

**An archaeological and historical
survey of the Mottisfont
Abbey Estate, near Romsey, Hampshire**

centred on SU 32712695

Volume 1: historical text & appendices

**by
Christopher K Currie BA (Hons), MPhil, MIFM, MIFA
with contributions by
Neil Rushton BA (Hons) MA
CKC Archaeology**

Report to the National Trust (Southern Region)

July 1999

Contents

	page no.
Summary archaeology and history	3
Summary management recommendations	6
1.0 Introduction	8
2.0 Historical background	8
2.1 Geology and topography	8
2.2 Historical and archaeological background	8
3.0 Strategy	9
3.1 Methodology	9
3.2 Time expenditure	10
3.3 Limitations of documentary research	10
3.4 Limitations of field survey	11
4.0 Early landscape history	11
4.1 Early Prehistoric landscape	11
4.2 Iron Age and Roman landscape	12

4.3 Saxon landscape	12
5.0 Medieval and post-medieval landscape history	13
5.1 The medieval period	13
5.2 The post-medieval period	18
6.0 Conclusions	28
7.0 Recommendations	29
7.1 Recommendations for general management, further survey and research: introduction	29
7.2 Management recommendations: those needing urgent attention	29
7.3 Management recommendations: general considerations	30
7.4 Recommendations for further survey	32
7.5 Recommendations for further research	34
8.0 Archive	34
9.0 Acknowledgements	34
10.0 References	35

Appendices

Appendix 1: Key to tithe map field numbers	40
Appendix 2: The Mottisfont Rental	49
Appendix 3: Land management and custumal diversity on the estates of Mottisfont Priory in the 1340s by Neil S Rushton	56
Appendix 4: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites on the Mottisfont estate: general principles and legislation	77
Appendix 5: Recommendations for built structures	82
Appendix 6: catalogue of photographs taken during this survey	85
Appendix 7: glossary of archaeological terms	87

Summary statement

This survey was proposed by the Southern Region of the National Trust as part of their continuing enhancement of their land management of their properties. It is eventually hoped that all National Trust properties will be incorporated on a centralised Sites and Monuments Record computerised database (henceforth SMR) held at the Cirencester office. The brief was drawn up for the survey by Caroline Thackray, Archaeological Adviser. C K Currie of CKC Archaeology was asked to undertake the survey on behalf of the property management. He was assisted by Neil Rushton.

The Mottisfont estate appears to demonstrate the evolution of diverse landscape containing land that has been used long-term for arable, meadowland and woodland land uses. It is a rare example of a former monastic estate, with later accretions, that has survived intact, and is still managed from its original centre. There is evidence for prehistoric activity on lands just above the valley flood plains, but little direct evidence for Roman or early Saxon activity.

The manor of Mottisfont enters the historical record as a manor held by the Archbishop of York at the time of the Domesday Survey. It appears to be a place of some importance as there are a number of subsidiary chapels in the locality attached to its church. The Domesday Survey also seems to suggest the existence of hamlets at Dunbridge, and possibly Oakley. About 1200 William Briwer or Brewer founded a small Augustinian priory on his own manor in Mottisfont. This land was different to that held by York Cathedral, the latter manor became known as Mottisfont Treasury, as it provided revenue for the Treasurer of York Cathedral.

A rental written *c.* 1340 shows that the Augustinian manor of Mottisfont with Cadbury (as it became known) was a thriving community. Three open fields seem to be implied from the rental, South Field, North Field and West Field. Their approximate extents can be postulated. Recent research seems to suggest that the priory had retained most of the land of this manor in their own hands as demesne, leaving the numerous peasantry to make their living mainly as waged labour. After the Black Death, the monastery seems to have fallen on hard times. It was threatened with suppression in the late 15th century, but survived until the Dissolution of the lesser houses in 1536.

At the Dissolution, the estate was granted to William Sandys of the Vyne, who began the conversion of the priory buildings into a mansion. The Sandys family held the estate until 1684, making the house their main Hampshire residence with the sale of the Vyne in 1653. On the death of Edwin Sandys in 1684 the estate passed to the Mill family, and it passed by inheritance until 1934, when it was purchased by Mr and Mrs Gilbert Russell. The widowed Mrs Russell bequeathed the estate to the National Trust in 1957.

It is uncertain if the extensive woodlands on the estate are early. Many of the woods examined were found to have grown up over former quarried ground. This activity seems to have been

extensive throughout the estate, and had begun before the Black Death as two quarry pits are mentioned in the *c.* 1340 rental. How far this activity increased after 1349 is not known, but many of the current quarries and woodlands seem to exist by the time of a map of 1724. Some of the quarries can be put down to specific industries. A brick or tile works existed on the estate from at least the 17th century, and only ceased operations early in the 20th century. 'Tile-' names in the *c.* 1340 rental suggest that tile-making may date back to medieval times. Other quarries were mainly marl and chalk pits. Gravel and sand pits also figure in the landscape. Extensive areas of these were being excavated early in the 20th century on Dunbridge Hill.

There is a lack of mention in any historical documents to common pasture within the manor. It is possible that the apparent high population in the area meant that this had been assarted at a date before records were made. A possible substitute was the extensive meadowlands on the estate, where common pasturing may have been practised after the hay crop had been removed. These seemed to have special status even in monastic times, as a large area of meadow was incorporated within the priory precinct. From *c.* 1700 water meadows are mentioned, but these seem to have covered only a limited area on the estate.

Descriptions of the estate in the late 19th century seem to suggest that many areas of former meadow were in a marshy, unimproved state. This may have been deliberate to accommodate sporting interests, which became increasingly important from the late 18th century. Shooting and fishing rights have since become an important source of income for the estate, particular in the river valley and amongst the estate's extensive woodlands. Arable farming remains the most important land use elsewhere on the estate.

Summary of management recommendations

These recommendations are of a general nature; for specific recommendations for each identified site, the management is referred to the site inventory (volume 2). Management recommendations for each site are given in the last section of each individual entry. There are only three estate specific recommendations that need urgent attention. These are listed below, before the more general recommendations. Other less urgent recommendations are listed under individual sites in the inventory, as indicated above.

Recommendations needing urgent attention

1. There is a tendency for historic quarries on the estate to be used for rubbish tipping. In particular, the management's attention is drawn to the extensive tipping in the quarry behind Hatt Farm. This has clearly been systematic and deliberately planned, possibly by a Trust tenant. Steps should be taken to prevent this activity, where feasible. In the case of the Hatt Farm Quarry, the rubbish should be removed and properly disposed of.
2. The stealing of garden furniture and ornaments (urns, statues, seats, even encaustic tiles) is on the increase. There are many examples of thieves using plant machinery to remove heavy objects. Mottisfont Abbey has a particularly fine and extensive collection of valuable urns and statuary. The management should be aware of this problem, and take steps to increase the security of the estate's gardens outside opening hours.
3. Vegetation on the island in the Mill Stream that forms part of the former mill site is likely to cause serious problems soon. Saplings have taken hold on the island, and their roots are causing damage to the masonry remains of the mill. This will get worse as the saplings grow, causing serious potential for damage from erosion during flood conditions. It is recommended that the saplings be cut down and treated to prevent regrowth. Other vegetation should be removed and its regrowth monitored. During vegetation removal, it is recommended that a survey of the upstanding remains of the mill is undertaken.

General considerations

1. Management should try to ensure that the integrity of the estate as a whole is preserved.
 2. Historic recognition of trees should be extended to include all historic trees, including those not planted as part of designed landscaping.
 3. Historic hedgerows and boundaries should be respected.
 4. Historic trackways should be respected.
-

5. The use of non-essential motorised vehicles on the Estate should be restricted.
 6. All staff should be made aware of the need to report incidents likely to have impact on the historic aspects of the landscape.
 7. Farming practices should be monitored for impact on archaeological sites.
 8. Forestry practices should be monitored for archaeological impact.
 9. Should any ground disturbance be contemplated around historic buildings or archaeological sites advice should be sought from the Archaeological Advisers at the Estates Advisory Office. In most instances it is likely that the presence of an archaeologist will be required to record any archaeological deposits that are disturbed.
 10. Metal detecting should not be allowed on National Trust property, unless part of a structured project approved by the Archaeological Advisers from the Estates Advisory Office.
 11. The following recommendations for historic buildings apply to old farm buildings, such as barns, as well as houses.
 - i. Any modifications or repairs affecting these structures should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.
 - ii. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.
 - iii. Historical fabric should not be removed from these buildings or their environs without consulting the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
 - iv. Should below ground excavation be undertaken in the vicinity of these buildings, advice should be sought from the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
 - v. Repairs should be undertaken with appropriate period materials. Modern substitutes should not be used.
 - vi. PVC and similar plastic window frames and doors are not suitable for National Trust vernacular buildings. If present, these should be replaced at the most convenient opportunity.
-

vii. Re-roofing should take account of any original insulation used within the building. This should not be removed without prior consultation with the archaeological advisers at Cirencester. e.g. there have been instances on other estates where straw insulation in roofs has been removed without recording.

viii. Repointing of masonry should be done with lime-based mortar. Generally, cement-based mortars should be avoided on historic buildings.

An archaeological and historical survey of the Mottisfont Abbey Estate, near Romsey, Hampshire (centred on SU 32712695)

This report has been written based on the format suggested by the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessments* (Birmingham, 1994) and The National Trust guidelines for Sites and Monuments Record creation and estate surveys, *Guidelines on the archaeological & historic landscape survey of National Trust properties* (1998). The ordering of information follows the guidelines given in these documents, although alterations may have been made to fit in with the particular requirements of the work.

1.0 Introduction

This survey was proposed by the Southern Region of the National Trust as part of their continuing enhancement of their land management of their properties. It is eventually hoped that all National Trust properties will be incorporated on a centralised Sites and Monuments Record computerised database (henceforth SMR) held at the Cirencester office. The brief was drawn up for the survey by Caroline Thackray, Archaeological Adviser. C K Currie of CKC Archaeology was asked to undertake the survey on behalf of the property management. He was assisted by Neil Rushton.

2.0 Description of the site

2.1 The site

The Mottisfont Abbey Estate (centred on SU 32712695) comprises a 1993 acre (821 hectares) estate on the west side of the River Test valley in Hampshire. The estate is based on a former Augustinian monastery founded c. 1201. After the Dissolution the estate passed to the powerful Sandys family of The Vyne, Sherborne St. John, Hampshire, in an exchange of lands with the king, Henry VIII. After 1540 the Sandys family gradually abandoned The Vyne as their principal home, transferring their main seat to Mottisfont.

The present house was converted from the medieval abbey buildings, and has been altered in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. The present estate derives mainly from the monastic holding inherited by the Sandys family. It is situated about 4.5 miles north of Romsey, to the west of the A3057. There are considerable areas of woodland in the north and west of the estate, with the River Test forming part of the eastern boundary.

The local geology comprises alluvium in the valley of the River Test, with some gravel beds adjoining. The higher ground in the west and north part of the estate rises to around 80m AOD. This part of the estate is on chalk, with some Reading Beds and London Clay.

2.2 Background history

Mottisfont is mentioned in Domesday Book amongst the possession of the Archbishop of York. The latter clearly did not hold the full extent of the manor as the archbishop opposed William Briwer's proposal to found an Augustinian priory there *c.* 1200. This opposition failed, and the priory flourished until around the time of the Black Death. This hit the priory particularly badly, and the house does not seem to have ever fully recovered. In 1494 Henry VII obtained a Papal Bull for its suppression, but this was never carried through, and the priory survived to its dissolution in 1536 (Cox 1903, 172-75).

After the Dissolution the priory and its lands were granted to William Sandys of the Vyne, in exchange with the crown for lands nearer London. Sandys converted the priory buildings into a mansion, apparently using all four sides of the main cloister, plus a subsidiary court to the south. The Sandys family continued their connection with Mottisfont until 1684, transferring their main Hampshire residence there after the sale of the Vyne in 1653.

In 1684 the estate passed to Sir John Mill, Bart, after Edwin Sandys had died without male heirs. Sir John was the son of Edwin Sandys' sister, Margaret. He was succeeded in turn by his sons, John and Richard. Four sons of Richard inherited the baronetcy in turn. Sir Charles Mill was the tenth and last baronet of this line. He died in 1835 leaving the estate to John Barker, his sister's son, who assumed the name of Barker-Mill. He was afterwards made a baronet. On his death in 1860, the estate passed to his widow, Jane. When she died in 1884 without issue, the estate passed to a distant relative, Mrs Vaudrey, who took the name Vaudrey Barker-Mill (Hollings *et al* 1911, 503).

The Mottisfont manor held by the archbishops of York became known as Mottisfont Treasury, as it came to form part of the revenues of the treasury of York Cathedral. The office was suppressed by the crown in 1547. Edward VI granted it to Edward, Duke of Somerset, but after he was attainted, it passed back to the crown in 1551-52. In 1589 Queen Elizabeth granted it to John Willes and Richard Paice of London. Two years later they sold it to Sir Walter Sandys, who incorporated it into the main manor of Mottisfont (*ibid*, 506).

Mottisfont contained a number of other sub-manors. Those that had lands now included in the present estate were ultimately incorporated into the larger manor. Cadbury Farm continued to be considered a 'manor' until comparatively recently, despite being granted to the priory by William Briwer as early as *c.* 1200. The so-called manor of Mount or Mount Hyde in the south of Mottisfont was purchased by William Sandys in 1584 (*op cit*, 507).

At the outbreak of the 1914-18 war, Mrs Vaudrey Barker-Mill moved out of the 'Abbey', as the house became known in the 19th century, and went to live in a smaller house in Romsey. Her eldest son was killed in the Battle of the Somme in 1916, and the estate passed to his son, Peter Barker-Mill, then a minor. Mrs Vaudrey Barker-Mill did not return to Mottisfont after the war, and from 1922 until 1934 it was without a tenant. When Mrs Vaudrey Barker-Mill died in 1932,

her grandson, Peter, decided not to live on the estate. In 1934 he sold it to Mr and Mrs Gilbert Russell, who began restoring the house to a liveable condition.

During the 1939-45 war the house was requisitioned by the military. Mrs Russell, now widowed, returned to live at Mottisfont in 1946, and in 1957 gave the estate to the National Trust. She continued to live in the village as a tenant of the Trust until her death in 1972. Around this time, the Trust's collection of historic shrub roses, comprising some 769 roses, was planted in the walled garden. The garden was declared open on Midsummer Day, 1974 (Honest 1976).

3.0 Strategy

The survey included the following:

1. An appraisal of the documentary history of the property. This was based on the Mottisfont papers and other relevant collections in the Hampshire Record Office, but also included any other records pertaining to the estate area. These will include: Saxon charters, royal medieval records (Domesday Book, Close and Patent Rolls, Inquisitions Post Mortem etc. in the Public Record Office), wills, contemporary published accounts, and cartographic sources (early OS maps, Tithe and Enclosure Maps, Parish Maps etc.).

2. Interpretation of the documentary sources.

3. A survey of the landscape that included looking at land use types, past and present, and how this has evolved; woodland types; hedgerows; boundaries and trackways; built structures; watermeadows, mills, ponds, and any other traces of water-management.

Where possible ploughed fields were subjected to a field scan. This did not include formalised field-walking, merely a walk-over of fields to note the *in situ* occurrence and date of any human debris that may be present as a surface scatter. Collection was not undertaken, but presence of artefacts was recorded to six grid points where possible.

4. The production of a full SMR for the estate. This included all identifiable earthworks, crop or soil marks, and any other known archaeological remains. The information was written according to the format recommended by the National Trust, and entered onto the central archaeological database at Cirencester.

5. Although a full analysis of buildings is not covered by this survey, it has made an outline assessment of the exterior of any historic buildings on the estate, such as garden structures, cottages, barns etc.

6. The survey identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity wherever possible.

7. A photographic record was made of the estate and its historic/archaeological features and landscapes, where this is considered appropriate. This is incorporated into the SMR.
8. Management recommendations have been made to ensure the sensitive treatment of historic/archaeological features and landscapes within the estate, where this is considered appropriate.
9. Maps, at appropriate scales, have been provided to identify archaeological and historical features etc. These indicate major landscape changes of the period.
10. The survey has included provisional interpretation of some tree plantings, and any other historical plantings or matters pertaining to the historical ecology on the estate where this was considered appropriate.

3.2 Time expenditure

The project was carried out in the spring and early summer of 1999. The greater part of the documentary and field work was carried out before 31st May 1999. The writing up of the report was carried out intermittently thereafter, with the project being completed at the end of July 1999.

It is estimated that the total time spent on the project was about 70 man days of eight hours each. 40% was devoted to documentary research and project liaison, 20% was devoted to fieldwork, and 40% to drawing, writing up and editing.

3.3 Limitations of documentary research:

Recommendations for further work are given in section 7.4

Although most of the primary sources relating to the estate were looked at, some more general documents relating to the history of the parish were too large to undertake more than a selected search. In particular, the Mottisfont Court Rolls were only looked at selectively for references to the estate.

This research only did little research on newspaper articles and oral sources, as it was considered that this was unlikely to reveal any substantial amount of data relating to the project brief.

The air photographs at the National Monuments Record were examined. All those found in the NMR were entered into the National Trust SMR database, although some of the later photographs may have been entered as groups defined by date, rather than individually.

As far as the photographic collections of Mottisfont were concerned, these were found to be widely scattered in local libraries and other sources. The author went through a limited

proportion of them selecting those that showed either landscape views or pictures of specific archaeological sites and historic buildings. Of the photographs seen, those that fell within these criteria were incorporated into the Sites and Monuments database at Cirencester.

3.4 Limitations of the field survey

Recommendations for further work are given in section 7.3

During the period of the survey, only the fields ploughed then were examined. Other fields may have subsequently been ploughed, or are proposed for ploughing. To obtain a fuller coverage of areas that are ploughed, it would be necessary to monitor the fields over a number of years.

The former woodlands and heathlands on the estate are extensive, and heavily overgrown in places, that sites may have been missed. Many of the sites that might exist here may only be discovered by chance.

4.0 Early landscape history

4.1 Prehistoric landscape

There are no obvious prehistoric remains, such as earthworks, within the study area to act as a focus for research. Consequently there has been little fieldwork undertaken locally. The exception to this is the fairly recent interest in the opportunities presented by mineral extraction to study Palaeolithic levels, mainly in the local gravel deposits (Roe 1968). This interest has been stimulated by the chance discoveries of Palaeolithic and later prehistoric flints found during earlier quarrying activity in the vicinity. A large number (over 180) of flint axes have been recovered from pits around Dunbridge. Much of this quarried area has now been grown over by timber plantations.

Before this survey, very little prehistoric evidence had been recovered from outside quarried areas. Exceptions included a Mesolithic flint scatter to the west of Hatt Farm (SU 31522650), a Mesolithic axe near Dunbridge station (SU 3226), with two Neolithic axes nearby (SU 3226), with a third at SU 317265). This sparsity may have been the result of the heavy woodland cover within the estate, which may have persisted throughout history. However, there were notable exceptions found during the survey.

Perhaps the most concentrated prehistoric flint scatter found during this survey was a Neolithic/Bronze Age site just above the flood plain of the River Dun to the north of Bitterne Grove. This scatter comprised a heavy concentration of waste flakes and burnt flint intermingled with occasional cores, scrapers and other tools just above a large scarp bank that forms the edge of the flood plain at this point. It is possible that this bank has been exaggerated by the accumulation of ploughsoil against the field boundary here. Although much of this accumulation is probably medieval and post-medieval, it is possible that it was begun during prehistoric times.

This study was not undertaken to exam artefact scatters in any detail, but the intensity of the concentration at this point could suggest an early settlement sited on drier ground just above the flood plain to take advantage of the adjoining fertile soils and plentiful water supply.

Having identified this site, the area around it was searched where access was possible. Despite being limited by spring crop cover, there seemed to be further scatters both to the west and north of the Bitterne Grove site. These were about 250m north of Dunbridge station at SU 31852636, and about 100m west of White House, in Hatt Lane, at SU 32302660. Both scatters seemed to have similarities with the Bitterne Grove site. From this, it might be suggested that the whole area between Hatt Lane and the River Dunn may represent the same basic site. It is perhaps noteworthy that this area became the medieval South Field, one of the open fields of Mottisfont.

The only other flint scatter located was just to the south of Yew Tree Pit at SU 32542774. There was little here characteristic enough to date it beyond a general Neolithic/Bronze Age date. The lack of finds elsewhere was almost certainly restricted by the prevalence of spring crops on the fields. It should be noted that three of the above four sites were found just inside entrances to the fields, where tractor activity had restricted crop growth. Based on the sites located from the limited access available, and the frequency with which prehistoric finds have been found in local quarries it might be suggested that ploughsoil observations do not reveal the true density of prehistoric activity in the area.

4.2 Iron Age and Roman landscape

There has been very little evidence for the later prehistoric (Iron Age) or Romano-British periods within the estate. The exception was some Romano-British pottery found during quarrying near Yew Tree Pit (SU 32552785). This site coincides closely with a prehistoric flint scatter found nearby, and may suggest this area was a favoured site for early activity.

Less than 300m SW of the SW corner of the estate are the remains of a hill-fort at Lockerley. It is possible that much of the estate fell within the catchment area of this fort, making it the central place for the locality.

4.3 Saxon landscape

There was little direct evidence for Saxon activity within the estate. The place-name, 'Mottisfont', derives from the spring by the moot, suggesting an important meeting place for the locality (Gover 1961, 189). Most commentators seem to equate the 'font' with the spring within the abbey grounds. That this later powered the medieval mill suggests it was an important, and consistent, water source.

The Domesday entry for Mottisfont suggests it had some local pre-eminence. Here it is recorded under the lands of the Archbishop of York, stating that there was one church and six chapels 'in the manor of Mottisfont' (Munby 1982, 4.1). This is unlikely to mean that there were six chapels

within the manor as it later became known, but that it was a mother church with six chapels dependent on it. These chapels are listed at Broughton, Pittleworth, two in Tytherley (probably East and West Tytherley), East Dean and Lockerley.

The York holding later became known as Mottisfont Treasury, because its revenues went to the Treasurer of York Cathedral. They did not make up the larger Mottisfont manor granted to Mottisfont Priory (later misnamed 'Abbey' in the post-medieval period). The York holding seems to have been the land to the immediate south and west of the village, the largest portion being approximately the eastern half of the medieval South Field.

The entry for this estate must be treated with caution, as it is not known what parts may have been attached to the other chapels outside the later manor of Mottisfont. The entry is, nevertheless, revealing. It states that it answered for four hides less one virgate. In lordship there was one plough. Five villagers and five smallholders had two ploughs. There was 39 and a half acres of meadow, and 'woodland for fencing'. It is recorded that the King's Reeve, Cave, took one of these hides, plus twelve and a half acres of meadow, one copse and one pasture worth ten shillings away without the knowledge of Hugh de Port (presumably the original owner who granted the manor to York).

This entry records the presence of meadow and woodland in the late Saxon manor, reflecting later land uses. It could suggest that, apart from the possible expansion of woodland in the post-medieval period, the land uses in the 11th century were not greatly different from later. This is but a brief glimpse of the early medieval landscape, but it informs the reader of the existence of elements in the landscape that have remained constant over a thousand year period.

Domesday records another small settlement at Dunbridge. This was held by Gilbert of Breteuil. In 1066 Kening held it in freehold from King Edward. It paid tax for one hide in 1066 and again in 1086. There was land for one plough, with half a plough in demesne. Two villagers and one smallholder had one plough between them. The manor was valued at ten shillings (Munby 1982, 43.2).

The name means bridge in the valley, and this was probably that same crossing over the River Dun near Dunbridge station. The road that leads from the bridge has cut a massive hollow in the hillside as it heads northwards. Further on there are traces of banks parallel with the present road edges, but set some way back. These indicate that the road once had very wide verges characteristic of old droving tracks. There are many examples in southern Hampshire that can be equated with the Saxon landscape (Currie 1995). It may be no coincidence that the later medieval rental for Mottisfont manor records a road called *Le Herewe* (HRO 13M63/3, folio 4r), plus a furlong in one of the open fields as *Droveforlong*. The latter can probably be identified with the 'Lower Drove' field name on the tithe map. This is to the east of the road north from Dunbridge.

The *Herewe* is a classic Saxon word meaning a military road. However, it is not necessary to take this quite literally, as 'military roads' are just as likely to have peaceful uses most of the

time. The name suggests an old and important road within the manor of Mottisfont. The road north from Dunbridge is a likely candidate, as is the road through the village that continues along Back Lane. The latter also has parallel banks suggesting it was once a wider road used in local stock movement.

These names give a hint of the importance, in Saxon and medieval times, of the seasonal pasture lands, or common pastures that once took up many hundreds of acres in each manor. Although the common lands of Mottisfont can no longer be traced, it is well to remember that they were important enough in Late Saxon times for King Edgar (AD 959-75) to issue laws on how they should be managed.

