasi-common fields or block holdings. To advance the study it is necessary to see if the defined ‘territories’ of the two field morphologies accord with any other data sets. The most interesting of these is the distribution of block glebes, as revealed by seventeenth-century glebe terriers. David Dymond’s work on the terriers for the parishes of West Suffolk shows that there is a clear concentration of these in the area south of the Gipping line suggested by the HLC mapping (Fig. 23) (Dymond 2002, 82, map 2). Conversely, common field terminology was much more common in the glebes to the north of that line (Fig. 24). This raises the very real possibility that the ‘random’ field area is linked to block holdings and that the area with fields belonging to the ‘co-axial family’ has significant associations with quasi-common fields of Type 3.

An important distinguishing factor between these two groups stems from their differing topographies. Rosemary Hoppitt has produced a map of relative relief for Suffolk, which shows not the actual height of the land, but changes in relief per kilometre square (Fig. 25) (Hoppitt 1989). This therefore shows where the land is sloping and where it is flat. The area south of the Gipping line is mainly sloping, but north of the line it is mainly flat. This would, of course, have had enormous effect on the farming of the areas in the Middle Ages. A slope was vitally important for arable farming in clay areas to ensure that water drained away, preventing the soils from becoming waterlogged. Where the land was flat the water tended to lie, keeping the soil cold and either rotting the seeds or malignly affecting the growth. In 1790 John Josselyn, in commenting on land at Fressingfield (S), stressed that ‘unless the arable land is laid dry, in some wet years they must lose their crops’ (Theobald 2002, 20). As Arthur Young noted, ‘a rule to which I know few exceptions, is,

---

Figure 22 The Suffolk Historic Landscape Characterisation map and the distribution of clay soils (Source: adapted from the Soil Survey of England and Wales 1:250,000 Soil Map of England and Wales, 1983)
Figure 23  The distribution of block glebes in West Suffolk  
(Source: data from Suffolk Record Office, Bury St Edmunds, E14/4/1–4)

Figure 24  The distribution of glebes with common field strips in West Suffolk  
(Source: data from Suffolk Record Office, Bury St Edmunds, E14/4/1–4)
that wherever there are rivers in it, the slopes hanging to the vales through which they run, and the bottoms themselves, are of a superior quality’ (Young 1797, 3). Where plenty of sloping land was available, arable farming was possible over a wide area. Where there was limited sloping land, the potential for successful arable land was also limited. In south Suffolk it seems that the abundant availability of sloping land meant that block holdings were quite feasible, as most of the blocks were likely to contain suitable land for arable crops.

But in the flat areas of north Suffolk, the land suitable for arable farming must have been in short supply. This would give a reason for the presence of relatively small areas of common fields — a sharing out of the limited supply of suitable land. The case study of South Elmham St Michael it seems that the abundant availability of sloping land meant that block holdings were quite feasible, as most of the blocks were likely to contain suitable land for arable crops.

But in the flat areas of north Suffolk, the land suitable for arable farming must have been in short supply. This would give a reason for the presence of relatively small areas of common fields — a sharing out of the limited supply of suitable land. The case study of South Elmham St Michael it seems that the abundant availability of sloping land meant that block holdings were quite feasible, as most of the blocks were likely to contain suitable land for arable crops.

An ancient origin for dairying in this area could explain the use there of a dialect term for a cow-house that is unique in England (Orton and Tilling 1969, 60–1; Wakelin 1972, 72, map 3). ‘Neat-house’ (from Old English neat ‘cattle’) was only recorded in north Suffolk and south Norfolk, and nowhere else. Earlier records suggest a slightly wider distribution that includes southwest Suffolk, but it does still seem to be a specifically East Anglian term.*

Robert Ryece, writing c.1605, gives support to these deductions about the varying availability of land that was suitable for arable crops ‘those parts inclining to the east commonly called high Suffolk [by this he seems to mean north-central and north-east Suffolk], do especially and chiefly consist upon pasture and feeding, contenting themselves only, with so much tillage as will satisfy their own expences’. In contrast, the ‘midle parts [by

Figure 25 Rosemary Hoppitt’s map of relative relief in Suffolk, overlain by the HLC trend boundary.

Source: based on Hoppitt 1989, 81; ©R. Hoppitt, used with permission
which he seems to mean south-central Suffolk] although enjoying much meddow and pasture, yett far more tillage doe from thence raise their chiefest maintenance' (Suffolk Breviary 1902, 29).

Despite claims that the co-axial systems on the East Anglian clays are ‘terrain oblivious’ (Williamson 1993a, 25), on closer examination it is clear that the alignments run at right-angles to the main water courses, changing their axes when the water courses alter theirs (Martin 1999b, 56). This suggests that the co-axial alignments may have a practical purpose, to drain water from the flat clay lands. This would fit with the observation that the co-axial systems are most apparent on the heaviest and flattest land, as at South Elmham St Michael, but tend to disintegrate when they reach more sloping land (Martin 1999b, fig.3.6).

Improvements to the drainage of these flat clay lands, whether through more effective ditches, more efficient furrowing methods or, from the second half of the eighteenth century, through underdraining, would have lessened the need to rely on a limited number of sloping common fields for arable crops. As their relative value lessened through the wider availability of arable land elsewhere, there would be a tendency for them to slip out of communal use into severalty. This could well be the main reason why common fields of Type 3 disappeared without any great difficulty and much earlier than those of Type 2. Their limited extents, combined with poorly developed communal cropping and folding arrangements, meant that there were few barriers to their conversion to severalty.

Although separable on the basis of dominant field morphology, the clayland areas with block holdings and Type 3 common fields share many attributes that tend to unite them and distinguish them from the Type 2 common field areas to the west and east. They both have numerous medieval moated sites and greens, and had dispersed settlement patterns in the nineteenth century (Figs 27–28) (Martin 1999a, 60–1; Roberts and Wrathmell 2000). It can certainly be argued that moats are more closely linked to the availability of water-retentive clay soils in both areas, but their dispersed pattern serves to underline that the dispersed settlement pattern recorded in the nineteenth century is the continuation of a medieval pattern. This dispersed pattern contrasts with the nucleated villages that are more typical of the areas with Type 2 common fields. Greens also show a close correspondence to clay soils, being most frequent on land with poor drainage. Not surprisingly, the largest greens occur on the extensive flat lands of north Suffolk, whereas in south Suffolk they are noticeably smaller and more linear in form, reflecting the narrower interfluves there (Martin 1995).

Beyond this topographically-determined divide there is also the suggestion of a cultural division, for one of the old terms used for a green has a distribution pattern that respects the Gipping line arising from the HLC work. This term is ‘tye’, derived from Old English teag ‘a close, an enclosure’, but here used in its later sense of ‘a common pasture’. In this developed sense, tye is only found in Kent, Essex and, in Suffolk, almost exclusively to the south of the Gipping line (Fig. 29) (Smith 1956, II, 177; Martin 1999a, 62–3).

That the Gipping divide has a cultural significance is further suggested by the higher frequency of Borough English tenure (inheritance by the youngest son) in the clayland of Suffolk to the north of the divide (Corner 1859; MacCulloch 1986, 31, map v), information derived from Corner; see also the Thelveton (N) and

Figure 26  The dairying region of Suffolk, as suggested by Arthur Young in his General View of the Agriculture of the County of Suffolk, 1797, together with the additional areas suggested by Jonathan Theobald in An Historical Atlas of Suffolk, 1999, compared with the HLC trend boundary. (Source: Dymond and Martin 1999, map 60)
Figure 27  The distribution of moated sites in East Anglia, with the addition of the HLC trend boundary
(Sources: Dymond and Martin 1999, map 25; Hedges 1978, fig. 21; Herts. HER; Kirby and Oosthuizen 2000, map 37; Wade-Martins 1994, map 28)

Figure 28  The distribution of greens in East Anglia
(Sources: Dymond and Martin 1999, map 26; Roberts and Wrathmell 2000, fig. 30)
The occurrence of Borough English is often linked with that of partible inheritance (gavelkind) and it may be that Borough English evolved from partible inheritance (Faith 1966, 82–3). Partible inheritance also seems to be more frequent north of the Gipping, as in the Walshall-le-Willows (S) case study. The fact that Borough English appears to be absent from the Type 2 common field area to the west suggests that although there are important differences between the claylands north and south of the Gipping divide, there are even greater differences between the claylands and the areas with Type 2 common fields.

The divide also appears to have significance in vernacular architecture. This is most clearly seen in the distribution of queen-post roofs, dating from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries. In Suffolk these have a distribution that almost exactly mirrors that of the dairying region discussed above, with very few examples south of the Gipping line (Fig. 31) (Colman and Barnard 1999). They are almost unknown in Essex, but common in much of Norfolk (Aitkens 1998, 45; Heywood 1998, 48). This roof type developed from the raised-aisled roofs of the fourteenth century. These too have a concentration in north-central Suffolk, but are also found sporadically as far west and south as Wymondley Bury in Hertfordshire and Felsted in Essex, and just over the Norfolk border in Harleston and Denton (Aitkens 1998, 40, 43). In contrast to the queen-post roofs, crown-post roofs and coupled-rafter roofs were more popular in Suffolk to the south of the line, and crown-posts were the dominant type in Essex from 1300 to the end of the medieval period (Colman 1999; Aitkens and Wade Martins 1998, 29; Walker 1998, 9). The Gipping divide also shows up in techniques of bracing the wooden frames of buildings: to the north ‘upward’ or ‘arch’ braces are usual, while to the south ‘downward’ or ‘tension’ braces are the norm (Aitkens 1998, 44).

In plan form there are also significant variations. To the north of the line the majority of timber-framed houses have an ‘in-line’ plan (i.e. all the rooms are contained within one axial roof), whereas to the south (in both south Suffolk and Essex) there is a much higher incidence of houses with the parlour and service rooms in cross-wings which are separately roofed at right-angles to the hall (Aitkens and Wade Martins 1998, 29; Walker 1998, 9). There are also differences in the siting of inserted sixteenth-century chimneys in former open halls. In south Suffolk the fireplaces heating the halls were often positioned at the low end, against the cross-passage, but in north Suffolk the fireplace was usually placed at the high end, between the hall and the parlour (and contained within the parlour). These north Suffolk parlours were often remarkably small and in the smaller houses were unheated. In the seventeenth century the high-end stack became the universal type in both areas (Aitkens and Wade Martins 1998, 29).

In farm buildings, the most obvious divide is between the clayland areas and the areas of Type 1 common fields. In the former the historic pattern was one of irregular farmyards dominated by timber-framed buildings of medieval or early post-medieval date. In the latter there is a greater incidence of planned farmyards of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century date, and also of brick or flint buildings. A more subtle patterning is however discernible.
Figure 30  The occurrence of Borough English tenure (inheritance by the youngest son) in Suffolk
(Sources: Corner 1859; Chorography of Suffolk; author)

Figure 31  The distribution of vernacular buildings with raised-aisle and queen-post roofs in Suffolk
(Source: Dymond and Martin 1999, map 82)
in the distribution of timber-framed aisled barns of medieval and early post-medieval date (Fig. 32). In Suffolk these occur mainly in the south-west quarter of the county (Aitkens 1999). There is a reasonable correspondence with the Gipping line in mid-Suffolk, but there is also a noticeable overlap to the west of Bury St Edmunds, where aisled barns also occur in the southern part of the Type 2 common field area. The explanation must lie in the greater emphasis in these areas on cereal crops, for the aisled barns have a greater volume than normal ones for the storage and processing of crops. As already mentioned, Robert Ryece drew attention to the importance of tillage in south Suffolk, but he also described ‘the westerne parts, either wholly champion or neer, the feilding abounding by tillage and flockes of sheepe, doe from thence emprove their greatest commodities’. This explanation is further borne out by the fact that most small barns, with up to three bays, are to the north-east of the Gipping line, while those with seven or more bays are predominantly to the south of the line (Aitkens and Wade Martins 1998, map 5). The small barns would only have had a single threshing floor, but two or more occur in the larger barns.

Discussion of the evidence for woodland in East Anglia, as recorded in Domesday Book, is complicated by the arcane way it was recorded. In East Anglia the size of the woodland is not expressed in terms of acres, but as wood for ‘x number of swine’. Oliver Rackham has shown that although it is possible to construct an approximate correlation graph, there are indications that in some cases, at least, the swine-assessment was not proportional to the size of the wood (Rackham 1980, 120–1, fig. 9.4). The distribution of woodland does however show a clear linkage with the clay soil areas; the areas of sandy soils in the Breckland, north-west Norfolk, and south-east Suffolk, together with the Flegg loams of north-east Norfolk, being largely devoid of woods (Fig. 33) (Rackham 1980, 122). Within the Suffolk part of the clayland, the Gipping line shows up as the division between an area with dense and large swine assessments to the north of the line and an area with more scattered and smaller assessments to the south of it. The distribution becomes denser again in Essex and in the small strip of clayland on the south-east side of Cambridgeshire. This last change may be related to different assessment methods in different counties, but the change at the Gipping line does seem to indicate something significant. There is also a suggestion of a difference in some of the words used in the Middle Ages for ancient woodland in the two areas. To the north, the term haugh/haw, from Old English haga (or Old Norse hagi — the two are largely indistinguishable) is found, whilst to the south hay/hey, from Old English (ge)haeg, seems to be more usual. P.H. Reaney noted that (ge)haeg ‘was, in Essex, a name for an enclosed wood or a forest enclosure’ and that it was relatively common (more so than in Hertfordshire) with some 60 examples, but that haga was rare (Reaney 1935, 586). The terms are etymologically linked, but the preference for the different forms suggests differences in people (Viking as opposed to English) or at least in dialect, or perhaps differences in the actual form of the woods in the two areas.

The Gipping divide also shows up in the modern distribution of ancient woodland, but in an inverse way to...
what might have been expected. Ancient woodland is now found mainly to the south of the line, extending on into Essex (Fig. 34). To the north of the line there is a much lighter and dispersed pattern of woodland, which continues into Norfolk (Rackham 1999; English Nature 1999). Part of the explanation lies in the Domesday Book data, which shows that the places where the wood assessment was greater in 1066 than in 1086 lie overwhelmingly to the north of the Gipping line. This indicates that woodland was being actively reduced in north Suffolk, but not in the south. One reason could be a difference in the type of woodland being recorded. It may be that in north Suffolk the woodland was more in the nature of wooded high clayland ‘waste’, grading into wood-pasture. In the south the Domesday woodland probably resembled the woods that survive today, that is to say, smaller, but clearly demarcated and managed areas, defined by banks and ditches, set in an enclosed landscape. This character may have made them more resistant to incidental damage through animal grazing.

There is some accumulating evidence to suggest that this divide is also reflected in trade patterns. At present this is most readily seen in the distribution of different types of medieval pottery. The products of Essex kilns appear to have dominated the markets to the south of the Gipping, as is well demonstrated by a sizeable assemblage recently excavated on a rural site at Preston St Mary, near the middle of central-south Suffolk. This site has produced nearly 25,000 sherds of medieval pottery, the majority of which have forms and fabrics that are very similar to Essex wares, with Hedingham Ware (from Sible Hedingham in north-west Essex, some 15–20 miles from Preston) as the most numerous identifiable type. This Essex dominance is also seen in the border towns of Sudbury and Haverhill and elsewhere in south Suffolk (Anderson 2004).

3. Extending the patterns and groupings: Essex and Hertfordshire

The above studies show that many of the trends identified in Suffolk do seem to extend outwards into the neighbouring counties, but as yet the data is not complete enough to do more than tentative mapping (Fig. 19). The available HLC maps of Essex and Hertfordshire suggest that the zone of ‘random fields’ resulting from pre-eighteenth-century enclosure extends in a broad belt diagonally across Essex and into eastern Hertfordshire, following the distribution of the boulder clay or glacial till. Its western end is dissected by the valleys of rivers like the Stort and the Rib; while those of the Lea and Beane mark its western limit.

To the north of this zone there is a change to fields characterised as resulting from eighteenth-century and later enclosure. These follow the chalk soils that stretch from southern Cambridgeshire, through north-west Essex and on into northern Hertfordshire. The testimony of eighteenth-century writers supports this characterisation: Charles Vancouver referred to north-west Essex as ‘the open-field county’ and D. Walker noted that in...
Hertfordshire ‘the larger common fields lie towards Cambridgeshire’ (Vancouver 1795, 104 — it made up his ‘District the Thirteenth’; Walker 1795, 48). The case study of Ardeley lies on the boundary of these zones, as Sir Henry Chauncy recognised in 1700, when he described the eastern part of the parish as being ‘much enclos’d, very woody, and the soil heavy’, but the western part as being ‘heretofore Champion’, with a mixed soil of clay, gravel, chalk and flint (Chauncy 1700, 131). These differences in farming regimes are likely to date back to at least the thirteenth century, for a survey of 1297 makes a distinction between land in ‘several’ and ‘non-several’ fields (campi separales and campi non seperabili) (Guildhall MS 25516, f.110r).

The common fields at Ardeley do not seem to have been organised into a regular three- or two-field system, but at the northern end of the adjacent parish of Weston there is evidence of a three-field system (Gray 1915, 370–1). Even more significant is the presence, just over six miles to the west, of Hitchin, the place that Frederic Seebohm used as a typical example of the three-field system (Seebohm 1883, 1–13). It is clear that there was here a rapid progression from enclosed fields to common fields of the Midland system. H.L. Gray regarded the chalk hills that extend across England from the Thames to East Anglia to be one of the fundamental divides of English field systems, separating the Midland three- and two-field systems from the more irregular regimes to the south and east (Gray 1915, 63, 401, 417–18). The significance of this boundary in landscape terms is reinforced by the fact that B.K. Roberts and S. Wrathmell have identified a very similar major line in their mapping of settlement provinces — to the north lies their Central Province, to the south, the South Eastern Province (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000, 2).

In Essex, to the west of a diagonal line drawn from Haverhill through Thaxted to Hatfield Broad Oak, there is abundant evidence for common fields, both through the testimony of eighteenth-century writers, as noted above, but also through parliamentary acts specifying the enclosure of common fields (Fig. 21). However, characterising the field systems of the rest of Essex is no easy task, for as H.L. Gray put it: ‘The early field system of few English counties is so difficult to describe as that of Essex’ (Gray 1915, 387). Early commentators on the enclosed landscape of the Essex clays were unanimous in declaring its antiquity. Messrs Griggs referred to ‘the inclosures which from time immemorial have almost universally prevailed’ (Griggs 1794, 8). Their views were echoed by correspondents to the Board of Agriculture from Great Dunmow and Boreham, who declared that the lands in their areas were all enclosed and had been ‘from time immemorial’ (Vancouver 1795, 202, 207). Enclosures were widespread by the sixteenth century, as is shown by the writings of Sir Thomas Smith and Thomas Tusser (see Chapter 3, 3.iii) and there is no reason to suppose that these replaced extensive medieval common fields. This does not mean that common fields were
completely absent, for, as in Suffolk, quasi-common fields of Type 3 (or possibly even Type 2B) do occur in varying intensities.

David Roden has commented that ‘there is no indication that communal cultivation was ever widespread’ in Essex, however he did acknowledge that there was documentary evidence from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries for ‘the existence of small common fields’ in southern Essex (Rawrath, Rocheford and Haverings) and at Lawling, to the south of the Blackwater estuary. He also noted ‘fairly extensive common fields’ in a group of townships around Colchester (Roden 1973, 340). R.H. Britnell’s study of the medieval fields of Colchester has shown that ‘instead of large open fields subdivided into furlongs, Colchester had an unsystematic arrangement of fields large and small, some subdivided and some not, in which holdings were usually made up of compact blocks of land rather than strips.’ There was little evidence, however, of communal cropping, with different crops being grown in the same fields, even quite small ones. Common rights did exist on some (but by no means all) of the arable land, but these seem to have been limited largely to common grazing after harvest and could relate to both enclosed and unenclosed land. In the eighteenth century these were called half-year lands, that is lands subject to commoning for six months when lying idle (Britnell 1988, 159, 161–3). Charles Vancouver referred to the existence of ‘open-field arable’ in his day just outside Colchester at Lexden, and at Dedham, slightly to the north on the south side of the River Stour (Vancouver 1795, 37). The Dedham common fields are confirmed by a parliamentary act for their enclosure in 1800 (Tate and Turner 1978, 110). There are also parliamentary acts for the enclosure of common fields in a group of parishes (Belchamp Otten, Belchamp Walter and Middleton in Essex; Great Waldingfield and Great Cornard in Suffolk) in the middle part of the Stour valley, around Sudbury (Tate and Turner 1978, 112, 242). The case study of Great Henny lies in this same area and although there was no parliamentary enclosure there, there is evidence that around 26% of its land did lie in common fields. This group lies only about five miles to the east of the main concentration of common field land in north-west Essex and may be a localised, valley-related, outlier of that grouping.

As in Suffolk, the enclosed landscape in Essex was associated with a dispersed settlement pattern in the nineteenth century (Wratmell 1999). Many of the dispersed farmsteads are moated, showing that this pattern was established by the Middle Ages. Excavations at Stedingford in Felsted have revealed that one dispersed farmstead originated in the mid-twelfth century (Medlycott 1996). This cannot be taken as a general horizon for the establishment of these dispersed settlement patterns as this site is but one of many dispersed farmsteads in Felsted, many of which are likely to have been in existence by 1086. Although nothing of this date was found in the excavations, a few of the excavated ditches appeared to be Roman in date, suggesting that this was not virgin territory. Fieldwork by Tom Williamson on the very edge of this zone in north-west Essex has revealed a pattern of small Roman settlements that were ‘evenly but sparsely scattered’, across the clay interfluves. This led him to conclude that there had been ‘extensive clearance [of trees for agriculture] in the Roman period’. The paucity of finds of the Saxon period suggests that there was an hiatus in the continuity of settlement, but although Williamson accepts that there was some contraction of land under cultivation, the ‘suggestive similarity between the Romano-British pattern of settlement and that of the early medieval period’ imply that this hiatus was more apparent than real (Williamson 1986). The HLC data only allows the approximate plotting of the eastern limits of this zone of ‘random-pattern’ fields in Essex, but it does seem to be substantially equivalent to John Hunter’s ‘Essex Till’ and ‘Mid Essex’ zones and the Countieside Agency’s ‘South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland’ Character Area (Hunter 1999a, 6; Countieside Agency 1999, 76). To the east of this the position is less clear, for although Oliver Rackham has suggested that common fields were absent from the south-east part of Essex, there is some evidence (as detailed above) for Type 2B or 3 common fields as well as ancient severity (Rackham 1986, 172). There is clearly a need for historical regression studies of field systems in this area. Although striking field patterns, like that of the Dengie peninsula, have been identified, there has been little attempt to understand how they were used in historic times (Rodwell 1978).

