as shown by the volumes of *Domesday Geography*, tends to confirm the association of moated sites with areas of late colonization, but their frequent appearance elsewhere, even in areas of considerable development in 1086, emphasizes the dangers inherent in arguing purely from such distribution-maps.

One awaits with interest the completion of a 1/625,000 map of moated sites that is being prepared by F. V. Emery which should provide a firmer basis for discussion when it is published. Moated sites, however, pose a particular problem. Many belong to small landowners, sub-tenants, whose estates lacked the highly organized administrative machinery of the larger units, and failed to produce or preserve detailed records. It is only by intensive studies based on counties or smaller units using archaeological, documentary and cartographic evidence that a clear picture will emerge. Work in Warwickshire suggests that a number of lines of enquiry may prove profitable. First, as has already been indicated, the relationship of moated sites to areas of early and late settlement is worth investigating. Secondly, the relationship between moated sites and manors; in Warwickshire, in the majority of cases examined in detail they form the capital messuages of manors, or of freehold estates of sufficient size and complexity to be called sub-manors. Thirdly, the relationship of moated sites to field systems; in Arden they are normally associated with assarted severalties, while in the Feldon, the land of the open field, they often lie in or near a nucleated village, or within a block of enclosed demesne. Fourthly, the considerable differences in form are themselves worthy of close study, as these may reflect variations in date and function. Many moats have associated complexes of fish-ponds. Finally, it should be emphasized that any study of moated sites must be considered as part of the wider study of the forms and patterns of settlement in the British Isles as a whole.

B. K. ROBERTS

**Reclamation of Waste Ground for the Pleasance at Kenilworth Castle, Warwickshire**

Before its revision in 1938 Warwickshire sheet xxvi.q o : the 25-in. Ordnance Survey map showed a plan of a rhomboidal moated area, about 220 by 200 yards, lying south of Pleasance Farm, roughly half a mile west of the castle at Kenilworth (SP/267725). This site lay at the W. end and on the N. side of the mere, an artificial lake west of the castle formed in the 12th century and finally drained in 1649. The earthworks, which are still intact, consist of two concentric rhomboidal moats about 40 ft. apart, except on the side of the mere, where the gap is wider. The inner and larger moat (30–40 ft. across), which has a causeway on its N. side, encloses an island of regular rhomb shape (370 ft. along each side) with its corners oriented towards the four cardinal points of the compass. A small excavation in 1923 on the E. corner revealed the base of a spiral staircase in a square tower (10 ft. square inside), and the excavators inferred that the island was enclosed with a wall having a tower at each corner. The inference is supported by reference to a tower or towers in records of repair to the Pleasance in 15th-century Ministers' Accounts. By far the most conspicuous part of the remains, however, is a very substantial excavation, 100 ft. wide and 270 ft. long, leading from the former edge of the mere and crossing the outer moat into the enclosure, which was evidently a canal or harbour allowing the Pleasance to be entered by boat. The site is hidden from the castle except at the top of the keep by a rise in the ground. The Pleasance was constructed by Henry V and abandoned in Henry VIII's reign,

---

41 See plan in *The History of the King’s Works* (H.M.S.O., 1963), ii, 684.
when the timber-framed buildings in it were taken down and re-erected in the castle: ‘... the pretty banqueting house of timber that stood thereby in the mere, and bore the name of pleasance, was taken down and part of it set up in the base court of the castle’. In the first edition of Dugdale’s *Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656) two buildings with this name are shown on the plan of the castle in the outer ward south of the Swan Tower.

The moats now lie in pleasant meadows, but the object of this note is to draw attention to a published reference which shows that the construction of the Pleasance required the reclamation of a thickly-overgrown area. It is not often that we can glean information of this kind about the previous condition of a site, and it is of especial interest in view of the suggestion by F. V. Emery that moating played some part in the reclamation of waste in the 13th and 14th centuries. The reference, the only contemporary record of the work, is chapter xi of the metrical life of King Henry V by Thomas Elmham, whose name appears in an acrostic at the beginning of the poem. Elmham, it is suggested, was the anonymous royal chaplain who wrote a prose account of Agincourt, at which he was present. He may therefore have been an eye-witness of the construction of the Pleasance, and in spite of the absurdly exaggerated language of the poem it evidently accurately reflects the contemporary view of the work as primarily a piece of reclamation. The period referred to is Lent, 21 February to 6 April, 1414. I have translated the Latin heading in the first paragraph and the verse itself in the second paragraph:

‘Chapter XI. How his majesty the king kept Lent at Kenilworth Castle, and in the marsh, where foxes lurked among the brambles and thorns, built for his entertain-ment a pleasure garden (viridarium). It was as if he foresaw the tricks of the French against his kingdom and how he would manfully drive out these and other insidious enemies. On this site he constructed a delicious place which he caused to be called Pleasant Mareys.

‘The king is at Kenilworth over Lent where he considers what ought to be done. There was there a fox-ridden place overgrown with briars and thorns. He removes these and cleanses the site so that wild creatures are driven off. Where it had been nasty now becomes peaceful marshland; the coarse ground is sweetened with running water and the site made nice. So the king considers how to overcome the difficulties confronting his own kingdom, the achievement of which will require correspondingly greater effort. He remembers the foxy tricks of the French both in deed and in writing and is mortified by the recollection.’

M. W. THOMPSON

THE SITE OF NEWTON (*NOVA VILLA*), STUDLAND, DORSET (FIG. 77)

The approximate location of Edward I’s intended new borough (*Nova Villa*) on the S. shore of Poole Harbour, Dorset, seems to have been recognized and accepted for over 40 years. More recently the suggestion has been made that certain remains on the ground might well mark the actual site. The purpose of this note is to show, first, that everything now points to rural and humble origins for the remains and, second, that there are strong arguments for thinking that the real site proposed for the town lay some ½ m. away. The points have been discussed with Professor M. W. Beresford, who is in full agreement with them.