Two other sub-manors of Mottisfont are possibly recorded in Domesday Book. These are Bentley and Oakley. Bentley is to the north of the present estate. It is not known if any of its lands were ever in the present estate.

The opinion of the VCH is that Oakley may be represented by the Domesday entry 'Hotlop' (Hollings *et al* 1911, 507). Agemund had held this small manor in freehold from King Edward. He still held it 1086. It had paid tax for three hides in 1066, but this had decreased to one hide by 1086. There was land for two ploughs, with one plough in demesne. There was one villager, two smallholders and one slave living there (Munby 1982, 68.23). This entry tells us very little, other than that it was unlikely if 'Hotlop' represented a village. In keeping with the nature of settlement in the area today, this was probably a dispersed settlement of a few small farms.

5.0 Medieval and Post-medieval landscape

5.1 Medieval landscape

The manor of Mottisfont had been granted by William Briwere at the foundation of the Augustinian priory there *c.* 1200 (Cox 1903, 172). When King John (1199-1216) confirmed Briwere's grant, the manor of Mottisfont has land at Cadbury attached to it (Dugdale 1846, vi, 481-83). From hereon, these two 'manors' seem to be linked together as 'Mottisfont with Cadbury', possibly to distinguish it from Mottisfont Treasury, the holding of York Cathedral.

There is little that can be said of the medieval landscape before Walter de Blout's rental of *c.* 1340 (see Appendix 2). The detail that can be derived from this document is the basis for our picture of the medieval landscape of the manor. The land management of the estate, as attested by this rental, is discussed in some detail in Appendix 3 by Neil Rushton.

5.1.1 The priory precinct

The rental gives a detailed description of the resources held within the priory precinct before passing on to the lands outside. The first item mentioned is the spring (*fons*) from which it is thought that Mottisfont takes its name. From this is fed a pond (*stagnum*) which supplies the

power for two water mills valued at 60 shillings a year (HRO 13M63, folio 1r). A number of commentators have implied this meant that there were two different mills in the precinct (eg Honess 1976). This is unlikely. A 'mill' in medieval documents generally meant a set of stones; two mills being two sets of stones. It is therefore more likely that the 'two' mills in the precinct were two sets of stones housed under the roof of the same building.

The rental continues by describing two gardens within the close, the great garden (*Magnum Gardinum*) and *Coumbesorchard*. They are valued with the pasture in the same place at 30 shillings a year. There are then a number of meadows included in the precinct, and within the infirmary close there is fruit trees and meadow valued at 6/8d. There is also a tannery and two dovecotes.

Some of the meadows are of considerable size. These are identified as being within the precinct (*infra clausum*). They are *La Southmede* (18 acres), *La Chalfhamme* (4 1/2 acres), *Le Orchardshamme* (4 1/2 acres), *La Northmede* (49 acres), and *Middlemede* (20 acres). Rushton (1999, 3) has suggested that the inclusion of these extensive tracts of meadow within the bounds of the precinct enabled the priory to take direct control of the considerable hay resource this represented. This direct management is reflected further in the priory's management of the entire Mottisfont manor, where intensive demesne farming appears to have been practised in the early 1340s (see below, section 5.1.2).

The importance of gardens and orchards within medieval institution should not be underestimated. The value of the great garden and *Coumbesorchard* at 30 shillings per annum suggests they covered a reasonable acreage between them. At the medieval St.Cross Hospital in Winchester, a recent study has shown that there were orchards and gardens covering over nine acres (Currie 1998a). The produce of these places was a vital part of their internal economy, shown by the fact that the infirmary had its own close of fruit trees. It should also be noted that medieval institutions took the opportunity to double up on their resources. Under the infirmary fruit trees, the ground was managed as meadow, whilst in *Coumbesorchard* the grass beneath the trees had additional value as pasture. This type of management is reflected in a 14th-century Italian gardening treatise by Piero de Crescenzi (Calkins 1986).

It is possible that the buildings of Mottisfont Priory represented a double cloister plan. Most of the main cloister range can be traced today on the east and west sides. It is possible that the infirmary court, mentioned above, was south of the main court. A plan of the surviving buildings made in 1724 (HRO 13M63/420) seems to show this second southern courtyard, although it is uncertain how far this had been altered at the Dissolution. Parch marks on the ground in dry summers only show the main cloister as complete (NMR SU 3226/7-19). Although, a court of sorts is shown to the south, this does not seem to be so well pronounced as that on the north side. This might be explained by some of the second courtyard's buildings being of timber, rather than entirely of stone, as the main court seems to have been.

5.1.2 The medieval manor

The priory rental lists a number of field names. From the descriptions given, there seems to be three large open fields. Two of these may be attached to Mottisfont, with the third attached to Cadbury. The Mottisfont fields are specifically called *Le Northfeld de Motesfonte*, and *La Southfeld de Motesfonte*.

The Cadbury field is specifically called *Le Westfeld de Cadebury*. The latter contains over 61 acres, with other nearby fields called *Aylesburyacre* at over four and a half acres, and *Ayrchesacre* at over four and a half acres. These fields are sown at the first sowing (*ad unium semen*). The vicinity of West Field can still be identified by Westfield Copse, south of Cadbury Farm. At the same sowing what appear to be parts of North Field are sown. These include *Le Puchalne* (over 1/2 acre), *La Longehalne* (1 1/2 acres plus), *Walyngton* (4 1/2 acres plus), *Herlegh* (16 acres plus) and *Houndestyle* (3 acres plus). Wallington and Herless can be identified today as field names to the north of Bengers Lane, thereby making the land here within North Field.

At 'another sowing' a further 20 1/2 acres plus between the king's road and the Cellarer's hedge is sown in Cadbury. This is probably the land between Westfield Copse and the B3084. A number of other furlongs are mentioned after this, few of which are identifiable today. The *Dunnynsok* seems to have the same root element as Dunbridge, possibly suggesting this land is south of Keepers Lane towards Dunbridge, 'in the valley' (HRO 13M63, folio 2v).

One of these furlongs extends from the 'nether part of the prior's quarry', suggesting that quarrying was being undertaken in the medieval period. One of the most notable features of the Mottisfont landscape is the large number of old quarries on the estate; most of the present woods grow on old quarry sites. The previous field names seemed to suggest that the land being described was in the south part of Cadbury's fields towards Dunbridge. Although one must accept that such an assumption could be dangerous, if this is correct, the quarry being mentioned could be one of three old quarries south of Hatt Farm.

In this same sowing *La Southfeld de Motesfonte* is mentioned, with a place called *Tylerslond* within it. 'South Field' field names still survived at the time of the tithe map to the south of Hatt Lane. It is likely that this is the South Field of medieval Mottisfont. As all the identified North Field names are north of Bengers Lane, it is possible that the land between Hatt and Bengers Lane was also in South Field. The name *Tylerslond* is interesting because it suggests an association with a person who makes tiles. Brick and tile making was carried on at Mottisfont (probably at Spearywell) in the late 17th century, when it recorded that William Berrier pays rent by providing the lord of the manor with a set number of bricks and 'Ridge Tyles' (HRO 13M63/39). It is possible to suggest that the *Tylerslond* name indicates that tile making was carried out in 14th century Mottisfont.

This name can perhaps be located more precisely. A map of the manor of Mottisfont Treasury, dated 1760, shows that the eastern part of South Field was in that manor. Any field names given as in South Field in the priory rental must therefore be in the western part of that field.

Another field name that survives in the 19th century is that associated with the vill's shepherd. In the rental is a place called *Le Schepherdelond* that seems to be part of South Field. In the tithe award is a 'Shepherds Garden Pit', now Yew Tree Pit in the north of the estate. This example demonstrates how easy it is to assume too much from names in the rental. It is clear from this that certain place names were common enough to occur in more than one place on the estate. Equating a medieval name with a later field name might not, therefore, necessarily be correct.

The rental records the lands sown at Cadbury during the third sowing (*Cadebury ad tercium semen*). Some furlongs of interest include one next to *Denebruggeshegge*, again bringing the Dunbridge name into play, and suggesting this furlong was on the edge of the open field where there was a hedge separating it from other lands. Another furlong extends above *Hurtheslane*, giving a road name. Another extends 'continuously along the road to *Le Tylcroft* 'within the gate of Cadbury along the southern part of the road', giving further indications that a tiler lived in Mottisfont (13M63/3, folio 3v).

After listing field names, the rental then lists the tenants of the manor. Forty-five tenants are listed holding from the prior. These tenants hold a total of 43 buildings differentiated as messuages, tenements or cottages. These different names might suggest a hierarchy of building type, the cottage apparently being the lowest and the messuage appearing to be the highest. A further two houses are mentioned as being next to others belonging to named persons who are not listed elsewhere as holding houses. On top of this two additional 'crofts' are listed plus a marlpit. If the crofts are houses, this seems to indicate that there were at least 47 houses in Mottisfont. Add to this those houses within the manor of Mottisfont Treasury, and the number must exceed 50, probably much higher.

The rental thereby indicates that Mottisfont was a populous settlement, with a high concentration of houses. Some of these would have been in the village, but a large number were probably spread out along the Spearywell road. These latter houses seemed to have made up a series of scattered houses and hamlets along a common road. Such settlements are common in wooded countryside, and have been given the name 'interrupted row' to define this type of dispersed settlement (Dyer 1990). Interrupted rows are common in southern Hampshire, where there has also been large areas of historic woodland (Currie 1995).

In 1351 Edward III had granted the treasurer of York Cathedral the right to hold a market at Mottisfont every Wednesday, together with two annual fairs (Hollings *et al* 1911, 506). It is possible that this represented a formalisation of activity that had pre-dated the grant. Mottisfont seems to have been a thriving community, with its own village tradesman apparently noted in the rental. Here are recorded John le King, a tailor, John de Chalke, a baker, and John le Bolt, a 'Sciswon', the latter probably being the village smith. In Clent, Worcestershire, a 'sisyer' is the

medieval name given to a scythsmith (Currie 1998b, 190). Other trades and professions are hinted at from surnames such as John le Tinker, Robert le Cowherd, Ade le Tanner, John le Muleward (miller), and John le Marshal (13M63/3, *passim*).

In conclusion, medieval Mottisfont seemed to be a moderately large rural community, possibly with the main settlement grouped around the church and the priory gate. There were possibly outlying settlements along the local lanes, particularly along the B3084. A number of later medieval and 16th century buildings still survive here attesting to a scattered community, possibly of an interrupted row type.

There would seem to have been three main open fields, North, South and West Field. North and South Fields were listed as attached to Mottisfont, whereas West Field is 'de Cadebury'. The field names listed allow a rough location of these fields. North Field appears to have been to the north of Bengier Lane. South Field was at least partly south of Hatt Lane, although it may also have included the land between Hatt and Bengier Lanes. The West Field of Cadbury probably extended from the vicinity of Cadbury Farm down into the valley of Dunbridge. This field would appear to have been the largest of the three, based on the greater number of furlong names that appear to be attached to it.

The rental also mentions some meadowland. The majority of this appears to be around the abbey, and included within the priory precinct. Rushton (1999) has suggested that this was to enable this valuable resource to be managed directly by the priory. He has also drawn attention to the fact that there seems to be very little land held by the tenants of the manor. There is also very little mention of customs owed the priory, nearly all the rents being paid in cash. The exceptions to this rule involve barely 4 acres of arable land, some small plots attached to the tenements and a marlpit. The only villager owing customary service appears to be Robert Poydas, who has to help with the washing of the lord's sheep (HRO 13M63/3, folio 7v). This seems to imply that the priory was managing its lands at Mottisfont directly, with the tenants being paid for their work. This does not appear to be the case on the priory's other estates, where customary works are still required from the tenants.

It is of interest to compare the Mottisfont rental and custumal with that of another Hampshire Augustinian house, Southwick Priory, near Portsmouth. This latter document dates from *c.* 1248, and shows that the tenants of Southwick performed extensive labour services (Hanna 1988-89, i, no. 193). It is uncertain whether this difference represents a genuine contrast in land management between the two monasteries, or is a reflection of the different dates of the two documents.

Another oddity of the Mottisfont rental is the lack of mention of common pasture and woodland. One wonders where the sheep that Robert Poydas has to wash are grazed. For part of the year, the meadowland probably served this purpose, but they could not be kept there all year or there would be no hay crop. Likewise, what has happened to the extensive woodlands that cover Mottisfont parish today? Although one has to be cautious in interpreting the disposition of the lands, there would appear to be no references to land in the northern part of the National Trust

estate where the larger acreage of woodland is today. One might assume that isolated copses apparently within the compass of the three open fields might have grown up after the 1340s. These include Westfield and Mason's Copses within what appears to be the medieval West Field, and Herless Copse, Queens Copse and Bounds Bottom within what appears to be the medieval North Field. There is no knowing how the village was affected by the Black Death, and the economic disruption of the later medieval period.

It is curious that nearly all the Mottisfont woodlands, except some areas of those in the far north of the parish, have grown up over old quarry areas. Does this suggest that they evolved, not in their own right as woodland, but as a by-product of another activity. That is, once the quarry was exhausted, the land became largely waste, until colonised by scrub that later developed into woodland. There are two quarries mentioned in the rental, demonstrating that marling and other forms of quarrying was already under way in 1340.

The quarry pits in Mottisfont derive from a number of different activities. There are chalk pits, marl pits, clay pits, and possibly gravel and sand pits. The rental mentions the name 'Chalkpark'. A park is an enclosure from which certain commodities are taken. The most obvious being a deer park for deer, but medieval people had parks for keeping all sorts of animals. Could chalkpark suggest an enclosure from which chalk was taken? The rental makes it clear that at least one of the pits it records was a marl pit (HRO 13M63/3, folio 8v). From this it seems that it was a medieval practice in Mottisfont to marl the land. Could this have been such an intensive activity that after many centuries it resulted in a massive shrinkage of available arable land? It is estimated that around 20% of the Mottisfont estate woodland has reverted to that state after having been used for quarrying. This process had clearly begun in the medieval period, and was largely complete by 1724. We therefore have an unusual wooded landscape that has not evolved because woodland was the most effective method of managing the land, but because the decimation of former arable land was so widespread that no other effective economic use could be made of the worked-out quarries.

5.1.3 After the Black Death

Very little is known about the manor and its landscape after the Black Death. It is only possible to make some general assumptions based on the history of the priory itself. The priory seems to have suffered as a result of the plague, as did so many others. In 1349 Robert de Bromore was elected prior, his predecessor, Walter de Blout (the writer of the rental), probably having died in the plague. He ruled for barely a year, possibly another plague victim, and was replaced in 1350 by Richard de Caneford. Richard lasted only two years. When he was replaced there was no one suitable left at the priory, and Ralph de Thorleston had to be brought in from Leicester to take his place (Cox 1903, 174-75). Such a quick turnover suggests that the priory was hard hit by the plague, and one might assume that the village suffered likewise.

In 1353 Henry of Lancaster, who had taken over as the priory's patron, petitioned the pope for an indulgence to all who visited the priory on Trinity Sunday, or who contributed towards its

upkeep (ibid). This was doubtless an attempt to gain some relief from the decimations of the plague. In 1410 they were claiming relief from the pope again. This time they claimed that their lands had been decimated by attacks by the French. They further claimed that the buildings were in want of repair, and the fields had been left for the most part uncultivated as many of the serfs had died in the plague (Honess 1976, 8). This was probably exaggerated, but it shows that the priory felt that the plague and the subsequent disruptions had hit their establishment hard. How much land had genuinely gone out of cultivation at this time is difficult to say.

There is evidence to suggest that the plague may have caused a serious long-term decline in the priory's fortunes. In 1494 Henry VII was granted a papal bull to suppress the priory, and use its revenues to found a college. At the time there were only three canons in residence instead of eleven according to the original foundation. Henry appears to have changed his mind, and decided to annex it first to his chapel at Windsor, and then to the great chapel at Westminster Abbey. A new bull was issued in 1500 to this effect, but, surprisingly, the opportunity was never taken up. The priory survived until the Dissolution, when it had ten canons and two novices in residence, and a modest annual value of £164-12-6d (Cox 1903, 174).

This episode probably demonstrates that Mottisfont Priory was still suffering from problems relating to the plagues and economic changes of the later 14th and 15th centuries. Although it is not recorded, it seems that a successful revival ensued rather than the planned suppression. The papal bull to suppress the priory was never implemented and at the Dissolution, there appears to be an almost full complement of canons again. Exactly what happened remains a mystery, but it would seem as if someone stepped in to save the priory, and revive its fortunes temporarily.

At the Dissolution, some redress is made concerning the lack of mention of woodland in the c. 1340 rental. A report on the monastery states that it held 60 acres of 'Great woods' and 92 acres of coppice wood on the estate. These are estimated to be sold at £106-13-4d (Gasquet 1894, 271). This is only a fraction of the woodland on the estate today, but it can not be assumed that this was the full extent. Post-medieval written surveys discussed below give much smaller acreages of woodland than are shown on a contemporary map of 1724. Why the full extent is not recorded then is a mystery, but it is possible the acreage given in 1536 was not the full extent of the medieval woodland. The 1536 survey possibly records only the timber and coppice ready for sale.

5.2 Post-medieval landscape

After the Dissolution the priory passed to William Sandys of the Vyne, who exchanged lands elsewhere with the king for the property. He converted the priory buildings into a mansion, an exercise than was apparently incomplete on his death in 1540. There are suggestions that the Sandys were active in consolidating their landholdings in the area. A book of deeds, many of the originals now being lost, compiled at the Vyne records purchases in the area. In February 1540 Sandys bought lands in Mottisfont worth £200 from Stephen Hamon (HRO 13M63/15, folio 248). In 1584 the family bought part of the manor of Mounthyde (Hyde Farm) in Mottisfont

from Nicholas Scope (HRO 13M63/11), with the other parts of that 'manor' being acquired early in the 17th century (HRO 13M63/15, folios 250-51). In 1591 Sir Walter Sandys did much to centralise their holdings in Mottisfont by buying the old manor of Mottisfont Treasury from John Willes and Richard Paice (Hollings *et al* 1911, 506).

Mottisfont seems to have gradually supplanted the Vyne as the Sandys' main seat during the 16th and early 17th century (Currie 1994). The latter was sold in 1653, leaving Mottisfont as the headquarters of the family's Hampshire estates.

The earliest major document concerning the Mottisfont estate is a survey of *c.* 1629. This is an imperfect document as it clearly does not list all the lands in the manor. It seems the demesne lands are not listed individually, and the fields named may be those put out to rent. The common Oakley Mead is mentioned, along with other field names that are still being used at the time of the tithe award. These include Hindes Orchard, Picked Mead, Munk Close, Great and Little Oakfield, South Field, and Drove Coppice, but also some field names that are neither identifiable later or at the time of the *c.* 1340 rental. One point of interest is that the survey records 'one new grubbed *moorit* ground' of nine acres (HRO 69M78/M4). This suggests that there was waste land or woodland in the manor at this time that was being brought into cultivation. Whether this was land that had been abandoned after the Black Death, or land that had never been cultivated, is uncertain. A further point of interest is that the survey states that the 'Mottesfont Copses' are 'employed for hedging stuff and faggotts for the Manor House'.

The Hearth Tax returns for Mottisfont from 1665 seem to show that it was a populous manor. The mansion house was rated at 35 hearths, the next largest return being seven hearths for 'Doctor John Howorth', probably the Rectory. Next comes three houses with six hearths, the majority of the other houses having one or two hearths. There are 32 properties, including the mill, paying tax on 110 hearths, and 37 properties untaxed (Hughes & White 1991), making a grand total of 69 houses in the parish, a figure not inconsistent with modern numbers outside the obviously modern developments around Dunbridge railway station. It should be noted that a number of the smaller one hearth properties, possibly those within the roadside strip in Spearywell, were abandoned in the early 20th century, often being replaced by more modern estate cottages around Hatt Farm and the School.

There follows a series of rentals of the estate throughout most of the later 17th and 18th centuries. The oldest dates from 1684 (HRO 13M63/39). This lists four freeholders, nine leaseholders 17 copyholders and twelve 'rack renters', with an additional ten named persons in Mount Hyde manor. Apart from the names of the tenants and their rents, it tells us little about the land management of the manor. The exception is William Berrier who pays his rent in kind, producing 1000 bricks, ten ridge tiles and ten quarters of lime. This indicates that the Mottisfont brickworks had already begun producing at this date. It also suggests that there were lime kilns on the site burning the produce of chalk pits to make lime. The extent of quarrying in the manor, visible through surviving quarry earthworks and pits, has clearly been extensive in the past, and this entry explains at least partly the local industries that the quarries were supplying.

This rental was probably taken to assess the value of the estate following the death of the last of the Hampshire line of the Sandys family. On the death of Edwin Sandys in 1684, the estate passed to Sir John Mill, the son of Sandys' sister, Margaret (Hollings *et al* 1911, 450). An undated sale particular of the estate of Sir John Mill is more informative (HRO 13M63/47). Internal references date the document to between 1697 and 1703. This sale did not take place, but the document lists some field names missing from the 1684 rental. The relevant portions listing field names and other information about the estate are listed as follows:

Mr Gatehouse & Mr Goddard holds part of the demesne by lease for 14 years from Michaelmas 1697 £220

The close called the Great Close worth £5

Mr Dowse holds part of ye Meadows called Eldon Mershes & 20 Cow Commons in Oakley Mead £16

Henry Abbot & Henry Kelsey holds other part of same meadow £19 pa

Robert Fryth holds part of Cadbury with part of Oakfield £37

Richard Mason holds the other part of Cadbury £10

Micharl Goddard holds Edneys Bargain late in possession Roger Edmonds £12-19

Henry Neate holds other part of Cadbury £11

James Frith [holds??] Bartletts £3

Henry Hunt for part of Cadbury Wild Grounds £1-10

William Compton for a little tenement £1

Ben Mersh for the Brick Kilns and ij house and land £10

Widow Attwoods tenant let at £2

Major Pyles Meadow, his lease will expire St Thomas Day 1703 being 37 1/2 acres Water Meadow and will be worth £40 [rent] £11

The Coppice one year with the other worth £36

The Copyholders Quit Rents £5-6-11d

The Leaseholders Quit Rents £3-4-4d'

There are 14 named copyholders, nine named leaseholders and four named tenants at will. It is worth noting that 'Major Pyles Meadow' is listed as 37 and a half acres of 'Water Meadow'. It was during the post-medieval period that many of the Hampshire meadowlands were converted to water meadows. Although there are references to meadows being deliberately flooded in the medieval period (see Currie 1998b), the systematic conversion of meadowland to flooded water meadows seems to have been largely a post-medieval phenomenon. This work may have been fairly extensive by the 17th century, but records seem to suggest that the greater extent of this conversion occurred quite late. It is possible therefore that this reference marks the beginning of the process on the Mottisfont estate. The reference to the land being worth £40 in the future might indicate that the conversion has only just taken place. Even by the time of the tithe map, there is only a small area of meadowland specifically marked down as 'watered' (HRO 21M65/F7/164/1-2).

There are a number of references in the Court Rolls that suggest people were taking water from the local rivers to flood their meadows. Presentments at the end of the 18th century suggest that it was becoming a serious problem. The tenants present the tenant of Oakley Farm for 'having lately' made hatches (water gates or sluices) where 'there never was any before'. By these he was taking 'great quantity of water out of the said Mill River to the Injury of the Lord...!'

The Mill River, as it was known, was causing further problems around the same time as this complaint (1794-95). The tenants of the manor complain that:

'... the River or Watercourse called the Mill River hath for some Time past been much injured by Thomas Gatehouse Esq and others by a Dam made at the Head of the same and also by Hatches erected at a place adjoining Thomas Gatehouse's Meadows where was formerly a Tumbling Bay called by the name of Bushels Bay [one assumes that this is above the Mottisfont estate] by which the water is conveyed out of the said Mill River which otherwise would Pass to Mottisfont for the Benefit of Sir Charles Mill and his Tenants and by the Banks of the said River and Watercourses leading from the same not being properly repaired and the River not being properly scoured and Amended by the several owners of the Lands which adjoin the said River' (HRO 13M63/419, no. 273).

One can guess that such a complaint, which was repeated by this formula over a number of years in the Mottisfont Court Books, was probably exaggerated. Nonetheless, it does demonstrate what was happening to the lands along the river, and the concern this caused the local people.

A survey of Sir Richard Mill's estate dated 1721 is the next document giving details of the land. It is far from being comprehensive, but it does allow the research to further reconstruct the landscape.

'Benjamin Mersh for Cadbury Farm and Sperrywell Wood to hold for Michelmas 1719 for 14 years at £44 out of which £2 pa is deducted for plowbote and cartbote.