4. Extending the patterns and groupings: Norfolk

There is no HLC mapping in Norfolk to guide the construction of regional groupings north of the River Waveney. However it is possible to make use of other landscape designations and definitions to outline some probabilities.

The zone of pre-eighteenth-century enclosure of co-axial type identified in the clayland parts of north Suffolk is known to continue into south Norfolk. It is present in the Scole case study and it formed the basis of Tom Williamson’s study of co-axial landscapes (Williamson 1987). The Countryside Agency regards the two areas as being part of the same character area, which it terms the ‘South Norfolk and High Suffolk Claylands’ (Countieside Agency 1999, 63–80). Susanna Wade Martins and Tom Williamson have similarly put the two into one farming region that they called the ‘Central Claylands’ (Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, x, 21–5). This continuity was recognised by William Marshall who, in 1787, noted that farming systems in south Norfolk ‘partake of the Suffolk practice’ (Marshall 1787, 1–2). In this area common fields of Type 3 are, therefore, to be expected.

The northern part of the Norfolk claylands, from Wymondham northwards, is however more dissected and has a different character. The Countryside Agency calls it ‘Mid Norfolk’ and Wade Martins and Williamson term it the ‘Dissected Boulder Claylands’ (Countieside Agency 1999, 34–9; Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, x, 28). The case study of Swanton Morley lies fairly centrally in this area and it does seem to be representative of the character. The dissected character of the clayland means that there was good natural drainage and a higher proportion of arable farming, historically, than in the area to the south (Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, 28). Unlike south Suffolk however, this seems to have resulted in a higher incidence of common fields rather than block holdings. At Swanton Morley, 67% of the land was in common fields.
The higher incidence of parliamentary enclosure in this area suggests that the common fields were of Type 2, rather than 3. The general landscape character is therefore likely to be one of 'eighteenth-century and later enclosure'. Aspects of clayland character, however, remain in the frequency of medieval moated sites and a generally dispersed settlement pattern. In the western and northern parts of Norfolk 'eighteenth-century and later enclosure' is also likely to be the dominant landscape type. Around 1600 Sir Henry Spelman of Narborough wrote that 'The parts from Thetford to Burnham, and thence Westward, as also along the Coast, be counted Champion: the rest (as better furnished with woods) Woodland (Arloft ed. 1953, p.35–6). William Marshall described west Norfolk as being 'either marshy, low land, applied chiefly to the dairy, after the manner of Cambridgeshire; or open sheep-walks and extensive heaths, whose stock are sheep and rabbits; or newly-inclosed country (chiefly of the last description)'. He also noted that there were 'towards the north coast, some pretty extensive common fields still open' (Marshall 1787, 1–2, 8). These views are borne out by the high incidence of parliametary enclosure in these areas. Type 2 common fields are well evidenced and are associated with a nucleated settlement pattern (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000, 8).

East Norfolk presents more of a challenge to characterisation. A French visitor, François de La Rochefoucauld, visiting the area around Blickling in north-east Norfolk in 1784 expressed this view of the landscape:

The countryside is uneven and was very early enclosed: there are great numbers of big trees in these enclosures and, as you survey them horizontally, there are many places where they form a mass and present a view of Germany, of immense forests with patches of cultivation, and houses, bell-towers and the houses of farms that can’t be seen: in these openings, nothing could be more delightful than the selection and the making of this view: it is quite unlike any view in England and makes tremendous effect (Scarfe 1988, 202).

Around the same time, William Marshall recorded a very similar impression of this East Norfolk landscape:

The INCLOSURES are, in general, small, and the hedges high and full of trees. This has a singular effect in travelling through the country: the eye seems ever on the verge of a forest, which is, as it were by enchantment, continually changing into inclosures and hedgerows. There is not, generally speaking, a piece of woodland or a coppice in the whole District: and even plantations are thinly and partially scattered. … Some remnants of common fields still remain; but in general they are not larger than well sized inclosures. Upon the whole, East Norfolk at large may be said to be A VERY OLD-INCLOSED COUNTRY (Marshall 1795, I, 4).

He goes on to state:

The farms of East Norfolk are principally inclosed; there being, as has been already observed, very few common fields at present in this District; and those few are in general very small, ten, twenty or thirty acres; cut into patches and shreds of two or three acres, down to half an acre, or perhaps, a rood each. … many beneficial exchanges of intermixed lands have lately taken place, and many more equally advantageous remain yet to be made. … But notwithstanding these intermixtures … there are many compact ring-fence farms to be met with in the District (Marshall 1795, 8–9).

Yet Wade Martins and Williamson have stated that in the eastern district of Flegg 'parliamentary enclosure had a much greater impact than in any other region of East Anglia except Breckland'. They go on to quote that in the Hundreds of East and West Flegg 59% of the total area was enclosed by parliamentary acts and that 55% of this consisted of common-field arable (Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, 47). Mapping by Michael Turner, however, suggests a lower overall figure of about 40%, which accords more with the figure of 38% given for the neighbouring hundreds of Happing and Tunstead by Wade Martins and Williamson (Turner 1994; Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, 47). The settlement pattern is complicated by the presence of the former island of Flegg, surrounded by the marshes that became Broadland. The former shows up on Roberts and Wrathmell’s map as a cluster of small nucleations within an ‘eye’ of medium density dispersion and the latter, not surprisingly, as a corona of very low density dispersion; further north, the settlement pattern is one of high density dispersion (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000, 8).

Professor Bruce Campbell’s study of this area found that surveys of the sixteenth century point towards common fields that averaged 60–70% of the surveyed areas, and perhaps 40–50% of the total parish areas (Campbell 1981b, 10). However it is the nature of those common fields that is more significant. Campbell noted that:

the layout of their fields shared one fundamental feature: a pervasive irregularity. There is no evidence that any of them ever possessed the sort of internal order that was the essence of the regular commonfield systems of the Midlands. … Moreover, the constituent parcels of individual holdings were extremely unevenly divided within these precincts [arbitrary divisions of the common fields] and there was a marked tendency for individual holdings to be concentrated within particular portions of the parish. … Likewise, communal rotations such as existed in the Midlands, and irregular cropping shifts such as existed in western Norfolk, were both absent from east Norfolk and harvest shack remained the sole common right to which its commonfields were subject (Campbell 1981b, 12–14).

He also noted that the ‘fields into which the arable was divided were substantial in number and varied in size’. His analysis of a survey of Martham in 1292 revealed that though 53.6% of the surveyed area (not the complete parish) lay in ‘relatively extensive’ fields with the suffix feld, a substantial portion, 35.8%, lay in much smaller fields with the suffixes dele, grave, lond, mere, toft and wong. A survey of the adjoining parish of Hemsby in 1422 recorded that the arable there was divided into almost a hundred separate divisions, the largest of which contained only 29.6 acres, and none of their names contained the element field. In both places he noted that, with the probable exception of the demesne land, the fields were characterised by ‘an intense degree of subdivision’. At Martham the land of the peasantry was divided into 2,122 separate parcels, with a mean size of 0.5 acre, and at Hemsby there were 1,479 parcels with a mean size of 0.7 acre (Campbell 1981b, 15–16).
This extreme parcellation seems to have been partly caused by the custom of partible inheritance, which was to be found in many, but not all, the manors of eastern Norfolk. There was also an active land market — at Martham ninety-eight separate transactions dealing with 37 acres were recorded in the manor court between 1288 and 1299 (Campbell 1981b, 22–3). What appears to have sustained this parcellation was the high fertility of the soil, the rich loams of Flegg being regarded as some of the best arable land in Norfolk. On such a fertile soil, peasant farmers could clearly subsist on very small holdings.

The fertility of the soil meant that smallholdings had a long-term viability here and it is likely that it was the problems attendant on re-organising these that gave rise to the high incidence of parliamentary enclosure in this part of east Norfolk. The pre-enclosure smallholdings, however, appear to have existed within a framework of fields of modest or even small size, some of which were probably hedged entities by the thirteenth century. This, presumably, is the ‘old-enclosed’ landscape that Marshall saw and commented upon. The Countryside Agency has divided this region into two interlocking character areas: ‘North East Norfolk and Flegg’ and ‘The Broads’. Significantly, one of the key characteristics of the former area is stated to be ‘A landscape of small- to medium-scale fields, small farms, high hedges and prominent hedgerow trees’ — a description that Marshall himself might have penned (Countryside Agency 1999, 40). The Countryside Agency goes on to note that ‘Early enclosure provided a small-scale intricate field system and narrow, winding lanes’.

The case study at Worstead lies in the northern part of this east Norfolk area, being on the boundary between the Flegg Loams and the Northern Heathlands. Its topography reflects this, with an extensive area of former heathland in the northern part of the parish. When mapped around 1600, the arable land of Worstead presented a picture of numerous small fields, mainly of linear form and weakly co-axial, with nine irregular areas of common fields that made up about a quarter of the total parish area. Their irregular form does, however, indicate that they were once larger, but had undergone piecemeal enclosure, probably over a long period. The remnants of the common fields were enclosed without the need for a parliamentary act; an act of 1821 only dealt with 310 acres of waste and commons (NRO C/Sca 2/342). The tithe map of 1843 shows a landscape where many of the features of the c.1600 map are still recognisable, but which has been thinned of field boundaries, the fields being now more square in shape (NRO MF780 (660)). The greatest change is in the northern part of the parish, adjoining the former heath, where a more fundamental reorganisation into rectangular blocks had been carried out.

In overall terms, the high incidences of parliamentary enclosure over large areas of western, central and northern Norfolk makes it likely that those areas will have landscapes resulting from eighteenth-century and later enclosure. But in south and east Norfolk there is evidence for earlier enclosure, linking those areas to the more southerly parts of East Anglia, where pre-eighteenth-century enclosure is dominant.
5. A new medieval farming systems map

By taking the data derived from Historic Landscape Characterisation mapping, tempering it with information taken from the case studies, parliamentary enclosure etc., it is possible to create a new map (Fig. 35) showing the likely extent of the various medieval farming systems that have been discussed in the earlier parts of this chapter. The map does not purport to be definitive, but it does provide a vehicle for debate and further research.

One obvious point of debate is the correlation between the regions on this new map and those put forward by Brian Roberts and Stuart Wrathmell in their *Atlas of Rural Settlement in England*, as they formed an important part of the research strategy of this project (Fig. 36). At first glance, there seems to be quite a lot of divergence between the two sets of regions, but this is to mistake the lines of both as sharp boundaries rather than as trend indications. When viewed as trends, it is possible to see that the two maps frequently reflect similar trends, even if the exact boundaries vary. At a detailed level, the eastward bulge of common fields along the Stour valley shown on my map finds an echo in a similar bulge on Roberts and Wrathmell’s map. Similarities in the trends of lines are also to be seen in south-east Essex, north-west Essex, east Cambridgeshire, east Suffolk and in parts of south Norfolk. However, there are some important differences. The ‘Gipping divide’ is not reflected in the Roberts and Wrathmell map and there is room to debate whether the correct boundaries on their map have been characterised as being of provincial, sub-provincial or local region importance.

If an equation is made between Roberts and Wrathmell’s Central Province and common fields of Type 1, the evidence from Ardeley suggests that there should be a buffer zone with fields of Type 2A to the north of Ardeley before the start of the Central Province. One could suggest that a line following the weight of the distribution of ridge-and-furrow might give a truer indication of the province boundary. This would include western Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire, but would exclude most of northern Hertfordshire. If it were to be argued that both Types 1 and 2A should be included in the Central Province, the boundary would have to be redrawn to include most of Cambridgeshire, north-west Suffolk and the western half of Norfolk. If the provincial boundary was left more or less in its present position, I would suggest that the eastern sub-provincial boundary of EWASH(E) should be moved to reflect the occurrence of common fields of Type 2A, that is to include the western half of Norfolk, north-western Suffolk (excluding the eastern bulge of the sub-provincial boundary that now includes Walsham-le-Willows) and most of eastern Cambridge (excluding the extreme south-east). The EANGL sub-province should perhaps be two sub-provinces. Firstly, a northern and eastern zone that comprises the areas with Types 2B and 3 common fields, that is east Norfolk, east Suffolk, east Essex, the Stour valley and the extreme south-east of Cambridgeshire and the south-west Suffolk. Secondly, a southern zone that is characterised by block holdings, but is divided into two
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segments by the Stour valley: the two parts being south-central Suffolk and central Essex. The debate about provincial and other boundaries is doubtless just beginning, but this project has provided some new information to stimulate and inform that debate.

Another important point of comparison is with the map of farming regions in East Anglia prepared for *The Agrarian History of England and Wales* in 1984 (Fig. 37) (Thirsk 1984, 198). The comparison shows, once again, numerous differences but also some shared trends. This shows a predominance of arable regimes in a broad band that runs across Cambridgeshire, north-west Suffolk and across most of Norfolk, except the south-east. This approximates to the areas of Type 2A and 2B common fields, though the extent of their ‘W. Suffolk fielding’ region is too extensive in the light of this project’s findings. There is also a failure to recognise the complexity of the Stour valley area.

Along the eastern coastal fringe there is another ‘intermediate’ zone, with significant amount of sheep in the Suffolk ‘Sandlings’ and of cattle in the ‘Saltings’ of Essex and the Broads of Norfolk. This corresponds in a generalised way, without the complex indentations and projections, to the areas of Type 2B and Type 3 common fields.

The overall impression is that two farming region maps are picking up on similar trends, with the new map providing a high degree of definition of the boundaries. The *Agrarian History* map is also a timely reminder that the differences in the organisation of the field systems were also often accompanied by important differences in the arable/pastoral balance. Some of these issues will be further examined in the next chapter.

6. Further research

This project has developed some new ways of looking at field systems and of combining data sets to stimulate ideas. It has been possible to suggest broad trends but there is now a need to carry out more detailed studies, particularly in the areas not covered by the case studies of the project, to validate and refine the conclusions. The generation of more data sets that can be converted into computerised maps is also clearly a priority, as is the further development of those that already exist in part. There is also a need to test some of the conclusions in the field. The differing natures of the field boundaries have only been touched upon. To further develop these aspects it will be necessary to collect data in the field.
Understanding the historical evolution of field systems is a necessary first step in understanding the character of the countryside. There are growing needs for the reliable characterisation of the countryside for development planning, farm subsidies, forestry plans and numerous other reasons. For East Anglia the first small step has been taken.

Endnotes
1. The term champagn or champion, from Old French champagne ‘open country’, was used by many early writers to describe open common fields.
2. The HLC maps used were: Suffolk version 1a, 2002; Essex May 2003; Hertfordshire March 2002.
3. The HLC mapping was based on field morphology, as shown on Ordnance Survey maps, it was not derived from the enclosure awards themselves, which would lead to a circularity of argument. The data on the distribution of common fields comes from the lists specifying ‘open’ field arable in Tate and Turner 1978.
4. For this see Stamp and Willatts 1936; a copy of the map is held by Suffolk County Council.
5. I am grateful to David Dymond for allowing me to use his notes on the original terriers of 1613–14, 1635 and 1638, contained in SRO (B) E14/4/1–4.
6. Neathouses are recorded in the glebe terriers of Brockley (1613), Ousden (1638) and Great Saxham (undated, but seventeenth century) — notes by D. Dymond on documents in SRO (B).
7. For a detailed discussion of underdraining methods, see Williamson 1999.
8. Tye is apparently absent from both Hertfordshire and Middlesex (Reaney 1935, 569). The only example known to me of a tye north of the Gipping is a 1446 reference (SRO (I) HA 1/CC1/8) to Thorney tye, which is probably now Thorney Green in Stowupland, just under a mile (1.5km) north-east of the Gipping. I am grateful to Nicholas Amor for alerting me to this. A claimed ‘Bemkes Tye’ in the same area in 1434 (Amor 2006, 183) is more likely to be Bremkres sih (SRO (I) HA 1/CC1/8). The first part probably refers to the Brongor or Brungor family (present in the area in the fourteenth century) and the second, abbreviated, part may be ‘si(t)ch’, meaning a small stream or ditch (Field 1993, 49–50).
9. This shows listed barns only and is likely to be under-representing barns in south-central Suffolk due to the lack of recent listing work in that area. Most of Suffolk was re-listed between 1983 and 1987, but the lists for the old rural districts of Clare, Melford and Cosford date from the 1970s.
10. I am grateful to Sue Anderson for information on the pottery evidence.
11. Speed noted that ‘This Description of Northfolke, I received from ... Sir Henry Spelman’. Spelman lived at Narborough in west Norfolk.
Chapter 7. The origins of fields in East Anglia
by Edward Martin

1. Introduction

This chapter addresses one of the core aims of the HFSEA project: an examination of how and why East Anglian fields are regionally distinctive. It builds on the new understanding of the character, morphology and tenurial history of East Anglian fields that has been gained through the case studies presented in Part B. It also flows logically from the discussion about sub-regional variations in the previous chapter. Our gaze now, however, shifts to an appreciation of East Anglia within the wider context of England.

To do this it is necessary to examine some of the ideas and theories that have been put forward by landscape scholars in the past. Two notable trends have been the search for explanations in a Roman or earlier past, on the one hand, and, on the other, the interpretation of East Anglia's fields through the prism of Midland England's common fields. This chapter is set out in three main sections that mirror the largest questions that this project has identified:

- **Centuriated and co-axial fields.** These terms have been used by archaeologists and historians to explain particular types of field pattern that are characterised by large-scale regularity. The theories behind them have raised important questions about continuity in the landscape and have tended to give a chronological rather than a cultural or geographic explanation for the origins of East Anglian fields. There are, however, important reservations regarding the cohesion of these patterns and their dating.

- **Common fields.** These, in their ‘classic’ form, are unarguably dominant in the Central Province, where ridge-and-furrow is their visible legacy, however this study has shown that the East Anglian forms are much more variable in terms of organisation and distribution, and pose important questions as to the origins of common fields, both regionally and nationally.

- **Block holdings or land in severalty.** The study has also identified extensive areas in East Anglia where the land appears always to have been farmed in groups of separately owned fields, each with an adjacent homestead. The full age of the fields that make up these blocks is therefore an important question, as is the reason why these areas did not develop common fields like other areas of East Anglia and the Midlands.

2. Continuity, centuriation and co-axial systems

The extent to which there is significant continuity between pre-medieval and more recent fields has been a major question for landscape historians in East Anglia (and elsewhere in England), as is the landscape ‘legibility’ of any continuity. These links give the landscape a ‘time depth’ that is of very great importance in general perceptions of the ‘value’ of the present day landscape. Developing some answers to this question is therefore not only of great academic interest but also a necessary part of the process for sustainable and informed management of the East Anglian landscape.

Chapter 2 reviewed the evidence for pre-medieval field systems in East Anglia that can be garnered from archaeological excavations. In this chapter I want to widen the discussion by exploring the evidence relating to field systems that have been claimed to be ‘early’ through the topographical analysis of the modern landscape. This has principally involved the interpretation of large scale regularities in the landscape as evidence for the Roman method of land allotment termed ‘centuriation’ or, more recently, as late prehistoric or Saxon systems that have been given the term ‘co-axial’ (for further explanations of these terms see Chapter 3, 6). Two of the HFSEA project’s case studies (Scole and South Elmham St Michael) were chosen with this particular question in mind.

Over eighty years ago the eminent Romanist, Professor Francis Haverfield, made the cautious suggestion that there might be traces of centuriation in Essex. This was based on two parallel straight roads (both now accepted as Roman roads) that cross the Roman road called Stane Street, one at Braintree and the other near Great Dunmow (Haverfield 1921). Haverfield’s modest suggestion was amplified by other writers, notably Rupert Coles, to suggest a more widespread occurrence of traces of centuriation in Essex (Coles 1939). Professor Dilke, however, in his major study of Roman surveying was not convinced by these suggestions, drawing attention to the fact that although there were traces of grid patterns, the measurements did not suggest a Roman origin (Dilke 1971, 191, 195). The current majority view on traces of centuriation in Britain, is that, as Professor Fulford has expressed it, ‘no example carries conviction’ (Fulford 1990, 26). The Felsted case study lies in the area between the two parallel roads identified by Haverfield, but this study did not find any evidence to suggest centuriation. But, as discussed in Chapter 2, Philip Crummy has suggested a possible small area of ‘semi-centuriation’ at Gosbecks, near Colchester, based on cropmark evidence.

In the 1970s Paul Drury and Warwick Rodwell started to apply ‘landscape analysis’ to some existing field systems in Essex, in an attempt to date them in terms of their relationships to ‘fixed points’, such as Roman roads. They focused particularly on the markedly rectilinear landscapes of the Dengie peninsula (between the Blackwater and Crouch estuaries on the east coast), the Thurrock area of south Essex, the Blackwater valley in the Kelvedon area, and the Chehmer valley around Little Waltham (Drury 1978; Drury and Rodwell 1978; 1980; Rodwell 1978; 1993, 58–9 and fig. 36). Their researches led them to suggest that these large systems could be Roman in date, with Rodwell noting that ‘the implications attending the identification of large areas of planned land division potentially of Roman date are considerable and
Critical examination of these theories, however, came from T.J. Wilkinson, in the wake of fieldwork along the line of the Grays bypass in the Thurrock area. From this work he was able to state that the securely dated ditches of the rectilinear landscape were medieval (twelfth to thirteenth centuries). This to him suggested that ‘either the system is medieval, or that these elements represent medieval infilling within pre-existing (‘Roman) rectilinear blocks’ (Wilkinson, 1988, 128). Stephen Rippon’s detailed examination of the field systems in south-east Essex further undermined the theory that there were traces of large Roman-period field systems in Essex. He showed that the earlier work had over-simplified what were in reality a number of more complex systems. Importantly, he concluded that ‘the regular landscape is not all one entity; there are numerous morphologically distinct landscapes in the area, with a generally similar orientation perhaps due to a framework of earlier trackways’. Further, he was of the opinion that this landscape ‘as it exists is a palimpsest, including both Roman and Saxon/medieval elements, though most of the regularity evident in the modern landscape probably dates to the middle or later Saxon period’ (Rippon, 1991, 55).