John Sims for lands late Roger Edmonds and all those lands part of Cadbury late in possession of John Rayly and the meadow late Major Piles from Michelmas 1720 for 7 years £50

Farmer Edny for upper Eldon and Mersh Mead £15 and for 20 cow commons and one rummer in Oakley Mead £1

John Sims for Tallyers plott 3/4d

William Matthews for Elder Lillelt Meadow lease expires Michelmas 1721 £8

Arthur Biddles widow for parcel of Elder Mershes lease expires Michelmas 1721 £8

John Hobbs for Noakes part of Cadbury from Michelmas 1716 for 11 years £11

William Matthews for the fishery £1-10s

Mr Goddard for the Inn widow Edmunds Cottage, Mottisfont Farm and Mills except the Great House, Great Court and Gardens £200

Mr Goddard for the Great Court £3

Widow Edmunds Cottage and Hoares let with the farm

Copyholders

Soloman Firth 2-2-3 acres 11/-

William Pitter's widow late Roger Edmunds 11-1-4 acres 12/-

Widow Fulras cottage, garden and orchard late Thomas Besants 1-1-10 acres 6/8d

John Edny House, shop and garden 0-3-25 acres 12/-

William Matthews for late widow Besants called Barlows a cottage and two acres of land in Southfield 2-2-31 acres late Luke Smith 8/-

Edward Beare 10/-

Widow Wellin a cottage and land 2-1-8 acres 5/-

John Blake a tenement and lands 9-3-17 acres 6/11d

John Goddard for late Henry Goddards 8/-

Widow of Roger Crowder 6/8d

Leaseholders

Edward Beare 6-1-30 10/-

Roger Cowders widow a cottage 0-1-6 acres 4/-

Robert Frith £1

Moses Brown 6/8d

Richard Mason 0-0-22 acres 2/-

John Bayley for Kelsey Kyles house and lands 12-1-22 acres 5/-

Benjamin Mersh for the brick kilns 10/-

Solomon Frith for Bowyers late Jacob Bartletts 14-3-9 acres 5/-

Widow Pinnock a cottage and two closes called Bushy Leaze & the tithe thereof 5/-

John Grey 5/-

John Rayley for Dobbs 3/6d

Nicholas Compton 2/-

Matthew Betteridge for cottage late Thomas Mersh's and the widow Blakeswell[s] 1/-

Woodlands by Nicholas Ayling measured by 16 1/2ft perch

Gardeners Coppice 5-3-3 acres

Drove Coppice 20-2-16 acres

Broomfield Coppice 5-0-7 acres

The Row in Monks Ground 0-1-25 acres

The Elm Plot in the upper part of Cunniger 0-1-39 acres

The pit in the lower part of Cunniger 0-0-16 acres

The Row in Rounds Field 1-1-10 acres

The Rows in Twelve Acres 0-1-10 acres

The Rows in Little Dolands Grounds 0-3-0 acres

The Row in Great Dolands Ground 0-3-0 acres

The Row in Broomfield Woody Pit 1-2-11 acres

The Row in Great Wallington 0-2-12 acres

The Pit in Little Nicall Dell 0-2-12 acres

Total 40-3-04 acres...' (HRO 13M63/56).

This document, together with the two previous, show that many of the field names occurring in the tithe award of 1839 existed by this date. The woodlands were only listed as being just over 40 acres, but this does not include Spearywell Wood, which was listed elsewhere in the survey.

Presumably other woodlands not separately listed were part of individual farm holdings. Soon after this survey a map of the estate was made (1724), that shows most of the present woodlands within the area covered were already in being. It is also noted that a number of former quarry pits are mentioned amongst the woodlands. This demonstrates that the phenomenon of old quarries evolving into woodland had already begun before 1721.

The Court Books occasionally record information that suggest that both quarrying and woodland activities were being carried out on the manor in the 18th century. In 1757 the tenants feel obliged to place a warning in the Court Book that a sand pit in Butler's Wood is a dangerous place 'to ride' (HRO 13M63/36/43). Towards the end of the century they are constantly required to put a notice in the Court Books about the way from the village to Bitterne Grove. They state that:

'... there is a Right of a Waggon Road through Parson's Hill and the lands on the South Side thereof to and from the Coppices called Bittengrove Coppice one of which said Coppice do belong to the Treasury Farm and the other called Little Bittengrove Coppice always did belong to the Mottisfont Priory Estate.' (HRO 13M63/419, no. 273)

That the tenants felt obliged to state that the way (seemingly the present Rectory Lane) was a right of a 'Waggon Road' suggests that the passage of wagons was crucial to its use. In other words, the importance of the road was the right to take wagons down it to remove the heavy woodland produce from the Copses.

The 1724 map (HRO 13M63/420) only shows that part of the Mottisfont estate that had passed to the Sandys family at the Dissolution. Large chunks of the present estate are missing, showing that the former priory had only held about half the modern estate, and about a third of the entire parish of Mottisfont. It shows most of the estate west of the B3084, plus other lands around Hatt and Bengers Lanes. However, it excludes all the later Spearywell Farm, the manor of Mottisfont Treasury (which includes about 50% of the village core), and Oakley Farm. This makes up a very considerable acreage, and demonstrates that neither the priory or the powerful Sandys family controlled the entire manorial economy.

There is no written survey to accompany the 1724 map, so the information given on it is limited. It does, however, show some important information, such as the layout of the former priory grounds. This has been discussed previously in some detail (National Trust 1991), but there are a few points that merit mentions here. The map shows the house as a double courtyard, a probable survival of the original priory conversion of 1536-40. As noted in the medieval section, the southern courtyard was probably the infirmary court. Much of this was swept away in the remodelling of the house by Sir Richard Mill in the 1740s.

The map also clearly shows the Mill Stream in existence with the mill by the present road bridge. This is the first definite proof that the Mill Stream existed before the house was altered in the 1740s. It has always been assumed that the priory mill, mentioned in the 1340s was powered by

a pond fed by the spring. The basis for this being the depiction of a sub-circular pond near the spring site on the 1724 map. However, close examination of this 'pond' shows it coloured in green, rather than the expected blue. It is not intended to make too much of this, but it might be suggested that any assumptions about the mill are treated cautiously. The fact that the Mill Stream pre-dates the 1724 map must allow some credence to the possibility that it was a monastic creation. Although stone found in the artificial bank holding back the stream has been taken to suggest it was made after 1536, it is possible that this arrived here through later repairs. It is unlikely that this bank has not had to be repaired over the centuries.

This caution has also been suggested by Rushton (1999), the translator of the rental, despite his being clearly aware that the rental seems to imply the mill was fed from the spring. If the latter had been the case, it can not have made a particularly powerful mill, and efforts may have been made to modify this system through the creation of a proper mill stream.

Another point of interest on the 1724 not taken up by anyone else is the marking out of tithe free land. This designation in the post-medieval period is usually taken to indicate former monastic lands. If this is the case, the lands marked seems to fall short of full extent of the priory's lands in Mottisfont. Instead only two large blocks are marked, one around the priory buildings, and the other around Cadbury Farm, including a considerable portion of woodland. It is further notable that the tithe free woodlands are very extensive, making up nearly two-thirds of this block of land that are little changed even today.

The second block around the priory coincides roughly in area with the acreage given 'within the close', including an extensive acreage of meadow. The boundaries of this land are, perhaps, not quite what might be expected. On the south, it coincides with the main road into the village, which turns into the Oakley Road along the west boundary. On the east, the boundary is, as expected, the main River Test. One might expect the northern boundary to be the lane to Oakley Farm, but this is not the case. Instead, the boundary follows an irregular route around the edge of fields to the south of this lane. The fields to the north, between the boundary and the lane, belonged to Oakley Farm up to the time of the tithe map and beyond. This extent was probably the priory precinct boundary.

In 1726 another survey of the estate was undertaken (HRO 13M63/58). The preamble to this describes the area around the house in greater detail than previously. This preamble was repeated almost word for word in another survey of 1742 (HRO 13M63/59). It states that:

'...Mottisfont Farm and Mills and great Court with the Fruit of the Walnut Trees and that part of the Fishery late James Wiltshires with appurtenances except the Great House, gardens, stables, coach house, fishponds, and the Liberty of running 2 horses in Cuniger, Munks or any Grounds not laid up for hay - with a covenant for Sir Richard Mill at any time to take into his hands the Great Court or any of the Grounds on the East Side of the Street and Lane leading from Yew Tree Pitt and the River allowing the value as adjudged by indifferent persons and also Liberty

thro' South Fields and little Dunbridge with his Coach and Horses paying the damage as adjudged...'

Both these surveys largely repeat information given in the 1721 survey, excepting for changes in the names of some of the tenants. The latter survey of 1742 seems to suggest that the Sandys house had not yet been altered. The reference to the 'Great Court' separately from the 'Great House' is slightly curious. Does this mean the 'Great Court' is not the courtyard shown within the plan of the house, but somewhere else? Or does it suggest that the double courtyard plan of the house had been subdivided between the lord and his tenant?

About 1760 a map was made of the Mottisfont Treasury manor (HRO 13M63/421). Although this had become part of the Sandys estates in the 1590s, it was still treated separately, as is shown by its omission from the 1724 map. This map probably shows the extent of the former York Cathedral medieval estate. The two main points of interest here are the identification of Dairy House as the 'Manor House', and the division of 'Hine [Hind] Meadow' into strips. These latter divisions are probably remnants of a time when this meadow was managed as a common meadow. Elsewhere Oakley Meadow remained a common meadow until it was formally enclosed *c.* 1790 (HRO 137M71/PZ2; 38M72/PZ2). A number of early surveys and particulars mention the 'cow commons' on Oakley Mead. These were the rights to common a certain number of cows on the meadow after the hay crop had been brought in. They are, curiously, the only mentions of commoning animals through the entire history of the estate, so it can only be assumed that common pasture rights had been extinguished fairly early in Mottisfont.

From the way Hind Meadow is divided into strips, it might be suggested that it was also managed as a common meadow at some time. It was referred to as a common mead in 1739 (Chapman & Seeliger 1997, 56), but it would appear to have lost its common status informally, unlike Oakley Meadow, which was formally enclosed. Chapman and Seeliger (*ibid*) consider that Plain Mead, the Peat Meadows, and Mill Mead may all have once had common status.

The next historic map concerned with the estate is the Oakley Common Meadow Enclosure Map of *c.* 1790 (HRO 38M72/PZ2). Most of this former common meadow was in Broughton manor, and none of it was in the early Mottisfont estate. Whether the 'manor' of Oakley really was the Domesday manor of 'Hotlop' is not provable on current evidence, but the lands of Oakley Farm remained a separate land unit from the rest of Mottisfont until into the 19th century. That lands associated with the name Oakley spill over the parish boundaries between Mottisfont, Broughton and Kings Sombourne might suggest that the land unit pre-dates the creation of these parishes. This could help suggest it was once a separate sub-manor.

The Enclosure Map gives the names of the people with rights in the common meadow. That portion given to the Mill family was relatively small, suggesting that the Mottisfont estate had only a small interest in this area in 1790. It also shows two small gravel pits within the former common, further showing that quarrying extended into such valuable lands. Meadow was generally the most highly valued land in the countryside before the present century.

In 1814 the Oakley Farm Estate was put up for sale. Sale Particulars and a map were drawn up showing it to be a substantial land holding of over 360 acres (HRO 58M71 E/B 80). The particulars mention that the farm had a threshing machine operated by water power, and commended the proximity of the River Test as affording an 'esteemed' trout fishery and providing water for irrigation. The Oakley holding subsequently became annexed to the Mottisfont estate. At the time of the tithe map, the Mill family were leasing the farm as a 314 acre unit to James Gilbert (HRO 21M65/F7/164/1-2).

The reference in the Oakley sale documents to the fishing on the Test and its tributaries is of interest. It is noted from the surveys of the Mottisfont estate that a fishery is included as a source of revenue. The value of the River Test as a sporting fishery, mainly for trout, started to be seriously noted in the 18th century. It currently boasts some of the highest rentals for freshwater fishing in the UK. The early interest of the Mill family in local sporting activities is shown by the fact that they seemed to have interests in sporting rights outside their own estate. In 1780 the estate is recorded to have paid two guineas for a half year's fishing rights on Viscount Palmerston's estate at Broadlands, Romsey (HRO 13M63/80). The family's interest in the fishing is further shown in the following spring when Willian King is paid expenses for taking 'the first Salmon' of the year down to Sussex (ibid).

From 1792 an ill-fated attempt was made to construct a navigable canal linking Salisbury to the Southampton to Andover Canal. The remains of this venture can be seen along side the south boundary of the estate. This canal met with constant difficulties, and was never completed. By the early 1820s it had become derelict and attempts to maintain it abandoned (Course 1976).

Account books from the 18th century, particularly those from the 1780s, give information about the activities within the estate's woodlands. Payments are made for all sorts of woodland activity, such as making faggots, lopping trees and other tasks. John Grant is often mentioned for transporting timber to various parts of the estate. In November 1781 he is paid 15 shillings for taking timber to 'Mottisfont Pitt' for 'repairs'. One presumes this was to the saw pit so the wood could be cut up for use in repairs to the various buildings on the estate. In April 1782 he is paid one pound for carting timber for a more specific purpose. On this occasion he took the timber to 'the Yard to cut out Planks for Barns floors' (HRO 13M63/80).

Towards the end of the 18th century, a summary analysis is drawn up for the estate. This lists Mottisfont and Cadbury as containing three messuages, 33 cottages, 36 gardens, 20 orchards, 403-2-2 acres of arable land, 297-1-33 acres of meadow, 9-2-38 acres of pasture, 203-3-1 acres of woodland, one mill, one fishery, one brick kiln, and six barns. It further states that there are no commons within the manor (HRO 13M63/88), confirming suspicions voiced above that any such areas (excepting the common meadows listed above at places such as Oakley) that may have existed had long since been enclosed.

Mention of commons here leads one to correct an error in the Mottisfont Catalogue in the Hampshire Record Office that could confuse and mislead future researchers. Document number HRO 13M63/100 is listed as being an agreement made on March 10th 1806 'between Sir Charles Mill and numerous other persons for enclosing certain waste lands in Mottisfont'. This listing is incorrect, the document is about enclosing the extensive common lands in Millbrook, another manor held by the Mill family. One assumes the error was made by the compiler reading that it was between Sir Charles Mill 'of Mottisfont', and assuming that the document therefore related to that manor. This error was repeated in the recent RCHME survey of the Duck Grounds (for a detailed discussion of this area see volume 2, site number 128640), where the document is cited as referring to 'Mottisfont' (RCHME 1998, 10).

At the time of the tithe map (1839), there was still a large portion of the present estate outside its bounds. This was Spearywell Farm. Little seems to be known about the early history of this land unit. The Mottisfont Treasury map of *c.* 1760 marks lands on its NW edge as 'school lands' (op cit), suggesting that this estate had been used to endow a school. The tithe map lists this as the 'Stockton Charity'. The farm was tenanted by James Edney, a member of a long-standing Mottisfont family, and extended over 151 acres (ibid). It was obtained by Sir John Barker Mill in 1849, and integrated with the rest of the estate (HRO 4M92/A14/2). Apart from a few outlying areas, therefore, the present estate only came into being in the mid 19th century.

Spearywell Farm was exchanged for land at Upton Scudamore in Wiltshire with the governors of Stockton Hospital, also in Wiltshire. The exchange document records the total acreage as 153 acres, 2 rods and 13 perches. A map accompanies the plan, showing little change from that shown on the tithe map (HRO 53M72/T22).

By this time, most of the land uses of the present estate had evolved. The woodlands were extensive, although there were still a few late additions to this acreage. These later additions included the new plantation north of Bounds Bottom, linking the overgrown chalk pits nearby with Bounds Bottom in one continuous stretch of woodland, and the overgrowing of the sand pits south of the Mill Arms at Dunbridge. Both these additions occurred after 1910. To the east of the house, parts of the former meadowlands had already been quarried for peat by 1839, and the mill seems to have been abandoned.

The first edition large scale Ordnance Survey maps of the early 1870s (sheet 48) reflect this situation. A brick works is shown in the hamlet of Spearywell, now marked as 'Mottisfont Brick Works'. This is shown again on the 1897 map, but seems to have been abandoned by the time of the 1911 6" map (sheet 48NW). A lease of 1835 to John Bradby gave him the right to extract clay from five plots of land totalling about ten acres around the brickworks' site. It also gave him the right to bring chalk over Newbridge in Michelmersh parish, but only for the express purpose of burning it to make lime (HRO 53M72/T10). In 1888 the lease was renewed, this time for John Wren, a brick manufacturer of Chandler's Ford, in Hampshire (HRO 53M72/T19).

In the meantime gravel and sand extraction seems to have expanded at Dunbridge, eventually having covered most of that part of the estate south of the Mill Arms. This area has subsequently been converted to a mainly conifer plantation, but traces of the old quarries are still clearly visible.

In 1835 Sir Charles Mill had died childless, and that branch of the Mill family became extinct. He left his estates to his sister's son, the Reverend John Barker, who adopted the name Barker-Mill. Reverend Barker-Mill was a keen sportsman, and it is around this time that there is some evidence that the estate's management was becoming increasingly concerned with its sporting rights, possibly in favour of agricultural land uses. This may be reflected in the abandonment of the village mill around this time.

This interest may have begun before the Reverend Barker-Mill's time. At the turn of the century the Mill family had begun to show interest in the shooting rights. It has already been mentioned above that by the later 18th century, the Test valley was becoming famed for its trout fishing, and this increasing interest in sporting rights is reflected throughout the valley. In 1803 Sir Charles Mill made inquiry with his legal advisers over the right of free warren that reputedly passed with the priory lands to the Sandys family (HRO 13M63/94). In May of that year, John Bridger, a former steward of Sir Richard Mill, was asked to give his evidence regarding the estate's shooting rights in Bentley and Oakley (HRO 13M63/95).

Reverend Barker-Mill's interest was mainly in hunting with hounds. He was master of the Mill Hounds and was responsible for building the lavish stable block to the NW of the house. There is a date stone on the building inscribed 1836, the year that Reverend Barker-Mill was elevated to a baronetcy, as the Reverend Sir John Barker-Mill. He died childless in 1860, but his widow continued to live at Mottisfont until her death in 1884. It was with her patronage that the village school was first set up in 1872 (Hones 1976, 37n). After this, the estate passed again to a distant relation, Mrs Marianne Vaudrey, who adopted the name Vaudrey Barker-Mill.

Mrs Vaudrey was an eccentric woman. Her husband died soon after her inheritance, and the estate was let out to tenants. She let the house to Daniel Meinertzhagen, a London businessman, whose family originated in Bremen, Germany, where he maintained extensive business interests. He obtained an unusual lease on the estate, whereby his seven year lease gave him the right to renew indefinitely at the end of the term. Mrs Vaudrey strangely had no right to revoke the lease at the end of the seven year period, but Meinertzhagen could vacate the property at any time giving a year's notice. On her part, Mrs Vaudrey retained the right to forbid any modernisation to the mansion, and electric lights and central heating could not be installed, a provision that was not strictly adhered to by the tenants.

A detailed account of life at Mottisfont at this time is recorded in an extremely well-written book *Diary of a Black Sheep*, by Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, the second son of Daniel Meinertzhagen. The Meinertzhagens loved Mottisfont, and were negotiating to buy the estate when their elder son, also Daniel, died unexpectedly. This so upset the family that they decided

to leave the estate as it left them with painful memories. They moved to Brookwood Park at West Meon.

Richard Meinertzhagen's book gives a fond portrait of the estate, and is worthy of including quotes from the text. He and his brother, Daniel, were keen sportsmen. Daniel kept one of the finest collections of birds of prey in the country in aviaries at Mottisfont (now long gone). This is recorded in *Country Life* soon after his untimely death (21st January 1899).

From Richard Meinertzhagen's book it would seem that the agriculture of the estate was in the doldrums. Much of the meadowland seems to have become neglected, and are described as being little more than marshland. Whether this was partly deliberate because of the importance of the sporting rights in the valley, or because of the late 19th century slump in agricultural prosperity is uncertain.

Meinertzhagen comments that they received the estate with its fishing rights for a mere £320 per year. He states that the fishing alone was 'worth as many thousands a year as we paid hundreds in rent for the whole estate' (Meinertzhagen 1964, 236). He further records how they used the spring in the grounds as their drinking water. It is the local shooting that stands out as being his greatest love.

'The shooting at Mottisfont was naturally good and... included some of the best partridge ground in Hampshire... the estate had such a variety of ground that small mixed bags could be secured every day of the week without doing any harm...our duck were wild-bred and in the winter we could get a large variety...Snipe and woodcock bred on the estate...

Dan and I knew every inch of the Mottisfont estate, every coppice, hedgerow, chalk-pit and almost every tree. In the valley we alone knew how to penetrate the wilderness of swamp and reedbrake we called the Duck-ground, where the herons bred. So unfrequented was the Duck-ground... that when I visited a favourite dry island in its midst in 1942...I found at the base of an old maple tree an old rusted saucepan, two tins of sardines and a pot of jam just as Dan and I had left them in 1897.' (ibid 291-92).

He mentions the ponds that exist in the meadows north of Oakley Farm, probably caused by early peat digging, as they are shown on the 1871 Ordnance Survey 6" map (sheet 48). These were used by himself and his brother for shooting duck, and they named their favourite haunt, Feltham's Ponds, after a labourer who had lived in a nearby cottage that had become derelict (op cit, 296). One morning he arrived at the pond too early for the morning shooting, and described the night sights he saw on a pond in the marshland that still survives largely untouched today.

'In the moonlight I saw an otter cross the ice, I saw white-fronted geese come in and settle on it and a bittern strode majestically across it from one dense reed-bed to another, very slowly, whilst a chorus of widgeon whistling up and down the valley filled the heavens with their wonderful music' (ibid).

He talks of the trees at Mottisfont, recalling some of the splendid specimens, some of which survive to this day. He claims the London Plane on the lawn as the finest in Britain, with a thirty foot girth four feet from the ground, and a great oak at Oakley that was 35 feet in girth five feet from the ground (op cit, 297-98).

On leaving the estate he wrote,

'It is surprising what little there is in my diary recording what we did with ourselves at Mottisfont. But I was never idle there. There were our aviaries, which required constant attention, and we were continually collecting and watching birds. There was shooting, fishing, hunting and eternal messing about with water. With seven miles of river and dozens of miles of dykes, water-channels and runnels in the water-meadows, combined with hundreds of acres of marsh and pond land, there was always something to accomplish. But what was constant throughout our stay at Mottisfont, an attraction which remains today, is the glamour of the old Abbey and the charm of the countryside with its diverse character of marsh, river, woods, arable land and chalk down.' (op cit, 350).

After the Meinertzhagens left Mottisfont, Mrs Vaudrey moved back into the house. She spent a large sum of money on restoring the house, and it is during this work that many discoveries relating to the earlier priory were made (Dale 1907). An extensive collection of photographs, dating from the later 19th and first half of the 20th centuries survives in the Hampshire Record Office (HRO 13M63/446) that records the house and grounds during the Meinertzhagen/Vaudrey period. They do much to convey the flavour of the estate during this time. At the outbreak of war in 1914 Mrs Vaudrey and her family moved to Romsey, and the house was only intermittently occupied for some years thereafter. In 1927 the contents were sold, and the house was left uninhabitable until after Mrs Vaudrey's death in 1932. It seems that it was during Mrs Vaudrey's later years that the former glebe lands of the parish were absorbed into the estate. The subsidiary vesting deed for nearly 24 acres of old glebe lands between the Rector and Mrs Vaudrey survives dated 1927 (HRO 53M72/T41).

The estate was inherited by her son, Peter Barker-Mill, who had no desire to give up his profession of art and design to live on the estate. The estate was put up for lease, but the owner was persuaded to sell the property to Mr Gilbert Russell, a great grandson of the 6th Duke of Bedford. He, with his wife, took over the estate in 1934, and undertook a number of alterations to the interior of the house. This included the Whistler Room, and some alterations to the gardens. Although many of their grander ideas were not carried out, designs by such well-known designers as Geoffrey Jellicoe and Norah Lindsey were implemented.

With the outbreak of the Second World War a number of people were billeted at the house. Mr Gilbert died in 1942, but Mrs Gilbert continued to visit regularly to continue her local commitments. Shortly after this the house became a military hospital, and the house was only returned to Mrs Russell in 1946 (Honess 1976, 42-43). In 1955 negotiations were begun with the

intention of handing the estate over to the National Trust. This was accomplished in 1957. The gift included the greater part of the village and over 2000 acres of land. Mrs Russell continued to live in the village as a tenant of the Trust until her death in 1972.

During 1972-73 the Trust's collection of historic shrub roses was planted in the old walled garden. The property is presently renowned for this collection that comprises over 760 roses. Since 1975 events such as open air theatre and music concerts have taken place in the grounds. The farmland on the estate is managed predominantly for arable produce, and the woodlands continue to provide first-class shooting for a variety of game.

6.0 Conclusions

The Mottisfont estate appears to demonstrate the evolution of diverse landscape containing land that has been used long-term for arable, meadowland and woodland land uses. It is a rare example of a former monastic estate, with later accretions, that has survived intact, and is still managed from its original centre. There is evidence for prehistoric activity on lands just above the valley flood plains, but little direct evidence for Roman or early Saxon activity.

The manor of Mottisfont enters the historical record as a manor held by the Archbishop of York at the time of the Domesday Survey. It appears to be a place of some importance as there are a number of subsidiary chapels in the locality attached to its church. The Domesday Survey also seems to suggest the existence of hamlets at Dunbridge, and possibly Oakley. About 1200 William Briwer or Brewer founded a small Augustinian priory on his own manor in Mottisfont. This land was different to that held by York Cathedral, the latter manor became known as Mottisfont Treasury, as it provided revenue for the Treasurer of York Cathedral.

A rental written *c.* 1340 shows that the Augustinian manor of Mottisfont with Cadbury (as it became known) was a thriving community. Three open fields seem to be implied from the rental, South Field, North Field and West Field. Their approximate extents can be postulated. Recent research seems to suggest that the priory had retained most of the land of this manor in their own hands as demesne, leaving the numerous peasantry to make their living mainly as waged labour. After the Black Death, the monastery seems to have fallen on hard times. It was threatened with suppression in the late 15th century, but survived until the Dissolution of the lesser houses in 1536.

At the Dissolution, the estate was granted to William Sandys of the Vyne, who began the conversion of the priory buildings into a mansion. The Sandys family held the estate until 1684, making the house their main Hampshire residence with the sale of the Vyne in 1653. On the death of Edwin Sandys in 1684 the estate passed to the Mill family, and it passed by inheritance until 1934, when it was purchased by Mr and Mrs Gilbert Russell. The widowed Mrs Russell bequeathed the estate to the National Trust in 1957.

It is uncertain if the extensive woodlands on the estate are early. Many of the woods examined were found to have grown up over former quarried ground. This activity seems to have been extensive throughout the estate, and had begun before the Black Death as two quarry pits are mentioned in the *c.* 1340 rental. How far this activity increased after 1349 is not known, but many of the current quarries and woodlands seem to exist by the time of a map of 1724. Some of the quarries can be put down to specific industries. A brick or tile works existed on the estate from at least the 17th century, and only ceased operations early in the 20th century. 'Tile-' names in the *c.* 1340 rental suggest that tile-making may date back to medieval times. Other quarries were mainly marl and chalk pits. Gravel and sand pits also figure in the landscape. Extensive areas of these were being excavated early in the 20th century on Dunbridge Hill.

There is a lack of mention in any historical documents to common pasture within the manor. It is possible that the apparent high population in the area meant that this had been assarted at a date before records were made. A possible substitute was the extensive meadowlands on the estate, where common pasturing may have been practised after the hay crop had been removed. These seemed to have special status even in monastic times, as a large area of meadow was incorporated within the priory precinct. From *c.* 1700 water meadows are mentioned, but these seem to have covered only a limited area on the estate.

Descriptions of the estate in the late 19th century seem to suggest that many areas of former meadow were in a marshy, unimproved state. This may have been deliberate to accommodate sporting interests, which became increasingly important from the late 18th century. Shooting and fishing rights have since become an important source of income for the estate, particular in the river valley and amongst the estate's extensive woodlands. Arable farming remains the most important land use elsewhere on the estate.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 Recommendations for general management, further survey and research

No survey can ever be complete. It is inevitable that new archives and new sites will be discovered with the passage of time. Furthermore, one can not expect estate managers to take in too much detail at once. This report has done its best to try to highlight the more important aspects of Mottisfont's development. Inevitably there are areas where more detail could have been given, but a survey needs to have a sensible deadline to ensure the final document is produced with a reasonable period. It is, therefore, the purpose of this section to suggest areas where further survey and research might be undertaken, and make recommendations for general management.

Details of the general management principles, plus specific recommendations for built structures, are given in Appendices 4 & 5, and under the individual sites in the inventory in volume 2. Only broad outline recommendations are given here. There are only three estate specific recommendations that need urgent attention. These are listed below, before the more general

recommendations. Other less urgent recommendations are listed under individual sites in the inventory, as indicated above.

7.2 Management recommendations: those needing urgent attention

7.2.1. There is a tendency for historic quarries on the estate to be used for rubbish tipping. In particular, the management's attention is drawn to the extensive tipping in the quarry behind Hatt Farm. This has clearly been systematic and deliberately planned, possibly by a Trust tenant. Steps should be taken to prevent this activity, where feasible. In the case of the Hatt Farm Quarry, the rubbish should be removed and properly disposed of.

7.2.2. The stealing of garden furniture and ornaments (urns, statues, seats, even encaustic tiles) is on the increase. There are many examples of thieves using plant machinery to remove heavy objects. Mottisfont Abbey has a particularly fine and extensive collection of valuable urns and statuary. The management should be aware of this problem, and take steps to increase the security of the estate's gardens outside opening hours.

7.2.3. Vegetation on the island in the Mill Stream that forms part of the former mill site is likely to cause serious problems soon. Saplings have taken hold on the island, and their roots are causing damage to the masonry remains of the mill. This will get worse as the saplings grow, causing serious potential for damage from erosion during flood conditions. It is recommended that the saplings be cut down and treated to prevent regrowth. Other vegetation should be removed and its regrowth monitored. During vegetation removal, it is recommended that a survey of the upstanding remains of the mill is undertaken.

7.3 Management recommendations: general considerations

7.3.1 Integrity of the estate

Recommendation: Management should try to ensure that the integrity of the estate as a whole is preserved.

This goes beyond retaining the land as a single unit, but includes the preservation of all the features within it, not just those that are obviously historic such as the buildings. Old tracks, hedgerows and even old trees are as important in a landscape as historic buildings.

7.3.2 Trees

Recommendation: Historic recognition of trees should be extended to include all historic trees, including those not planted as part of designed landscaping.

The difference with trees in non-designed areas is that they do not necessarily need replacing if they die. It is often preferable that areas of historic woodland are allowed to regenerate naturally.

What is required of management, however, is that practices should not be adopted that will accidentally damage historic trees. This includes considerations such as the inappropriate siting of car parking in areas where this will cause root compaction to historic trees.

7.3.3 Hedgerows

Recommendation: Historic hedgerows and boundaries should be respected.

Some of the hedgerows on the Mottisfont estate are of great antiquity. These should be vigorously preserved, both as habitats and as historical boundary alignments. Where hedgerow trees are lost through natural causes, the management should consider their replacement. Care should be taken to ensure replacements are in keeping with the original hedge. Such statements may be obvious, but exotic species, even when they are closely related cultivars to native species, should not be encouraged.

It should be noted that, since June 1997, planning regulations have been introduced to protect hedgerows considered to be important. It is now an offence to grub up a hedgerow without applying to the local authority for permission. They, in turn, assess whether the hedgerow merits preservation, and gives a decision accordingly (Howard 1998). Further details can be found in Appendix 4, section 2.5.

7.3.4 Trackways

Recommendation: Historic trackways should be respected.

The ancient trackways of the Mottisfont estate are amongst some of its oldest features. It could be argued that many of the old tracks and lanes date to at least Saxon times, if not earlier. It is vital that they should not be harmed in any way. Diversions of old tracks for the convenience of motor vehicles should be particularly resisted.

Unfortunately, many of Mottisfont's old trackways have been converted to modern usage, often giving them inappropriate surfaces, allowing motorised use on them. There is little that can be done about much of this now, but undisturbed tracks should not be given this treatment in future.

7.3.5 Motorised vehicles

Recommendation: The use of non-essential motorised vehicles on the estate should be restricted.

This recommendation follows on from 7.3.4. Clearly the Trust's staff need to have access to certain areas, but the indiscriminate use of heavy motor vehicles can be devastating for archaeological remains. In particular heavy tractors and tracked vehicles carrying out forestry work can cause much damage to earthworks in woodland, as well as to the fragile nature of the ancient trackways on the estate. It is recommended that should such vehicles be needed in the

future they should keep to existing tracks, and not wander indiscriminately over potentially undisturbed areas. Forestry work in winter and wet weather can be particularly destructive as deep ruts are cut into the countryside. There should be clearly defined restrictions on non-essential vehicles using unmade tracks. The current craze for the pleasure driving of four-wheeled vehicles over unmade tracks should be actively discouraged on all National Trust property.

7.3.6 Staff awareness

Recommendation: All staff should be made aware of the need to report incidents likely to have impact on the historic aspects of the landscape.

The management should ensure that all staff should be aware of the need to protect the historic landscape and potential archaeological sites. This awareness needs to be extended to all field staff, especially those working out on the estate. The management might consider the need to extend this to tenant farmers. It is recommended that all outdoor staff, and possibly certain tenants, should attend an awareness meeting or lecture at regular intervals. Correctly organised, this only need to take up about 1.5 hours every two or three years, depending on staff turnover.

7.3.7 Farming practices

Recommendation: Farming practices should be monitored for impact on archaeological sites.

The management should be aware of any changes in current practice proposed by tenant farmers. Such changes should be reported to the Archaeological Advisers at Cirencester where a decision on the need for action can be taken. Any changes in ploughing techniques, the alteration of land use, or new drainage measures should be reported as a matter of course.

A particular problem on the Mottisfont estate is the dumping of unwanted materials in old quarry hollows. One example to the SW of Hatt Farm is especially bad. Tenant farmers should be actively discouraged from dumping, and should be required to contribute actively towards discouraging illegal fly-tipping in old estate quarries.

7.3.8 Forestry practices

Forestry practices should be monitored for archaeological impact.

The creation of new commercial timber areas can have wide-ranging effects on both the local ecology and archaeology. Any proposals in this area of work need to be reported to the Archaeological Advisers at Cirencester, who will decide if action needs to be taken. It is to be noted that forestry practices in areas let out to outside contractors can be particularly inappropriate for land held in trust for the nation. For example, the report on the Vyne estate in

Hampshire was critical of the Forestry Commission's management of part of that estate (Currie 1994). All outside contractors in this area of work should be carefully monitored.

7.3.9 Historic buildings

These recommendations apply to old farm buildings, such as barns, as well as houses. Further details of more specific recommendations applicable to certain categories of buildings are given in Appendix 3.

1. Any modifications or repairs affecting these structures should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.
2. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.
3. Historical fabric should not be removed from these buildings or their environs without consulting the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
4. Should below ground excavation be undertaken in the vicinity of these buildings, advice should be sought from the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
5. Repairs should be undertaken with appropriate period materials. Modern substitutes should not be used.
6. PVC and similar plastic window frames and doors are not suitable for National Trust vernacular buildings. If present, these should be replaced at the most convenient opportunity.
7. Re-roofing should take account of any original insulation used within the building. This should not be removed without prior consultation with the archaeological advisers at Cirencester. e.g. there have been instances on other estates where straw insulation in roofs has been removed without recording.
8. Repointing of masonry should be done with lime-based mortar. Generally, cement-based mortars should be avoided on historic buildings.

7.3.10 Metal detecting

Metal detecting should not be allowed on National Trust property.

Metal detecting is a growing hobby in the UK. It can cause considerable damage to archaeological sites. Unscrupulous users have even been known to cause serious damage to crops by their activities. Metal detecting should not be allowed on any National Trust land. Only in special circumstances can detecting be permitted, and then only if it is carried out under archaeological supervision, as part of a structured project approved by the Archaeological Advisers at the Estates Advisory Office.

7.4 Further survey

The type of archaeological and historic sites discovered at Mottisfont are not those that are most easily given to formal surveying. Nevertheless there are some areas, such as old quarries and woodbanks, where continued monitoring would be beneficial. In doing these works, it is possible that further sites might be discovered to add to our knowledge of Mottisfont's development, particularly in the earlier periods. The recommendations here are as follows:

7.4.1 Historic buildings

Recommendation: Detailed recording of historic buildings in advance of any structural alterations.

This is obvious for estates where the centrepiece is a country house, but recording should be extended to cover all vernacular buildings of historic interest on the estate. Those buildings that may conceal evidence of earlier structures should be carefully recorded. This should include the older farm buildings associated with the estate.

7.4.2 Ground disturbance

Recommendation: Recording of ground disturbances around the estate where appropriate

Should any services need installing or other works that require ground disturbance, monitoring of the trenches should be considered. To avoid wasting resources exploring areas where there is no reason to suspect archaeological remains, the management is advised to consult the archaeological advisers at Cirencester for guidance. In particular, this work may prove useful adjacent to any historic building.

7.4.3 Arable farmland

Recommendation: A monitoring programme of the evidence revealed by ploughing.

The discovery of prehistoric sites through observations made after ploughing frequently demonstrates continuity of land use back into the prehistoric periods. The fields ploughed at Mottisfont that were available for field scan during this survey were only a representative

selection of those that will be ploughed over a longer period. If more fields are ploughed in the future, it might be useful to monitor the disturbed soil for evidence of man's past activities.

If this recommendation is to be taken up, it is urged that field scanning (the identification of archaeological finds *in situ* without removing them from the field) only is undertaken. Field walking, whereby artefacts are removed from the field, should only be undertaken in special circumstances. Neither the National Trust or Hampshire Museum Services have the facilities for the storage of large collections of archaeological materials recovered by field walking.

7.4.4 The estate woodlands

Recommendation: A continuing monitoring programme for the estate woodlands.

The extent of the woodland, and the variability of the ground cover there, has only allowed a restricted walk-over of the area. A continuing monitoring programme of the woodland and former woodland areas under different conditions could continue to reveal archaeological sites missed during this survey. In particular the examination of root boles following the falling of trees after high winds can often reveal evidence for sites. Should any occurrences of uprooting of trees during high winds occur in future, it is recommended that the soils revealed be examined. This policy can be extended to cover all trees so threatened within the estate, whether in woodland or otherwise.

7.5 Further research

Areas that would benefit from further research include the following:

7.5.1 Further searches for previously unrecorded medieval and early post-medieval documents

It is possible that further research amongst the numerous Court Rolls surviving for Mottisfont could recover useful information. It is highly recommended that a thorough search is made, although the time required would make the cost prohibitive for a professional researcher. This work may only be attempted if a suitable volunteer, with a knowledge of medieval Latin and early post-medieval calligraphy, can be found.

7.5.2 Further research on pictorial evidence for Mottisfont

It is highly likely that there are a number of unseen pictures and photographs of Mottisfont in private collections. Continuing searches are sure to reveal more of these that could contribute to our understanding of the later history of Mottisfont.

7.5.3 Newspaper articles

Again, a thorough search of newspaper articles was beyond the brief of this work. As with the Court Rolls, the time factor makes this research impracticable for professional researchers. It is considered that it could make a useful project for a volunteer, or group of volunteers.

7.5.4 Oral history

Although oral testimony must always be viewed critically, it can be of use. It is possible that there are only a few years left to collect the testimony of those local people who remember Mottisfont earlier this century. It is important to collect this information before it is too late. Again this would make a useful project for a volunteer, guided by advice from the Trust's Regional Public Affairs' staff.

8.0 Archive

Copies of this report will be housed at the Estates Advisory Office at Cirencester, Glos., at the Regional Headquarters at Polesden Lacey, and at the property headquarters based at Mottisfont. The archaeological inventory that results from the survey will be added to the national computerised database currently being set up by the Trust.

Copies of the report are also to be placed in the Sites and Monuments Record of Hampshire County Council and the National Monuments Record, Swindon, Wiltshire.

9.0 Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are given to all those involved with this project. At the Estates Advisory Office in Cirencester, Caroline Thackray, acted as Archaeological Adviser to the project. Barry Futter, Property Manager, and Philip Marshall, Head Warden of the Mottisfont Estate, provided on-site guidance, assistance and facilities to carry out the research and fieldwork. Assistance was given by the property staff at Mottisfont, and at the Regional Headquarters at Polesden Lacey, Surrey.

Documentary information was obtained from the Hampshire Record Office in Sussex Street, Winchester. Sites and Monuments data was obtained from the Hampshire County Council SMR in the Planning Department at The Castle, Winchester, Hampshire. Thanks are given to the staff of both organisations for their assistance and advice.

10.0 References:

10.1 Original sources in the Hampshire Record Office (hereafter HRO):

HRO 13M63/1-108 Mottisfont Collection, documents relating to the Mottisfont Priory estate in Mottisfont from *c.* 1200-1850. The most useful documents in this collection are the various rentals, surveys and account books for the estate. Those considered to be the most valuable are:

HRO 13M63/3 Rental of priory estates *c.* 1340, giving considerable detail of field names etc.

HRO 13M63/15 List of documents relating to Sandys estates in 1613, summaries of contents of each document given, many now lost.

HRO 13M63/18 Survey of Mottisfont with Cadbury, 1629

HRO 13M63/39 Detailed rental of 1684

HRO 13M63/47 Particulars of manor of Mottisfont made for sale that did not take place, *c.* 1700

HRO 13M63/48-49 Account books, 1705-10, giving list of tenants and rents

HRO 13M63/54-55 Account books, 1715-17, 1720-21

HRO 13M63/56 Survey of estate, 1721

HRO 13M63/57 Account book, 1722-24

HRO 13M63/58 Survey of estate, 1726

HRO 13M63/59 Survey of estate, 1742

HRO 13M63/65-66 Account books, 1759-61

HRO 13M63/80 Account book, 1781-92

HRO 13M63/88 Late 18th-century summary of estate, brief but useful

HRO 13M63/109-22 Mottisfont Collection, documents relating to Mottisfont Treasury manor, 1677-1781

HRO 13M63/419 Mottisfont Collection, Mottisfont Court Books, 1711-1802

HRO 13M63/428 Report on alterations to the house by A R Rahbula, May 1937

HRO 13M63/438 Lenygon & Morant, estimates and correspondence for alterations to house, 1938

HRO 13M63/446 Extensive catalogue of photographs of Mottisfont Abbey and grounds, 19th/early 20th century, includes a copy of the 'earliest known print' of the house, with plan, dated 1743, air photographs of house, grounds and village from 1938-39, copies of early prints, pictures, and photographs of 19th-century date, and useful interpretive photographs (some showing hidden medieval walling) of interior parts of house with plaster etc removed, 1930s

HRO 24M65 Estate Records for Mottisfont, mainly 1939 onwards

HRO 56M71/E/B/80 Sale Particulars, Oakley Manor Farm, 1814, with map

HRO 53M72/T10, T19 Leases for Mottisfont brickworks, 1834, 1888

HRO 53M72/T22, Deed of exchange relating to Spearywell Farm, with map, 1849

HRO 53M72/T41, Vesting deed for glebe lands, 1927

HRO 69M78/M1-M6 Barker Mill Collection, documents relating to Barker Mill family estates, 1543-1701

HRO 69M78/M4 Survey of Mottisfont Abbey estate *c.* 1629

HRO 4M92 Documents relating to Barker Mill estates in former hands of solicitors, Tylee, Mortimer and Attlee, mainly 19th century

Maps in HRO:

HRO 13M63/420 Mottisfont Collection, map of Mottisfont Abbey estate with Cadbury, 1724

HRO 13M63/421 Mottisfont Collection, map of Mottisfont Treasury estate, 1760

HRO 137M71/PZ2 Enclosure map of Oakley Mead, 1790

HRO 38M72/PZ2 Enclosure map of Oakley Mead, 1790

HRO 56M71/E/B/80 Sale Particulars, Oakley Manor Farm, 1814, with map

HRO 21M65/F7/164/1-2 Tithe map and award for Mottisfont, 1839

HRO 21M65/F7/36/1-2 Tithe map and award for Broughton, 1837-38

HRO 53M72/T22 Deed of exchange concerning Spearywell Farm, with map of same, 1849

HRO 54M71/361 Parish map, 1886 (largely copied from tithe map)

Ordnance Survey maps in the HRO:

OS 6" sheet 48 (1871 ed)

OS 6" sheet 48NW (1897 ed)

OS 6" sheet 48NW (1911 ed)

OS 6" sheet 48NE (1910 ed)

10.2 Original sources in print

Calkins, R. G. 1986, 'Piero de' Crescenzi and the medieval garden', McDougall, E. B. (ed.), *Medieval gardens*, Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium, History of Landscape Architecture ix, Washington: Dumbarton Oaks, 157-73

K A Hanna (ed.), *The cartulary of Southwick Priory*, Hampshire Record Series nos. 9-10, 2 volumes, Winchester, 1988-89

E Hughes & P White (eds.), *The Hampshire Hearth Tax Assessment, 1665*, Hampshire Record Series no. 11, Winchester, 1991

B Langley, *New Principles of Gardening* London, 1728

G Markham *Cheape and good husbandry*, London, 1623 ed

10.3 Secondary sources

AC Archaeology, *Mottisfont estate, archaeological study*, unpublished report to National Trust, 1995

Anon, 'The Mottisfont eagles and their master', *Country Life*, January 21st 1899

H Avray Tipping, 'Mottisfont Priory, Hampshire', *Country Life*, November 19th 1921, 652-59

C J Bond, 'Water management in the urban monastery' in R Gilchrist & H Mytum (eds), *Advances in monastic archaeology*, British Archaeological Reports, British series no. 227, Oxford, 1993

J Chapman & S Seeliger, *A guide to enclosure in Hampshire 1700-1900*, Hampshire Record Series no. 15, Winchester 1997

E Course, 'Southampton Canal Tunnel', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 33 (1976), 73-78

J C Cox, 'Religious houses: Mottisfont' in W Page (ed), *The Victoria history of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, volume 2, London, 1903, 172-75

C K Currie, *Medieval fishponds in England; aspects of their origin, function, management and development*, unpublished MPhil thesis, University College, London, 1988

C K Currie, 'The role of fishponds in the monastic economy', R Gilchrist & H Mytum (eds), *The archaeology of rural monasteries* British Archaeological Reports, British series 182 (Oxford, 1989), 146-72

C K Currie, *The Vyne estate, Sherborne St. John, Hampshire: an archaeological survey*, unpublished report to The National Trust (Southern Region), 1994

C K Currie, 'Saxon charters and landscape evolution in the South-Central Hampshire Basin', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society*, 50 (1994), 103-25

C K Currie, *Polesden Lacey and Ranmore Common estates, near Dorking, Surrey: an archaeological survey*, unpublished report to the Southern Region of the National Trust, 3 vols, 1996

C K Currie, *A Historical and Archaeological Assessment of the Wey and Godalming Navigations and their Visual Envelopes*, unpublished report to the Southern Region of the National Trust, 5 vols, 1997

C K Currie, 'A possible ancient water channel around Woodmill and Gater's mills in the historic manor of South Stoneham', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 52 (1997), 89-106

C K Currie, 'Earthworks in St. Cross Park, near Winchester, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 53 (1998a), 169-82

C K Currie, 'Clent Hills, Worcestershire: an archaeological and historical survey', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, no 16 (1998b), 183-206

C K Currie & M Locock, 'Excavations at Castle Bromwich Hall, 1989-91', *Post-medieval archaeology* 27 (1993), 111-99

W Dale, 'Notes on Mottisfont Abbey', *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*, 2nd series, XXI (1907), 339-49

C Dyer, 'Dispersed settlements in medieval England. A case study of Pendock, Worcestershire', *Medieval Archaeology*, 34, (1990), 97-121

R Edwards, *Historic rural settlement in Hampshire - Test Valley*, unpublished report to Hampshire County Council, 1997

P Everson, 'The gardens of Campden House, Chipping Campden, Gloucestershire', *Garden History*, 17.2 (1989), 109-21

F Gasquet, 'Overlooked testimonies to the character of the English monasteries on the eve of their suppression', *The Dublin Review*, 114 (1894), 245-77

J P Greene, *Medieval monasteries*, Leicester, 1992

G B Grundy, 'The Saxon charters of Hampshire with notes on place and field names , parts 1-4', *Archaeological Journal*, 2nd series, xxvii (1921), 55-173; xxxi (1924), 31-126; xxxiii (1926), 91-253; xxxiv (1927), 160-340

Hants County Council, *Archaeology in Hampshire. Annual report for 1981*, Winchester 1981

P Henderson, 'Sir Francis Bacon's water gardens at Gorhambury', *Garden History*, 20.2 (1992), 116-31

M Hollings, O M Moger, & M Perry, 'Mottisfont', in W Page (ed), *The Victoria history of the county of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, volume 4, London, 1911, 503-11

K A Honess, *Mottisfont Abbey. A short history*, unpublished typescript, King Alfred's College, Winchester, 1976

B Howard, 'The hedgerow regulations 1997', *Hampshire Field Club & Archaeological Society newsletter*, new series no 29 (1998), 23-24

C Hussey, 'Mottisfont Abbey, Hampshire-part I', *Country Life*, April 29th 1954, 1310-13; 'Mottisfont Abbey, Hampshire-part II', *Country Life*, May 6th 1954, 1398-1401

J Hutchins, *The history and antiquities of the county of Dorset*, 4 vols, London, 1861-70

Institute of Field Archaeologists, *Standard and guidance for archaeological desk-based assessments*, Birmingham, 1994

R Meinertzhagen, *The diary of a black sheep*, London, 1964

National Trust, *Mottisfont Abbey. Historical survey of park and garden*, internal report, 1991 (revised 1993)

National Trust, *Mottisfont Abbey Archive*, unpublished archive of materials concerned with the property's history kept at Mottisfont Abbey, 1995

National Trust, *Guidelines on the archaeological & historic landscape survey of National Trust properties*, Cirencester, 1998

N Pevsner & D Lloyd, *The buildings of England. Hampshire and the Isle of Wight*, Harmondsworth, 1967

G F Prosser, *Select illustrations of Hampshire*, London, 1837

D A Roe, *Gazetteer of British Lower and Middle Palaeolithic sites*, CBA Research Report 8, London, 1968

RCHME (Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England), *An earthwork survey at the Duck Ground - Mottisfont, Hampshire*, unpublished RCHME report, 1998

RCHME (Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England), *Further investigations at the Duck Ground - Mottisfont, Hampshire*, unpublished RCHME report, 1999

N Rushton, *Land management and customal diversity on the estates of Mottisfont Priory in the 1340s*, unpublished paper (included here as Appendix 3), 1999

S Squires, *National Trust Vernacular Buildings Survey, Mottisfont Abbey Estate*, unpublished report to the Southern Region of the National Trust, 1993

C Taylor, P Everson, & R Wilson-North, 'Bodiam Castle, Sussex', *Medieval Archaeology*, XXXIV (1990), 155-57

C Thackray, *Brief for archaeological and historic landscape survey of the Mottisfont Estate, Hampshire*, unpublished National Trust report, 1998

C Tracy, 'Bindon Abbey. The post-Dissolution development of the site' in L Keen & A Carreck (eds), *Historic landscape of the Weld Estate, Dorset*, East Lulworth, 1987, 67-68

T E C Walker, 'The Clives at Claremont', *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, 65 (1968), 91-96

E Whittle, 'The Renaissance Gardens of Raglan Castle', *Garden History*, 17.1 (1989), 83-94

E Whittle & C Taylor, 'The early seventeenth-century gardens of Tackley, Oxfordshire', *Garden History*, 22.1 (1994), 37-63

P Willis, *Charles Bridgeman and the English Landscape Garden*, London, 1977

J J Wymer, *Gazetteer of Mesolithic sites in England and Wales*, CBA Research Report 20, London, 1977

10.4 Other sources:

County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) at the Planning Department, The Castle, Winchester, Hampshire

Appendix 1: Key to tithe map field numbers

In order to try to show how the estate was managed in the past, the groupings of fields are given as in the tithe award. This often reflects units of management (in the case of land retained in hand by the Barker Mill family) or individual farms. The Mottisfont tithe survey contains a rather high percentage of fields that are not named. These are often designated by a line crossed through the page after the tithe map number. This was not uncommon for tiny plots of land, but it is odd when applied to larger land units. The largest unnamed unit is number 195, a land unit of over 39 acres, and probably part of the old medieval North Field.