In 1987 Tom Williamson drew attention to co-axial patterns on the claylands of Norfolk and Suffolk (Williamson, 1987). Williamson identified the remains of a co-axial field system covering some 35sq. km in the Scole-Dickleburgh area of Norfolk and noted that the Roman ‘Pye Road’ cut obliquely across it, suggesting that the field system was earlier. He further identified a similar system covering 20sq. km in the Yaxley area of north Suffolk, 7km to the south, which was also thought to pre-date the same Roman road. He also saw a smaller system to the east of the River Gipping in the Stonham Aspal/Crowfield area of Suffolk (Williamson, 1999). He thought, however, that the most striking co-axial landscape in Suffolk, that in the South Elmham/Iketshalls area was laid out in relation to a pre-existing Roman road and therefore later, possibly even Saxon. This landscape had attracted attention before, as a possible example of centuriation (Hoskins, 1967, 142–3; Scarfe, 1972, 116; Bigmore, 1973; Adams, 1976, 4). But Oliver Rackham was the first to suggest a linkage with the Dartmoor reaves and to put a possible Bronze Age date on it. He suggested the Roman road had been ‘insinuated along one of the main axes’ of a pre-existing system (Rackham, 1986, 158).

Among Williamson’s doubts about this early date was the fact that the system was ‘virtually coterminal with two groups of parishes — twelve in all — that share two names: the four Iketshall and the eight South Elmhams’; he thought could represent ‘a single large middle or late Saxon estate’ (Williamson, 1987, 428–9).

Although Williamson has described the co-axial systems as ‘terrain oblivious’, it is very clear that the main axes tend to run more or less at right-angles to the main watercourses (Williamson, 1993a, 25; Martin, 1999b, 56). In addition, the pattern of fields often has the appearance of being fitted into a pre-existing framework of roads and tracks, rather than being a planned unity. Peter Warner has observed that the ‘distinctive elements of Williamson’s co-axial field systems are the long lanes and drifts’ and that ‘the essence of the coxial pattern is not so much the grid pattern of fields, but the linear pattern of boundaries running in parallel’. He has also pointed out the more widespread evidence for co-axial lanes in Norfolk and Suffolk (Warner, 1996, 46–51). Rippon has, with regard to Essex, stressed that where there was a pre-existing grid of roads and tracks, the subsequent development of fields within the grid would, almost by default, tend to have a planned appearance (Rippon, 1991, 49).

Two of the case studies, the Scole area and South Elmham St Michael, include areas of co-axial fields and therefore the evidence from them has a direct bearing on this debate. The Scole study indicates that the large co-axial system that Williamson has claimed here is not, in fact, a continuous entity, but consists of a number of separate ‘panels’ that relate to particular drainage systems. The study has also put into question the validity of using a relationship with a Roman road as a means of dating a field system. Although there is undeniably an unconformity between the orientation of the Roman road there and that of much (though not all) of the claimed co-axial system, it is also true that the two are functionally distinct. There would have been no functional advantage in using the Roman road as the basis of a field system and it is clear that post-Roman farmers were quite capable of accommodating unconformable elements into their farming systems. There is no real evidence of individual field boundaries being truncated by the ‘imposition’ of the road. There is however good environmental evidence to indicate that woodland in the Waveney valley, in the southern part of the Scole area, was being cleared in the Bronze Age and that cereal crops were being grown in the vicinity in a continuous sequence from the Iron Age. It is therefore likely that the core arable areas identifiable in the medieval documentation are the same as those used in prehistory. With similar needs for soil drainage and stock movement, it would not be surprising if their fields shared a common alignment. The admittedly limited evidence from excavations suggests that this is indeed the case. It does not, however, prove that the existing field boundaries are prehistoric in date, only that they are probably on a similar alignment to the prehistoric land divisions. Therefore there must be a probability that some boundaries, at least, are indeed prehistoric in origin, even if their present appearance owes more to later periods. From this, it can be argued that where a co-axial field system lies on land that has a high potential as a ‘core’ arable area (i.e. fertile soils with adequate drainage), there is a probability that the alignment of field boundaries, and possibly some of the actual boundaries themselves, are prehistoric in date.

The circumstances at South Elmham St Michael, however, appear to be different. Here the co-axial field system is most apparent on areas with heavy, poorly-drained clay soils, not on the core arable area. The case study produced evidence to suggest that the co-axial system occurred in an area that contained appreciable amounts of woodland in the late Saxon period. This suggests that the co-axial pattern here is early medieval in date. This would accord with the observation that most of the co-axial boundaries at the southern end of South Elmham St Michael appear to stop at Le Franchisemere (the parish and hundred boundary). The fact that the principal axis of the co-axial system lies at right-angles to the main watercourse suggests that drainage was the primary concern of the people who constructed the system. Drainage problems on the whole of this clay
plateau in north Suffolk gave rise to a reliance on grassland and historically this was an area of dairy farms.

The pattern of co-axial roads and lanes that accompanies and frames the field systems in the South Elmham runs from the edges of the gravel terraces beside the River Waveney up on to the clay plateaux, where it becomes more distinct. In effect these roads and lanes appear to link the well-drained areas with good arable potential, on the terraces, with a clay hinterland that has a predominant wood/pasture function. These lines of communication may also have served as property or rights boundaries and could have an ancient history. However at present it is difficult to be more precise on this question of their date. There is a growing body of evidence for early settlement on the river terraces, as at Flixton, but on the clay plateaux the evidence remains thin (Boulter 1999; 2002; 2000/21; 2000/94; Selkirk and Boulter 2003; Martin 1999b, 56). It does however suggest that the field systems between the roads are a later development.

The case study evidence indicates that it is a mistake to regard the East Anglian co-axial field systems as a single monument type with a similar origin and date range. A common archaeological obsession with morphological studies, rather than locational analyses, has given a false identity to systems that though superficially similar, have different functions and dates. It is unfortunately true that the enthusiasm for finding centuriation in the first part of the twentieth century has been replaced by a similar obsession with co-axial fields as an undoubted indicator of the identity to systems that though superficially similar, have different functions and dates. It is unfortunately true that the enthusiasm for finding centuriation in the first part of the twentieth century has been replaced by a similar obsession with co-axial fields as an undoubted indicator of the capacity of our distant ancestors to plan landscapes on a vast scale. The truth emerging from Norfolk and Suffolk, as well as Essex, is rather different. Field systems that could be labelled ‘co-axial systems’ certainly do exist in the region. They are not, however, vast terrain-oblivious entities that result from large-scale land division and planning at a particular period. They are, instead, made up of smaller panels, sometimes relatively closely spaced, that are closely related to the drainage pattern, and they are not all of the same date. Most have probably also undergone a long sequence of evolution, rather than being single planned events. Because of their mixed origins, it is not possible to point to a specific correlation with any one type of landholding, tenurial or settlement pattern. Nor are they the dominant type of field pattern in East Anglia.

3. Common fields

i. The emergence of common fields

Currently, there seems to be general agreement amongst scholars that common fields were certainly in existence in England by the twelfth century and are not evidenced before the eighth century. The earliest charter reference to gemænan lande, ‘common land’, occurs in a charter of AD 849 for Cotfon Hackett in the wooded and pastoral region of north Worcestershire, but the earliest likely reference to subdivided arable land comes in a lease of Alveston in Warwickshire, dated 966, where there is mention of ‘every other acre in the divided hide’ and ‘every third acre of open land’ (feld landes in the original text) (Hooke 1988, 128).

David Hall has suggested an eighth-century origin for the common fields in Northamptonshire by linking the creation of the fields with the abandonment of some settlement sites that were then overlain by the fields, as at Raunds, where sites appear to have been abandoned before about 850 (Hall 1995, 130–1 and 137). Other authors have preferred a more cautious ninth- or tenth-century date for what Tony Brown and Glenn Foard have termed the ‘great replanning’ of the late Saxon landscape (Fox 1981; Hooke 1981; Harvey 1985, 43; Astill 1997, 200–1; Brown and Foard 1998, 65 and 76; Hooke 1998, 121; Fowler 2002, 290–1).

Many authors have also drawn attention to the fact that this period coincides with the traumatic upheaval caused by the Viking invasions and settlement (Finberg 1972, 492; Brown and Foard 1998, 82; Dark 2000, 157; Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, 135–6; Fowler 2002, 291). Comparisons between maps showing areas with common fields and the distribution of place-names of Scandinavian origin reveal that there are indeed significant correlations between the two in the area stretching from Northamptonshire northwards to Yorkshire, though not in the counties running south-westward from Oxfordshire. However it is not a simple case of common fields being introduced by the Vikings, for the available evidence indicates that in the Viking homelands they appear to be slightly later than the English ones. In Denmark and Sweden common fields make their appearance between the late tenth century and the beginning of the twelfth (Goransson 1961; Randsborg 1980, 67–8; Porsmose 1987, 276; 1993, 265; Tesch 1993, 140; Poulsen 1997, 119; Widgren 1997, 178–80). The earliest evidence for common fields, in fact, comes from the Frankish areas of the Continent in or around the eighth century (see Chapter 3, 3.i). The causation of the English common fields is, therefore, plainly a complex story and probably due to a combination of factors rather than a single one. Recent research has suggested a number of possible factors that could have played a part in the emergence of common fields in the late Saxon period:

• Climate. From the middle Anglo-Saxon period there seems to have been a trend towards an increasingly warm and dry climate, which reached its peak in the so-called Medieval Warm Epoch. This climatic amelioration may have facilitated an agricultural expansion by enabling cereals to be grown in areas that were formerly unfavourable (Dark 2000, 28, 157–8, 171; Simmons 2001, 53, 70).

• Population. Population figures are notoriously difficult to estimate because the figures depend heavily on the extent to which sites are ‘archaeologically visible’ at different periods (Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, 40–4). The Anglo-Saxon period is a case in point, as the early pottery is significantly less durable than the late material, therefore the apparent rise in the number of sites from the early period to the late may just be the product of greater visibility. However, taken at face value, this rise in the number of ‘archaeologically visible’ sites in East Anglia across the Saxon period does suggest that there was a growing population and presumably a concomitant pressure to find additional farmland (Newman 1992, 34).

• Social and political. Although the extent to which England was settled by Scandinavians has been heavily disputed, there can be no doubt of the upheaval caused by the Viking invasions and the financial drain imposed on the English settlements by the massive Danegeld payments (Sawyer 1958 and 1981; Fellows Jenson 1975; 1981; Gelling 1978, 219–36; Dyer 2002,
The English re-conquest of the Danelaw in the tenth century also brought substantial social changes in its wake, including the re-establishment of the church hierarchy and monasteries. The English administrative apparatus also appears to have been significantly reformed in the first half of the tenth century, with new shires being formed in the Midlands and hundreds making their first certain appearance in the Hundred Ordinance of c.939–61 (Whitelock 1996, 429–30; Hart 1992, 294–303; Reynolds 1999, 75–81; Hill 2001). Frankish influence on political organisations and the church was considerable throughout this period and the concept of standardised farming units as administrative and taxation aids could well have been a Frankish import (Bullough 1991, chapter vii). The framework of standardised units made a major contribution to the way common fields were organised, but the concept was also applied to block holdings.

- Technological improvements. As discussed more fully in Chapter 3, 5.i), there does seem to be some evidence for the more widespread adoption of the mouldboard plough from about the tenth century AD. Mouldboard ploughs, by turning the soil in a single pass, removed the need to cross-plough in order to prepare a seed bed, as was required with the earlier ards. This allowed greater areas of land to be ploughed in the same time and also favoured the development of long ploughlands or fields. In long fields the turning of the plough was kept to a minimum, saving both time and effort. We only need to look at what has happened to the English landscape post-1950 to see the powerful effect improved technology can have on field systems.

The establishment of these fields seems to have ended the tendency for Anglo-Saxon settlements to ‘shift’ in the landscape, for the existing villages largely overlie their late Saxon predecessors. The earlier shifting tendency was well demonstrated by the excavations at Mucking (Hamerow 1993, 86–7). There the actual movement was not great, but enough to give a series of separate settlement clusters of different dates. Similar Wanderungssiedlungen ‘wandering settlements’ are known in the Continental homelands of the Anglo-Saxons and are part of a tradition that stretches back to the Iron Age (as they probably are too in England) (Hamerow 1991; 2002, 104–5; Hedeager 1992, 190–1). In Denmark the ‘wandering settlements’ also ceased when common fields were introduced (Nässman 1989, 174; Porsmose 1987, 276; 1993, 265). There is an implication here that these new agricultural landscapes were on a scale and permanence that was totally new.

\[\text{ii. The Viking impact}\]

Any consideration of the political and social organisation of East Anglia in the late Saxon period has to take into account the evidence for the impact of the Vikings on the region. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that in 880 King Guthrum, after concluding a treaty with King Alfred, led his Danish army ‘into East Anglia, and settled there and shared out the land’. Subsequently East Anglia formed a part of the Danelaw until its re-conquest by Edward the Elder in 917 (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 1965, 50 and 66). Despite this clear reference to Danish settlement in East Anglia, several authors have suggested that the evidence for an influx of a substantial number of Scandinavian settlers is even weaker here than in other parts of the Danelaw (Davis 1955; Hart 1992, 28; Dyer 2002, 47). Tom Williamson has summed up this view:

There is no documentary evidence to suggest a large-scale peasant immigration, and in Norfolk, as elsewhere in England, archaeological evidence for such a folk-movement is meagre. There are, it is true, many items of metalwork now known from the county – but these need indicate nothing more than trade with Scandinavia, or the presence of a Danish elite and the consequent prevalence of Danish taste. … [It] suggests that the Vikings formed a small minority of the county’s population (Williamson 1993a, 107).

The place-name evidence for Viking settlement in East Anglia is certainly not as strong as it is in parts of the central and northern Danelaw, but the names are reasonably numerous and they do have an interesting distribution (Fig. 38) (Cameron 1969, 75–86). They are most numerous in Norfolk, where there were forty Domesday vills called thorpe (‘outlying or dependant settlement’) and around twenty-one containing the element -by (‘farmstead, village’), as well a number of other names containing Scandinavian terms such as kirkja ‘church’, laundr ‘grove’, thevett ‘clearing’, toft ‘house site, homestead’ etc (Williamson 1993a, 109–10). In Suffolk, there are about nineteen thorpe names (some no longer current), only three certain -by names and a small number of other names incorporating other Scandinavian elements (Martin 1999a, 50–1). These names are to be found predominantly to the north of the ‘Gipping divide’ discussed in the previous chapter. In Essex the list is even smaller, with about five thorpe names and one -by name, mainly in the north or near the coast (Reaney 1935, xxvii–xxviii; Hart 1992, map 3.1; Coates 2005). Some years ago I found a similar pattern in the ancient names of burial mounds or barrows: in Norfolk and north Suffolk there were names derived from Old Norse haugr, but in south Suffolk and Essex the names were, instead, derived from Old English hlauw (Lawson et al 1981, 4–7). In the previous chapter I also suggested that there was a differential north-south distribution in two terms used in wood names, with haugh/haw in the north and hay/hey in the south. Although the former could be derived equally from Old English haga or from Old Norse hagi, the parallels discussed here suggest that the Old Norse term is the most likely: hay/hey is however clearly from the Old English term (ge)hæg.

Cambridgeshire presents a contrast to the areas already described. At first glance it appears to have very few place-names that show a Scandinavian influence: there are no -by or thorpe names, only two names based on other Scandinavian words and about four Anglo-
Scandinavian hybrids. However P.H. Reaney, in his survey of the Cambridgeshire place-names, showed that medieval sources reveal field-names that frequently contain personal names and terms of Scandinavian origin. This led him to assert that although the Scandinavian element in Cambridgeshire is slighter than that of Northamptonshire, ‘it is stronger than that in Bedfordshire or Huntingdonshire and much stronger than that in Essex or Hertfordshire’ (Reaney 1943, xix–xxii, 306).

In the case studies, Scandinavian influences were observed in the place-names of all of the northern studies — Worstead, Swanton Morley, Scole, South Elmham St Michael and Walsham-le-Willows — and at Sutton on the east coast. At Worlingworth there was little evidence of Scandinavian influence, except in the use of haugh for a wood. At Dullingham, on the west side of the region, where there were relatively few minor place-names, there is a small amount of evidence for the medieval use of a few Scandinavian terms. In the southern case studies — Great Henny, Felsted, Ingatestone and Ardeley — there was no detectable Scandinavian influence. There thus seems to be an emerging pattern of a Scandinavian-influenced north and west, and an English south.

The minimalist view of the Viking presence in Norfolk was challenged by the late Sue Margeson, who pointed out that the majority of the Viking objects of tenth- and eleventh-century date found in Norfolk were of ‘lowly’ quality suggesting that they had belonged to settlers rather than to a lordly elite (Margeson 1996). The recognition of many of these ‘lowly’ objects as being of Viking origin is relatively recent and it is certain that the growing number of objects that are being seen and recorded through the Portable Antiquities Scheme will necessitate a substantial reassessment of the material evidence for the Viking presence throughout the whole of England.

A study by Karl Sandred of the -by place-names in Norfolk also suggests that the settlers came from ‘the class of ordinary Scandinavian peasants’ rather than a lordly elite. This is shown by the high incidence of uncompounded personal names which occur as the first elements of these -by names, as opposed to the more aristocratic compound names, which are conspicuous by their rarity. This is in contrast to other areas of England with place-names of Scandinavian origin, where compound names frequently form 30% or more of the personal names used as first elements (Sandred 1987). In another study Sandred has shown that in a parish with an English name, Flitcham cum Appleton, in an area of western Norfolk where major names of Scandinavian origin are ‘almost entirely absent’, the unusually full record of medieval field names has revealed ‘quite a strong Scandinavian element’. This was apparent both in the use of terms of Scandinavian origin and in the presence of Scandinavian personal names (Sandred 1979; 2001, 45). It is not yet possible to draw wider conclusions about the field-names of Norfolk as the place-name survey there is still in progress and in the case of Suffolk, the English Place-Name Society has only just started work on the county.
The differences in vernacular building traditions, discussed in the previous chapter, cannot, as yet, be placed in any meaningful English versus Scandinavian context and also clearly relate to a period several centuries after the Viking interventions. However, they may stem from social groupings and activity zones that were formulated at an earlier period. Medieval feudal allegiances may be a pointer to such groupings, as there are interesting resonances between the patterns previously identified and some landholding patterns, as revealed by Domesday Book. An illustration of this is the contrasting distributions of lands belonging to the two largest feudal honours in Suffolk in 1086 (Fig. 39). Although these honours were then held by Normans, they were substantially based on the large estates of the Saxon thegns who were their antecessors — Richard son of Count Gilbert’s honour of Clare was founded principally out of the estates of Wihtgar son of Ælfric, and Robert Malet’s honour of Eye was based on the estates of Edric of Laxfield.

One East Anglian building tradition has, however, been seen as a more direct reflection of cultural links with the North Sea/Baltic area in the early Middle Ages (mainly the eleventh and twelfth centuries). This is the strongly East Anglian tradition of building round church towers (Heywood 1988; 2005; Blair 2005, 424–5). Within East Anglia, however, they are heavily concentrated in Norfolk and north Suffolk, with only scattered examples in the southern part of the region (Fig. 40). In this, they do seem to reflect the distribution of Scandinavian place-names, and around 18% of the churches do actually bear Scandinavian-influenced names.

Contemporary documentary evidence for the period of Danish rule in the Danelaw is limited, but with the aid of later documents it is possible to see that the Danelaw was not a single entity but a grouping of a number of different units, each with its own history and character. Cyril Hart (1992, 8–19) has usefully distinguished these as:

- The Northern Danelaw. Centred on the Viking kingdom of York, this endured until the death of Eric Bloodaxe in 954.
- The Five Boroughs. Named after five defended burhs, each of which had its own army: Derby, Leicester, Lincoln, Nottingham and Stamford. Reconquered 918–20.
- The Eastern Danelaw. A territory dominated by the Danish kingdom of East Anglia founded by Guthrum. This was centred on Norfolk and Suffolk, but probably included the next two regions as satellite territories. Reconquered in 917.
- ‘The Outer Danelaw’, perhaps better described as ‘the Four Boroughs’. Territories dependent on the boroughs of Bedford, Cambridge, Huntingdon and Northampton, each ruled by its own earl. From an early period Northampton inclined towards the Five Boroughs, but the others were under domination of the Danish kingdom of East Anglia until their reconquest in 917. Thereafter their administrative history evolved on a different course to that of East Anglia. Probably as a result of their different modes of surrender to King Edward, different policies seem to have been applied to the Danish settlers in the four territories: in

Figure 39 The feudal honours of Clare and Eye in 1086; with the addition of the HFSEAP farming system boundaries
Huntingdonshire and Bedfordshire most of the Danish landowners were replaced by English thegns, but in Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire, many Danes remained in possession of their lands. The difference between the two groups was still apparent in 1066, with a significantly higher proportion of Scandinavian names amongst the landowners of Cambridgeshire and north-east Northamptonshire than among those of Huntingdonshire and Bedfordshire.

- ‘The Southern Danelaw’. A less coherent territory that included the later shires of Buckinghamshire, Middlesex, Hertfordshire and Essex. Returned to English rule in a piecemeal fashion from about 906 to 917.

Although normally considered a part of the Danelaw, Hart has produced some very interesting evidence to suggest that most of Essex remained in English control throughout the period of the Danish kingdom of East Anglia. From a detailed study of the English ealdormen, he has suggested that from 825, when the last native East Saxon king was expelled by King Egbert of Wessex, until 946, Essex formed, together with Surrey, Sussex and Kent, a single administrative unit subordinate to the kings of Wessex, first as a subkingdom and then, from 860, as an ealdordom. Hart further suggests that the Danes only succeeded in settling the north-east corner of Essex, perhaps reaching as far south as Witham, but that the rest of Essex remained under West Saxon rule (Hart 1992, 125).

This conclusion is of great significance because it seems to fit so well with the place-name evidence discussed above that pointed to an ‘English’ south and a ‘Scandinavian’ north and west. Moreover, the limited Scandinavian place-name evidence in Essex occurs in just the areas where there is some evidence for common fields, i.e. in the north along the Stour and in the coastal fringe. On the Suffolk coastal fringe there is again a coincidence of evidence for common fields and Scandinavian place-names. In the rest of Essex and in south-central Suffolk, where there is only thin evidence for Scandinavian place-names, there is strong evidence for block holdings. Interestingly, in view of the political links that Hart has suggested between Essex and Kent, similar block holdings occur there too (Baker 1965).