Abbreviations: A-arable; P-pasture; M-meadow; W-wood; F-furze; D-down; H-homestead; Wi-withies; G-garden; Pi-pit; Wa-water; FP-fir plantation; Pl-plantation; WM-water meadow

Map abbreviations: 1724 MC-Mottisfont with Cadbury Map; 1760 MT-c. 1760 Mottisfont Treasury; 1790 OE-Oakley Enclosure Map; 1813 OF-Oakley Farm Sale Map; OS-Ordnance Survey

Tithe map no.	Tithe award field name	acreage in acres rods & perches	land use	Other maps
---------------	------------------------	---------------------------------	----------	------------

From the Mottisfont tithe map & award (HRO 21M65/F7/164/1-2)

Sir John Barker Mill owns & occupies

191	Catshill	14-2-13	A	1724 MC
192	Catshill Row	0-2-38	W	1724 MC
262	not named	0-3-32	W	1724 MC
263	not named	1-2-7	A	1724 MC
317	Part Great Wallingtons	0-1-2	W	1724 MC
318	ditto	4-1-28	A	1724 MC
321	Chalk pit & row	0-3-24	W	1724 MC
322	Half Moon Piece	6-0-3	A	
324	Bounds Bottom Piece 6-2-39		FP	1724 MC
326	Town Field	7-1-6	A	1760 MT (Town Field)
398	Farm House	0-0-30	G	1724 MC
436	Gravel Pit	0-0-31	-	
443	Sims Farm	0-2-25	H	1760 MT (Barn stables yard)

445	Sims Farm House	0-0-31	G	1760 MT (The Manor House)
446	Home Field	11-3-6	A	1760 MT (Home Field)
463	Part of South Field	35-2-1	A	1760 MT (3 fields, Four Acre Close, The Sixteen Acres, The Seven Acres)
108	Part of Senates Copse	9-1-34	W	
111	ditto	9-1-20	W	
264	West Field Coppice	11-3-24	W	1724 MC
289	Old Kiln Ground	1-1-8	P	1724 MC
291	not named	0-3-36	W	1724 MC
450	Little Coppice	2-3-14	W	1724 MC
464	Bitten Grove Coppice	16-1-14	W	1724 MC; 1760 MT (Bitten Grove Coppice)
491	Pt of Drove Coppice	24-1-26	W	1724 MC
498	Hatchers Coppice	4-3-28	W	1724 MC
533	Long Coppice	6-3-35	W	
537	Sand Pits Coppice	6-1-24	W	
335	New garden	0-2-3	G	1724 MC
336	Kitchen garden	1-1-6	G	1724 MC
337	Late Carters	0-3-24	-	1724 MC
338	Pt of Connygaer	8-0-6	P	1724 MC
393	Dog Kennel & Yard	0-3-31	-	1724 MC
399	Barn, stable granary etc	0-1-26	-	1724 MC
403	Timber Yard	0-1-26	-	1724 MC
408	Hop Pit	0-1-18	G	1724 MC
444	Carpenters Shop & Yard	0-0-23	-	1760 MT
250	Near the Pound	0-0-20	FP	1724 MC
267	not named	4-1-32	FP	1724 MC
269	not named	5-1-19	FP	1724 MC
275	not named	5-3-27	FP	1724 MC
281	Black Row?	5-3-34	W	1724 MC
290	Clay Pits	0-1-8	-	1724 MC
319	Half Moon Field	0-2-22	FP	
323	Bounds Bottom	3-1-30	FP	1724 MC
489	Gorters	5-1-16	FP	1724 MC
181	Denates Meadow	11-3-15	P	1724 MC
299	Keepers House	0-1-35	-	1724 MC
341	Temple Meadow	10-1-24	P	1724 MC
342	not named	0-3-3	PI	1724 MC

343	not named	2-1-6	Pl	1724 MC
348	Withy Bed & old peat pits	2-2-21	Pi	1724 MC
349	Peat Pits	1-0-37	Wa	1724 MC
350	Drying Ground	0-2-0	P	1724 MC
357	River to Engine House			1724 MC
358	not named	1-0-26	Pl	1724 MC
359	not named	0-2-6	Pl	1724 MC
360	Four Acres	4-3-3	M	1724 MC
361	not named	2-3-8	Pl	1724 MC
362	The Island	3-1-16	Pl	1724 MC
364	The Island	2-3-12	Pl	1724 MC
367	Withy Bed	0-1-24	Wi	1724 MC
380	Lodge & yard	0-0-7	-	1724 MC
381	Plantation	0-1-21	G	1724 MC
383	not named	0-2-17	G	1724 MC
384	Withy Bank	0-1-8	Pl	1724 MC
385	not named	6-2-2	P	1724 MC
388	not named	1-2-18	Pl	1724 MC
390	Park, lawn etc	11-0-3	G	1724 MC
391	Pleasure gardens	3-0-18	G	1724 MC
392	Stables etc	0-3-38	-	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns & occupies; tithe free land

107	Black Pits Coppice	31-3-27	W	1724 MC
119	Speary Well Wood	34-1-24	W	1724 MC
217	Coal Coppice	15-3-4	W	1724 MC
220	not named	1-2-4	W	1724 MC
258	Masons Coppice	11-3-20	W	1724 MC
266	Cadbury Wood	38-0-22	W	1724 MC
268	Scrubs Row	4-0-14	W	1724 MC
270	Elizabeth Coppice	5-1-17	W	1724 MC
274	Pt of Elizabeth Coppice	0-3-26	W	1724 MC
490	Pt of Drove Coppice	3-2-12	W	1724 MC
120	Black Pits Firs	6-1-14	Pl	1724 MC
218	North Heath	8-0-6	Pl	1724 MC
219	not named	1-3-15	Pl	1724 MC
221	not named	1-1-38	Pl	1724 MC
276	Pt of West Field	1-1-38	Pl	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, James Gilbert occupies

78	Great Ground Row	0-3-0	W	
79	Great Ground	14-3-13	A	1813 OF (Great Ground)
80	Hassock	4-1-32	P	1813 OF
81	High Hook	0-0-18	H	1813 OF
82	Cottage & garden	0-0-28	G	1813 OF
83	Six Acres	7-1-24	P	1813 OF (Little Ground)
84	Six Acres Row	0-1-2	W	1813 OF
85	Long Ground	8-2-10	P	1813 OF (Long Ground)
86	Long Ground Row	0-3-15	W	1813 OF
126	Newlands Coppice	10-2-9	W	1813 OF (Newlands Coppice)
134	Newlands Row	3-0-2	W	1813 OF
135	Newlands	6-1-14	A	1813 OF (Newland)
136	Newlands Row	0-1-8	W	1813 OF
139	Great Coppice	30-1-24	W	1813 OF (Great Coppice)
140	Seven Acres Row			1813 OF
141	Pt of Hassocks South	2-3-21	P	1813 OF
142	Round Coppice	7-2-22	W	1813 OF (Round Coppice)
143	Gravel Close	24-2-27	A	1813 OF (Gravelly Close 16-0-14)
144	Seven Acres	7-1-0	A	1813 OF (Upper Twelve Acres 15-2-28)
145	Seven Acres Row	0-0-27	W	1813 OF
146	Upper Twelve Acres	13-3-16	A	1813 OF (Upper Twenty Acres 19-1-21)
151	Yew-tree Pit Field Row	0-3-12	W	1813 OF
152	Yew-tree Pit Field	15-0-1	A	1813 OF (Lower Twenty Acres 12-1-20)
153	Yew-tree Pit	0-3-35	P	1813 OF (Yew Tree Pit)
154	Shepards Garden Pit	0-3-12	W	1813 OF (Hop Pit)
155	Lower Twelve Acres Row			1813 OF
156	Lower Twelve Acres Row	1-1-22	W	1813 OF
157	Lower Twelve Acres	13-1-16	A	1813 OF (Twelve Acres)
158	Lower Twelve Acres Row North	0-1-6	W	1813 OF
159	Queens Mead Coppice	15-0-30	W	1813 OF (Queen Mead Coppice)
160	Queens Mead	13-2-1	P	1813 OF (Queen Meadow)
162	Pt of Oakley Mead	1-3-7	P	1813 OF (Little Meadow)
163	Oakley Coppice	14-2-25	W	1813 OF (Oakley Meadow Coppice)
164	Brook Ground	4-2-8	A	1813 OF (Brook Little Ground)

165	Long Meadow	4-1-25	P	1813 OF (Rough Cow Pasture)
166	Cow Pasture Field	5-2-17	A	1813 OF
167	ditto	1-1-27	P	1813 OF
168	ditto	2-1-31	A	1813 OF (Cow Pasture Field)
169	River			
170	Cow Pasture	8-1-2	P	1813 OF (Rough Cow Pasture & Hollow Pollard Meadow)
171	Oakley Farm	0-1-37	G	1813 OF
172	Oakley Farm House	0-1-17		1813 OF
173	Oakley Farm	0-2-11	H	1813 OF
174	Hog Mead	6-1-34	WM	1813 OF (Hay Moor Meadow & Great Meadow)
180	Paddock	2-3-34	P	1813 OF (Rackets)
182	Labourer's Cottage	0-0-39	G	1813 OF
183	House Piece	14-0-37	A	1813 OF (Home Field, Rickyard Piece & Horse Piece)
184	Little Racketts	4-0-26	A	1813 OF (Middle Rackets)
185	ditto	2-1-12	P	1813 OF (Middle Rackets)
186	Twenty Acres	21-3-34	A	1813 OF (Ten, Eight, & Seven Acres)
187	Pit & Row	0-1-3	W	1813 OF
189	Great Racketts	8-1-33	A	1813 OF (Great Rackets)

Total this holding (Oakley Farm): 314-2-21 acres

Sir John Barker Mill owns, James Gilbert occupies

190	Monks Ground	17-1-8	P	
-----	--------------	--------	---	--

Sir John Barker Mill owns, George King occupies

292	Brick Kiln Field	7-1-8	P	1724 MC
315	Wallington Row	0-2-8	W	1724 MC
316	Great Wallingtons	16-3-32	A	1724 MC
447	Chalk Pit & Row	0-1-18	W	1724 MC
448	Halt Close	23-2-14	A	1724 MC
465	Pt of South Field	16-3-31	A	1724 MC
466	Rendalls Ham	3-3-19	P	1724 MC; 1760 MT (Ranal Ham)
467	Poor House Close	7-1-19	A	1724 MC
472	Gardeners Pit	0-2-1	A	1724 MC
473	Gardeners Field	9-2-3	A	1724 MC

474	Chalk Pit	0-1-32	-	1724 MC
475	Home Paddock	2-1-5	A	1724 MC
476	Orchard	0-1-36	P	1724 MC
477	Halt Farm House	0-1-15	G	1724 MC
478	Halt Farm	0-2-27	H	1724 MC
481	Halt Farm Garden	0-0-26	-	1724 MC
484	Paddock	1-0-30	P	1724 MC
485	House Close	9-0-21	A	1724 MC
486	House Field	4-3-3	A	1724 MC
487	Twelve Acres	14-0-1	A	1724 MC
488	not named			1724 MC
492	Great Dolands	24-0-15	A	1724 MC
493	Barn Close	14-1-35	A	1724 MC
494	Little Dolands	16-0-14	A	1724 MC
496	Broom Close Row	0-0-33	W	1724 MC
497	Broom Close	16-0-37	A	1724 MC
499	Upper Sponden Mead	7-1-9	P	1724 MC
501	Lower Sponden Mead	7-1-9	P	1724 MC
503	Wine Mead	3-1-35	P	1724 MC
504	Dairy House	0-0-16	G	1724 MC
505	ditto	0-0-13	G	1724 MC
506	Barn, cowhouses & yard	0-2-8	H	1724 MC
507	Yard Paddock	1-3-29	P	1724 MC
523	Upper Dunbridge Meadow	4-2-23	M	1724 MC
524	Hatch Paddock	1-0-11	P	1724 MC
526	Lower Dunbridge Meadow	7-1-20	M	1724 MC

Total for this holding (Halt Farm): 226-1-33 acres

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Henry Paice occupies

304	Picked Close Row	0-1-18	W	1724 MC
305	Picked Close	2-2-15	A	1724 MC
306	Picked Row			1724 MC
307	Middle Field	3-3-34	A	1724 MC
308	Green Field	3-3-17	A	1724 MC
309	Green Field Row	0-0-23	W	1724 MC
312	Little Close	0-1-36	A	1724 MC
313	Little Close Row	0-1-11	W	1724 MC
325	not named	2-1-2	A	1724 MC
334	Malt House, Stable, Yard	0-0-38	-	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Samual Osman occupies

425	Pt of Hind Meadow	0-1-32	G	1760 MT (pt of Hine Meadow)
427	ditto	1-1-34	P	1760 MT (pt of Hine Meadow)
429	ditto	1-3-3	P	1760 MT (pt of Hine Meadow)
430	ditto	2-3-36	P	1760 MT (pt of Hine Meadow)
432	ditto	0-1-11	G	1760 MT (pt of Hine Meadow)

Sir John Barker Mill owns, John Delacourt occupies

242	Garden	0-0-13	G	1724 MC
243	Cottage & garden	0-1-6	G	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Moses Edney occupies

404	Garden	0-0-14	G	1724 MC
405	Dog & Partridge Inn	0-0-27	-	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Thomas Grace occupies

251	Garden	0-0-14	G	1724 MC
253	Cottage & garden	0-0-28	-	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Thomas Marks occupies

112	Colins Close Row	0-2-1	W	
113	Colins Close	4-3-1	A	
114	not named	0-0-22	H	
115	Orchard	0-0-22	P	
116	Two tenements	0-0-27	-	

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Edward Moody occupies

457	House, buildings, yard	0-1-21	-	1724 MC
458	Orchard	0-1-24	P	1724 MC
459	Orchard & Pit	0-2-25	P	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, John Bailey occuppies; tithe free land

230	Pt of Cadbury Farm	2-3-30	P	1724 MC
-----	--------------------	--------	---	---------

Sir John Barker Mill owns, John Bradley occuppies; tithe free land

229	Pt of Cadbury Farm	2-1-4	P	1724 MC
237	Little Bunny Leaze	2-1-4	P	1724 MC
238	Brick Kiln, Pits, & Yard	1-3-8	-	1724 MC
239	not named	0-1-35	G	1724 MC
240	ditto	2-3-33	A	1724 MC
241	House & garden	0-0-9	-	1724 MC
247	not named	0-0-19	G	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, John Brown occuppies; tithe free land

366	Pt of Plain Meadow	4-2-35	P	1724 MC
368	ditto	1-2-26	P	1724 MC
369	ditto	0-0-17	P	1724 MC
374	ditto	1-1-9	M	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, William Edney occuppies; tithe free land

231	Home Field	13-3-13	A	1724 MC
232	Cadbury Farm	0-1-24	H	1724 MC
233	Cadbury Farm House	0-2-39	G	1724 MC
234	Great Rye Close	7-1-26	A	1724 MC
235	Pinnocks Field	7-1-16	A	1724 MC
236	Pinocks Field Row	2-3-24	W	1724 MC
254	not named	0-1-17	W	1724 MC
255	ditto	5-2-31	A	1724 MC
256	ditto	0-0-25	W	1724 MC
257	ditto	0-0-27	W	1724 MC
259	ditto	0-0-26	W	1724 MC
260	Middle Oak Field	4-0-26	P	1724 MC
261	Middle Oak Field Row	0-0-32	W	1724 MC

265	Upper Oak Field	6-1-7	A	1724 MC
271	Elizabeth Mead Row	0-3-15	W	1724 MC
272	Elizabeth Mead	3-3-20	P	1724 MC
273	Elizabeth Mead Row	0-2-0	W	1724 MC
277	West Field Row	0-0-29	W	1724 MC
278	West Field	22-2-3	A	1724 MC
279	West Field Row	0-3-38	W	1724 MC
280	ditto	0-0-16	W	1724 MC
281	Black Row	5-3-34	W	1724 MC
283	not named	0-0-35	W	1724 MC
284	ditto	8-2-12	A	1724 MC
285	Five Acres	5-1-2	A	1724 MC
286	ditto	0-2-16	W	1724 MC
287	Great Oak Field Row	0-2-16	W	1724 MC
288	Great Oak Field	11-2-29	A	1724 MC
297	Keepers Ground	5-2-10	A	1724 MC
298	Gravel Pit	0-3-38	-	1724 MC
301	not named	0-1-22	W	1724 MC

Total for this holding (Cadbury Farm): ??

Sir John Barker Mill owns, James Carter occupies; tithe free land

373	Pt of Mill Mead	4-2-26	M	1724 MC
377	ditto	1-3-6	P	1724 MC
378	ditto	2-2-20	M	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Thomas Coombs occupies; tithe free land

371	Pt of Mill Meadow	10-3-16	WM	1724 MC
372	Withy Bed	0-1-10	PI	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, John Edney occupies; tithe free land

355	Pt of Peat Meadow	2-3-30	P	1724 MC
356	ditto	3-1-19	P	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, James Jewell occupies; tithe free land

351	Pt of Peat Meadow	1-3-20	P	1724 MC
353	ditto	2-0-10	P	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Thomas Marks occupies; tithe free land

118	Pond Close	1-2-13	A	1724 MC
-----	------------	--------	---	---------

Sir John Barker Mill owns, John Mersh occupies; tithe free land

121	Friths Close	3-1-4	P	1724 MC
122	Garden	0-0-23	G	1724 MC
123	Row	0-0-24	W	1724 MC
124	Cottage & garden	0-1-20	-	1724 MC
125	Paddock	0-1-24	P	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Martha Osman occupies; tithe free land

345	Pt of Peat Meadow	2-3-13	P	1724 MC
347	Old Peat Pits & Withy	2-0-9	Pl	1724 MC
353	Pt of Peat Meadow	1-3-26	P	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, John Rogers occupies; tithe free land

176	By Hatch			1724 MC
177	Pt of Peat Meadow	1-0-18	P	1724 MC
365	Pt of Plain Mead	1-3-28	P	1724 MC
370	ditto	0-3-2	P	1724 MC
375	ditto	0-1-2	P	1724 MC
382	ditto	4-0-9	P	1724 MC

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Rev O D St John occupies; tithe free land

379	Mill or Dog Mead	3-2-25	M	1724 MC
-----	------------------	--------	---	---------

Trustees of the Stockton Charity own, John Edney occupies

127	Aldermoor Coppice	6-1-18	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
-----	-------------------	--------	---	----------------

128	Coppice Close Row			OS 6", 1871 ed
129	Cobbett Close	7-0-25	A	OS 6", 1871 ed
130	Cobbett Close Row	0-1-22	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
131	Levers Well	2-3-1	P	OS 6", 1871 ed
132	Lower Drove	1-1-12	P	OS 6", 1871 ed
133	Bushy Coppice	9-1-6	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
193	Chalk Pit & Row	0-1-7	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
195	not named	39-0-7	A	OS 6", 1871 ed
196	Brown Close Row			OS 6", 1871 ed
197	Birch? Coppice	13-1-36	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
198	Upper Drove	0-3-6	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
199	Upper Bottom Piece	9-1-39	A	OS 6", 1871 ed
200	Row & Pit	0-2-14	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
201	Lower Bottom Close Row	0-2-10	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
202	Herless Row	0-1-29	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
203	Lower Herless	4-3-15	P	OS 6", 1871 ed
204	Little Herless	4-0-14	P	OS 6", 1871 ed
205	Upper Herless	10-0-35	A	OS 6", 1871 ed
206	Queen Coppice	6-1-21	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
207	Nine Acres	10-1-32	A	OS 6", 1871 ed
208	Long Close	10-1-33	A	OS 6", 1871 ed
209	Long Close Row	0-1-26	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
210	Two Acres	1-3-10	A	OS 6", 1871 ed
211	Speary Well Farm House	0-0-37	G	OS 6", 1871 ed
212	Orchard	0-0-38	P	OS 6", 1871 ed
213	Speary Well Farm	0-2-7	H	OS 6", 1871 ed
244	Upper Herless Row	0-0-31	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
314	Herless Coppice	11-0-30	W	OS 6", 1871 ed
320	Chalk Pit	0-0-38	-	OS 6", 1871 ed

Total for this holding (Spearywell Farm): 153-3-0 acres

Rev O D St John owns & occupies (Glebe Lands)

423	Lower Parsons Hill	9-1-10	A	MT 1760
424	not named	0-0-33	Pl	MT 1760
428	Pt of Hind Meadow	0-1-23	P	MT 1760
431	ditto	0-3-4	P	MT 1760
433	Parsons Hill	13-0-5	A	MT 1760

From the Broughton tithe map & award (HRO 21M65/F7/36/1-2)

Sir John Barker Mill owns, James Gilbert occupies

474 Meadow 3-3-32 P 1790 OE

Sir John Barker Mill owns, James Jewell occupies

470 Meadow 2-1-10 P 1790 OE

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Martha Osman occupies

467 Meadow 3-3-38 P 1790 OE

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Sam Osman occupies

468 Meadow 6-3-6 P 1790 OE

Sir John Barker Mill owns, Thomas Pearce occupies

461 Meadow 2-0-3 P 1790 OE

463 Pasture 7-0-1 P 1790 OE

Appendix 2: The Mottisfont Rental

The following is a transcription of the Mottisfont section of the Mottisfont Rental of c. 1340 (HRO 13M63/3). No attempt has been made here to relate details of the other priory estates listed later in this document. The translation, with comments, was prepared by Neil Rushton BA MA for CKC Archaeology. Editing, for inclusion herein, was by C K Currie.

Folio 1r

Motesfonte

Within the close of this monastery (*cenobium*) is a certain fountain (*fons*) from which there is a pond (*stagnum*) with two water mills which provides service and easement for various officials within the court, and it is valued at 60s pa.

There are also in the same place two gardens - *Magnum Gardinum* and *Coumbesorchard*. They are valued with pasture in the same place 30s pa.

Item there are two curtilages, one within the close and one without - value 6/8d pa.

Item a certain pasture called *La Condrove* with enclosed pasture - value 6/8d pa.

Item a certain place (*placea*) within the infirmary close of fruit trees and meadow - value 6/8d pa.

Item a small piece of meadow belonging to the Sacristan - value 2s pa.

Item a certain *mansum* with meadow at the tannery - value 13/4d

Item there are also two dovecotes here - value 13/4d

Also at the same place is held the prerequisites of the court and the assize of cloth and beer - value 20s pa.

Folio 1v

Likewise there is in the same place a certain meadow called *La Southmede* containing [21 acres crossed out] 18 acres.

Likewise there is in the same place a certain place called *La Chalfhamme* containing 4 1/2 acres.

Likewise there is in the same place a certain place called *Le Orchardeshamme* containing 4 1/2 acres.

Likewise there is also within the close (*clausum*) a certain meadow called *La Northmede* with a headland (*cum foreta*) containing 49 acres of meadow.

And in the same place is a certain place called Middlemede containing 20 acres.

Likewise there is at *Okelegh* lying in diverse places containing 10 1/2 acres.

Likewise next to *Okelegh* [is] a certain meadow which is called *Abbeyshamme* containing [blank].

Likewise there is at *Cadebury* a piece of meadow called *Aylesburyesmede* containing 4 1/2 acres.

Likewise at *Bentlegh* [is] 1/2 acre of meadow.

Item at *Strode* one piece of meadow - it contains 1 1/2 acres.

Dunbrigge

Item a meadow within the close next to the barn (*granam*) called *Chalkpark* - it contains 10 acres.

Folio 2r

Land of *Cadbury*, *Mottisfont*, *Strode* and *Bentley* measured and divided at three sowings...
(*Terra de Cadebury, Motesfonte, Strode & Bentelegh mensurata & divisa ad tria seia put comodius & domo fieri posset per frem Walteru le Blout celerarium forincecum*)

Cadbury at the first sowing (*Cadeburi ad unum semen*)

At the same place a field called *Le Westfeld de Cadebury* it contains in total 61 acres 1 perch and 10 *perticatas*.

There is a place next to *Cadbury* called *Aylesburyaere* it contains 4 acres and 20 perches.

A place at *Bentley* called *Feywynescroft* or *Pykedcroft* it contains arable land 7 1/2 acres 1 perch 4 *perticatas*

Another place at *Bentley* called *Le Southlond* it contains 25 acres.

A place at *Cadbury* called *Ayrchesacre* it contains 4 1/2 acres and 8 *perticatas*.

In *Le Northfeld de Motesfonte* in the greater southern part 2 1/2 acres 1 perch 24 *perticatas*.

There is also here a place called *Le Puchalne* it contains 1/2 acre 1 perch 5 *perticatas*.

There is also here a place called *La Longehalne* it contains 1 1/2 acres 1 perch 13 *perticatas*.

Folio 2v

In the same place a place called *Walynghon* it contains 4 1/2 acres 22 *perticatas*.

In the same place a place called *Herlegh* it contains 16 acres 20 *perticatas*.

In the same place a place called *Houndestyle* it contains 3 acres 30 *perticatas*.

Cadbury at another sowing (*Cadeburi ad aliud semen*)

There is in the same place lying between the King's road & the Cellarer's Hedge from the northern part 20 1/2 acres 1 perch and 29 *perticatas*.

Also here a furlong between *Donnyngesok* & *Stykelinche* it contains 6 acres 1 perch 15 *perticatas*.

Ibid a furlong extending above *Dunnyngsok* it contains 8 acres 15 *perticatas*.

A furlong called *Stykelynych* it contains 5 acres 25 *perticatas*.

A place called *Le Celreresare* it contains 4 acres.

A furlong from the nether part of the prior's quarry it contains 4 acres 34 *perticatas*.

A furlong between the prior's meadow (*hayam*) and the cellarer's meadow it contains 3 1/2 acres 34 *perticatas*.

A place called *Prioresaker* it contains 6 acres 20 *perticatas*.

A furlong abutting *Nywegate* north of the road it contains 3 1/2 acres 18 *perticatas*.

A place of arable land called *La Strode* it contains 9 1/2 acres 1 perch 20 *perticatas*.

A place in *La Southfeld de Motesfonte* called *Tylerslond* it contains 4 1/2 acres 1 perch 23 *perticatas*.

In the same place a place called *Poynesaket* and it is the headland and it contains 1/2 acre 1 perch 12 *perticatas*.

In the same place a furlong which was of Matildis de Halle it contains 4 acres 1 perch 16 *perticatas*.

Ibid a place called *Le Schepherdelond* it contains 1 1/2 acres 18 *perticatas*.

Folio 3v

Cadbury at the third sowing (*Cadebury ad tercium semen*)

There is also a furlong extending above *Le Stokwelle* in the southern part of the Prior's oak it contains 9 acres 18 *perticatas*.

A place called *La Deneaker* it contains 1/2 acre 1 perch 30 *perticatas*.

A furlong called *Le Scherteforlang* next to Prior's Oak containing 3 acres and 1 perch.

A furlong at the head of the southern part of *Sherteforlang* it contains 4 1/2 acres 32 *perticatas*.

A furlong extending above *La Lege* next to *Denebruggeshegge* it contains 4 1/2 acres 1 perch 10 *perticatas*.

A furlong called *La Shertelond* abutting above the hedge of Peter de Denebrugge it contains 11 acres.

A furlong in the southern part of the road which runs towards *Newegate* it contains 4 1/2 acres 1 perch 2 *perticatas*.

A furlong extending above *Hurtheslane* it contains 11 acres.

A furlong which extends continuously along the road to *Le Tylcroft* within the gate of Cadbury along the southern part of the road. It contains 6 acres 1 perch 24 *perticatas*.

A furlong abutting above *Le Stokwelle* it contains 8 acres.

There is a small piece of land extending above the wood of Peter de Denebrugge.

Folio 4r

There is a place called *Le Tylcroft* it contains 2 1/2 acres 1 perch 10 *perticatas*.

Also a croft containing four furlongs.

A furlong called *Droveforlong* it contains 7 1/2 acres 26 1/2 *perticatas*.

A furlong extending to *La Dene* all along the gate and ditch to the head of *Les Fiveacres* it contains 3 1/2 acres 7 *perticatas*.

A furlong extending from the cow-house (*vaccaria*) all the way to *La Deene* it contains 6 acres 1 1/2 perches 9 *perticatas*.

A furlong behind the stable of the carter called *Le Scherteforlang* it contains 2 1/2 acres.

A field called *Les Fiveacres*, a furlong called *Le Hevedforlang* next to *Le Hereweeye* abutting above the garden of Ade Putefast it contains 2 acres 1 perch 14 *perticatas*.

1 furlong called *Le Netherforlang* it contains 6 1/2 acres 33 *perticatas*.

Folio 5r

John le Lernynggrom holds by free charter in the village of Motesfonte one messuage at La Greyvhull with an adjacent curtilage free of services for the term of his life and Edith his wife. They owe rent at the four terminals of the year 10s. And they ought to make payment at the court of the lord.

Alexander le Heliere holds as John for the term of his life and Petronilla his wife 10s 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Petrus Colston has a messuage at *La Greyvhulle* with a curtilage adjacent free for the term of his life and Cecil his wife rent 14s. 4 terms/payable to the lord.

Stephen le Sapere holds a messuage in which he stays which was formerly Augustium le Hayward free for the term of his life and his wife Agnetis rent 3s pa. 4 terms/payable to the lord.

Stephen and his wife Agnetis hold one messuage with adjacent curtilage which Cecil le Kayes formerly held free for the term of life rent 6/8d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Agnes la Rede holds a messuage freely for term of her life rent 2s. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord. Also

Folio 5v

she pays 3/4d pa for the lighting of candles for St. Mary of Motesfonte at two terms namely Easter and Michelmas - and she pays 6s to [?] at the aforesaid terms.

Henry atte Hurst holds one messuage freely for term of his life and Avicie his wife - rent 3s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord. Also they pay for the lighting of a torch (*tortica*) at the altar 12s at Michelmas.

Thomas South holds a messuage freely for term of his life with Isabell his wife - rent 8s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord. Also rent 6d pa for torches at the altar.

Johannes le Tynekere holds a messuage and tenement from Thomas South and a tenement from William la Tournour freely for the term of his life and that of his wife Juliane and John his son. Rent 2/6d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Richard atte Dych holds one messuage with a small croft next to it, freely for the term of his life. Rent 3s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Folio 6r

John de Wycchebury holds one messuage which was formerly held by Walter Pipard, chaplain, freely for the term of his life. Rent 5s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Robert Lumbard holds one messuage which he holds freely for term of his life and Matilda his wife. Rent 3/4d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John de Nhusted [sic] holds one messuage with a curtilage next to it which was Nicholas Guerard's freely for term of his life and his wife Agnes. Rent 2s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John de Juyugho [sic] holds a cottage next to the tenement of Richard Joup freely for term of his life. Rent 20d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

William de Pattlesholte holds one messuage in the corner freely for term of his life. Rent 4s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John le Tynekere holds one messuage freely for term of his life. Rent 2/6d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Robert Ruffegray holds one messuage which was formerly held by Juliane Lumbard freely for term of his life. Rent [not give].

Folio 6v

Henry de Schyfford holds one cottage next to the messuage of the aforesaid Robert Ruffegray freely for term of his life.

William le Freyusche holds one messuage which was John Martyn's with a garden and curtilage next to it and 2 acres of land in *La Southfeild* freely for term of his life. Rent 9s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Master Richard de Aulton rector of the church of Mottisfont holds a place with the court from opposite the garden formerly Coumbe freely for term of his life. Rent 2s pa at Christmas and St John the Baptist's day.

Folio 7r

John Seleman holds one messuage which Luke Morton once held for term of his life. Rent 4s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John le Frend holds one part of a messuage formerly Richard le Boghyere for term of his life and Matilda his wife by the calculation of court. Rent 3s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Agnes le Boghyere holds one part of the aforesaid messuage for term of her life by calculation of court. Rent 2s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

William le Palmere holds one part of the said messuage for term of his life and Diote [sic] his wife by calculation of court. Rent 4s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Robert Lumbard holds one cottage with 1 acre of land adjacent to it between the tenement of John Martyn and the tenement of John le Brond for term of his life and his wife Matilda. Rent 3/6d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John le Kyng - Tayllour holds one cottage in the corner for term of his life by calculation of court. Rent 2/4d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

The same John holds two parts of the tenement formerly of Robert le Couherde by calculation of court for term of his life and Agnes his wife. Rent 5s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John atte Schute holds a third part of the said tenement for term of his life and Lucie his wife by calculation of court. Rent 4s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Folio 7v

Johanna who was the wife of Ade le Tannere holds one cottage with an adjacent curtilage for the term of his life by calculation of court. Rent 2s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John Clarbolt holds one cottage with a curtilage for term of his life by calculation of court. Rent 2s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Alice de Clere holds one cottage with curtilage for term of her life by calculation of court. Rent 2s pa. 4 terms/*et faciet sectam*....

Agnes de Merssche holds one cottage with a curtilage for term of her life by calculation of court. Rent 18d pa. 4 terms/to pay...

John le Saghyere holds one cottage with curtilage for term of his life by calculation of court. Rent 2s pa. 4 terms/to pay...

Robert Poydras holds one messuage with curtilage next to it and 1 acre of land in *La Southfelde* for term of his life and Margaret his wife by calculation of court. Rent 3s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord. And he is to help in washing and keeping the lord's sheep.

The same Robert holds 2 cottages elsewhere in the western part of the messuage with a curtilage next to it for term of his life and Margaret his wife by calculation of court. Rent 20d pa. 4 terms.

The same Robert holds one piece of land where his *rakka* [rack for feeding animals?] is situated in *la Southfelde* for term of his life and Margaret his wife by calculation of court. Rent 12d at the feast of Michelmas.

Alicia Lucas holds a cottage with curtilage for term of her life by calculation of court. Rent 4s pa. To pay at St. Mary's feast and 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John le Muleward holds one cottage with curtilage and one acre

Folio 8r

of land in *La Northfelde* for term of his life and Alice his wife by calculation of court. Rent 4s pa. To pay at St. Mary's feast and 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John le Mareschal holds one messuage and adjacent curtilage and [?] acre of land in *Le Southfeld* for term of his life by calculation of court. Rent 10s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

Richard le Fryman holds one cottage and 1 1/2 acres of land for term of his life and Edith his wife by calculation of court. Rent 5s pa. 4 terms and he is to come to the court of the lord twice a year.

Peter Corny holds one cottage and one acre of land for term of his life by calculation of court. Rent 4s pa. 4 terms and he is to come to the court of the lord twice a year.

Folio 8v

John Dunnok holds at the will of the lord one cottage with curtilage which was formerly held by John Poumre. Rent 2s pa 4 terms/make payment...

Alicia Kerverose holds at the will of the lord 1 cottage with curtilage formerly held by Agnes Verite. Rent 2s 2d pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John le Mareschal holds at the will of the lord one place called *Le Marlyngputte*. Rent 4d pa. 4 terms.

Roger le Cocke holds one cottage with curtilage at the will of the lord. Rent 3s pa. 4 terms and he comes to the court of the lord twice a year.

Walter Scadde holds one croft of a certain Payn at the will of the lord. Rent 2s pa. 4 terms.

John le Bolt - *Sciswon* holds at the will of the lord one part of a tenement formerly of William le Tornor. Rent 6s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John de Chalke, baker, holds at the will of the lord one part of a tenement formerly William Tornor. Rent 7s pa. 4 terms/payable at the court of the lord.

John Savvey holds at the will of the lord one croft formerly of the said William Tornor lying at the head of the curtilage formerly of the said William. Rent 2s pa at Easter and Michelmas.

Appendix 3: Land management and custumal diversity on the estates of Mottisfont Priory in the 1340s

by Neil S Rushton¹

The general pattern of land management on both secular and ecclesiastical estates in the late-14th and 15th centuries was for land previously held as demesne to be farmed out for money rents.² Subsequently, those tenants taking on the land leases gradually became free of the custumal obligations associated with demesne farming.³ The social unrest centred around the uprisings of 1381 was, at least in part, the product of landlords being unable to come to terms with this situation and attempting to reimpose custumal obligations on their unfree tenants, who were seeking to capitalise on the socio-economic advantages presented to them by the dramatic demographic changes brought about by the Black Death.⁴ However, the chronology of the decline of demesne farming and labour-services was not wholly dependent on the social upheavals caused by the Black Death; landowners of the 12th century had practised mixed demesne and lease farming on their estates, and conditions on most large estates in the early-14th century reflected the incomplete reclamation of land for direct management by lay and ecclesiastical landowners after the inflationary pressures of c. 1180-1220,⁵ reclamation which did not necessarily involve the retention of labour-services, but could instead involve the hiring of wage labour.⁶ Likewise, despite the general trend towards leasing demesne land and commutation of services after the Black Death, there was still extensive regional variation in

This essay was originally presented to the Department of History and Archaeology at the University of Southampton as part of an MA degree, by Neil Rushton, a part-time employee of CKC Archaeology. The subject of the rental was suggested to the author by C K Currie, and has been slightly modified for inclusion in this report. It is proposed to present it for formal publication.

J. L. Bolton, _____
pp. 208-16. A. R. H. Baker, *Changes in the Later Middle Ages*, in _____

J. E. Martin, _____

For the causes of the 1381 uprising the seminal study is R. H. Hilton, _____

P. D. A. Harvey, *The English Inflation of 1180-1220*, _____
The chronology and extent of demesne leasing and reclamation between the 12th and the 14th centuries is
a _____

S. H. Rigby, _____
MacMillan, 1995), pp. 75-76.

Hampshire alone; the Bishop of Winchester was leasing out large amounts of land in the hundred of Crondal in the late-13th century,⁷ whereas on the estates of Breamore Priory a majority of peasant farmers were still performing large numbers of workdays on the demesne farm at the dissolution.⁸

It is in this context that the estates of the Augustinian house of Mottisfont Priory in Hampshire can be studied thanks to the survival of a detailed rental compiled by the cellarer of the priory, Walter de Blount, between 1340-42⁹. The rental is not complete, but it does list all the manors belonging to Mottisfont with details of demesne land-areages with field names and values, assize rents of named freemen and villeins, and the custumal services owed in villeinage. With this rental, various other documentary sources, archaeological evidence and geographical analysis, the strategies of land management and the extent of custumal service on the demesne land of the priory on the eve of the Black Death can be assessed.

The priory precinct and close

The economic centre of a monastic estate was the precinct.¹⁰ At Mottisfont the rental allows for a partial reconstruction of this precinct although the actual location of buildings and features can only be deduced from archaeological and geographical evidence (*see* Fig. 1). Inside the precinct there were two water mills¹¹ powered by water from the spring to the south of the church which formed a millpond (*stagnum*) with a value of 60s per annum, derived from the priory's monopoly over milling rights in the manor.¹² There is no mention of fishponds within or without the

F. J. Baigent, _____

. Some were apparently still carrying out work services on the demesne land of the priory's successor landlord as late as 1583, when there was a dispute over services recorded in the court rolls; T. Light, *The End of Customary Work Services*, _____

. HRO 13M63/3. This is an oak-bound book consisting of the _____ prefaced by a copy of Walter of Henley's treatise on husbandry (11 folios), and also including various confirmations, charters and taxation records dating from 1204-1501. Walter de Blout became prior of Mottisfont in February 1343; HRO A1/6, folio 108r.

. S. Moorhouse, *Monastic Estates: Their Composition and Development*, in R. Gilchrist and H. Mytum (eds), _____

. That is, two sets of milling stones; eg see C K Currie, 'Earthworks in St Cross Park, near Winchester, Hampshire', _____

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 1r; _____
milling rights to the priory. For the milling rights of lordship within the manor in general _____

precinct and so fish for the canons own diet was most probably obtained from the priory's five acre fishpond at Timsbury.¹³ Although, monastic fishponds were not constructed to produce a commercially exploitable surplus,¹⁴ and it is possible that the rental does not note them within the precinct for this reason. A potential location for fishponds at the priory would be on the site of the later peat excavations and duck ground to the east of the precinct stretching towards the River Test. The artificial water channel here is usually thought to be post-dissolution in date - some moulded stone from the priory has been found constituted in its bank.¹⁵ But, this could easily be from a *rebuilding* of the bank, and it is feasible that the river diversion and the earthworks are medieval in origin and constitute fish management by the priory for their own consumption.¹⁶

Also within the precinct were two gardens, one containing fruit trees, valued at 30*s.* p.a.; two dovecotes valued at 13*s.* 4*d.* p.a.; two curtilages and their associated buildings which are described as within and without the precinct; a tannery with meadow valued at 13*s.* 14*d.* p.a.; a pasture called *Condrove* valued at 6*s.* 8*d.* p.a.; meadows belonging to the Infirmarer (with fruit trees) and the Sacristan valued at 6*s.* 8*d.* p.a. and 2*s.* p.a. respectively; and two meadows containing 4 acres each and both containing the place-name element -*hamm*- suggesting that they were the meadows to the east of the church.¹⁷ Interestingly, there are three further meadows - *Southmede*, *Middelmede* and *Northmede* - which contain a total of 87 acres stated as being within the/a close (*infra clausum*) at the priory.¹⁸ The only area large enough to contain such a close was that located to the north of the church, and that whatever was used to enclose the close effectively extended the precinct boundary to encompass the large tract of land stretching to the Oakley road. The retention of such a large acreage of meadow within the priory's immediate vicinity meant that there was a convenient bloc of enclosed demesne meadow which would not have been feasible anywhere else in the manor. The subsequent ease of transportation of the harvested hay to the priory and the failure of the rental to give values to the meadows (as it does elsewhere), suggests that the hay was for the use of the home farm rather than for commercial

. In 1528 the priory was having to import fish from Southampton; _____

. C. K. Currie, pers. comm.

. The earliest detailed map of the area is by Charles Mason from 1724 and shows the water systems in place at that date; HRO 13M63/420. For Hampshire medieval fishponds, and their scarcity within the chalk belt _____

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. 1r-1v. The two meadows are called _____

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 1v. Explicitly listed with the entries for the precinct, ie. it was not a close elsewhere.

profit. The annual yield of hay from such an area would have served the needs of winter fodder and other domestic uses of an institution the size of Mottisfont.¹⁹

The buildings and curtilages pertaining to the home farm of the priory must have been at the west gate - the south-east gate area being too small an area and liable to waterlogging - where access to and from the village and the north-south routeway would have allowed the economic activity of the priory to be carried out here by lay officials and servants without infringing upon the ritual areas of church and cloister. This home farm was essential for the everyday running of the priory and its household, but even with the large area of meadow within the close, the main land management concerns of the priory and the basis of its wealth was not the home farm but its extramural estates.

Land management on the priory estates

In the 1340s Mottisfont Priory held jurisdictional rights over 11 manors, and held land and/or tenements in a further 14 known locations as well as various small parcels of land which are unidentified. The priory had also appropriated eight churches by 1340. The full details of these manors and land endowments is given in addendum 1, and it is from the rental that the agricultural management of the estates can be elucidated. The geographical location of the priory's estates conforms to the pattern noticed at other Augustinian priories, whereby the majority of manors are within a days travelling time from the priory.²⁰ The original foundation grant of William Briwere furnished the priory with mostly local lands,²¹ and subsequent land acquisitions by the priory seem to confirm a policy of increasing the endowment only within a limited area.²² Figure 2 demonstrates the cluster of estate lands along the Test valley within a radius of 10 miles (17 kilometres) of the priory. Access to and from these estates was thus made easy by road or river without having to deal with the logistics of administering remote manors. The only truly distant possessions were lands in Kidwelly, Cardiganshire and the appropriated church of Mullion in Kerrier, Cornwall, both of which owed cash only.²³ The three Wiltshire

The land area north from the west gate and the church complex, and enclosed within the water channel to the east and the boundary of later tithe free land near Oakley Road to the north (shown on the 1724 map) is approximately 80 acres. The flood plain of the River Test would also have constituted meadow land.

O. Rackham, _____
S. Harvey, Domesday England, in _____

D. M. Robinson, _____
Reports, 80, 2 vols (Oxford, 1980), I, pp. 314-20. These figures are based on the ____

The foundation date is _____
are printed in, William Dugdale, _____

manors of Burbage, Wilton and Marten were more than a days journey from Mottisfont, but their closeness to each other meant that the priory could administer them as a unit. The site of the *curia* at Burbage seems an impressive residence with two manor houses, a hedged moat and a home farm with a bailiff and four named administrative officials,²⁴ and it is reasonable to suggest that these three manors formed a sub-estate managed from Burbage.²⁵ The slightly different format of the rental and internal differences of land measurement for these Wiltshire manors is further evidence that this was the case.²⁶

Despite these differences there was an attempt to standardise the management of the estates - it is not an accident that a copy of the 13th-century treatise known as the *Husbandry* by Walter of Henley has been attached to the beginning of the rental.²⁷ The land divisions used throughout adhere to the criteria for measuring stipulated in the *Husbandry*:

All the land ought to be measured, each field by itself and each furlong by name. And each meadow by itself and each pasture and wood And all the land ought to be measured with a rod of sixteen foot, because on land which is measured by the rod of sixteen foot one may in many places sow four acres of wheat, rye and peas with one quarter and in other places one may sow five acres with one quarter and a half. And one may sow two acres of land with one quarter of barley, beans, or oats.²⁸

Between May 1340 and May 1342 Walter de Blount conducted a complete survey of the priory's arable, meadow and pasture lands, demesne and leased, using the *Husbandry's* advice, and the rental entries for the demesne land demonstrate the open-field system being adapted to local

which have been used to help reconstruct the 14th-century endowment; HRO 13M63/1, 2.

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 82r.

. Wilton was granted to the priory in 1227, suggesting an active land acquisition policy which took into consideration the administrative advantages of such a sub-estate; _____

. For instance, Hampshire virgates are explicitly stated as being 28 acres and the Wiltshire virgates as 32 acres. But it is the wording of the Wiltshire entries which suggests separate administration, such as the inclusion of linear land measurements as calculations for areas which are not found in the Hampshire entries, and the more detailed break down of customary services for the Wiltshire villeins. The Wiltshire entries are, HRO 13M63/3, fols. 70r-91r. All main entries in the rental are in the hand of Walter de Blount.

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. i-xi. The treatise (which is in Norman French) is printed and translated in, _____

social and environmental conditions. At all the manors, except Durley,²⁹ the demesne arable land lay in two or, more usually, three open fields divided into named furlongs.³⁰ At Mottisfont manor itself there were three fields - the north, south and west fields - and closes at *Strode* and *Bentlegh*, which were all labelled as land at *Cadeburi* and then divided into three sowings (*sementes*).³¹ Unfortunately, the crops of these three sowings are not specified but it is clear that certain parts of *all* three fields were under one of the three seeds, and that the unit of measurement which mattered was the furlong not the whole field.³² The survey was made in May³³ and so the first sowing of 132 acres would have been the previous winters seed of wheat, whilst the second sowing of 84 acres would have been the spring mixture, probably barley.³⁴ This leaves 96 acres for the third sowing spread between the three fields. The fact that all the remainder of the demesne land at Mottisfont is specifically stated as being at a third sowing suggests that the manor was practising what Bruce Campbell has termed intensive mixed-farming:

Demesnes practising this most exacting form of husbandry devoted the lions share of the winter course to wheat, the most demanding crop of all, and partly to replenish soil nitrogen, partly for fodder, and partly for food, grew legumes on a larger scale than in any other farming system. This is consistent with virtually continuous cropping of the arable and the near elimination of fallows³⁵

Legumes are spring-sown and so could have constituted the third sowing. If so, it is demonstrative of the intensification of arable farming at the Mottisfont manor to a level unusual in Hampshire³⁶ - suggesting that the pre-Black Death population pressure at the priory's home

. The small amount of arable land here, the three tenants renting salt pans from the priory, and the 11 tenants paying rent in quarters of salt, suggests that Durley manor was more dependent upon the Solent than upon agriculture; HRO 13M63/3, fols. 41r-45r.