This distinction between an English south and a Scandinavian north finds further confirmation in a linguistic study by Gillis Kristensson of the differential pronunciation of an initial fricative (‘f’) as a voiced (‘v’) sound. The isophone for this runs horizontally across the southern end of Cambridgeshire in the vicinity of Dullingham and then across southern Suffolk to hit the east coast near Aldeburgh, coming close to the northern boundary of block holdings as identified in this study (Fig. 38). In the area to the south the fricative is voiced, but not to the north. Kristensson has shown that the voicing of initial fricatives occurred in late Old English, but that in areas of Scandinavian influence, the tendency towards voicing was ‘counteracted and forestalled’ (Kristensson 1995, map 14; 1997). An example of voicing was found in the Felsted case study, with the use of *ven* for ‘fen’.

Kristensson’s phonetic boundary finds a reflection in David Parsons’s study of the relative proportions of Old Norse and Old English personal names in Domesday...
In a special study of Suffolk he showed that Norse names were more prevalent in the northern half of Suffolk than in the south — dividing the county into quadrants based on hundreds, the north-west had an average of 33%, the north-east 37%, the south-west 24% and the south-east 28%. The highest proportions were found in the four north-eastern hundreds of Blything, Wangford, Lothing and Lothingland (46%, 44%, 43% and 52% respectively), the north-central hundred of Blackbourn (40%) and, interestingly, the south-eastern hundred of Wilford (42%), which includes Sutton, where a Norse influence was detected in the place names. One of the lowest proportions was seen in the south-central hundred of Babergh (16%), adjoining the Essex border (Parsons 2002, figs 5 and 6).

The inclusion of south-central Suffolk in the ‘English’ area does, however, present a problem as its history would suggest that it belonged to the Scandinavian-controlled territory. After all, it was at Hadleigh, in the heart of this area, that King Guthrum had a villa regia and where he was buried in 890 (Stevenson ed. 1904). One possible explanation, but too lengthy for a full discussion here, is that Guthrum had extensive royal estates in south Suffolk and north Essex which, as royal domain, may have had a different history to the other lands taken over by the Danes. After the English re-conquest in the tenth century some of these estates may re-occur as a concentration of properties belonging to Ealdorman Ælfgar and his family. A possible hint of the lingering influence of Guthrum’s court is a localised ‘hot-spot’ of Norse names in the hundred of Cosford (36%), which includes Hadleigh, in David Parsons’s study of Domesday personal names (this hundred also contains the only Thorpe place name recorded in south-central Suffolk) (Parsons 2002, fig.6).

### iii. Free men and cultural identity in East Anglia

We can now return to the apparent coincidence of the areas of Scandinavian settlement with common fields. Lack of evidence for common fields in the Viking homelands makes it unlikely that they introduced them to England. They do, however, seem to have brought with them the idea of the free peasant — a man who owned and farmed his own land. Not all Scandinavians were free men, but they do seem to have cherished the notion and free farmers played an important part in their society (Jones 1969, 150). Equally important was the disruption the Vikings caused to the existing land laws, social customs and hierarchical organisation (Hart 1992, 4).

It has long been recognised that the greatest densities of free men and sokemen recorded in Domesday Book are in the former Danelaw areas and that this suggested a link between a high density of free men and Scandinavian settlement (Dodwell 1941, 151–3; Ekwall 1945, 26–8; Stenton 1971, 515–17; Faith 1997, 121–5). Dissident voices have however been raised about that link, both in terms of whether Domesday Book was consistent in its recording of free men and sokemen, and in terms of the origins and meaning of the term ‘sokemen’ (Davis 1955; Sawyer 1958; Fellows Jensen 1975). In part the debate raged as to whether sokemen were actually the descendants of Vikings or whether they might just be the result of social changes that occurred in the train of the
Viking intervention. There are also problems as to the exact differences between free men and sokemen, not to mention the exact meaning of the vague term ‘soke’. For the purpose in hand, I propose just to accept that there appear to be valid differences in the distribution of free men and sokemen within the context of eastern England and that their freer status set them apart from the other peasants recorded in Domesday Book.

Professor H.C. Darby plotted the densities of the ‘free peasantry’ aggregated up to the hundred level and, in the absence of any more detailed plotting, his figures have been used here (Darby 1971, fig.105). By using hundreds as the basic units there is a lack of precision in the boundaries, however they are still very revealing when compared to the place-name evidence for Scandinavian settlement (Figs 38 and 41). In Norfolk and Suffolk there is a very close correspondence between the place-names and the high figures for free men and sokemen, making it likely that the two are inter-related. By contrast, the southern ‘English’ areas are characterised by a low proportion of free men as well as a low incidence of Scandinavian names.

This suggests a possible scenario as to how and why block holdings and common fields developed or survived as contrasting farming systems. Taking the ‘English’ area of Essex first, its wealth of woodland, as revealed by Domesday Book, is often taken as indicating that it was an area of late settlement. However locational analysis suggests that although woodland was certainly present on the heavier, poorer-drained soils, there were substantial areas of slope soils on the valley sides that probably had a long history of arable cultivation stretching back into prehistory, as suggested by the analysis at the start of this chapter. The distribution of Roman agricultural tools and equipment is heavily concentrated in south-east England, including Essex, making it likely that arable farming was most developed in that region during the Roman period (Fig. 42) (Jones and Mattingly 1990, map 6:47). The distribution of Roman villas in East Anglia, and in particular those with mosaic floors, is also heavily weighted towards south Suffolk and Essex, suggesting either greater economic prosperity or a greater adoption of the Roman way of life. Either way, this would suggest a developed agricultural economy rather than an undeveloped forested region. Environmental studies are not yet detailed enough to provide a clear view, but there is certainly widespread evidence for cereal crops on all soil types in Roman Essex (Murphy 1996, 175). Two sites in Essex (Mucking and Springfield Lyons) have also produced evidence for the cultivation of spelt, the major wheat type of the Iron Age and Roman period, into early Saxon times (at Springfield Lyons there is also evidence for late Saxon spelt and some emmer), suggesting a continuity with Roman arable farming (Murphy 1994, 27 and 37; 1996, 177). With no period of Scandinavian rule to introduce change, it is likely that the prime agricultural land evolved in a continuous sequence from Roman farming practices into the block holdings seen in the early medieval period. There is also a concomitant suggestion that these settled agricultural communities had a complex and hierarchical social structure that gave precedence to
stiffs, but interspersed among them are scattered mentions of small acreages in *le Towneefeld* and in a *campo* called *le Hatches* (BL Add.Chi. 32901 (SRO(B) microfilm J715)). A survey of 1632 confirms this by listing a number of holdings, frequently of an acre or thereabouts, in *le Towneefeld* and a lesser number in an adjacent area called *Hatches* (SRO(B) 2957). Both areas also included parcels of glebe land and the glebe terrier of 1613 explicitly refers to *The Common Towne Field* (SRO(B) E14/4/1). There was no parliamentary enclosure here and no common fields are shown on the 1839 tithe map, but groups of fields bearing the names *Town Field* and *Hatches* indicate where these areas lay (SRO(B) T98/1,2). They lay in an area of irregular co-axial land boundaries on the south-facing sloping land to the north of the village street. The 1632 survey also makes it clear that there was also a large amount of land in closes; this makes it likely that Chelsworth did not have a regular common field system of Type 1, but a mixture of a limited number of common fields of Type 3 and numerous closes in severaly.

A short stretch of the northern border of Chelsworth adjoins the parish of Hitcham, where, however, there is no evidence for common fields and on the west it shares a longer border with Monks Eleigh, where again there is no evidence for common fields. Both Hitcham and Monks Eleigh had block demesnes and block tenements and both, as a result, have dispersed settlement patterns (Martin in preparation).

In Chelsworth, however, settlement is concentrated in a street village at the base of the common fields. This street village includes houses of late medieval origin, suggesting that it is not the result of any post-medieval reorganisation. This abrupt change of field and settlement pattern in quite a small area presents quite a challenge to interpretation.

Chelsworth means the *worth* of either a *ceorl* ‘a free peasant’ or of a man named *Ceorl*. In view of the evidence at Chelsworth for subdivision, the possibility of a link with the *ceorls*, the class of non-aristocratic free farmers is very interesting, though nothing positive can be established.

There may also be significance in the fact that on its north side Chelsworth adjoins two small parishes that both have hybrid Anglo-Scandinavian names: Bilstedon ‘Bildr’s tun’ and Kettlebaston ‘Ketilbiorn’s tun’. In view of the rarity of Anglo-Scandinavian in south-central Suffolk, the occurrence of two of them here must be significant. Both places are small and situated on high clayland, suggesting that they are secondary settlements.

Another problem area for interpretation is Cambridgeshire. H.C. Darby’s map of ‘Domesday free peasantry’ in eastern England shows very low percentages (mainly under 10% except for a few small pockets where up to 25% were recorded) across the whole of Cambridgeshire (Darby 1971, fig.105). This could be taken as a contradiction of the model outlined above, where a connection was suggested between Scandinavian settlement, high numbers of free peasants and common fields. What the map fails to show however is that there was a substantial drop in the number of sokemen in Cambridgeshire between 1066 and 1086. Domesday Book records around 900 sokemen there in 1066, but only about 200 in 1086, indicating a loss of about 75%. The loss was mainly through a reduction in status to villeins, a process that Cyril Hart has suggested may have started by the later tenth century and was accelerated after the
Norman Conquest (Hart 1995, 71–2). An approximation of the former importance of sokeland can be gained from a map prepared by Mary Hesse giving the percentage of sokeland hides to the total in each hundred (Hesse 2000b). This reveals a considerable amount of sokeland in south-western Cambridgeshire, with percentages that rise to 61% in Wetherley Hundred, south-west of Cambridge. This is an area where there is clear evidence later for common fields and is also the area where there was the strongest evidence for ridge-and-furrow in Cambridgeshire in 1947 (Kain and Mead 1977; Hall 2001, fig.11). Not surprisingly, Roberts and Wrathmell included this area in their Midlands settlement province (Roberts and Wrathmell 2000).

There is therefore a growing amount of information that tends to support the prima facie impression of a link between areas of Scandinavian influence and common fields. This is not to deny that there is evidence for other, older, cultural divisions that may also be significant. Elsewhere I have discussed in detail the question of the boundary between the two main Iron Age tribes in eastern England, the Iceni and the Trinovantes (Martin 1999b, 82–91). Remarkably, the suggested boundary between the two tribes is very similar to the boundary between block holdings and common fields across Suffolk. The Iron Age boundary could even be pushed further back, for there is evidence for differences in early Bronze Age burial rites between the northern area (north-west Suffolk and Norfolk) and southern one (south-east Suffolk and Essex).

In the former area both cremation and inhumation burials occur, but in the south-east cremations are in the majority (Lawson et al 1981, 64–88 and 96). The distinction is less clear with Beaker burials, which appear normally to be inhumations in both areas (D.L. Clarke (1970, 453) noted the possibility of Beaker cremations at two sites in north Suffolk and Norfolk and two in south Suffolk). There is also a possibility of differences in the use of early Bronze Age ceramics, with Food Vessels being more prevalent in the north and west of the region than in the south (Lawson et al 1981, 77–8; Couchman 1980, 40). Even further back in the Neolithic there are differences in the preferences for stone axes between the two areas: in the north-west Group VI axes from the Lake District (Great Langdale) are the commonest type, but in the south-east Group I stone axes from Cornwall predominate (Cummins 1979). The boundary is, of course, an important natural one as well, in that it is a watershed that divides the rivers that drain northwards to the Wash and the North Sea and those that drain towards the south-east and the Thames estuary. There is therefore a strong chance that a natural boundary precipitated a cultural one.

As the Romans tended to use the pre-existing tribal units for their own administrative units, it is likely that the southern part of Suffolk continued to be closely associated with the rest of the Trinovantian territory in Essex and with Camulodunum (Colchester) its cultural capital. If this was the case, at what stage did the River Stour emerge as a political boundary? A decade ago Michael Parker Pearson, Robert van de Noort and Alex Woolf addressed this particular question in a provocative paper that took a critical look at the automatic assumption that Norfolk and Suffolk equalled East Anglia and Essex equalled the East Saxon kingdom. They were able to show that while there was good evidence for regarding Norfolk and those parts of Suffolk north of the watershed as being Anglian in character, the evidence for south-east Suffolk was more mixed and they concluded that there was ‘no clear indication as to whether the Orwell and Deben rivers [in south-east Suffolk] were under East Saxon or East Anglian political control by the early seventh century’. In view of this, they raised the possibility that the great royal burial at Sutton Hoo was not that of the East Anglian king Rædwald, but perhaps that of the East Saxon king Sæberht, who died c. 616–18 (Parker Pearson et al 1993).

Even without going as far as this, there are some curious features concerning the East Anglian royal dynasty, the Wuffingas. Firstly, instead of being centred in the Anglian heartland north of the watershed, they appear, by about AD 660, to have been seated in the south-east of Suffolk, where Bede records they had a royal residence at Rendlesham. If Sutton Hoo was indeed theirs, they also had their royal burial ground in this area. The naming pattern of the Wuffinga dynasty also has a lot in common with the distinctive sibilant naming pattern of the East Saxon Seaxneating dynasty. There is also the possibility that the Wuffingas were, strictly, neither Anglian nor East Saxon, but a separate group who occupied a corner of the old Trinovantian territory and had close relations with their Seaxneating neighbours or perhaps kinsmen to the south of the Stour. If so, for reasons unknown, they must later have turned northwards and absorbed the Anglian areas north of the watershed (Martin 1999a, 22). William Filmer-Sankey has come to a similar conclusion in summing up the results of his work at the Snape Anglo-Saxon cemetery (late fifth to early seventh century) some nine miles north-east of Sutton Hoo. He sees greater similarities between this cemetery and Saxon Essex, than with the northern parts of East Anglia, leading him to suggest that the Wuffingas and their people in the Suffolk Sandlings were perhaps ‘ethnically distinct’ from the rest of the East Anglians (Filmer-Sankey and Pestell 2001, 265–6).

Into this cauldron of possibilities about the ‘Essexness’ of south Suffolk one could add the evidence already discussed about the concentration of lands belonging to the ealdorman of Essex in south-central Suffolk. It is also worth noting the rarity of names in -ingham, or of any of the -ing- compounds in south Suffolk and Essex. Names in -ingham are however very common to the north of the Gipping. Their distribution is in fact alarmingly similar to that of the Scandinavian names, even though the ingham names are supposed to represent a much earlier naming tradition. A.H. Smith did note that names incorporating Old Norse heim ‘homestead, estate’ (which is the equivalent of Old English ham) were common in Scandinavia in the pre-Viking age, but that ‘apart from a few sporadic examples it was not found in the western countries occupied by Vikings during the period of their migrations’ (Smith 1956, I, 241–2). There are certainly some questions about this, but unfortunately without more extensive research it is not possible to take this point any further here.

Although the currently available information on the distribution of Anglo-Saxon artefacts that appear to be ‘Anglian’ in character definitely shows a concentration in an area that has the Wash and the Fens at its centre (running from Yorkshire in the north, through Lincolnshire into Cambridgeshire, eastward into north-west Suffolk and then into Norfolk) there is a growing amount of material from south-east Suffolk that could
alter this perception (Fig. 43) (Parker et al. 1993, 34–45; Hines 1993, 90–3 and 1997, 303–5). However, at present, there is some justification for suggesting that the inhabitants of Cambridgeshire, north-west Suffolk and Norfolk shared some sort of shared identity that was different to those of south Suffolk and Essex.

One could even push the evidence a bit further and ponder whether the cultural differences were emphasised by differences in life styles. Could one, by projecting backwards the farming differences seen in the pre-industrial age, suggest a difference between predominantly arable farmers to the south and pastoralists to the north? Does the Icenian love of showy horse harness fittings betray their pastoralist background? Does the proliferation of Roman villas in Essex and south Suffolk reflect a widespread availability of well-cultivated farmland? At present it is probably not possible to give convincing answers to all these questions, but they do raise an important point and that is that environmental and practical factors can be as important as cultural and racial ones, and in most cases they interact. This last point cannot be over-stressed, changes are seldom monocausal, but are brought about by the simultaneous coming together of a variety of causes and influences; in many cases what actually triggers the change can be, in itself, relatively insignificant.

4. Block holdings and hedged fields

The discussion in Section 2 of this chapter pointed to extensive areas in the southern part of East Anglia where there is very little evidence for common fields. In these areas block holdings — which can be simply defined as groups of enclosed fields in close association with their controlling farmsteads (as more fully described in Chapters 3 and 4) — are dominant, with no convincing evidence for an intervening period of medieval common fields. The question therefore naturally arises of when exactly did the field systems associated with block holdings come into existence?

Despite a paucity in East Anglia of Anglo-Saxon charters with boundary clauses, or other landscape descriptions, there are some interesting items among the few that do exist (Hooke 1998, 85–6). The earliest is that for Chelsworth in south Suffolk, of AD 962, for an estate whose boundary can be followed with reasonable precision. Its boundary clause uses the term ‘hedges’ (heges) in two places. Firstly, on the north-east side of the parish, where the boundary is now unmarked and appears to follow the meandering course of a former minor watercourse. Secondly, on the south-east side of the parish, where the boundary crosses the floodplain of the River Brett and climbs the valley side; in the language of the charter, the boundary runs along *heges the scyt of tham burnan* ‘the hedges that drain to the stream’ (Hart 1992, 484–5). There are still sinuous hedged boundaries in this position today, which do indeed drain down to the river. At Acton, also in south Suffolk, a charter of 1000–02 refers in its boundary clause to an *ealdan hege* ‘old hedge’, identifiable as the hedge-line that marks the north-east boundary of Acton, from just north of Balsdon Hall south-eastward for 1.5km to the Melford Road.
woods’ and feldas thæs heges on Glæsne Roman road (stræte) running through Braintree, and to synonymous with (gehere seems to have a different meaning, being Heges 1930, 42–3, no.16(I), will of Æthelric). It refers to Anglo-Saxon Wills adjacent to the Felsted case study (describes some land in the vicinity of Rayne in Essex, will of a man named Æthelric, dating from Pl. 66). thousand years ago, the hedge is visually and ecologically much the same as others in the locality (Pl. 66).

It is possible that some Suffolk references to hegæs should be taken to mean woods rather than hedges. The will of a man named Æthelric, dating from c.995, describes some land in the vicinity of Rayne in Essex, adjacent to the Felsted case study (Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 42–3, no.16(I), will of Æthelric). It refers to wudas (‘woods’) and feldas (‘open land’) to the east of the Roman road (stræte) running through Braintree, and to thæs hegæs on Glæsne (‘the enclosure at Glazenwood’). Hegæs here seems to have a different meaning, being synonymous with (ge)hæg which is usually translated as ‘an enclosure’, but which I have argued has a meaning in southern East Anglia of ‘a wood’ (see Chapter 6, 206–7). I would therefore see the phrase in the will as meaning ‘the wood of Glazenwood’, which is exactly what the modern form, Glazenwood, means.

Even with this reservation, however, these examples do suggest that hedged and ditched fields existed in south Suffolk and Essex by the late Saxon period and that elements of these field systems survive in the modern landscape. The existence of considerable amounts of woodland in Essex in the eleven century indicate that the patterns were not yet complete, however locational analysis does provide a pointer to those areas where ‘ancient fields’ are most likely. In the case studies, there are parallels to the panels of optimum arable land on the valley side at Scole, discussed above, in the areas of block demesne identified at Felsted and Ingatestone. These block demesnes occupied the best available land in their parishes and are likely to have had continuous histories as arable land, stretching back certainly to late Saxon times and possibly beyond. This does not mean that they have survived unchanged, but they are likely to contain alignments and probably some actual boundaries that are very ancient.

This comparison between Scole and Felsted/Ingatestone is very revealing, for it indicates that although they developed different farming systems, they started from a similar basis. At Scole, common fields developed on the optimum arable land, but at Felsted/Ingatestone similar areas developed into block demesnes. There was clearly an important cultural difference that triggered these two diverging paths. This question of why common fields arose in some areas but not in others is one of the most important questions in English medieval landscape studies.

Although most distinctly seen in the southern part of the region, block holdings do occur in variable quantities in most parts of East Anglia and have emerged from this study as one of the distinctive characteristics of the region’s historic landscape. As suggested in the discussion above, there is good reason to think that some could pre-date the common fields, rather than the other way round, as is usually supposed. Medieval records indicate that these block demesnes could contain individual fields that were up to 70ha in extent (see Chapter 6, 199) and in this they bear a strong resemblance to the large demesne culturae recorded in the Frankish realms between the Seine and the Rhine in the ninth century (Elmshäuser and Hedwig 1993, 348–53; Verhulst 2002, 17).

Their significance for land management and conservation is that the enclosed fields of block holdings have left a rich legacy of hedgerows and boundaries quite different to the ridge-and-furrow bequeathed by the Midland common field systems, and considerably more ancient than the enclosure hedges that succeeded those common fields.

5. Conclusion — culture and cultivation

The evidence reviewed in this chapter, and in Chapter 2, indicates that from the second millennium BC there existed landscape units that can be described as ‘fields’, even if many were for livestock rather than arable. There is also evidence suggesting a continuity of open, farmed, landscapes in the river valleys and other land with a good agricultural potential. Although there may be continuity in the axes of boundary ditches that also functioned as land drains, there was also significant evidence for the replanning of field systems over time, possibly related to an age-old tendency for settlements to shift within their territories as generations or needs changed. In poorly-drained areas with heavy soils it is likely that wood-pasture economies developed that fluctuated in extent depending on climatic and population factors. Trackways developed for the movement of livestock between settlements, water and feeding areas probably influenced the layout of field boundaries. Altogether the evidence suggests a continuity of landscape use from prehistory down to the Anglo-Saxon period. There may have been expansions and decreases in the extent of land actively used, and changes in the type of use, but a wholesale abandonment is unlikely. This further suggests that some aspects of the prehistoric landscape must still be with us today, though we might not be able to recognise
them because they have been adapted for use in later farming systems.

By the end of the tenth century, significant changes had occurred that were to profoundly affect the farming landscapes for the next thousand years. A key factor must have been the greater adoption of the mouldboard plough. This must not only have made ploughing more efficient, thus stimulating an expansion of the arable areas, but also must have influenced the shapes of fields, making them longer and thinner. A simultaneous climatic improvement would have encouraged expansion by making some of the colder and wetter land more suitable for arable crops. The expansion of the arable seems to have had the effect of decreasing the tendency of settlements to shift. This was most extreme in the Midlands, where settlements coagulated into nucleated villages, allowing for the reorganisation of most of the landscape into large open fields. In East Anglia the trend towards nucleation was reduced perhaps because of the relative abundance of land unsuitable for conversion to arable through being poorly-drained clayland or dry and sandy heaths (such land did, of course, have an economic value as animal pasture). A continuing demand for arable expansion on the clayland did, however, about the twelfth century, lead to the emergence of green-side settlements in the former wood-pasture ‘wastes’.

It is against this background of arable expansion that the Viking interventions should be viewed. Breaks in established social patterns, and a new or strengthened concept of equitable sharing of the better land, would seem to have triggered the development of common fields. Massive settlement by Scandinavians was not necessary to achieve this; instead they could be regarded rather like a yeast fermenting a mix — the stronger the yeast, the greater the reaction, certainly, but in overall terms probably still a relatively small proportion of the overall mix. Although there were undoubtedly earlier, underlying, cultural and natural factors that contributed to the evolution of the different farming systems that have been identified in this project, the correlation with the evidence for Scandinavian settlement or influence is also compelling, explaining the appearance of common fields in the northern and western parts of the region, along the east coast and along the Stour valley. This implies a late ninth-century date for the origins of common fields, in the northern and western parts of the region, along the east coast and along the Stour valley. This implies a late ninth-century date for the origins of common fields, though the systematisation of them may in fact be the product of English royal policy in the tenth century. However the trends towards arable expansion, creating large ‘open’ arable fields, could be considerably earlier than this. The occurrence of a ‘middle furlong’ at Roydon in Norfolk, c.1030, suggests that ‘open’ and probably ‘common’ fields were present by that date in the Waveney valley (Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 68–9 and 179). It is important here to emphasise that ‘open’ fields do not necessarily mean ‘common’ fields, as the large demesne fields identified in Essex and south Suffolk are variants of ‘open’ fields.

No study can ever hope to give the definitive and unchallengeable interpretation of the historic landscape, but it is hoped that this project has suggested some new ways of analysing complex landscape evidence and, through the integration of new techniques with more traditional forms of analysis, has enabled some fresh models to be developed. Some of the more speculative ideas will be proved wrong, but undoubtedly new patterns have emerged that challenge many existing views on farming systems, landscape evolution and cultural groupings. By demonstrating that existing county boundaries are not necessarily the strongest cultural boundaries, the study has produced new units for reviewing a whole range of data — agricultural, archaeological, architectural, historical and linguistic.

One of the aims of this project, when it was set up under English Heritage’s Monuments Protection Programme, was to explore how the origins and development of fields in this Eastern Province differed from those of the Central Province. It is therefore no surprise that the ramifications of the HFSEA project have spread beyond a purely regional scope to embrace such national questions as the origins of common fields. The ramifications could even be said to be international, for large numbers of the emigrants to New England in the seventeenth century came from East Anglia, including John Winthrop, the first governor of Massachusetts, who came from Groton in south Suffolk. These emigrants to a new world took with them their inherited notions on how farmland should be allotted and organised and American scholars have perhaps become more aware than many English ones, of the strong tradition for ‘enclosed-farm’ holdings that these East Anglian settlers took to America (Sumner 1963, xvii, 60; Cronin 2003, 74). A component of that cultural baggage was also perhaps a spirit of independence that arose from their long tradition of managing their own farming regimes in East Anglia, ‘wheare most enclosures be’.

In the wake of the HFSEA project there is now scope to give a clearer definition of the areas of East Anglia where block holdings dominated to compare with the information on settler origins, potentially giving new insights on the origins and development of the American landscape and mentality. At the same time of course, the spirit of independence continued to run like a thread through East Anglian history and culture, making the better understanding of the region’s distinctive field patterns, and behind that, its overall culture and identity, a pressing concern. The next, final, chapter of this book will begin the task of seeing how the insights that have already been gained into landscape character and regional identity, and particularly the strengthened context given for hedgerow protection now that enclosed fields can more clearly than ever be shown to be distinctively ‘East Anglian’, might start to influence spatial planning and land management in the region.

Endnotes
1. For another critical examination of the co-axial concept, see Peterson 1990.
2. There is also a mention of the purchase of ‘every eighth acre’ in Brandon, Suffolk, in the mid-tenth century, but this is only recorded in the Liber Eliensis 1962, 111, no.36; Liber Eliensis 2005 (Fairweather tr.), 134.
3. The division between these two areas was, of course, the boundary between the Danelaw and the English lands, as established in a treaty between Guthrum, the Danish king, and Alfred the Great c.866–90 (Hart 1992, 7; Roberts and Wrathmell 2002, figs 5.4 and 5.6).
4. His map unfortunately does not map the throrp names.
5. I hope to pursue this argument more fully elsewhere. For Ælfgar and his family see Anglo-Saxon Wills 1930, 6–9, 34–43; 141; Hart 1992, 127–34.
6. These include one reference to le Owtfeld alias Townefeld and one to le Townefeld de Chelmes worthe.
7. I am grateful to Mr J.B. Weller for a great deal of information about the medieval landscape of Monks Eleigh, based on extensive documents at Christ Church, Canterbury.
8. The form *Ceorleswyrthe* in AD 962 (Hart 1992, 472) makes it clear that the first element is in the genitive singular.
9. For *ceorls* see Finberg 1964, 144–60; Faith 1997, 116 and 126–8. The wording of the 962 charter could be interpreted as making an oblique reference to *ceorls* in stating that it was a *ruricolis* *ulgariter Ceorleswyrthe prolatum est* ('commonly known by the country folk as Chelsworth') as *ceorl* was normally rendered in Latin as *rusticus*, a synonym for *ruricola*. 
Chapter 8. Managing the historic field systems of East Anglia for the future
by Edward Martin

No record of an ancient hedge can be complete; recording is not an adequate substitute for protection (Rackham 1986, 204).

1. Conservation priorities

Field systems form an important part of the historic landscape and the need to conserve the historic landscape has been recognised at both a national and an international level. English Heritage has expressed its commitment to conserving and enhancing ‘the locally distinctive character of the landscape’ (English Heritage 2002). The European Landscape Convention recognises that landscape is cultural as well as natural, that it exists everywhere and not only in special places, that it is the result of change (the interaction of people and nature through time) and is therefore dynamic, requiring sustainable management (e.g. of character and of process) as much as protection of fabric (Fairclough and Rippon 2002; Fairclough 2002).

As stated in Chapter 1, one of the objectives of this project was to identify and assess mechanisms for the management and protection of the field systems in East Anglia. A fundamental finding of this project is that conservation priorities need to be tailored to the specific conditions and traditions of different regions. This can be clearly seen by contrasting the conservation priorities of the Midland areas of England with those of East Anglia. In the Midlands, conservation efforts in relation to fields have been concentrated on two distinct targets. Firstly, the existing fields sometimes contain the earthwork remains of medieval ploughing in the form of ridge-and-furrow and these earthworks have been the focus of much attention and require specialised conservation management (Hall 2001). Secondly, the boundaries of the fields, which are mainly hedgerows of a late date that overlie the ridge-and-furrow, have been separately managed under a different set of management measures.

The situation in East Anglia is different. Here, the fields are more likely to be surrounded by ancient boundaries, which exhibit a greater diversity of form and age (Pl. 67). Ancient cultivation traces within the fields are, however much rarer. This is not because ridge-and-furrow, as found in the Midlands, has been eroded away, but because a different method of ploughing was used. Small amounts of ridge-and-furrow do occur on the western fringes of the region, but over most of East Anglia ‘stetch’ ploughing was the norm and this produced low ridges that seldom survive as earthworks (see Chapter 3, 5.ii–iii). Management attention in East Anglia, therefore, will be focused more on field boundaries and less on the land they contain; an inversion, perhaps, of the priorities in the Midlands. Because so little exists, however, any cultivation traces, whether of stetch ploughing or ridge-and-furrow, will be of great importance and will need careful management.

The boundaries of East Anglian fields are vivid testimonies of the region’s long farming and settlement history and are a key aspect of its regional identity. As this report has demonstrated, this region is characterised by distinctive types of fields associated with dispersed settlements and holdings in ‘severalty’, that is land held in individually-owned blocks. This represents a completely different way of managing the landscape to the Midlands model, where large common-fields were subdivided into separately-owned strips. It is this major distinction that has given East Anglia a different ‘feel’ to the Midlands. Of such major distinctions are regional identities made. These distinctions themselves are interdependent with other regional characteristics, such as the fact that, in some parts of medieval and early-modern East Anglia, a significant proportion of the land was not under the plough. This contrasts, for example, with the East...
Midlands, where 90% or more of the township fields were in arable cultivation by 1300.

East Anglian field boundaries provide the ‘structure’ of the landscape, being intricately linked to settlement patterns and road and track systems. Field patterns are of fundamental importance in determining the character of any given area of countryside. To preserve local distinctiveness there is a need to conserve overall field patterns — in other words whole landscapes, not just representative samples or individual hedges.

In East Anglia field boundaries can be hedges, ditches or banks, or any combination of the three. The plant species in hedges can vary, as can their management and their position relative to a bank or ditch. The presence, species and density of hedgerow trees also varies. Changing the appearance of boundaries can change the local character as much as changes to the pattern. It is, therefore, important that account is taken of the historical evidence for boundary management in each region. As well as often being the oldest visible features in the countryside, field boundaries are also important wildlife habitats, especially in areas, like East Anglia, that are predominantly arable today. Ancient species-rich hedgerows are recognised as a National Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitat (UK Steering Group 1995).

In East Anglia the conservation priorities for historic field systems are therefore:

- the management and preservation of historic field patterns (i.e. their shapes, sizes and inter-relationships).
- the maintenance of the varied visual character of the field boundaries, based on valid historic precedents.

2. Conservation in a changing world

Alarmingly, between the 1840s (the period of the tithe maps) and the 1980s, many areas in East Anglia are estimated to have lost 50% of their pre-eighteenth-century landscape features. In some places the loss was over 70% (Dymond 1989). Although some boundaries were lost in the nineteenth century through the increase in arable farming, the greatest loss was in the second half of the twentieth century. The great drive to produce sufficient food to feed the nation in the dark years of the Second World War set off perhaps the greatest agricultural revolution that this country has seen.

Pre-eminent among the changes was the increase in mechanisation. Although tractors were first developed in the late nineteenth century, their uptake had been gradual. By 1939 there were 60,000 tractors on British farms, but by 1949 there were 260,000 and 478,000 by 1956. The combine harvester was developed in 1928, but there were only about 1,000 in use in 1941, however that figure had risen to over 11,000 by 1950 (Weller 1982, 161–5; Spargo 1989, 166). Through these machines there was an explosion in arable farming: Between 1939 and 1944 the area under the plough in Britain increased from 12,900,000 to 19,400,000 acres. As the machinery increased in power and size, the land units were radically revised to make more efficient use of the machinery. This led to an unprecedented loss of historic field boundaries (Pls 68 and 69).

The effects of mechanisation were increased by government-supported drives towards greater intensification in the 1950s and 60s, and further encouraged since 1974 through the Common Agriculture Policy of the European Community. Concerns about the impact of these changes led, in 1968, to the Countryside Act, which for the first time brought together the needs of agriculture with those of countryside conservation. Since then it has been increasingly realised that there has to be a greater balance between these two important issues in countryside management. The way that the countryside is being used and appreciated is undergoing significant changes, as are attitudes to what should be the aims of government funding. Most significant amongst recent policy reviews is that of the Policy Commission on the Future of Farming and Food (2002; ‘the Curry Report’). Building on this the government has issued its Strategy for Sustainable Farming and Food that has advocated the introduction of a broadly-based agri-environment scheme and a ‘whole-farm approach’ (DEFRA 2002). At the time of writing the details of these are still undecided, as a result it is difficult to present a detailed series of possible prescriptions tailored to current regulations and initiatives. So, instead, a more general approach has been adopted, examining some of the issues that should guide the conservation of field systems.

Firstly, it needs to be acknowledged that field systems and their boundaries present a huge challenge by their very scale. Within Suffolk alone it is estimated that, in spite of heavy losses in the twentieth century, there are still about 13,800km of hedges (Parker 2000; 2001, 6). The greatest density is in the clayland areas where most of the field boundaries are ‘ancient’ (i.e. certainly pre-1800 and frequently medieval or earlier). In these areas there is an average density of 4km of hedges per square km. Field systems like these are therefore amongst the largest archaeological ‘sites’ in the country. The management of these field patterns is, consequently, a landscape issue. Historic Landscape Characterisation maps (see Fig. 19) indicate the extent of these ‘ancient’ landscapes, as well as providing a guide to twentieth-century losses. Surveys in both Norfolk and Suffolk have shown that it is precisely in those areas of ‘ancient countryside’ that the loss of hedges has been the greatest (Baird and Tarrant 1973, 14 and fig. 2; Podd 1995, sect. 2.8).

Secondly, many field boundaries are living entities like hedges. Without suitable treatment and management these can change radically in appearance and sometimes can actually die and disappear completely. However, management, can itself cause fundamental changes in the appearance and nature of the boundaries. It is therefore vital that management advice and incentives are grounded in an understanding of the historic character of the landscape, the traditional management of the boundaries and local variations in this. In part this can be supplied by gathering together documentary evidence about past techniques of hedgerow and field management (see the annex to this chapter) and by ongoing work on landscape characterisation at both a local and a county level. However it should be supplemented by information provided by farmers themselves about how they remember the boundaries on their land being managed. The oral history of those who have worked the land has a great potential to inform the study of traditional management practices. Together, the documentary and
Plate 68  Aerial view of recently flattened hedges at Brook Hall, Ilketshall St Margaret, Suffolk, 1973. Much of the historic landscape in this area has now been lost
oral evidence should ensure that both general trends and local variations are identified.

Ideally, ‘whole-farm audits’, as recommended most recently in the Curry Report, should include a ‘farm character audit’ which contains descriptions of the field boundaries, their condition and their management. This farm character audit could cover:

- the present appearance of the fields and boundaries
- arable cultivation techniques, both now and in the past
- the management and use of grassland
- the management of the boundary features, both now and in the past
- the predominant woody plant species in the hedges
- the species, density and nature (e.g. pollards, standards) of the trees in the boundaries
- the presence of boundary banks and ditches, if possible with an indication of their sizes and profiles
- a consideration of the contribution that the boundaries make to the wider landscape patterns of the parish or other historic units.

Farming support grants (e.g. the proposed Entry Level Scheme of Environmental Stewardship) should encourage or require appropriate management of field boundaries, which could be dependant on following local, traditional, precedents for the type of boundary, their appearance and historic management. Until now very little attention has been given to collecting together the documentary evidence for traditional management and the annex below is a first attempt to draw together some of the evidence.

Information of this type is essential for verifying the authenticity of claimed ‘traditional’ management practices. Further research would undoubtedly add considerably to the outlines given below in the annex. The importance of this data is not to force the implementation of outdated management methods but to enable a greater understanding of how these practices influenced the form and nature of the boundaries. Modern methods and machinery can be used to achieve a traditional appearance, but an understanding is needed of how the traditional methods determined that appearance. There is also, of course, a need to acknowledge that there may occasionally be strong evidence for divergent but nevertheless long standing management practices on particular farms.

In the past, the notion of ‘additionality’ in the grant-aiding of hedge works may have led to an over-emphasis on hedge planting and possibly over-management. The planting of new hedges might be justified in terms of creating greater opportunities for biodiversity but it is a flawed view to see this as ‘reconstruction’ rather than as the creation of new landscape types meeting conservation or green agendas. These new landscapes may consciously model themselves on past, lost, landscapes and field patterns, but their motivation, and hence ultimately their character, is different. We should be honest about our reasons for planting new hedges, and about what the result would be.

From a historic environment viewpoint, the emphasis should be on supporting the conservation of existing historic hedges, rather than planting new ones. The natural regeneration of hedges, where possible, should be preferred to new planting. Where new planting is carried out, it should be done with regard to local precedents for plant species, associated features such as ditches and the...
placeing of the plants relative to those features. Regular cycles of work, rather than short-term blites should be the guiding spirit. It cannot be assumed any longer that farms will have labour available for regular maintenance of hedges and their associated features, therefore funding will be increasingly needed for this essential work. It is also important to realise that not all field boundaries were hedges and therefore to plant a hedge on a traditionally non-hedged boundary would lead to a change in local character.

Grant-aiding the re-creation of destroyed historic boundary lines poses some important ethical questions. There is a very real danger of creating an ersatz landscape that is neither traditional nor modern. There is certainly a strong case for ‘filling-in’ damaged parts of field patterns, creating links between areas with more complete patterns. This reduces the fragmented appearance of the landscape and lessens the ‘ghettoising’ of the surviving areas. These links are also beneficial to wildlife, enabling them to spread to new areas. Where there is more widespread damage there is less certainty about the wisdom of slavishly recreating lost patterns, especially as new hedges frequently have a character that sets them apart from traditional ones. In these cases it should perhaps be acknowledged that a new landscape has been created. If needed, new boundaries could be dictated by modern needs.

Where there have been substantial changes in management practices there may also be issues about respecting the time-depth thus revealed in hedgerow management, in much the same way as we might hesitate to re-insert a fifteenth-century window into a house whose present façade is eighteenth-century in character.

3. Recommendations for managing field systems

To secure the preservation of historic ‘fieldscape’ it is recommended that:

- Historic Landscape Characterisation maps, which now exist or are in the process of being created for all the counties of East Anglia, should be used and analysed as a guide to the extent, survival, condition, completeness and diversity of different historic landscape types.

- The agri-environment schemes should be developed to include more of an emphasis on local, traditional, forms of hedge and boundary management.

- Information on the local character of field boundaries and their traditional management should be gathered (see the Annex to this chapter for a start towards this). This could build towards a national archive of traditional landscape management that could be consulted by all bodies giving advice and grants for land management.

- Farmers should be encouraged to carry out ‘whole farm audits’, including a characterisation of the field boundaries.

- Grant support should be targeted on the conservation of existing historic field boundaries and patterns, rather than their reinstatement after extensive loss.

- Where new hedge planting, including ‘gapping up’, is carried out, it should have regard to local precedent in terms of species, tree content and associated features, particularly banks and ditches. The placing of the hedge plants in relation to the banks and ditches should also follow local precedents. Where possible, hedge plants grown from local stock should be used to protect genetic diversity.

- The Hedgerow Regulations should be applied wherever possible in ways that recognise the area-based overall pattern of which an individual hedge is a part.

- It needs to be recognised that not all field boundaries consisted of hedges, and therefore new hedge-planting should only be grant-supported where it is appropriate to the local character.

- The rationale for planting new hedges, even if they are on the line of lost historic hedges, should be more explicit. Where damaged but still recognisable and ‘readable’ areas of historic fieldscape exist, new planting should aim to create links between the surviving portions. The restoration of completely lost patterns raises serious philosophical issues and it may be better to accept that a new landscape has been created. In those circumstances hedge planting should perhaps create new patterns for new landscape, ecological or economic purposes.

4. A framework for historic landscape management advice

- Historic landscape advice should be sought on all applications to government funded agri-environment schemes, for applications under the Hedgerow Regulations and for screening decisions for Environmental Impact Assessments (Uncultivated Land and Semi-Natural Areas).

- At present the main repositories of historic landscape information are the Historic Environment Records (HERs). These are held by local authorities, mainly at the county level, though some are held at district or unitary authority level.

- A network of historic landscape advisors needs to be established to provide this advice at an appropriately detailed level. At present, some counties are fortunate in having English-Heritage supported Countryside Archaeological Advisors or Historic Environment Countryside Advisors, but these posts are not permanent ones. Funding will be required to retain these posts and to extend the network.

- An historic landscape report, including a characterisation of the fields and boundaries, should be a requirement of the proposed Farm Environment Plans for the Higher Level Scheme of Environmental Stewardship.

- Historic landscape objectives need to be included in the county target statements for the new Environmental Stewardship scheme.

- Informative and ‘best practice’ guides, tailored to an appropriate local level, need to be produced on a range
of historic landscape aspects to help farmers, their advisors and DEFRA and Natural England staff.

5. The outlook for the future

In the twentieth century English rural society underwent enormous changes and the fabric of the historic landscape was equally affected by these changes. In East Anglia, traditions of farming that had endured for centuries were swept away by the tide of increasing mechanisation and much of the landscape was re-shaped to accommodate the new machines. However, by the end of the century it was realised that much that was important in giving character to the landscape was in danger of being lost. Remedial measures, including this project, have now started to be put in place to safeguard our landscape heritage for future generations. If implemented, the recommendations outlined above would go a long way secure the survival of an essential part of the historic landscape in East Anglia for the twenty-first century and, hopefully, beyond.

Endnote
1. The potential of the oral history of farming can be seen in the works of George Ewart Evans (Evans 1956; 1960; 1966).
Historical evidence for the nature and management of field boundaries in East Anglia

The evidence presented here is not meant to be taken as a narrow prescription for management methods that must be slavishly employed today, but as an aid to understanding the way boundaries were traditionally managed. There is an unavoidable bias towards the understanding the way boundaries were traditionally managed. The three most important were: Arthur Young (1741–1820) of Bradfield Combust in Suffolk, Secretary to the Board of Agriculture from 1793; William Marshall (1745–1818) a Yorkshireman who worked for a time in Norfolk, travelled widely and was a rival and critic of Young; and Charles Vancouver (1756–1781) from Norfolk, who undertook agricultural drainage and reclamation work in Ireland, North America and the Netherlands. Their testimony is also important because they were largely describing practices that were long-rooted in the region. Their writings can often be used to amplify and confirm less explicit descriptions by earlier writers. The increasingly ‘national’ perspective of farming advice and comment in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries means that local distinctions and practices were usually less clearly expressed by later writers.

1. The nature of hedges

Writing in 1787, William Marshall described the hedges of East Norfolk as being ‘high and full of trees’ (Marshall 1787, 4). These hedges were permitted to stand for many years without cutting: ‘Twelve or fourteen years is considered as a moderate growth, twenty or even thirty years it is sometimes permitted to remain without cutting’ (Marshall 1795, 96). In Suffolk, Arthur Young mentioned ‘broad hedge-rows’ that were ‘nurseries of timber’ (Young 1797, 144–5). Hugh Raynbird, writing in 1847, noted, with the dismay of an improving agriculturalist, that ‘the number of species of shrub in every kind’ (Vancouver 1795, 87).