. For a concise and well referenced overview of the medieval open field system see
Ault, Open-Field Husbandry and the Village Community: A Study of Agrarian Bylaws in Medieval England,

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. 2r-4r.

Baker and R. A. Butlin (eds), _____

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 9r.

. Baker and Butlin, _____

. B. M. S. Campbell, Economic Rent and the Intensification of Agriculture, 1086-1350, in _____

. Campbell, Intensification of Agriculture, p. 236 (map) and p. 238.

manor was coercing it into a more soil-demanding agricultural regime which required the sowing of nitrogen replenishing legumes instead of the annual fallowing of a third of the arable land. This would have been possible on the high grade agricultural land of the Test valley, away from the flood plain, demonstrated by the high values of land recorded in the *Nonarum Inquisitiones* of 1342, which have been mapped by Stamper.³⁷ In general, Hampshire does not show any contraction in land under cultivation in the pre-Black Death years as has been demonstrated from the *Inquisitiones* for other parts of the country, and this was certainly not the case at the priory's home manor.³⁸ Alternatively, such land management could be seen less as an enforced system for localised needs and more of an adaptation to meet the wider needs of the market where increased demand, because of the continued demographic growth and the expansion of the monetary economy, created the potential for increased cash profits from increased yields.³⁹

In practice, the priory's land management policies were probably a reaction to both. The nearest local market in 1342 was only two miles away in Lockerley, and Winchester, only 12 miles distant, provided a major market for consumables.⁴⁰ The population pressures would have created a market-demand for leguminous vegetables so as to make their intensive cultivation economically profitable despite the apparent downturn in prices in the two decades before the Black Death.⁴¹ But, if the priory were intensifying its arable farming as an economic venture alone it would surely have introduced it on its other manors where the soil and drainage allowed. This was not the case. The only other manor which apparently supported a sowing of its last third of furlongs was Timsbury, when it was surveyed in May 1340.⁴² At Nether Wallop 29% of demesne land was fallow in May 1340,⁴³ whilst at Longstock, Lower Eldon, East Dean, Marten

1807). This central government taxation assessment could well have been the inspiration for Walter de Blount to carry out his survey. P. A. Stamper, *Medieval Hampshire: Studies in Landscape History* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southampton, 1983), pp. 72-83, discusses the _____

. A. R. H. Baker, *Evidence in the _____*
England During the Early Fourteenth Century, _____

. Bolton, _____
Economy, in _____

. Stamper, *Medieval Hampshire*, p. 42.

. Bolton, _____
Centuries of the Price of Consumables, Compared with Builders Wage Rates, in _____

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 59r-61r. Although even this is not certain as the first 73 acre collection of demesne furlongs in _____

HRO 13M63/3, fols. 11r12r. The field is called _____

and Burbage there were three fields containing sometimes more than one type of winter or spring sowing each (rye, for instance, could be sown at the same time as wheat in winter) but which did not receive a third sowing in their open-fields.⁴⁴ Somborne and Wilton manors seem to have worked a two-field system sowing winter and spring mixtures. Somborne is complicated by its multi-manor status but the arable land of Wilton was certainly divided into a north and a south field and there is mention of inferior and superior furlongs which suggests that the thinner soil and higher altitude of the Wiltshire manor meant that a system of fallowing was in operation. There was certainly no third sowing here.⁴⁵

Without another rental for comparison it is impossible to say whether the intensive mixed-farming recorded at Mottisfont manor in the 1340s was an innovation or an established policy, but, it does seem (along with other evidence discussed below) that the demesne arable land on the priory's home manor was being managed differently from the other estates. This could have been to supply the priory with either cash or with extra food/fodder, but whatever the case it was a policy specific to the home manor and not a general estate policy.

Land set aside for oats (*terra avenosa*) is recorded at Nether Wallop, Longstock, Timsbury and Merton.⁴⁶ Oats were the primary medieval fodder-crop and its presence at the manors where it is not explicitly mentioned is probably concealed within the unspecified sowings.⁴⁷ Although, at Longstock, the large demesne areas reserved for oats (134 acres) could certainly have provided an estate surplus for manors lacking land for oats without resort to the market.⁴⁸ Every manor had demesne meadow,⁴⁹ usually of between 8 and 20 acres,⁵⁰ for its own use, but, the amounts of demesne pasture at each manor were very diverse (*see* addendum 1), with large amounts at Lower Eldon and Timsbury. The priory's sheep flock seems to have contained an absolute

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. 17r .

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. 35r-40v & 79r-80v.

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. 12v-13v, 22v-24r, 60v, and 74r-74v.

. Campbell, *Intensification of Agriculture*, pp. 230-32. There is a useful table on p. 231 showing the principal English seigniorial mixedfarming systems 1250-1349, which demonstrates the importance of oats in the agricultural cycle more acres were oatsown than any other crop. Also _____

. The fields are located north and south of the track running west towards Danebury Hill

. Except Wilton, but this is because the opening folio for the manor, which would usually record the extent of meadow is missing; HRO 13M63/3, fol. 79r begins in the south field of the manor.

. The exceptions are Mottisfont (as discussed) and Timsbury which had 80 acres of meadow; HRO 13M63/3, fols. 59r-59v.

minimum of 790 sheep.⁵¹ The rental thus indicates that the priory's management of its estates followed the standard monastic practice of centralised administrative control over the production of movable commodities (oats and wool) in order to supply other estate manors or the market (made easier by the limited geographical extent of the estate), but that methods of farming the main arable fields were more limited by local custom and conditions, so limiting the intensification of mixed-farming practice to Mottisfont itself, and perhaps Timsbury.⁵² This is reflected in the custumal diversity of the priory's manors.

Custumal diversity on the priory estates

From the total amount of arable and meadow land recorded in the rental just under 37% was being farmed out to tenants.⁵³ But, there is considerable disparity in the ratios of demesne to leased land between the priory's manors. The two Wiltshire manors of Marten and Wilton conform closely to this average, as do Timsbury, Lower Eldon and Sombourne in Hampshire. But, Nether Wallop, Longstock, East Dean and Burbage all record higher ratios of leased land to demesne. However, the most noticeable variation is once again the home manor of Mottisfont where all but five of its 450 acres remained demesne land in 1340-42. To what extent did diversity in custumal tenure of the individual manors account for this disparity?

At Timsbury five tenants held their homes and land without any imposed custumal rents except that of *heriot*, which makes it reasonable to allow them free-status.⁵⁴ Amongst them Walter de Brustowe and William le Fox were the biggest landholders with the largest rents and as such were fairly typical examples of the one or two prosperous freemen recorded at most of the priory's manors.⁵⁵ Between them these five free-tenants paid cash rents for their messuages and 44+ acres of arable land and meadow. But, most of the rented land at the manor was held between 18 villeins paying cash rents and custumal service for 150 + acres of land.⁵⁶ The amounts of land held by these individuals varies between 20 acres of arable (5) and acre (1), with an average of just under eight acres. This variation in landholding is reflected in the

of its own manors were included in the rental.

. Page, _____

. N. Neilson, Customary Rents, in _____

by P. Vinogradoff (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), pp. 87-89.

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 62v. Walter held a capital messuage and 21 acres of arable land for an annual rent of 14 _____

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. 62v-67r.

variation of custumal rents - two villeins owed minimum work-services but were paying the high cash rents of 11s. 2d. for 10 acres of land, and 19s. for 17 acres of land and various crofts.⁵⁷ In contrast, the villeins holding 20 acres of land owed cash rents of between 4s. 6d. and 7s. 6d., but with heavy work-services on the lords demesne.⁵⁸ The priory could thus afford to keep the majority of its land in demesne at the manor because the unfree tenants were either unable or unwilling to pay cash to commute their services, and the custumal infrastructure here was still strong enough for the priory to be able to guarantee a substantial amount of its demesne would be worked through custumal payment. For the smallholder villein in Timsbury, such as John le Douk with three acres of land, the payment of his annual cash rent of 6s. would only be possible by his hiring himself (or members of his family) out as a wage labourer, thus allowing the priory an adaptable work-force but condemning the poorly endowed manorial tenant to a life largely consisting of working for his lord on the demesne farm, either through custumal obligation or in order to pay his cash rent.⁵⁹

This pattern can be seen at the other manors with larger amounts of demesne land than land at farm, whilst at Nether Wallop, Longstock and East Dean, where there were greater numbers of free-tenants, the trend was for more land to be leased and for the villeins here to hold larger acreages, pay larger cash rents, and owe less customary services.

As with the actual management of the land, the customary tenure at Mottisfont home manor differs from the rest of the estates. Here, there are 44 tenants in the village paying on average 4s. 8d. p.a. But, they are all free-tenants and they hold very little land between them (5+ acres in the open fields). Some tenants are paying what sound like recently commuted work-services by rendering cash for the lighting of candles at the priory church,⁶⁰ but most paid straight cash rents. From this it must be deduced that they were either wage-labouring or carrying out a trade in the village. The priory was thus using wage-labour at its home manor to work its large demesne holding - a system well-established here by 1342. The priory would also have housed a number of *hinds*, for agricultural labour, within the precinct,⁶¹ allowing the manor to be farmed in much the same way (though on a smaller scale) as was much of the Bishop of Winchester's estate from

. HRO 13M63/3, fols. 62v-63v. They are Stephen Martyn and Adam le Wheybole.

. The work-services of Stephen Sprynghom of Timsbury contain details of the boonwork he owes in autumn as well as carting, lifting and shepherding duties; HRO 13M63/3, fols 64r-64v. Other tenants holding property and land in villeinage are stated as owing the same services.

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 65v. John le Douk did not owe as many customary services as Stephen Sprynghom.

. HRO 13M63/3, fol. 5v; e.g. Agnes le Rede pays 3...

. At the Reformation Mottisfont housed 29 _____

at least the 13th century.⁶² This would help explain the low lay subsidy assessment for Mottisfont in 1334 where only 11 people were paying 1 4*s.* 5*d.* - considerably lower (both in numbers of people and in tax value) than the county average.⁶³

The limitations of the rental of Mottisfont Priory as a historical document are mainly its incompleteness and the lack of supporting documentary evidence from the 14th century. There are, for instance, no sources which would allow any computation of grain yields or wage costs for the priory's manors, as there are for the neighbouring Bishop of Winchester's estate.⁶⁴ Nor can any comparative study be made from earlier or later in the century in order to assess the chronology of any changes in land management or custom on the priory's manors. But, what does emerge from the rental is an indication of the localised diversity in land management strategy and in the customal conditions of tenure throughout the priory's estates at a fixed moment in time just before the Black Death. The amount of land held in demesne, and the servile status of villeins performing work-services at many of the manors fits the generally recognised pattern of pre-Black Death agricultural conditions throughout lowland England. But, Mottisfont Priory was also practising widespread leasing of its demesne farm at this date, carrying out intensive mixed-farming on its home manor, and commuting work-services for cash rents, which suggests that the conditions generally prevalent in the later 14th century were already to be found on the priory estates before the Black Death.

Customal diversity: bibliography

Manuscripts:

Winchester, Hampshire Record Office:

A1/6: Register of Adam Orleton, bishop of Winchester (1333-1345).

13M63/1, 2: 15th-Century Mottisfont Priory Cartularies

13M63/3: Mottisfont Priory Rental.

13M63/420: 1724 Map of Mottisfont Priory and Village, Surveyed by Charles Mason.

21M65/F7/164/1-2: Mottisfont Tithe Map and Apportionment, 1839-41

London, Public Record Office:

. The best discussion of many aspects of wage labouring on demesne estates in a 12th and 13th-century context is still, M. M. Postan, _____

. Stamper, *Medieval Hampshire*, p. 294.

. J. Z. Titow, _____
(Cambridge: University Press, 1972).

SC 12 33/27 1536 Commissioners Report for the Dissolution of Monastic Houses in Hampshire.

Printed sources:

A Collection of Records and Documents Relating to the Hundred and Manor of Crondal, ed. by F. J. Baigent, Hampshire Record Society 3 (London, 1891).

The Brokage Books of Southampton 1477-8 and 1527-8, ed. by K. F. Stevens and T. E. Olding, Southampton Record Series 28 (Southampton 1985).

Calendar of Charter Rolls (London: HMSO, 1903-).

Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII (HMSO, 1864-1932).

Calendar of Patent Rolls (London: HMSO, 1901-).

Nonarum Inquisitiones in Curia Scaccarii, ed. by G. Vanderzee (Record Commission, 1807).

Taxatio Ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae, auctoritate P. Nicholai IV, circa A. D. 1291, ed. by T. Astle, S. Ayscough and J. Caley (Record Commission, 1802).

Valor Ecclesiasticus, temp. Henrici VIII, auctoritate Regia Institutus, ed. by J. Caley and J. Hunter, 6 vols (Record Commission, 1810-34).

Walter of Henley and other Treatise on Estate Management and Accounting, ed. by D. Oschinsky (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

William Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, ed. by J. Caley, Sir H. Ellis and Rev. B. Bandinel, volume 6 (London, 1846).

Secondary works:

Ault, W. O., Open-Field Husbandry and the Village Community: A Study of Agrarian By-Laws in Medieval England, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 55 (1965), 1-102.

Baker, A. R. H., Evidence in the *Nonarum Inquisitiones* of Contracting Arable Lands in England During the Early-Fourteenth Century, *The Economic History Review* 19 (1966), 518-32.

Baker, A. R. H., Changes in the Later Middle Ages, in *A New Historical Geography of England before 1600*, ed. by H. C. Darby (Cambridge: University Press, 1976).

Baker, A. R. H. and R. A. Butlin, eds., *Studies of Field Systems in the British Isles* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973).

- Bolton, J. L. *The Medieval English Economy 1150-1500* (London: Dent & Sons, 1980).
- Bond, J., Water Management in the Rural Monastery, in *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by R. Gilchrist and H. Mytum, British Archaeological Reports 203 (1989), pp. 83-111.
- Bridbury, A. R., The Farming Out of Manors, *The Economic History Review* 31 (1978), 503-20.
- Britnell, R. H., The Proliferation of Markets in England, 1200-1349, *The Economic History Review* 34 (1981), 209-21.
- Campbell, B. M. S., Economic Rent and the Intensification of Agriculture, 1086-1350, in *Medieval Farming and Technology: The Impact of Change in Northwest Europe* (Leiden, NL: Brill, 1997), pp. 225-49.
- Currie, C. K., Medieval Fishponds in Hampshire, in *Medieval Fish, Fisheries and Fishponds in England*, ed. by M. Aston, 2 vols British Archaeological Reports 182 (Oxford 1988), II, pp. 267-89.
- Currie, C. K., The Role of Fishponds in the Monastic Economy, in *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by R. Gilchrist and H. Mytum, British Archaeological Reports 203 (Oxford 1989), pp. 147-72.
- Eiden, H., Joint Action Against Bad Lordship: The Peasants Revolt in Essex and Norfolk, *History* 83 (1998), 5-30.
- Hall, D., *Medieval Fields*, Shire Publications 28 (Aylesbury, 1982).
- Harvey, P. D. A., The English Inflation of 1180-1220, *Past & Present* 61 (1973), 3-30.
- Harvey, S., Domesday England, in *The Agrarian History of England and Wales 1042-1350*, II (Cambridge: University Press, 1988).
- Hilton, R. H., *Bond Men Made Free: Medieval Peasant Movements and the English Rising of 1381* (London: Temple Smith, 1973).
- Holt, R., *The Mills of Medieval England* (London: Blackwell, 1988).
- Knowles, D., *The Religious Orders in England*, 3 vols (Cambridge: University Press, 1948-59).
- Light, T., The End of Customary Work Services, *Avon Valley Archaeological Newsletter* 12 (1998), 19-20.
-

Martin, J. E., *Feudalism to Capitalism: Peasant and Landlord in English Agrarian Development* (London, 1986).

Miller, E., England in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: An Economic Contrast?, *The Economic History Review* 24 (1971), 1-14.

Miller, E., Farming of Manors and Direct Management, *The Economic History Review* 26 (1973), 138-40.

Miller, E., ed., *The Agrarian History of England and Wales 1348-1500*, III (Cambridge: University Press, 1991).

Moorhouse, S., Monastic Estates: Their Composition and Development, in *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, ed. by R. Gilchrist and H. Mytum, *British Archaeological Reports* 203 (Oxford, 1989), pp. 29-82.

Neilson, N., Customary Rents, in *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*, II ed. by P. Vinogradoff (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910).

Page, F. M., *The Estates of Crowland Abbey: A Study in Manorial Organisation* (Cambridge: University Press, 1934).

Page, W. (ed.), *Victoria County History, Hampshire*, 5 vols (1900-14).

Parain, C., The Evolution of Agricultural Technique, in *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, ed. by M. M. Postan (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), I, pp. 125-79.

Peers, C. R., Notes on Mottisfont Priory, *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London* 21 (1907), 341-49.

Phelps, E. H. and S. V. Hopkins, Seven Centuries of the Price of Consumables, Compared with Builders Wage Rates, in *Essays in Economic History*, (London: Edward Arnold, 1962), II, pp. 179-96.

Platt, C., *King Death: The Black Death and its Aftermath in Late-Medieval England* (London: UCL Press, 1996).

Postan, M. M., The Chronology of Labour Services, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 20 (1937), 169-93.

Postan, M. M., *The Famulus: The Estate Labourer in the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Cambridge: University Press, 1954).

Postan, M. M., The Rise of the Money Economy, in *Essays in Economic History*, ed. by E. M. Carus-Wilson (London: Edward Arnold, 1954), I, pp. 1-12.

Postan, M. M., *The Medieval Economy and Society* (London: Penguin, 1972).

Postan, M. M., A Note on the Farming Out of Manors, *The Economic History Review* 31 (1978), 521-25.

Rackham, O., *The History of the Countryside* (London: Dent & Sons, 1987).

Reed, C. G. and T. L. Anderson, An Economic Explanation of English Agricultural Organization in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, *The Economic History Review* 26 (1973), 134-37.

Rigby, S. H., *English Society in the Later Middle Ages: Class, Status and Gender* (London: MacMillan, 1995).

Robinson, D. M., *The Geography of Augustinian Settlement*, British Archaeological Reports 80, 2 vols (Oxford, 1980).

Smith, A. H., ed., *English Place-Name Elements*, part 1, English Place-Name Society 25 (Cambridge: University Press, 1956).

Stamper, P., *Medieval Hampshire: Studies in Landscape History* (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southampton, 1983).

Titow, J. Z., *Winchester Yields: A Study in Medieval Agricultural Productivity* (Cambridge: University Press, 1972).

Custumal diversity: addendum 1

This addendum gives full quantitative data of all the manors recorded in the Mottisfont Priory rental 1340-1342. The information includes the place-name form in the rental; date and source of the grant; location; soil type; median height above sea level; HRO 13M63/3 rental reference; value of appurtenances listed as *infra curia*; amounts of land held in demesne; total amounts of land at farm; the property holding manorial tenants details; land-only leases without property (these sums having already been incorporated into the totals); and extra notes. Also listed are other estates known to belong to the priory in the 1340s with the source references.

Abbreviations and symbols used:

A.S.L. - Above Sea Level

Cartulary 1 - HRO 13M63/1 (15th-century priory cartulary)

Cartulary 2 - HRO 13M63/2 (15th-century priory cartulary)

CCHR - *Calendar of Charter Rolls*

CPR - *Calendar of Patent Rolls*

L & P - *Calendar of Letters and Papers Henry VIII*

Monasticon - W. Dugdale, *Monasticon Anglicanum*

VCH - *Victoria County History*

+ - indicates that the given figure is a *minimum* amount due to unspecified figures in the rental

All area amounts are to the nearest acre.

Infra curia values are inclusive of all sums listed (including pleas and prerequisites of the court)

MOTTISFONT (*Motesfont*)

with **Bentley** (*Bentlegh*), **Okelegh** (*Okelegh*), **Cadbury** (*Cadeburi*) and **Strode** (*Strode*)

GRANTED: c. 1201 Foundation (*Monasticon* VI, p. 481-82)

LOCATION: SU 327270. Thorngate Hundred.

SOIL TYPE: loam/sand over chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 34m

REFERENCE: fols. 1r-8

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: £7 18s. 8d.

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Within the precinct/close - 96 acres meadow and unspecified areas of garden, orchard and pasture within the precinct

Arable: 312 acres

Meadow: 37 acres

LAND FARMED OUT: (Arable) 5+ acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 44

Cash rents: £10-6-8d

Land leased: 5 acres arable

Villeins: none

NETHER WALLOP (*Wallop*) (became the manor of Wallop Heathmanstreet .pa in 16th century)

GRANTED: 1279 from St Peters, Gloucester (*VCH Hampshire* IV, p. 527)

LOCATION: SU 304365. Thorngate Hundred.

SOIL TYPE: loam/sand over chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 54m

REFERENCE: fols. 9r-16r

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: £2 7s.

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Pasture for 300 sheep in common pasture

Arable 86 acres

Meadow 15 acres

LAND FARMED OUT: Arable: 129 1/2 acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free: 8

Cash rents: £1 4s 1d

land leased 51 1/2 acres

Villians: 11

Cash rents £2 9s 10d

Land leased 64 acres arable

LAND ONLY: 9 leasing 14 acres arable @ 6s 4d

LONGSTOCK (*Langstoke*)

GRANTED: c. 1201 Foundation (*Monasticon VI*, p. 482)

LOCATION: SU 359371. Kings Somborne Hundred.

SOIL TYPE: peat/gravel over chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 45m

REFERENCE: fols 17r-32v

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: £1 6s 8d

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Within the close - 6 1/2+ acres of garden, meadow and curtilage

Arable 372 acres

Meadow 19 1/2 acres

LAND FARMED OUT:

Arable 329 acres

Meadow 10 acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 7
Cash rents £2 14s 8d
Land leased 72 1/2 acres
Villeins 22
Cash rents £3 15s 7d
Land leased 210 acres arable/5 1/2 acres meadow
Work services listed

LAND ONLY: 20 leasing 46 1/2 acres arable/4 1/2 acres meadow

KINGS SOMBORNE (*Somborne*) (Kings Somborne was a multi-manor vill)

GRANTED: c. 1201 Foundation (*Monasticon* VI, p. 481)

LOCATION: SU 362309. Kings Somborne Hundred.

SOIL TYPE: loam/clay/gravel over chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 35m

REFERENCE: fols 35r-39v

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: £3 18s 2d

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Private pasture for 130 sheep/Common pasture for 200 sheep/Private pasture for 15 cattle
Arable 189 acres
Meadow 22 1/2 acres

LAND FARMED OUT/MANORIAL TENANTS:

The tenants of Somborne owed tithes to the rectory of the church which was appropriated to Mottisfont. There are 54 named tenants owing tenths from 138 acres of arable and 20 acres+ of meadow. Their status is unspecified.

DURLEY (*Durlegh*)

GRANTED: 1204 Grant of King John (*Monasticon*, p. 483)

LOCATION: SU 358107. Eling Hundred.

SOIL TYPE: clay/sand

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 18m

REFERENCE: fols 41r-45v

VALUE *INFRA CLAUSUM*: 6s 8d

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Arable 27 acres

Meadow 8 1/2 acres

LAND FARMED OUT:

Arable 30 acres

Meadow 3 1/2 acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 7

Cash rents 18s 11d

Land leased 1 acre arable/3 1/2 acres meadow

Villeins 21

Cash rents £1 5s 2d

Salt rents 30+ quarters

Land leased 29 acres arable/unspecified meadow

LAND ONLY: 1 saltpan leased for 12d

LOWER ELDON (*Elledene*)

GRANTED: 1201 Foundation (*Monasticon* VI, p. 481)

LOCATION: SU 357278. Kings Somborne Hundred

SOIL TYPE: loam/clay/gravel over chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 60m

REFERENCE: fols 46r-51v

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: 6s 8d

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Arable 144 1/2 acres

Meadow 20 acres

Pasture 59 acres

LAND FARMED OUT/MANORIAL TENANTS: not listed

EAST DEAN (*Deone*)

GRANTED: c. 1201 foundation (*Monasticon* VI, p. 481)

LOCATION: SU 275267. Thorngate Hundred

SOIL TYPE: loam/clay over chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 38m

REFERENCE: fols 52v-58v

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: £1 16s 8d

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Private pasture for 160 sheep
Arable 68 acres
Meadow 7 1/2 acres

LAND FARMED OUT:

Arable 199 acres
Meadow 4 1/2 acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 7
Cash rents £1 10s 6d
Land leased 40 acres arable/unspecified meadow
Villein 12
Cash rents £3 12s 3 1/2d
Land leased 159 acres arable/4 1/2 acres meadow
Work services listed

LAND ONLY: 1 pays 3s for 2 acres meadow

TIMSBURY (*Tymberbury*)

GRANTED: c. 1201 Foundation (*Monasticon VI*, p. 481)

LOCATION: SU 346246. Kings Somborne Hundred.