In south Essex, Charles Vancouver similarly disapproved of the hedgerows ‘filled with old pollards, and rubbish of every kind’ (Vancouver 1795, 87).

In terms of plant species, Marshall noted that ‘old hedges’ in East Norfolk ‘in general, abound with oak, ash and maple stubs’ (Marshall 1795, 96). In terms of ‘planted hedges’, he recorded that:

The hedgewood usually planted is whitethorn; which, if properly planted, flourishes abundantly in the Norfolk soil; some few barren spots excepted; in which situations furze is the principal fence. Crabtree is sometimes, though seldom, planted; but I have seen it make a rapid progress upon very poor soil; and for such it would, I apprehend, be found preferable to the hawthorn. Holly abounds in old hedges; growing very luxuriantly, and forming an admirable shelter for cattle in winter; besides giving, in that bleak season, a cheerfulness and fancied shelter to the face of the country (Marshall 1795, 112–13).

‘Furze’ or gorse was also noted as a hedge plant in parts of Suffolk. John Norden, the map-maker, referred in 1610 to the coastal area of Suffolk as an area notable for its furze hedges, commenting that ‘the furze hedges which I have seen in that part of Suffolke, no cattle can pierce them’ (Norden 1610, 199). This was probably in the area around Orford, which he surveyed for Sir Michael Stanhope in 1600–2. Furze or whin was also recommended as a suitable hedging plant for ‘walklands’ in a lease of Ferry Farm, Sutton, in 1815 (SRO(I) HB17:52/15/3; Warner 1985, 45). Another unusual hedge plant used in that area is Scots pine. Pines were not indigenous to the area, but were thought to be appropriate for dry and sandy soils in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. These ‘pine lines’ were used on a larger scale on the sandy soils of the Breckland in the same period. Straight lines of contorted pines that were formerly managed as cut hedges are now recognised as important landscape features (Rackham 1986, 223–4; Sussams 1996, 105; Countryside Agency 1999, 61 and 73).

In north Essex, Vancouver recorded ‘some excellent hawthorne hedges’ (Vancouver 1795, 13). Also writing on Essex, Messrs Griggs noted the ‘ditches … and the thick hedges of whitethorn, which grow upon the banks raised by what is thrown out of them’ (Griggs 1794, 8). In Hertfordshire, D. Walker noted that the ‘inclosing fences are white thorn or hazle, or a mixture of both, intermixed with elm and other underwood’ (Walker 1795, 49).

Over thirty years ago Max Hooper put forward evidence to suggest that ‘the number of species of shrub in a thirty-yard length of hedge is correlated with the length of time the hedge has existed’. His research indicated that: The correlation coefficient was +0.85 and the regression equation for predicting the age of the hedge from the number of species in a thirty-yard length came to $X = 110 \times Y + 30$. Here X is the age of the hedge in years and Y is the number of species in a thirty-yard length (Hoskins 1967, 118; Hooper 1971, 6–7; Pollard et al 1974). At a rough approximation this suggested that each shrub species in a sample thirty-yard stretch represented a hundred years of the hedge’s existence. This method of hedge dating has come to be known as ‘Hooper’s Method’ or ‘Hooper’s Rule’. Hooper himself was careful to state that the dating was only approximate and suggested that ‘the limit of accuracy of the prediction is in the order of 200 years’. Subsequent research has suggested that such dating precision is unlikely, but Oliver Rackham was of the opinion that the method ‘can distinguish between hedges of the Enclosure Act period from those of Stuart or Tudor times or of the Middle Ages’. However he was also of the opinion that ‘the rule seems not to extend back more than 1100 years; it does not differentiate Anglo-Saxon from Roman hedges’. He also showed that there were some important exceptions to the rule, notably elm hedges, where the highly competitive suckering habit of elms suppresses
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the pre-existing species and results in a hedge predominantly of elms (Rackham 1986, 191–202).

Sylvia Addington’s work on hedges in five clayland parishes of Fritton, Morning Thorpe, Stratton St Michael, Tasburgh and Hempnall in south Norfolk has shown that the majority (about 60%) contained between four and six species of shrub per 30m length, with about 80% having more than four species (the range being one to nine) (Addington 1982, 116–17). The commonest species being ash (Fraxinus excelsior), blackthorn (Prunus spinosa), crabapple (Malus sylvestris, ssp. mitis, ssp. sylvestris), dogwood (Thelycrania sanguinea), elder (Sambucus nigra), field maple (Acer campestre), goat willow (Salix caprea), hawthorn or whitethorn (Crataegus monogyna), hazel (Corylus avellana), pedunculate oak (Quercus robur), small-leaved elm (Ulmus carpinifolia), wild plum (Prunus domestica, Prunus institia) and wild rose (Rosa canina sp., Rosa arvensis).

Amongst the less common species present were almond-leaved willow (Salix triandra), common osier (Salix viminalis), common sallow (Salix cinerea), cared willow (Salix aurita), holly (Ilex aquifolium), hornbeam (Carpinus betulus), spindle (Euonymus europaeus), spurge laurel (Daphne laureola), sycamore (Acer pseudoplatanus) and Wych elm (Ulmus glabra). Most one-specie hedge (about 3% of the total) were composed of either elm or hawthorn (Addington 1982, 118–20 and 138–9).

Similar results have been obtained for the clayland parts of Suffolk and Essex. A survey of 225 hedges in Walsham-le-Willows in 1979–84, revealed that 91% had four or more species and 49% had six or more (maximum ten). The species present were similar to those in south Norfolk (Addington 1982, 118–19). Colin Ranson showed that there was a clear distinction in the latter, hedges of five to ten species predominated (maximum being ten) (Hunter 1993, 116).

At Rougham in Suffolk, work by David Dymond and Colin Ranson showed that there was a clear distinction between the northern and central parts of the parish that were enclosed in the late eighteenth century, and the southern part that was of ‘ancient countryside’ character. In the former, hedges had mainly one to four species, but in the latter, hedges of five to ten species predominated (Rackham 1986, 197–9).

2. Ditches and banks

William Marshall noted that in Norfolk:

The size of the ditch is from three to five feet wide — and two to three and half feet deep; the medium, four feet wide and three feet deep, with a bank three feet high, forming what is called ‘a six-foot dick’. For an out-side fence against a common or road, five feet wide and seven feet high, (measuring from the bottom of the ditch to the top of the bank when fresh-made) is a more suitable fence (Marshall 1795, 108).

Nathaniel Kent similarly recommended a ditch four feet wide at the top and three feet deep ‘properly sloped, with a bank seven feet high, from the bottom of the ditch, including the setting of the quick-s sets’ (Kent 1796, 162).

The 1827 enclosure award for Worstead (N) stipulated the new ‘fences’ there were to consist of:

- ditches four feet wide at the top and three feet deep perpendicular and of banks adjoining to such ditches and formed of the earth taken from the same and that the banks of such fences shall be planted with white thorn layer in a proper manner and that half hurdles or thorns shall be set on the summit of such banks and shall there remain or if taken away or spoiled shall be from time to time renewed during the space of seven years next ensuing the date of this award (NRO C/Sca2/342).

At Ferry Farm in Sutton, Suffolk, a lease of 1815 stipulated that the ditches on the arable land were to be 4:1ft wide at the top, 3ft deep and 20in wide at the base, while those on the meadows were to be 6ft wide, 3ft deep and 4ft wide at the bottom (SRO(I) HB17:52/15/3; Warner 1985, 45).

These references suggest that the size of ditches and banks varied with regard to the type of land they enclosed and to external features such as roads.

3. Hedge planting

William Marshall gives the most detailed information on hedge planting methods:

THE METHOD OF RAISING NEW HEDGES in Norfolk … The hedgeling is defended on one side by a deep ditch, while the other side is sufficiently guarded by the excavated mould formed into a mound, and crested with a stout brush hedge; in the setting of which the Norfolk labourers, from constant practice, are very proficient.

It is striking, and indeed an interesting fact, that hedges in Norfolk are raised with good success, although neither post, rail, stake nor edder be made use of in defending them. ….

But not withstanding much praise is due to the Norfolk method of defending young hedges, the mode of planting, here in common use, is very reprehensible. Instead of the quicksets — provincially, ‘layer’ — being planted in or near the soil which is to support it, they are laid in or near the top of the bank — perhaps, two feet above the natural level of the adjoining inclosure — and probably five feet above the bottom of the ditch: nor are they, there, planted with their roots downwards, in the manner which nature dictates; but with their heads pointing into the the ditch; and, to complete the absurdity of the business, the workman, in dressing the face of the bank, frequently draws the back of his spade downwards over the top of the plants, pressing them, of course, flat to the face in which they not unfrequently stick! Yet, he says, he thereby does no harm; and it is possible he may be right; but, to a person who has seen any other way of proceeding, he appears to be doing very wrong.

Nevertheless, it is surprising to see the progress which quick [meaning young hedge plants, often hawthorn or Crataegus monogyna], this planted, will sometimes make the first two or three years after planting; and this, probably, is the false light by which the advocates of the method are led away. The top of the bank is loose made ground, and the upright brush hedge, by collecting driving rains, supplies it amply with moisture. But the same rains not unfrequently assist in washing down the face of the bank, together with the quick, into the bottom of the ditch. Even the ordinary moulderings of the bank, by frosts and moderate rains,
The reason why a hedge planted low in the face of the bank, does not flourish for a few years after planting is obvious: the bank being steep, and without a break from top to bottom, it shoots off the rain water, which falls against it, into the ditch; while that collected by the dead hedge, above, is not sufficient to moisten it to the bottom; which is, of course, deprived of the benefit of rain water. Besides this want of moisture, the superincumbent weight of the bank is inimical to the tender fibrils of the young plants; and their progress, so long as they remain confined under the bank, and cramped with its pressure, is of course slow. But this difficulty once overcome; the roots having once reached though the bank, and got possession of the adjoining inclosure; the plants flourish again; while their principal roots being firmly and coolly situated, they continue to flourish, even in defiance of ‘buckstalling’ and ‘out-holling’. ... The reason why quick, recently planted at the foot, and in the face, of a tall bank, is checked in its growth, for the first two or three years, is, not more obvious than the method of preventing it. If instead of laying-in the plants in the immediate face of an unbroken bank, they were to be planted on the back of an offset, or break in the bank, the evil effects abovementioned would be removed: for by this simple alteration in the formation of the bank, the young plants become supplied, at once, with every thing necessary to their support; namely, moisture, air, and loose earth for the infant roots to strike in.

This is not merely a theoretic plan: it is in common practice in many parts of the kingdom; and I have myself practised it, in three different and distant parts of it, with success. In Norfolk however, where hares are vermin, some caution is necessary: the shelf should not be made too wide; and should, while the plants are young, be kept stuck with bushes, to prevent the hares from running along it. ... The mean distance of planting quick is about six inches: the calculation is a hundred to three rods’. ... At present, it is a practice, though perhaps not of long standing, to sow furze seed upon the top of the bank, as a guard successive to the brush hedge, and as a source of kid and fuel. The common way is to sow it upon the back, at the foot of the dead hedge: this, however, is injudicious; for the furze being of a spreading nature it is liable, after the hedge is gone to decay, to overrun the quick. Many fine young hedges I have seen materially harmed through an injudicious management of the furze hedge; which ought to stand on the back, not on the top, of the bank; as in this situation it is better guard to the bank (which is liable to be scraped down by cattle and sheep), and less injurious to the hedge it is intended to defend. About two thirds of the distance between the foot of the bank and the foot of the brush hedge; namely one third of that space from the foot of the hedge; is a good situation (Marshall 1795, 102–9).

With ‘wornout’ hedges, Marshall recommended: REPLANTING WORNOUT HEDGES. It will be doing justice to the Norfolk management to mention a practice, which at present prevails, of grubbing up old wornout hedges, and planting new ones in their stead. In this case the old hedge is (or ought to be) thrown down in autumn — that the soil may be thoroughly soaked and tempered with the winter’s rains and frosts — early in spring the foot of the bank should be formed, and in due season, the layer put in, and the fence completed (Marshall 1795, 111).

Arthur Young, in 1804, gave a briefer description of hedge creation associated with new enclosures in Norfolk: ‘the fences consist of a ditch four feet wide and three deep, the quick laid into the bank, and a dead bush head made at the top’ (Young 1804a, 185). In Essex, Vancouver recommended a method of planting that he had seen in the Helions Bumpstead/Haverhill area:

Some excellent hawthorne hedges have been lately raised, by planting one row only at six inches asunder, rather than two rows nine inches or a foot apart. These hedges have not been cut down, nor do they require it, to thicken their bottoms, as they are at this time a complete protection against hogs, and in other respects form a beautiful and effectual fence. Nothing can be more evident, than that a row of plants set thus ...... six inches distant from each other, must form a more complete and effectual fence at the bottom, than an equal number planted thus: at a double distance, and occupying the same length, but at a greater depth of ground upon the hedge row. (Vancouver 1795, 13).

4. Hedge management

It is clear that in 1800, as now, there were two very different ways of managing hedges:
• coppicing — the regular cutting down of all the vegetation to its base to encourage a strong regrowth that would provide a stock-proof barrier (Pl. 70);
• plashing, which today is more commonly called laying — a thinning of the hedge timber, followed by the selection of some growing rods which are partially cut to make them pliable and then interwoven with living or dead stakes to provide a strong barrier (Pl. 71).

Different areas had and still have different preferences for these two methods, which has important implications for the appearance of the countryside.

The plasshynge method was known to John Fitzherbert (c.1460–1531) of Norbury, Derbyshire, and he gives one of the earliest and most detailed instructions on how ‘to plashe or pleche’:

If the hedge be of x or xii yeres growyn syte it was first set, thanne take a sharpe hachet, or a handbyll, and
cutte the settes in a playne place, nygh unto the erthe, the more halue a sonder, and bende it downe towarde the erthe, and wrappe and wynde theym together, but alwaye se that the toppe lye hyer then the rote a good quantyte, for elles the sappe wyll not renne in to the toppye kyndely, but in processe the tope wyll dye, and than set a lyttel hedge on the back side, and it shall nede no more mendynge many yeres after. And if the hedge be of xx, xxiiii or xxx yere of age, sythe it was fyrst sette, than wynde in first al the nethermoste bowes and wynde them together, and than cutte the settes in a playne place a lyttel from the erth, the more half a sonder, and to lette it slaue downewarde, and not upwarde, for dyuerse causes, then wynde the bowes and braunches therof in to the hedge, and at every two fote, or iii fote to leaue one set growyng, not plashed, and the toppe to be cut of four fote hygh, or there aboute, to stande as a stake, if there be any suche, or els to set an other, and to wynd the other that be pleched about them. And if the bowes wyll not lye playne in the hedge, than cut it the more halfe a sonder, and bynd it to the hedge, and then shal he not nede for to mende that hedge, but in fewe places, xx yeres after or more. And if the hedge be olde, and be great stubbes or trees, and thyn in the bottome, that beastes may go under, or betwene the trees: thanne take a sharpe axe, and cutte the trees or stubbes, that growe a fote from the erthe, or there about, in a plaine place, within an inch or two inches of the side and let them slaue downward, as I sayd before, and let the toppe of the tree lye over the rote of an other tree, and to pleche downe the bowes of the same tree, to stoppe the holowe places. And if all the holowe and voyde places wyl not be fylled and stopped, than scoure the olde dyche, and cast it up newe, and to fyll with erthe al the voyde places. And if soo be these trees wyll not reche in every place, to make a sufficyent defence, than double quickie set it, and dicht it new in eyvery place, that is nedeful, and set a hedge therupon, and to overlay the settes for eatynge of shepe and other cattel (Boke of Husbandry c.1535-40, 54-55)

A similar description of plashing is given by Gervase Markham (?1568-1637) of Cotham in Nottinghamshire, though he did admit that ‘diuers Countries differ diuersly in those workes’ (English Husbandman 1613, pt. II, ch. VI). Both Fitzherbert and Markham had a Central Province background, living within about 35 miles of each other.

Arthur Young had farmed for a time at North Mymms in Hertfordshire and he doubtless drew on his local knowledge when he asserted in 1804 that ‘Hertfordshire may be considered as the county where the plashing system is carried on to the greatest extent: it has been universally practised here from time immemorial’ (Young 1804b, 49). In his report on the agriculture of Hertfordshire, Young gives a detailed account of the plashing method, supplemented by several line drawings. He recommended the use of whitethorn (Crataegus monogyna) for this method, either through new planting or through selection in mixed hedges. Starting with a hedge of twelve-years growth, he advised that after thinning the growth, living ‘hedge-stakes’ of whitethorn were be selected at every three to four feet which were to be cut off at the required height of the hedge. The remaining whitethorn standards were to be ‘plashed down’ (i.e. cut almost through at the base, leaving ‘just a very thin slice’ connecting them to their stump, making them bendable) and interwoven with the living hedge-stakes. All the ‘plashes’ were normally bent in the same direction, except where there was a deficiency in live growth, when they could be turned the other way to fill a gap. Finally, long rods of dead wood, called ‘edders’, were interwoven along the top of the stakes ‘to keep the
stragling branches in their place, and bind the whole together.’ For future management, Young recommended that the plashing be renewed every twelve years, the old plashing being cut off for firewood and new ones laid down. Alternately, where whitethorn ‘abounds’ the hedge could be kept in shape by clipping. Young noted a deficiency in Hertfordshire of what he would describe as ‘a thorough good ditch (such as would be called a ditch in Suffolk)’. He also noted that ‘where there are ditches, small or great, the hedge is on top of the bank; which is far preferable to the Suffolk method of making them on the level of the field, with an immense bank of earth upon the roots. When planted at this level, the Leicestershire custom is preferable, that of setting the hedge on one side of the ditch, and making the bank on the other.’ (Young 1804b, 49–52). Young was in favour of plashing, but noted that ‘it should not be concealed, that I have met with some persons who disapprove of the whole business, and prefer cutting up, as in Suffolk, &c. all the growth of a hedge on repairing it.’ (Young 1804b, 53).

The Rev. John Howlett, Vicar of Dunmow contributed the description of Essex hedges to Young’s 1807 report on Essex fences: Our Essex fences generally consist of hedge-rows, of various kinds of wood — hazel, maple, ash, oak, elm, black thorn, white thorn, with timber and pollard trees interspersed and growing in them at different distances. These hedges, especially in soils not perfectly dry, have commonly a ditch on one side, of from one foot and a half to three, and even four feet deep, according to the different quantities of water to be conveyed off from the land; and, if properly made, are at least one-third wider at the top than at the bottom.

These hedges were ‘usually cut down at the end of nine, ten or twelve years, and the pollard trees lopt’. Most of the hedge was cut down ‘within an inch or two of the old stubb [with] some few of the larger and stiffer stems being left eighteen inches high, to serve instead of a stake or support of a dead fence to be made’. The ditch was scoured out and ‘one spit’ was thrown upon the bank ‘to nourish and promote the growth afresh of the pared off quick’. Howlett goes on to note that:

The new made fence has great variety, agreeably to the convenience, fancy, or judgement of the farmer. Sometimes not only, as I have just observed, here and there a stiffer and stronger stem is left as a kind of stake, but great numbers untouched, and at their full height, which are splashed, bent down, and entwined with one another, as well as with the loose wood and bushes entirely cut down, and in due proportion, form a kind of hedge, part of which (the splashed) is continually growing and mixing with the young shoots of the parts cut off close to the stubbs, and it is not easily carried away by hedge breakers and stealers of wood.

When all the hedge is cut entirely down, and no stems, short or at full length, left behind, the new fence is still susceptible of different constructions. Of these the old fashioned one, in my apprehension, is by far the strongest, neatest, and best. When a spit of earth from the ditch has been nicely and properly laid upon the bank, as already described, the workman selects a sufficient number of stakes from the wood of the hedge cut down, and lops off the pollards, provided they can be furnished from thence; if not, he procures them from some other quarter. These, having prepared and sharpened (which I should have observed, are best from three-fourths of an inch to more than an inch in diameter), he, with his hedging beetle, drives down upon the top or highest part of the bank, deep enough to make them stand firm and steady, and at distance of from twelve to eighteen inches from each other. He then takes repeated handfuls of the longer of his bushes, runs the sharp ground points a little way into the ridge of the bank, then inclining them in an angle of about fifteen degrees from the line of the earth, intervenes or raddles them, as it is here called, between and on both sides the stakes, as far as their length will admit, taking care always to let the top, or brush end, come out on the ditch side. At the same time, he contrives dextrously to work in a considerable quantity of the shortest bushes among the longer, and so as to hang a little down the bank on the ditch side; and if any of them are thought too loose and stragglag, he pins them firmly down with a crotched peg, which he cuts and shapes for the purpose. This operation he continues, either the whole length of his hedge, or as far as he chooses to complete it at a time. Then takes his eathers, as they are here styled (for I believe it is merely a provincial term, signifying the longer boughs in his cut down wood, or obtained elsewhere, as it may happen, in size about as large as a man’s finger); the hedger, I say, takes his eathers, four or five in number, begins where he left off, and goes the contrary way to what he went when laying the foundation with his bushes. He puts two or three on the other; then he twists and entwines them together with his hands till he come to the next stake, to encompass which, he again makes the same separation as before, and so on till he has gone through the whole, always taking care, as he approaches towards the end of his materials in his hands, to insert and entwine fresh ones into them, so as to form one continued unbroken rope or cord from one end to the other, and which is made as straight and uniform as possible. He then, with his bill, brushes off the loose boughs and brushes which hang down the bank on the ditch side, and renders them perfectly smug, neat, and smooth. Last of all, he takes his hedging beetle, or mallet, with his left hand, on one side of every stake in succession, and with his bill in his right, he cuts off the top of each at a single stroke, about two or three inches above the entwined eathers, and every cut being equally slanting, or oblique, both with regard to the level of the ground, and the direction of the fence, when beheld at a distance, the exhibit the appearance of a straight white cord, which, contrasted with the general colour of the bushes, is extremely beautiful. The work is now completed, and is every where so firm, compact, and close, that hardly a mouse can penetrate through it. It is, indeed, one of the neatest and most elegant pieces of workmanship performed by our husbandry labourers. Often, with infinite pleasure, have I seen them, immediately after the full completion of a fence of this kind, eyeing askance, with manifest emotions of joy, and heartfelt self-complacency, at the wonderful dexterity, the matchless skill and ingenuity they had therein displayed!
A hedge of this sort, thus completely finished, used to remain very little impaired three or four years, and till the fresh shoots from the old stock had risen high and thick enough to cover and conceal it.

Howlett, however, noted with regret that few farmers would now go to the expense of a well-constructed dead hedge of this type, 'for it is sure to be torn up, destroyed, and burnt, stake, eathers, bushes and all, by the destitute poor, who from deficiency of wages, are utterly unable to purchase fuel, and compelled to steal it, or perish with cold.' Instead the farmers now contented themselves 'when they have cut down the old one, with making the bank something higher, scattering a few loose bushes upon the side of it, and sticking a few stragglers upon the topmost ridge.' New hedges 'upon stubbing up old hedge-rows, for the purpose of enlarging and making new divisions of fields … are generally planted with quick, which is commonly white thorn of one or two years' growth, from the nursery gardens.' (Young 1807, 179–84).

There is less detailed evidence for Suffolk hedges, though Young in 1804 condemned them as being 'under a very inferior management; under that of cutting up all the live wood, and trusting the defence of the young growth to very inferior management; under that of cutting up all the growth, from the nursery gardens.' (Young 1807, 179–84). Ethers were the things needeth to mend or to make' (Grose 1731–91), a London-based antiquary, who noted this in his dialect dictionary of 1790: 'Edder. Fence wood, commonly put on the top of fences. Edder. In Suffolk/Essex border in the mid-sixteenth century, recommended ‘plash hedge of enclosier’ as one of the activities for February. He further recommended, under ‘Lopping of pollengers [pollards]’, that farmers should ‘In lopping and felling, save edder and stake, thine hedges as needeth to mend or to make’ ('Five Hundred Points 1573, 74 and 80'). Edders, in an East Anglian context, were also noted by Francis Grose (1731–91), a London-based antiquary, who noted this in his dialect dictionary of 1790: ‘Edder. Fence wood, commonly put on the top of fences. Norf. and Essex’ (Grose 1790).

Major Edward Moor in Suffolk, recorded the practice as ‘buck-heading’ and described it as ‘cutting down live fences to within two or three feet of the ground.’ (Moor 1823, 50).

Edward Moor, in Suffolk, recorded the practice as ‘buck-heading’ and described it as ‘cutting down live fences to within two or three feet of the ground.’ (Moor 1823, 50).
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Edward Moor, in Suffolk, recorded the practice as ‘buck-heading’ and described it as ‘cutting down live fences to within two or three feet of the ground.’ (Moor 1823, 50).

The unpardonable custom of hacking off the side boughs of tall hedges, leaving the tops to overhang the young shoots, is here too prevalent. But suffering the soil to be washed away from the roots, is not more destructive to a hedge than this vile practice (Marshall 1795, 100–2).

Nathaniel Kent also commented on the ‘buckstalling’ of hedges in Norfolk:

Another very bad practice relates to their fences. No farmers raise a white thorn hedge sooner, or destroy it so soon; every other time of cutting hedges of this sort, they are buck-stalled, as it is called, which is cutting the whole hedge off at about three feet from the ground, which is an irreparable injury to it, by checking the growth, and making it hollow at the bottom (Kent 1794, 55).

The last, however, is seldom done, nor often requisite; for the Norfolk husbandmen are pretty observant in limiting interweaving and/or the use of temporary ‘dead hedges’ of varying complexity to protect new growth. This enables a better understanding of the more fragmentary comments of other writers. Thomas Tusser (c.1524–80), who was born at Rivenhall near the east coast of Essex and later farmed on the edge of the Stour estuary on the Suffolk/Essex border in the mid-sixteenth century, recommended ‘plash hedge of enclosier’ as one of the activities for February. He further recommended, under ‘Lopping of pollengers [pollards]’, that farmers should ‘In lopping and felling, save edder and stake, thine hedges as needeth to mend or to make’ (‘Five Hundred Points 1573, 74 and 80’). Edders, in an East Anglian context, were also noted by Francis Grose (1731–91), a London-based antiquary, who noted this in his dialect dictionary of 1790: ‘Edder. Fence wood, commonly put on the top of fences. Norf. and Essex’ (Grose 1790).

Major Edward Moor (1771–1848), a native of Wantisden in the Sandlings of south-east Suffolk and later a resident of Great Bealings on the edge of the Sandlings, included references to the hedging practices in his dialect dictionary of 1823:

ETHER. Rhyming with whether — as a verb, denotes the operation of running a line of hazel or other flexible wands intertwingly along the top of a hedge, to keep it more firmly within the hedge stakes ‘Mind you ether it right strong’. As a substantive, Ethers are the things so used.
PLASH. To cut down a quick hedge when grown old and stubby, and intertwining some of the lower branches — it includes also the operation of out-hauling the ditch and heightening the bank.

PLEACH. Is described to be a branch of whitethorn brought down and laid horizontally in a fence to thicken a weak part. It is notched (or snotted) at the point of tact with the earth which is loosened to encourage the pleach to strike root, and to which it is kept fixed down by a hooked (or crome) stick, or peg.

This operation is called pleaching, and is more used in Norfolk than in Suffolk, and is there more talked of than used (Moor 1823, 50, 282–3).

A west Norfolk perspective is provided by the Rev. Robert Forby (1759–1825; born in Stoke Ferry, lived later at Barton Bendish and Fincham). In his dialect dictionary, published posthumously in 1830, he makes no mention of the terms laying, plashing or pleaching, but was aware of ethers:

ETHER, v. to wattle, or intertwine, in making a staked hedge. Otherwise to ‘bond a hedge’, meaning, particularly the finishing part at top, of stouter materials, which is to confine all the rest (Forby 1830, 107).

In Essex, in the 1920s, Edward Gepp recorded nothing of ethers, laying, plashing or pleaching, but did record:

BRAID: to twine or interlace the long branches of a hedge or bush (Gepp 1923, 23).

The visual evidence presented by East Anglian landscape painters is difficult to evaluate because hedges usually feature as background elements and are not painted in detail, making their precise nature difficult to judge. It is also clear that there was a certain degree of ‘artistic licence’ in the way landscapes were presented, particularly the incorporation of elements that owed more to picturesque Continental landscapes than to specific English ones. The works of Thomas Gainsborough (1727–88), from Sudbury in the Stour Valley, are often a problem in this respect, however there are some relatively early landscape sketches that may be taken directly from the Stour Valley. Two at least of his pencil sketches from the 1750s seem to show treed landscapes with low hedges that appear to contain interwoven elements — possibly the result of hedge laying, but more likely, in the context of the Rev. Howlett’s commentary (see above) the overgrown remains of a woven ‘dead hedge’. Much more clearly represented are wooden paling fences, featured in several paintings, particularly around buildings, but also as small patches in other boundary features (Hayes 1970, pls 24–6).

John Constable (1776–1837) from East Bergholt, also in the Stour Valley, is usually taken as a more reliable depicter of actual landscapes (Sunderland 1981, 5). His view of ‘The Stour Valley and Dedham Church’ of 1814–5 shows men digging from a dunghill in front of what appears to be an interwoven low hedge (B. Taylor 1975, pl.41). In ‘The Cornfield’, a view of a tree-flanked lane leading from East Bergholt to Dedham, there is a low hedge in the middle distance (enclosing a cornfield) that appears to incorporate some vertical stakes (Sunderland 1981, pls 39–40). Loosely spaced vertical hedge stakes also appear in an 1830s painting by a member of the ‘Norwich School’ of painting: James Stark’s ‘Eaton Old Church from Keswick Mill’ (Scott 1998, 31). Like Gainsborough, both Constable and the Norwich School painters seem to have been attracted by the picturesque qualities of wooden fences and in their paintings wooden fences, of both post-and-rail and pale types, are not uncommon (Sunderland 1981, pls 12–13; Scott 1998, 45, 91, 93). Literary confirmation for the presence of paling fences in the Stour Valley is provided by the French traveller, François de La Rochefoucauld, who in 1784 commented on ‘fences and palings painted white’ around houses in the Long Melford area and on a similar ‘little fence, at elbow height, freshly painted white’ around a house at Mistley (Scarfe 1988, 109–10, 123).

A more comprehensive picture is provided by the great national dialect survey carried out in the 1950s (East Midlands and East Anglian section). To the question ‘But if your hedge is overgrown and there are gaps in the bottom, what do you do to it?’, the term ‘pleach’ was only recorded in Nottinghamshire; ‘plash’ was found only in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, with an isolated ‘splash’ at Codicote in Hertfordshire. ‘Lay’ or ‘layer’ was the common response in a wide area in the western part of the region (Leicestershire, Rutland, Northamptonshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, Berkshire, Cambridgeshire) but also occurred in north Norfolk, the western edge of Suffolk, the western edge of Essex, and, interestingly, at single locations on the eastern edges of Suffolk (Yoxford) and Essex (West Bergholt), with ‘relay’ occurring close to the last at Tiptree. The term ‘line’ occurred in several places on the eastern edge of Essex (Little Bentley, Little Baddow, Tillingham and Canewdon). In a narrow zone across the centre of Norfolk, the response was ‘to braid’ and an outlier of this term was also noted at East Mersea on the Essex coast. But in a broad diagonal band, south-west to north-east, across central Essex and Suffolk none of these terms were recorded, and, even more than that, at Mendlesham in central Suffolk it was expressly stated that ‘hedges were usually cut right down’, i.e. coppiced, not plashed or laid (Orton and Tilling 1969, 438–9).

This dialect evidence, when mapped in conjunction with the field system regions described in Chapter 6 (Fig. 44), is highly revealing. It confirms a strong link between hedge laying or plashing and areas with Type 1 or 2A common fields and, to a lesser extent, with Type 2B. Robert Forby came from the Type 2A area of west Norfolk and Thomas Tusser, Edward Moor, Gainsborough, Constable and the Norwich School painters all came from areas with Type 2B common fields. Their evidence suggests that in those areas some form of hedge laying using ethers and stakes was practiced well before 1800, though it is not always clear whether these employed live or dead wood. The evidence for hedge-laying in East Anglia therefore seems to be limited to certain areas and to have been less carefully done than that of the Midlands (a farming writer in 1697 contrasted East Anglian hedges with the more manicured ones of the Midlands, especially Northamptonshire and Warwickshire, Young 1967, 38). But in the areas with Type 3 common fields or block holdings, coppicing was the traditional method of hedge management. Coppicing was recorded by Sylvia Addington as the traditional way of managing hedges in five parishes in South Norfolk in 1982 (Addington 1982, 116). Coppicing was also the traditional management method at Bocking in Essex in 1977 (Hunter 1993, 114, 116).

There is clearly a need to do more research on regional and sub-regional methods of hedge management as the
appearance of the hedges makes such a fundamental contribution to overall landscape character. Inappropriate hedge management can quite alter the historic landscape character.

5. Trees in hedges
Nathaniel Kent, in describing the process of piecemeal enclosure in Norfolk, states that:
wherever a person can get four or five acres together, he plants a white thorn hedge round it, and sets oaks at every rod distance, which is consented to by a kind of general courtesy from one neighbour to another (Kent 1794, 22).

Marshall gives similar evidence:
Upon some estates it is the practice to put in, when a new hedge is planted, a holly at every rod, and an oak plant at every two or three rods, among the whitethorn layer.

This is an excellent practice; provided the oaks be trained to a proper height before they be suffered to form their heads. For, in this case, they will become a valuable source of timber, without injuring, in any material degree, the inclosures they grow between. It is the roots of the ash and elm, and the tops of low pollards, and tall overgrown hedgewoods, which are injurious to the farmer. A timber oak, of fifteen to twenty feet stem, does very little if any injury either to the crop, or the hedge growing under it (Marshall 1795, 113–14).

Estate surveys indicate that clayland farms were frequently well-endowed with trees, mainly in hedges, but also free-standing in fields (see also the next section). At Denham, Suffolk, a survey of 1651 suggests that there was an average of 15.4 trees per acre. At Thorndon, Suffulk, a 1742 survey indicates a density of 29 trees per acre, of which 69% were oaks, 17% elms and 16% ashes; 82% were pollards, 13% were saplings and only 5% were ‘timber’ trees (Williamson and Skipper 1994, 60–1; Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, 23–5).

In most places, ownership of the timber in hedges belonged to the landowner, not the tenant, who was usually only allowed loppings from the hedge shrubs and pollards. The frequency and types of trees in hedges was therefore frequently dictated by the landlord’s policy. Where landlord influence was strong, as on estates, there was a tendency for numerous standard trees, particularly oaks. A notable example of this was recorded by Nathaniel Kent, who mentions the work of Robert Marsham of Stratton Strawless, Norfolk, who had ‘judiciously scattered a great number of trees on the sides of the roads near his residence’ (Kent 1796, 88–9). The appearance of hedges can therefore reflect localised social factors. A widespread encouragement of standard trees in hedges could obliterate these local distinctions.

6. Linear woods (springs, shaws and rows)
Estate maps of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries sometimes show narrow linear woods or rows of trees along field boundaries or sometimes in the middle of
fields. Examples in south Norfolk can be seen on maps of Tibenham (1640) and Hedenham (1769) (Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, 24–6). Similar features occur on maps of Dennington (1627) and Eye (1626) in Suffolk (NRO NRS 11903; SRO(I) HD78:2671, Eye). Twin rows sometimes look like avenues, but where there seems to be no vista line or positioning relative to a house or other buildings, a ‘wood row’ rather than an ornamental avenue seems to be the more likely interpretation. These linear woods may make up some of the ‘grovetts’ of written descriptions.

In Essex, John Hunter has noted similar linear woods on estate maps of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Hunter 1996; see also the Ingatestone case study). Most frequently found on demesne land, the woods normally follow field boundaries, particularly those orientated north-to-south (to minimise the shading of the adjacent farmland) and can appear fenced or unfenced. The woods were usually called ‘springs’ in north and central Essex, but ‘shaws’ in south Essex (also in Kent and Sussex). The term ‘spring’ for a wood is first recorded in Middle English, with the meaning of ‘a young plantation, a coppice’; ‘shaw’ comes from Old English sceaga, meaning ‘a small wood, a coppice, a strip of undergrowth’ (Smith 1956, II 99, 140). There is also evidence for the use of the term ‘row’ for these woods, e.g. Bovingdon Rows in Bocking and Hods Row in Debden.

Fenced springs were probably coppiced, but the unfenced ones must have been open to grazing animals and are more likely to have been composed of pollards. Linear field-edge groves, usually of pollards, were also a common feature of north-east Hertfordshire in the early eighteenth century (Williamson and Skipper 1994, 61). Hunter has suggested that these linear woods may have been a fashion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but declined sharply as a result of the agricultural ‘improvements’ of the nineteenth century and are now rare.

Research in Sussex has suggested that shaws there were traditionally often two rods wide (33 feet) and were managed as coppice with some standard trees, mainly (4 to 5 in a 30 yard stretch). Oak and elm were the main standards, but fruit trees, e.g. bullace, crab apple, wild pear, cherry and damson, were also common, as was hazel (Tittensor and Tittensor 1986). With further research on local examples, similar linear woods could perhaps be considered for reintroduction into the East Anglian landscape, as has already been done at the Weald and Downland Museum in Sussex.

7. Hedge greens

The clearest description of these is provided by D. Walker in 1795:

The pastures and meadows of Hertfordshire are principally the hedge greens surrounding the arable fields; these are of different widths from 15 to 20 feet, and upwards; the grass thereon is in general mowed and made into hay; and when the fields to which they belong are fallow, or after harvest, are depastured by the cattle and sheep, and manured by their dung, when they resort to the hedge greens for pasture, or the adjoining hedges for shade or shelter (Walker 1795, 13).

David Hillman, in Tusser Redivivus, 1710, glosses Thomas Tusser’s 1573 term ‘greenes’ for grassed strips on the edge of fields as ‘hedge greens’.4 ‘Hedge greens’

Plate 72 A good example of a traditional large hedge on the clayland of Suffolk, here associated with a grass buffer strip (similar to what were called ‘hedge greens’) that is highly beneficial to the health of the hedge
(together with ‘road greens’) were also mentioned by Vancouver, 1795, in Essex (Vancouver 1795, 87). Similar grass strips were described as ‘dools’ by Edward Gepp in his survey of the Essex dialect and there is some evidence for the term in Suffolk too (Gepp 1923, 41; for dools see also Chapter 3, 4.x). In Norfolk, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, similar strips were termed ‘borders’ and were also used to grow hay (Wade Martins and Williamson 1999, 25). In part these were the headlands that were necessary for the turning of plough teams, but they seem to have been wider than was strictly required.

The Rev. Howlett in 1807 recognised the importance of these hedge greens for the health of hedges, noting that ‘when they [i.e. farmers] dig up their greens, they pare down the hedge-row banks so exceedingly close, that they cut through many of the roots of the quick, which soon dwindle, and finally dies’ (Young 1807, 184). The same thing must occur when modern ploughing comes very close to hedges. In nature, these greens are very like the 6m and 2m uncropped margins to arable fields that are promoted under the modern agri-environment schemes (Pl. 72).

Endnotes
2. Edders or ethers were long flexible rods woven horizontally between vertical stakes — ?from Old English edor, eodor ‘enclosure, fence’.
3. I am grateful to Richard Livall for the suggestion that I should look at Constable’s hedges.
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accreted field systems 34, 35
acre, definitions and use of term 19–20
Acton (S)
The Berry 36n
hedge mentioned in bounds of Balsdon 23, 225–6, 226
ridge-and-furrow wrongly identified 32
agglomerative field systems, definition and use of term 34
aggregate field systems, definition and use of term 34–5
agri-environment schemes 230, 233, 244
agriculture, evidence for see animal husbandry; arable agriculture; cattle husbandry; common fields; crop rotations; sheep husbandry
aisled barns, distribution 205, 205
Aldringham (S), foldage 37n
Allwood Green (S) 16, 54, 171, 177, 178–9
animal husbandry
field organisation 24–5
prehistoric and Roman 7, 8, 9, 10
see also cattle husbandry; common pasture; sheep husbandry
arable agriculture
prehistoric and Roman 7, 8, 9, 10
see also common fields; crop rotations
archaeological evidence for early fields in East Anglia 7–10
see also under Ardeley with Luffenhall hamlet; Dullingham; Felsted; Ingatestone; Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva;
South Elmham St Michael; Sutton; Swanton Morley with Worthing;
Walsingham-le-Willows; Worlingworth; Worstead
Ardeley with Luffenhall hamlet (H), case study 159–70, 160, 165, 167, 169
archaeological evidence 170
land ownership 159–60, 162
landholding and land types 160–70, 163
location, soils and topography 5, 159
maps 160, 161, 163–4, 167, 169
place-name 159
Ardleigh (E)
archaological evidence 8
hide as block holding 18
ards 9, 29
Ashfield (S), common rights 16
assart, definition and use of term 25
Babingley (N), ridge-and-furrow 37n
Balsdon (S) see Acton
banks see ditches and banks
Bardwell (S) see Stanton
Barford St Michael (Oxon), ridge-and-furrow near 31
Barking (S)
folding rights 24
size of virgate/yardland 19
Barrington (S)
foldage 37n
use of term ‘inhams’ 27
barns, ailed, distribution 205, 205
Barton Mills (S), shifts 20
beast-goings, definition and use of term 16
Bedfield (S), stetch ploughing 33
Bedfield Long Green (S), grazing rights 16
Belchamp Otten (E), common fields 208
Belchamp Walter (E), common fields 208
Benhall (S), ridge-and-furrow wrongly identified 32
Bentley (S), berewick 11
berewick, definition and use of term 11, 13–14
Bergholt see East Bergholt (S); West Bergholt (E)
Bideford (S), place-name 223
Bisk, Rev. Z. 24–5
block holdings
definition and use of term 22–3
and field system regions of East Anglia 197–200, 210, 211–12
origins 214, 225–6
percentages in case studies 193, 194, 195
see also core block demesne; detached block demesne; severalty; tenement blocks
Blomefield, Francis 77
Blooming (E)
Bovington Hall estate, hedge dating 236
Bovington Rows 243
coppicing of hedges 241
severalty 23
use of term ‘yardland’ 37n
bond land, definition and use of term 15
borders (bordarii), definition and use of term 14, 15
bordland, definition and use of term 14
Boreham (E), enclosure 207
Borough English tenure, distribution 201–3, 204
Borough Fen (Peterborough), archaeological evidence 7
bossage, definition and use of term 16
bote, definition and use of term 16
boundaries
terms describing 28–9
see also ditches and banks; field boundaries; hedges; linear woods
bovate, definition and use of term 18
Boxted (S), The Wick 14
Braiseworth (S), crofts 27
Brancaster (N)
folding rights 24
size of virgate/yardland 19
see also under ‘landsettageum’ 18
Brand, John 30
Brandon (S)
country commons 21
folding rights 24
sites near, archaeological evidence 9
warren 32
Brantham (S), berewicks 11
breek, definition and use of term 23–4
Breckland, definition and use of term 23–4, 37n
Bridgham (N), size of virgate/yardland 18
Brockley (S), neat-house 213n
Bronze Age see prehistoric period
Bungay (S), grazing rights 16
Burnham (N)
folding rights 24
tenements 19
Burrough Green (C), Radfield and Burghden Grange 183, 186, 187
‘bury’, term for primary manors 13
Button Haugh Green (S), intercommoning 16
Buxhall (S), tofts 27
Bury St Edmunds, ditches 241
Bypo (E)
coppicing of hedges 241
Cawston (E), ditches 241
Caxton (S), enclosure 207
selection criteria 2–5
see also Ardeley with Luffenhall hamlet; Dullingham; Felsted;
Great Henny; Ingatestone; Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva; South Elmham St Michael; Sutton; Swanton Morley with Worthing; Walsingham-le-Willows; Worlingworth; Worstead
cast(s)atts/cas(s)ata, definition and use of term 18
cattle husbandry
dairying 13, 200, 201, 203, 216
grazing rights 16, 22
prehistoric 7
see also droves

261
definition 45  
land quality 45, 74  
morphology 45, 75  
ocurrence 45, 72, 193, 195  
position 45, 74  
size 45, 74  
survival in modern landscape 45, 75  
dialect evidence for hedge management 241, 242  
dispersed settlement 193  
Essex 208  
Norfolk 209  
Suffolk 201, 206, 223  
Diss (N) see Roydon  
ditches and banks, as field boundaries 229, 230, 232, 236  
division, definition and use of term 25–6  
dole (dool), definition and use of term 28–9, 243–4  
Downham Market (N), ridge-and-furrow near 30  
Dringstone (S), ridge-and-furrow wrongly identified 32  
droves 51, 52  
definition and use of term 16, 51  
land quality 51, 75  
morphology 51, 75  
ocurrence 51, 72  
position 51, 74  
size 51, 74  
survival in modern landscape 51, 75  
Dullingham (C), case study 179–87, 185, 187  
archaological evidence 180, 183–4  
landholding and land types 180–3, 181, 184–7  
location, soils and topography 5, 179–80  
maps 181, 186–7  
place-name 179  
East Anglia 2  
East Anglian Historic Landscape Characterisation Map 195, 196, 198  
‘local regions’ (Roberts and Wrathmell) 2, 3, 4, 193, 194  
see also Historic Field Systems of East Anglia Project  
East Bergholt (S), heaths 11  
East Dereham (N)  
size of virgate/yardland 19  
use of term ‘close’ 26  
East of England Historic Landscape Characterisation Project 1, 2, 36, 193  
East Mersea (E), hedge laying 241  
Elmstead (E), hide as block holding 18  
Elmswell (S), common rights 16  
enclosure of common fields  
pre-eighteenth-century 22, 23, 195–8, 207–9, 210  
eighteenth-century and later (parliamentary enclosure) 22, 195, 197, 206–8, 209, 210  
English Heritage  
and conservation of historic field systems 229  
and historic landscape characterisation 1–2  
see also Historic Field Systems of East Anglia Project  
ertexting, definition and use of term 18  
Essex, constructing regional groupings 196, 206–8  
estover 16  
estuaries marsh commons, definition and use of term 16  
ethers 240, 241  
European Landscape Convention 1, 229  
Evans, George Ewart 34  
Eye (S)  
archaological evidence 7  
crofts 26  
linear woods 243  
Eye, honour of 219, 219  
Falkenham (S), map (1591) 23  
fallow  
definition and use of term 20  
see also folding  
farm buildings, distribution of types 203–5, 205  
Feering (E), use of term ‘field’ 25  
Felsham (S), hedge dating 236  
Felsted (E), case study 140–51, 145, 149  
archaological evidence 150–1  
Stebbingford Farm 147, 151, 208  
land ownership 140, 143, 144–7  
landholding and land types 12, 140–4, 141, 147–51  
location, soils and topography 5, 140  
maps 141, 143  
place-name 140  
Felwell (N), size of virgate/yardland 19  
fen commons; definition and use of term 16  
Fen Drayton (C), archaeological evidence 7  
Fengate, Peterborough see Peterborough  
field (campus), definition and use of terms 25  
field boundaries  
historical evidence for nature and management 235–44, 238, 242–3  
management and conservation 229–34, 229, 231–2  
see also ditches and banks; hedges; linear woods  
field terminology 20–5  
field systems, glossary of modern descriptors 34–6  
types of field 25–9  
Finningham (S), former Allwood Green 177  
Fitzherbert, John 23, 237–8  
Fitcham cum Appleton (N), field names 218  
Flixton (S)  
Flixton Park Quarry 9, 216  
landholding and field systems 95, 96, 100, 103, 216  
Flockthorpe (N), size of virgate/yardland 19  
folding, definition and use of terms 24  
Folkingham, William 13, 33  
Forby, Rev. Robert 29, 241  
Fornham St Martin (S), foldage 37n  
Fransham (N), common-edge settlement 17  
Freckenham (S), ridge-and-furrow wrongly identified 32  
free land, definition and use of term 15  
free peasantry and cultural identity in East Anglia 221–5, 221  
see also sokemen  
Frenze (N) see Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva  
Fressingley (S), Josselyn on land in 198  
Fritton (N), hedge dating 236  
Frymning (E)  
land ownership and land types 152, 153, 154  
parish 151  
‘full land’, definition and use of term 18  
furlong, definition and use of term 25–6  
Gainsborough, Thomas 241  
gavelkind (partible inheritance) 203, 210  
gavolland, definition and use of term 15  
Gayton (N), ridge-and-furrow 37n  
Gepp, Edward 241, 243–4  
Gipping, River, as boundary (‘Gipping divide’)  
between landscape types 198–206, 211  
between settlement areas 217, 224  
glebe  
definition and use of term 15  
distribution of block glebes and glebes with common field strips 198, 199  
Glemsford (S)  
folding rights 24  
size of virgate/yardland 18  
Goosesbecks (E) see Colchester  
Grays bypass (E), fieldwork 215  
grazing rights 16, 22  
see also animal husbandry; common pasture  
Great Barton (S), foldage 37n  
Great Cornard (S), common fields 208  
Great Dunmow (E), enclosure 207  
Great Henny (E), case study 124–30, 129  
land ownership 124–6  
landholding and land types 125, 126–30, 127  
location, soils and topography 5, 124  
maps 124, 125, 127, 130  
place-name 124  
Great Saxham (S), nea-house 213n  
Great Waldingfield (S), common fields 208  
green-edge settlements 16–17, 186  
greens  
definition and use of term 15–17, 51, 54  
distribution 201, 202  
green-edge settlements 16–17, 186
generals and trends 72–6
identifying in modern landscape 76
see also common fields; common pasture; demesne; heath;
meadow; parkland; tenement blocks; woodland
land units, terminology 17–20
landsettagium, definition and use of term 18
Latter, Hugh, Bishop of Worcester 24
Lawford (E), archaeological evidence 8
Lawling (E), common fields 208
Lawshill (S) map (1611) 23
severity 23
size of virgate/yardland 18
Layer Marney (E) hide as block holding 18
Wick Farm 13
laying of hedges (plashing) 237–42, 238
letes, definition and use of term 14
Levington (S) see Nacton/Levington area
Lexden (E)
common fields 208
hide as block holding 18
leys, definition and use of term 20
linear woods (springs, shaws and rows) 242–3
Little Baddow (E), hedge laying 241
Little Bealings (S), hedge laying 241
Little Bentley (E), hedge laying 241
Little Henny (E), landholding and land types 124, 125, 130
Little Saxham Park (S), ridge-and-furrow 32
Long Melford (S), Melford Green 17
Lowestoft (S) see Peterborough, Fengate, archaeological evidence 7, 9–10
Luffenhall (H) see Carlton Colville
Ludham (N), use of term 'landsettagium' 18
Luffenhall (H) see Ardeley with Luffenhall hamlet
lychets 35
management of historic field systems 229–34, 229, 231–2
historical evidence for nature and management of field boundaries
235–44, 238, 242–3
 Mangreen (N), place-name 16, 17
manor, definition and use of term 12–13
mansus, definition and use of term 18
Market Weston (S), place-name 36n
Markham, Gervase 238
Marlingford (N), use of term 'landsettagium' 18
Marshall, William on common fields and enclosure 21, 22, 23, 208, 209
on crop rotation 20
on field boundaries 23, 235, 236–7, 240, 242
on ploughing methods 32
Marsham, Robert 242
Martham (N) common fields 21
landholding 209–10
size of virgate/yardland 19
use of term 'erising' 18
meadow see common meadow; demesne meadow; several meadow
meare see mere (meare) and merebalk
Mellis Green (S), common land 16
Mendlesham (S), hedge coppicing 241
mere (meare) and merebalk
definition and use of terms 28–9
see also dole (dool)
Merton (N), use of term 'pecia' 27
Merton, Statute of (1236) 17, 25
Methwold (N) ploughing 37n
use of term 'pecia' 27
Middleton (E), common fields 208
Middleton (N), ridge-and-furrow 37n
Middleton (S), tenements 19
Midlands farming system 20–1, 22, 24, 193, 207
field terminology 25, 26, 27
ridge-and-furrow 22, 30, 31, 33
see also common fields, Type 1
Milden (S), 'green dole' 29
Mildenhalh (S), West Row Fen, archaeological evidence 7
'minster parishes' 11
Mistley (E), fence round house 241
moated sites, distribution 201, 202, 208, 209
molland, definition and use of term 15
Monks Eleigh (S) block holdings 223
virgates/yardlands 18–19
Moor, Edward 34, 240–1
moor (meaning 'unenclosed waste') 25
Morning Thorpe (N), hedge dating 236
mouldboard ploughs 29–30, 32, 33, 34, 217
Mucking (E), archaeological evidence 10, 217, 222
'multiple estates' 11, 13
Nacton/Levington area (S), archaeological evidence 8–9
'neat-house', definition and use of term 200
Needington (C), archaeological evidence 7
Neolithic see prehistoric period
New England (USA), emigrants from East Anglia 227
Newton (N) size of virgate/yardland 19
use of term 'landsettagium' 18
Norden, John 230
Norfolk, constructing regional groupings 208–10
North Shoebury (E), archaeological evidence 10
Northwold (N), size of virgate/yardland 18
Norton (S) common rights 16
use of term 'field' 25
Norwich School painters 241
nucleated settlement 193, 201, 209, 217
Oakley (S), archaeological evidence 9, 114, 116
ol(d)land, definition and use of term 23–4
open fields see common fields
organic field systems, definition and use of term 36
Ousden (S), neat-house 213n
outfield, definition and use of term 23–4
outland, definition and use of term 15
Outwell (N), size of virgate/yardland 18
Over (C), archaeological evidence 7
oxgang, definition and use of term 18
Pakenham (S), foldage 37n
Palgrave (S), The Green 17
parish, definition and use of term 11–12
parkland 72, 73
definition 72
land quality 72, 75
morphology 72, 75
occurrence 72
position 72, 74
size 72, 74
survival in modern landscape 72, 76
parliamentary enclosure see enclosure
partible inheritance (gavelkind) 203, 210
pasture, common see common pasture
Payne, R., mapmaker 172–4
pecia, definition and use of term 27–8
perch, definition and use of term 19–20
Peterborough, Fengate, archaeological evidence 7, 9–10
Pettaugh (S) see Wroston/Pettaugh
pightle, definition and use of term 27
place-names, as evidence of Viking settlement 217–18, 218/19, 219, 220
plashing see laying of hedges
pleaching 241
ploughs and ploughing methods 9, 29–34, 217
see also ridge-and-furrow; stetch (stitch) ploughing
population change, and origins of common fields 216
post-1950 agricultural landscape 195
Potter Heigham (N), use of term 'landsettagium' 18
pottery
Thorford and Thetford-type wares 17
trade patterns 206
precinct, definition and use of term 25–6
prehistoric period 7–10
co-axial field systems 7, 8, 214–15
cultural divisions and development of common fields 224
ploughing 9, 29
Preston St Mary (S) archaeological evidence 10
pottery from 206
Pulham (N), size of virgate/yardland 19
purpurestures, definition and use of term 25
quarentina (quarentena), definition and use of term 25–6
queen-post roofs, distribution 203, 204
quillets, definition and use of term 15
raised-aisted roofs, distribution 203, 204
random field systems
definition and use of term 36
and regional groupings 195, 198, 206, 208
Ransome, Robert 30
Rattlesdon (S), foldage 24
size of virgate/yardland 19
Rawreth (E), common fields 208
Raynbird, Hugh 34, 235
Rayne (E),
Rayne (E), heges 226
rectilinear field systems, definition and use of term 36
Redgrave (S)
partible inheritance 37n
tenements 19
regionality in East Anglian field systems 193–213
regular aggregate field systems, definition and use of term 35
reticulated field systems, definition and use of term 36
ridge-and-furrow 22, 30–3, 31, 211, 229
Ringstead (N), use of term 'landsettagium' 18
Risby (S), foldage 37n
riverside commons 57, 58
definition and use of term 16, 58
land quality 58, 75
morphology 58, 75
occurrence 58, 72
position 58, 74
size 58, 74
survival in modern landscape 58, 76
Roberts, James 33
Rocheford (E), common fields 208
rod, definition and use of term 19–20
Roman period 7–10
centuriation 8, 35, 214–15
cultural divisions and development of common fields 224
dispersed settlements in Essex 208
distribution of Roman villas and agricultural tools 222, 222
ploughing 9, 29
rotation of crops, definition and use of term 20
Rougham (S)
foldage 37n
hedges 236
rows see linear woods
Roydon (N), 'middle furlong' 26
Rumburgh (S), 'green-way' 16
Rushford (S), foldage 37n
Ryeoe, Robert 23, 200–1, 205
Ryston (N), ridge-and-furrow 37n
Saffron Walden (E), sheepwalk 24–5
St Osyth (E), wick 13
Sands, William, mapmaker 124, 125
Santon Downham (S), 'water-meadow woods' 37n
Scandinavian settlement see Vikings
Scole, Frezne, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva (N), case study 103–17,
111, 113, 115
archaeological evidence 114–17
land ownership 103–8
landholding and land types 12, 105, 106–17, 215
location, soils and topography 5, 103
maps 105, 108, 109, 110–14, 113
place-name 103
selion, definition and use of term 27–8
several heath 64, 65, 67
definition 64
land quality 64, 75
morphology 64, 75
occurrence 64, 72
position 64, 74
size 64, 74
survival in modern landscape 64, 76
several meadow 60, 62, 63
definition 63
land quality 63, 75
morphology 63, 75
occurrence 63, 72
position 63, 74
size 63, 74
survival in modern landscape 63, 76
several woodland 69, 70
definition 69
land quality 69, 75
morphology 69, 75
occurrence 69, 72
position 69, 74
size 69, 74
survival in modern landscape 69, 76
several woodland
shape, definition and use of term 22–3
see also block holdings; several heath; several meadow; several woodland
shackage, definition and use of term 25
shaws see linear woods
sheep husbandry
common pasture 16
field organization 24–5
heath 64
prehistoric and Roman 7
'wick' indicating sheep pasture 13
sheepwalk (sheep-gate), definition and use of terms 24–5
Shelley (S), berewick 11
shifts, definition and use of term 20
Shipdham (N), size of virgate/yardland 19
shot, definition and use of term 25–6
Shotley (S), berewick 11
Shouldham (N), 'ridge-and-furrow' 37n
Shudy Camps (C), lack of ridge-and-furrow 30
Sible Hedingham (E), pottery kilns 206
Sibton (S), tenements 19
sift, definition and use of term 18
Skippon, Sir Philip 37n
Sleley (N), landholding 77, 79, 80, 83, 86
Smith, Sir Thomas 23
Snape (S), cemetery 224
social structure, terminology 1–17
sokenen 11, 13, 14
and Viking settlement 221–2, 222, 223
see also free peasantry
sources for case studies 2–5
South Elmham St Michael (S), case study 95–103, 99, 101
archaeological evidence 101–3
land ownership 95–6
landholding and land types 96–103, 97, 215–16
location, soils and topography 3, 95
maps 96, 97
place-name 95
South Elmham St Peter (S)
origins of parish 102–3
Roman sites 103
South Elmhams (S)
landholding and land types 16, 100, 215
manor of South Elmham 96, 100
parish structure 11, 95, 102–3
see also South Elmham St Michael; South Elmham St Peter
South Hornchurch (E), archaeological evidence 8
Southwood (N), use of term 'landsettagium' 18
Spelman, Sir Henry 24, 209
Springfield Lyons (E), evidence for Roman agriculture 222
springs see linear woods
stadia (stadium), definition and use of term 25–6
Stanford Rivers (E), use of curate and hide 36n
Stanton (S)
foldage 37n
Rush Green, Stanton/Bardwell 16
stetch ploughing 37n
tenements 19
Wyken Hall, Stanton/Bardwell 14
Stark, James 241
statues relating to landholding 12, 17, 25
Staverton (S)
crofts 26
tenements 19
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stetch (stitch) ploughing 22, 30–2, 31, 33–4, 33
stints, definition and use of term 16
Stoke Ash (S), Eastwick Farm 14
Stoke-by-Nayland (S)
archaeological evidence 8
Wick Farm 14
Stonhams (S), place-names 11
Stow Bardolph (N), ridge-and-furrow 37n
Stowlangtoft (S), foldage 37n
Thornham (S)
thorn
Thetford (N), use of term ‘bovate’ 37n
Thelveton (N)
Thelnetham (S), use of term ‘onwent/unwent’ 37n
Terrington (N), size of virgate/yardland 18
tenement, definition and use of term 15
stetch ploughing 37n
Stukeley (C), archaeological evidence 7
Stuston (S), archaeological evidence 9, 116
Sudbury (S), pottery from 18
Suffolk, constructing regional groupings 195–206, 196–207
summerles (summerland), definition and use of terms 20
Sutton (S), case study 131–40, 131, 135
archaeological evidence 134, 139–40
Sutton Hoo 9, 131, 139–40, 159, 224
land ownership 131–4
landholding and land types 134–40, 137
location, soils and topography 5, 131
maps 132–4, 133, 137–9
place-name 131
Swanton Morley with Worthing (N), case study 87–95, 93, 95
archaeological evidence 92, 94–5
land ownership 87–91, 94
landholding and land types 89, 90, 91–4, 95
location, soils and topography 5, 87
maps 88, 89, 91, 92
place-name 87
Talcolmeston (N), ‘ridge-and-furrow’ 37n
Tasburgh (N), hedge dating 236
tenanted land, definition and use of term 15
tenement, definition and use of term 19
tenement blocks 45–8
definition 45
land quality 48, 74
morphology 48, 75
occurrence 45, 72, 193, 195
position 48, 74
size 45–8, 74
survival in modern landscape 48, 75
terra villanorurn, definition and use of term 15
Terrington (N), size of virgate/yardland 18
Thelnetham (S), use of term ‘onwent/unwent’ 37n
Thelveton (N) see Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva
Thetford (N), use of term ‘bovate’ 37n
Thetford and Thetford-type wares 17
Thorndon (S)
Ganderwick 14
trees 242
Thornden (S)
toifs 27
use of term ‘wong’ 26
Thorpe (N), crofts 27
Thorpe Parva (N) see Scole, Frenze, Thelveton and Thorpe Parva
three-course crop rotations 20
Thurston, Edmund, mapmaker 78, 84
Tibenhain (N), linear woods 242
Tilling (E), stitch ploughing 34
Tillingham (E), hedge laying 241
Timworth (S), use of term ‘sift’ 18
Tiptree (E), hedge laying 241
toft, definition and use of term 27
Tottenhill (N), ridge-and-furrow 37n
trees
in hedges 230, 232, 242
see also common woodland; demesne woodland; linear woods;
several woodland; woodland
Troston (S)
use of term ‘inharn’ 27
use of term ‘onwent/unwent’ 37n
use of term ‘sift’ 18
turbary; definition 16
Tusser, Thomas 23, 240, 241, 243
Twinstead (E), landholding and land types 126, 129, 130
two-course crop rotations 20
tythes
definition and use of term 15–17, 27
distribution 201, 203
United States of America, emigrants from East Anglia to New
England 227
Upwell (C), Christchurch, archaeological evidence 8
Vancouver, Charles 30, 206–7, 208
on field boundaries 235, 237, 243
vernacular architecture, distribution of features 203–5, 204–5, 219
Vikings, impact on settlement and landholding 11
development of common fields 216–25
place-name evidence 217–18, 219, 220, 221
vill, definition and use of term 11–12
vilain land, definition and use of term 15
virgate (yardland), definition and use of terms 18–19
Walsingham (S), ridge-and-furrow 32
Walpole (N), size of virgate/yardland 18
Walsham-le-Willows (S), case study 170–9, 177
archaeological evidence 179
land ownership 171
landholding and land types 171–9, 175
location, soils and topography 5, 170–1
maps 171, 172–5
place-name 170
Walsoken (S), size of virgate/yardland 18
Walton (N), size of virgate/yardland 19
warland, definition and use of term 14–15
waste, definition and use of term 25
Wattsfield (S), stitch ploughing 33
Wattsham (S), connection with Hitcham 12
went, definition and use of term 25–6
West Bergholt (E), hedge laying 241
West Deeping (Lincoln), archaeological evidence 7
West Harling (N)
foldage 24
grazing rights 16
West Stow (S), archaeological evidence 10, 32
Westhorpe (S)
field strips 27–8, 28
stetch ploughing 37n
Weslton (S), tenements 19
Weston (H), common fields 207
Westwick (N), place-name 14
set soils commons
definition and use of term 16
see also riverside commons
Wetheringsett (S)
folding rights 24
size of virgate/yardland 19
use of term ‘inharn’ 27
Wimbish (N)
size of virgate/yardland 19
use of term ‘eriung’ 18
Winifarthung (N), ‘ridge-and-furrow’ 32
Winston/Pettaugh (S), foldage 37n
Witham (E), use of term ‘field’ 25
Witham-le-Willows (S), case study 170–9, 177
archaeological evidence 179
land ownership 171
landholding and land types 171–9, 175
location, soils and topography 5, 170–1
maps 171, 172–5
place-name 170
Woodbridge (S), foldage 24
size of virgate/yardland 19
use of term ‘inharn’ 27
wick, definition and use of term 13–14
Wimborne (S), place-name evidence 217–18
Wimborne (N), size of virgate/yardland 19
use of term ‘eriung’ 18
Winfarthing (N), ‘ridge-and-furrow’ 32
Winston/Pettaugh (S), Manewic: 36n
Witham (E), use of term ‘field’ 25
Witham-le-Willows (E), hide as block holding 18
wong, definition and use of term 25–6
woodland
distribution 205–6, 206–7
terms for
haugh/haw/hay/hay
bege/(ge)taeg: 205, 226
see also common woodland; demesne woodland; linear woods;
sveral woodland
Woolpit (S), foldage 37n
Worlingworth (S), case study 117–23, 119–20, 123
archaeological evidence 118
land ownership 117
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landholding and land types 117–23, 121
location, soils and topography  5, 117
maps 117, 118–21, 123
place-name 117
Worstead (N), case study 77–87, 83, 85
archaeological evidence 87
land ownership 77–84
landholding and land types 80–7, 81, 210
location, soils and topography  5, 77
maps 78–9, 81, 84–6
place-name 77
Worthing (N)
stetch ploughing 37n

use of term ‘onwent/unwent’ 37n
Worthing (N) see Swanton Morley with Worthing
Wymondham (N), use of term ‘landsettagium’ 18
yardland see virgate (yardland)
Young, Arthur 20, 198–200
on dairying in Suffolk 200, 201
on field boundaries 235, 237, 238–9, 240
on ploughing 30, 33–4
Yoxford (S)
hedge laying 241
tenements 19
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