SOIL TYPE: loam/clay over gravel

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 23m

REFERENCE: fols 59r-67r

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: £2 13s 7d

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

137+ acres of private pasture
Arable 220 acres
Meadow 80 1/2 acres

LAND FARMED OUT:

Arable 181+ acres

Meadow 13 1/2 acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 4

Cash rents £1 14s 1 1/2d

Land leased 24+ acres arable/unspecified meadow

Villeins 21

Cash rents £4 18s 5d

Land leased 157 acres arable/9 1/2 acres meadow

Work services listed

MARTEN (*Merthone*)

GRANTED: c. 1201 Foundation (*Monasticon VI*, p. 481)

LOCATION: SU 284602. Kinwardstone Hundred, Wilts.

SOIL TYPE: chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 145m

REFERENCE: fols 70r-78r

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: £1 7s 8d

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Within the close - 14 acres meadow and 4 acres garden

Arable 188 acres

Meadow 18 acres

Pasture 52 1/2 acres

LAND FARMED OUT:

Arable 128 1/2 acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 1

Cash rents 1d

Land leased 1 windmill (*molendinium venticium*)

Villeins 24

Cash rents £4 18s 4d

Land leased 119 acres arable

Work services listed

LAND ONLY: 3 leasing 9 1/2 acres arable for 3s 11d

WILTON (*Woltone*)

GRANTED: 1227 (*CChR 1226-1257*, p. 40)

LOCATION: SU 267615. Kinwardstone Hundred, Wilts.

SOIL TYPE: chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 129m

REFERENCE: fols 79r-81v

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: missing folio

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

Arable 129 acres

LAND FARMED OUT:

Arable 84 acres

Meadow unspecified

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 5

Cash rents 13s 9d

Land leased 41 acres arable

Villeins 2

Cash rents 18s 8d

Land leased 43 acres arable

Some work services listed

BURBAGE (*Burbache*)

GRANTED: c. 1201 Foundation (*Monasticon VI*, p. 481)

LOCATION: SU 230615. Kinwardstone Hundred, Wilts.

SOIL TYPE: chalk

HEIGHT A.S.L.: 165m

REFERENCE: fols 82r-91r

VALUE *INFRA CURIA*: no values given

LAND HELD IN DEMESNE:

25 *perticatas* and a moated site and 9 acres around the *curia*

Arable 68 acres

Meadow 5 acres
Pasture 1 1/2 acres

LAND FARMED OUT:

Arable 125 1/2 acres
Meadow 9 acres
Pasture 2 acres

MANORIAL TENANTS:

Free 3
Cash rents £3 9s 1d
Land leased 16 acres arable/9 acres meadow/2 acres pasture
Villeins 6
Cash rents £1 14s 4d
Land leased 106 acres arable
Work services listed

LAND ONLY: 2 lease 2 1/2 acres arable for the rent of 1/2lb wax and 20 cloves

Other land/property surveyed in the rental but not constituting manors:

Andover (*Andevere*) fols 33r-33v - 7 tenants paying 16s. 6d. in assize rents for tenements in the town, one of whom also holds 3 acres of (unspecified) land.

Stockbridge (*Stokebrugge*) fols 34r-34v - 6 tenants paying 1 14s. in assize rents for tenements and land. The amounts of land are unquantifiable because most of the areas given are *pecia* (small piece of land). 6 acres of meadow are specified as being held by one tenant and 1 acre (+ 3 *pecie*) between three tenants.

Winchester (*Wynton*) fols 68r-69v - 18 tenants paying 7 1s. 8d. and 1lb pepper in assize rents for tenements in the town. Very detailed breakdown of the tenements locations, including three separate tenements on the bridge next to St Marys nunnery which were in the process of being knocked into one Tannery shop and for which a one-off payment of 15s. 6d. is to be made.

Other land/property held by the priory before 1350 and still in their possession at a later date. Land acquired as part of the priory's estates by Sir William Sandys at the Reformation is only included if it can be shown to be in the priory's possession pre-1350. Several parcels of meadow and pasture recorded in the cartularies and foundation grants/confirmations have not been traced:

Land held in Michelmersh was swapped with St Swithuns, Winchester in 1231 for rents in **Drayton** (Barton Stacey), and land there which in 1316 consisted of 84 acres (*VCH Hampshire* III, p. 424; *CPR 1313-1317*, p. 450).

Westley (*Monasticon* VI, p. 481).

Compton (*VCH Hampshire* IV, p.476; *Monasticon* VI, p. 481; *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 45; Cartulary 2; *L & P* XI, p. 87).

Braishfield (*Monasticon* VI, p. 482; Cartulary 1).

Lockerley (*VCH Hampshire* IV, pp. 500-02; Cartulary 1).

Broughton An estate was first granted in 1227 and then enlarged in 1301 and 1302, but the manor was never held by the priory (*VCH Hampshire* IV, p. 495; *CChR 1226-1257*, p. 40; *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 45; Cartulary 2; *L & P* XI, p. 87).

Bossington (*VCH Hampshire* IV, p. 492; *CPR 1301-1307*, p. 412; Cartulary 2). 100 acres and a messuage were leased by the priory to Nicholas Pershute in 1316 - an example of land being farmed out *en bloc* rather than the in the usual piecemeal fashion found throughout the rental; *Feudal Aids* II, p. 310.

Enham (Cartulary 2).

Upper Eldon (Cartulary 2).

Wellow (*CCHR 1226-1257*, p. 40; *L & P* XI, p. 87)

Kidwelly (Cardiganshire) This was a priory possession in the 1291 taxation of Pope Nicholas IV (*VCH Hampshire* II, p. 173).

Appropriated churches pre-1350 (in Hampshire unless specified):

Kings Somborne Little Somborne Ashley Longstock Durley Eling
Berwick St James (Wilts.) Mullion, Kerrier (Cornwall)

Custumal diversity: addendum 2

Sum totals derived from the rental data in addendum 1. The 54 tenants at Kings Somborne and the tenth they owed in tithes from the listed 138 acres of arable land and 20 + acres of meadow are not included. It should be remembered that these totals necessarily fall short of the full amounts of land and revenue in the hands of the priory in the 1340s because of land/property and its value not accounted for in the rental, and because the values of spiritualities attached to the appropriated churches are not included. Some idea of the cash income amount being accounted for in the rental is gained by a comparison with the (under assessed) value given in the *Taxatio* of Pope Nicholas IV in 1291 when the priory's holdings and values were much the same as in the rental, and the value given in the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of 1535 when the priory estates had increased both in size and in value.

Taxatio value 1291 - £30

Valor Ecclesiasticus value 1535 - £124 3s. 5d

Land held in demesne

ARABLE 1800 acres
MEADOW 343 acres
PASTURE 192 acres
790 head of sheep
15 head of cattle

Farmed out land

ARABLE 1211 acres
MEADOW 40+ acres
PASTURE 2 acres

Tenants

FREE: 86 on priory manors - 31 at Andover, Stockbridge and Winchester
VILLEINS: 119
36 non-tenants leasing land only, without property

Land values within manorial curie

£22 1s 9d

Cash rent values

£46 4s 6d from priory manors
£9 12s 2d from Andover, Stockbridge and Winchester
Total - £55 16s 8d

Also rent in kind - 1lb pepper; 30+ qts of salt; 1b wax; 20 cloves; 1lb cumin.

Sum total value: £77 18s 5d (+ 15s 6d from Winchester as a one-off payment)

Appendix 4: Guidelines for the management of archaeological sites on the Mottisfont estate: general principles and legislation

1.0 Introduction and general principles

1.1 Introduction

The Guidelines given here are adapted from those laid down by Surrey County Council for land in their management. These Guidelines were written in their draft form by members of Surrey County Council, and were adapted by the present author for historic and archaeological landscape evaluation of Surrey County Council land at Colley Hill, Reigate (Currie 1997a) and Wisley and Oakham Commons (Currie 1998b), near Wisley, Surrey. They are incorporated here with the permission of the Surrey County Archaeologist, Dr David Bird.

It should be noted that the Guidelines given here are of a general nature. The reader is referred to the archaeological inventory (Volume 2) for specific recommendations that apply to individual archaeological sites on the Mottisfont estate.

1.2 General principles

The purpose of any Archaeological Management Guidelines is to provide the basic recommendations for the preservation of archaeological features and the conservation of the historic landscape in question. These guidelines have been drawn up from published material, and the authors' experience. Although the guidelines are for archaeology, where possible they have been integrated with objectives for any nature conservation interest there may be within the estate. The guidelines are to be used as appropriate according to the characteristics of the land, and have been tailored to suit these individual requirements.

The client should realise that any guidelines given in this report represent best practice. In some cases practical usage of the land may not allow these high standards to be fully implemented. The writer recognises the practical limitations of the guidelines in certain circumstances. However, the client is urged to try to attain these standards whenever possible. If they can not be maintained, advice should be sought from the Archaeological Advisers in the Estates Advisory Office (currently in Cirencester) for methods of mitigating the impact of any damaging operations.

The guidelines are often drawn up according to habitat/landscape type rather than archaeological site/feature type. This is because the same archaeological feature can occur in different habitats that require different land management activities to conserve the habitat structure. The report will try to point out any potential conflict with the nature conservation interest if this occurs.

An archaeological or historical feature is defined as any object or site arising from man's past use of the land. The feature can survive extant as an earthwork or ruin, buried beneath the ground

level as stratified deposits, a surface scatter of artefacts, a crop or soil mark. Marginal land such as heathland and commons is more likely to contain extant earthworks and features, whereas agrarian landscapes contain more sites as crop marks or find scatters. This is a direct result of the intensity and type of land use activities prevailing.

The **Key Management Guideline** for any archaeological feature or site is *to minimise the amount of disturbance*. Physical disturbance can be either man-induced such as through development, forestry such as planting and harvesting, or agricultural practices such as cultivation or outdoor pig-rearing. Similarly insidious activity such as burrowing into extant earthworks by rabbits and the like, or through root action by trees and shrubs; the latter is often the result of neglect or abandonment of positive land management. Chemical disturbance to stratified deposits occurs through drainage, root action and chemical applications (e.g. fertilisers and pesticides).

How a site or feature is managed depends upon its form or structure, but the main rule to remember is to minimise the disturbance both during any management action and afterwards; for example when removing tree and scrub growth from a barrow, and preventing any subsequent erosion of the profile by access or water.

2.0 Statutory protection of archaeological sites

2.1 Ancient Monuments Legislation

The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (AMAA Act 1979) provides the statutory protection for archaeological sites of national importance. The Act defines a monument as:

- a) any building, structure or work, whether above or below the surface of the land, and any cave or excavation;
- b) any site comprising the remains of any such building, structure or work or of any cave or excavation, and
- c) any site comprising, or comprising the remains of, any vehicle, vessel, aircraft or other movable structure or part thereof which neither constitutes nor forms part of any work which is a monument as defined within paragraph (a) above; and any machinery attached to a monument shall be regarded as part of the monument if it could not be detached without being dismantled. (Section 61 (12)).

The AMAA Act 1979 also distinguishes between a monument as above and an ancient monument which is a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM); and any other monument which in the opinion of the Secretary of State (for the National Heritage of England, English Heritage

takes on this role) is of public interest by reason of the historic, architectural, artistic or archaeological interest attaching to it (Section 61 (12)).

Selection of monuments of national importance for England is based on criteria published in Annex 4 of the Planning Policy Guidance: Archaeology and Planning (PPG 16) (DoE 1990). These criteria are indicative rather than definitive. The AMAA Act 1979 does not allow for the protection of the setting of monuments. It was thought that this was best achieved through the local planning process.

The National Heritage Act 1983 established the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage) whose prime duties are:

- a) to secure the preservation of ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England.
- b) to promote the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of Conservation Areas situated in England.
- c) to promote the public's enjoyment of, and advance their knowledge of, ancient monuments and historic buildings situated in England and their preservation.

With regard to (a), English Heritage have taken a number of sites of high archaeological and historical importance under their direct management as English Heritage Guardianship Sites (both Wales and Scotland have their own equivalents). Many of these were taken over from the Ministry of Works, but they are being added to from time to time. (Where appropriate some of these Guardianship Sites have been transferred more recently to the care of local authorities, a development that has not always been popular.)

The Monument Protection Programme (MPP) undertaken by English Heritage was begun in 1986. It was designed to review and evaluate the existing information on known archaeological sites, to identify those of national importance and which should be protected by law. If a monument is deemed of national importance it is placed on the 'Schedule' and protected by the AMAA Act 1979. The MPP is also reviewing scheduled sites to ensure that they fit the criteria for national importance.

Land use activities affecting a Scheduled Ancient Monument require consent from the Secretary of State. These are activities which result in the demolition, destruction or damage to the SAM and includes archaeological excavations: also repair, tipping or making alterations to a SAM; any flooding or tipping on land on, in or under a SAM. However some land use activities are exempt. Namely agriculture, forestry and horticultural works providing that this was the normal land use of the previous five years. This exemption does not include major ground disturbance operations, such as drainage, sub-soiling or tree planting.

Field Monument wardens are appointed by English Heritage to visit scheduled sites on a regular basis to inform landowners of their existence, and to offer advice on the best form of management for the monument.

The AMAA Act 1979 allows for grants for management agreements for monuments (whether scheduled or unscheduled), relating to the ongoing surveillance and management, including shrub management, pest control and fencing. Capital grants are available to owners that include consolidation of masonry structures.

The management of archaeology within the planning framework is detailed in the Planning Policy Guidance 16 (DoE 1990).

2.2 National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)

NNRs are designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, and represent the best examples of a particular habitat. They are managed by English Nature who in many cases lease the site from the land owner. They are the equivalent of English Heritage's Guardianship Sites. SSSIs are areas of land of special nature conservation interest of national importance under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Amended) and Wildlife and Countryside (Amendment) Act 1985. The biological sites are selected using criteria published in 1989. These criteria formed the basis of those used for ancient monuments. On designation, a list of potentially damaging operations (PDOs) is forwarded to the landowner for which consent is required from English Nature. Management agreements are then drawn up for the site to avoid those activities. The nature conservation interest of a given site may conflict with any archaeological site within the SSSI and vice versa. At the same time any given PDO may also be damaging to the archaeology. A lack of awareness of the respective conservation interests within a given area can lead to conflicts, especially if resources are limited for on-site meetings and monitoring programmes. However there is considerable opportunity to draw up integrated management agreements that can benefit either interest, and overall NNR and SSSI status can provide effective protection to archaeological sites, in particular non-scheduled ones. This could be achieved through the Site Management Statements being produced by English Nature.

2.3 Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas

The law relating to listed buildings has been consolidated into the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 [LBA]. The listing of buildings of special architectural or historic interest is the responsibility of the Secretary of State, and central to it is the drawing up of the list under Section 1 (1) of the LBA. A building includes 'any structure or erection and any part of a building, structure or erection but does not include any plant or machinery comprised in a building'. It also includes any object or structure fixed to the building, and any object or structure within the curtilage of the building which, although not fixed to the building forms part of the land, and has done so since before 1 July 1948. (Section 1(5) LBA). Buildings are graded according to their relative importance.

Grade I are those buildings of exceptional interest (only about 2% of listed buildings so far are in this grade).

Grade II* are particularly important buildings of more than special interest (4% of listed buildings).

Grade II are buildings of special interest, which warrant every effort being made to preserve them.

These criteria are non-statutory, and all that is required under the Act is that the buildings are of special architectural or historic interest.

Listed Building Consent is the mechanism by which demolition, alteration or extension to a listed building is controlled. Work undertaken without this consent is an offence. For a more detailed account of listed buildings see Hunter and Ralston 1993 & Planning Policy Guidance 15 (DOE 1994).

Section 69 of the LBA imposes a duty on local planning authorities to designate as conservation areas any 'areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance'. This enables local authorities to effect conservation policies for a given neighbourhood or area (DOE 1994). Section 71 of the Act places a duty on the local authority to publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas, which are based on clear assessment and definition of an area's special interest.

The PPG 15 specifically refers to Conservation Areas [4.2] within the built environment, and also to the wider historic landscape [2.26] where the onus is in the local authorities to define planning policies that take account of the historic landscape.

2.4 Treasure Trove

It is an offence to use a metal detector in a protected place (i.e. on a Scheduled Monument, one in Guardianship, or in the ownership of the Secretary of State, or a local authority, or in an area of archaeological importance). It is also an offence to remove any object of archaeological or historical interest found using a metal detector from a protected site without consent from the Secretary of State.

The Treasure Act came on to the statute books in 1997, following the drawing up of a Code of Practice between users of metal detectors, landowners and the archaeological community. This new act strengthens the law on treasure trove. Objects other than coins that contain at least 10% by weight of gold or silver, and are at least 300 years old will be deemed Treasure. All coins more than 300 years old, and found in hoards will be deemed treasure, as well as all objects found in clear archaeological association with items that are Treasure will be deemed to be

Treasure whatever they are made of. Advice on the exact changes to the law made by the Treasure Act should be sought should the need arise.

Deliberate concealment of Treasure Trove, and failure to report finds to the County Coroner will be liable to 3 months in prison, or a fine up to £5000 or both.

2.5 Hedgerow Regulations

In June 1997 new regulations were introduced giving statutory protection to certain types of hedgerow. Planning permission is now required before certain types of hedgerow can be removed, either in whole or part. It is strongly advised that expert opinion is sought before any changes, other than cutting, to hedgerows are made.

These regulations apply to hedgerows that:

- i) marks a historic parish boundary.
- ii) incorporates a Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- iii) incorporates an archaeological feature recorded in the County Sites and Monuments Record (SMR).
- iv) is wholly or partly within an archaeological site recorded in the County SMR and is associated with that site.
- v) marks the boundary of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor recorded in the SMR or held at a Record Office.
- vi) is visibly related to a building or feature of a pre-1600 AD estate or manor.
- vii) is recorded in a document at a Record Office as an integral part of a pre-Enclosure field system.
- viii) is part of, or is related to, a building or feature associated with a substantially complete pre-Enclosure field system.
- ix) is part of, or is related to, a building or feature associated with a pre-Enclosure field system, and that system is identified in a local planning authority document as a key landscape characteristic.

2.6 Other Landscape Designations

These include Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs); Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and Green Belts.

Appendix 5: Recommendations for built structures

1.0 Introduction

Built structures can occur in the form of relict industrial, agrarian and recreational features or currently functioning buildings such as domestic houses, or reused industrial structures. The following recommendations were formulated by Jeremy Milln, Regional Archaeologist, Mercia Region, and are presently adopted for most National Trust vernacular buildings. They are included in estate reports on the Polesden Lacey (Currie 1996) and River Wey Navigations Estates (Currie 1997). They have been adapted here to suit estate requirements.

2.0 Threats and potentially damaging operations

The main threat is from lack of maintenance and loss of use, leading to a general decay in the fabric of the built structure, the rate of decay depends on the materials used, age of structure, and previous use. Once the roof is no longer water tight then decay accelerates. This is made worse by vandalism and removal of material for reuse elsewhere. If the structure is not protected the end result is demolition and realisation of the potential market value of the site as a redevelopment plot.

Threat also comes from unsympathetic reuse and development with loss of the historical integrity of the building, especially if it was once part of a larger complex that has now disappeared.

Buildings under threat include farm structures, which are not suited to modern farming methods and machinery; farms that have ceased agrarian activity and are threatened with fragmentation and development; industrial structures such as lime kilns, brick works, rural craft buildings (carpenters' yards etc.). Buildings and structures associated with designed and parkland landscapes, such as ice houses, game larders etc.

3.0 General management guidelines for built structures

Establish which buildings within the estate are statutorily or locally listed, some relict built structures may be also listed or scheduled (see above). Ensure that any management agreements still fulfil the objectives for the conservation of the structure. Listed building consent for works to listed buildings must be sought from the local planning authority.

3.1 Consolidate relict structures and ruins to make them safe and prevent further decay. Seek advice from English Heritage, Hampshire County Council and the local District Council on methods of repair.

3.2 Where possible repair using original materials and techniques.

3.3 To safeguard a historic building it must retain some function. Explore avenues for sympathetic reuse of redundant buildings.

3.4 Those buildings requiring further analysis and recording should be identified as well as those structures in immediate danger.

4.0 Specific recommendations for different building categories

4.1 For all buildings pre-dating 1945

1. Repairs should be undertaken with appropriate period materials. Modern substitutes should not be used.

2. PVC and similar plastic window frames and doors are not suitable for Trust vernacular buildings. If present, these should be replaced at the most convenient opportunity.

3. Re-roofing should take account of any original insulation used within the building. This should not be removed without prior consultation with the archaeological advisers at Cirencester. e.g. there have been a number of instances in the past where straw insulation in roofs has been removed without recording.

4. Repointing of masonry should be done with lime-based mortar. Generally, cement-based mortars should be avoided on historic buildings.

4.2 Specific requirements for each category of building pre-dating 1945

Category A: all buildings pre-dating 1800

1. General recommendations given above should be applied to all buildings in this category, with the following as specific requirements for this class of building.

2. A full analytical survey record of this building is required as it is a complex structure exhibiting evidence of development over a long period. Any modifications or repairs affecting the structure should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.

3. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.

4. Historical fabric should not be removed from this building or its environs without providing an opportunity for recording by an archaeologist.
5. Excavation in the vicinity of this building, both internally and externally, should be monitored by an archaeologist.

Category B: all buildings of more than one structural build post-dating 1800

1. General recommendations given in section 1.0 should be applied to all buildings in this category, with the following as specific requirements for this class of building.
2. Any modifications or repairs affecting the structure should be preceded by an archaeological/analytical survey. This should include a basic plan, and where appropriate sections and elevations, at a scale of at least 1:50, supported by written descriptions and photographs. Photographs should be taken in both colour and monochrome or slide; the latter for long-term archival purposes.
3. Subsequent opportunities arising to record historic fabric during repair work should be taken to supplement this record. Details of any new repair work should be recorded and added to this entry in the Sites and Monuments Record.
4. Historical fabric should not be removed from this building or its environs without consulting the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.
5. Should below ground excavation be undertaken in the vicinity of this building, advice should be sought from the archaeological advisers at Cirencester.

Category C: all single-build post-1800 buildings

1. General recommendations given in section 1.0 should be applied to all buildings in this category.
2. For specific recommendations, those given in the above category (Category B) of buildings of more than one structural build post-dating 1800 should be followed. The exception here being that a more detailed archaeological/analytical survey required during repair works to Category B buildings may not be required here.

4.3 Requirements for buildings post-dating 1945

No survey or archaeological work required. In most cases the retention of a photographic record, with notes, should be sufficient.

Appendix 6: catalogue of photographs taken during this survey

All photographs were taken in monochrome and colour slide. The following list is duplicated for both types. Monochrome examples should be prefixed CKC/MF/M/* (* referring to the frame number given below). Colour slide examples should be prefixed CKC/MF/S/* (* referring to the frame number given below). All photographs were taken as indicated.

Photo no.	Description
January 1999	
1	Mottisfont Abbey from the S
2	ditto
3	Mottisfont, summer house from S
4	ditto
5	Mottisfont, stable block from S
6	ditto
7	Mottisfont, the spring from the SW
8	ditto
9	Mottisfont, Mill Stream from bridge (from S)
10	ditto
11	Mottisfont Abbey from SE
12	ditto
13	Mottisfont Abbey, north lawn looking out into the park from SE
14	ditto
March 1999	
15	Mottisfont Abbey & spring from SW
16	ditto
17	Remains of Mottisfont Mill from N
18	Mottisfont, stable block from S
19	Mottisfont Abbey, south front from S
20	ditto
21	Mottisfont Abbey, west wing from W
22	Mottisfont Abbey, north front from NE
23	Mottisfont, fishing hut from S
24	ditto
25	Oakley Cottage, from S
26	Oakley Farm, from E

27	Icehouse, Rectory Lane, from W
28	ditto
29	Site of flint scatter with scarp lynchet at Bitterne Grove from W
30	4/5 Rectory Lane from NE
31	Mottisfont church from S
32	1 & 2 Rectory Lane from SE
33	The Fox & adjoining house from SE
34	Dairy House from S
35	Abbey Farm from NW
36	Abbey Farm House from SE
37	Upper Lodge from SW
38	Mottisfont Abbey grounds, icehouse, from SE
39	The White House, Hatt Lane, from S
40	Hatt Farm House from E
41	Grassed-over Quarry at bottom of Hatt Hill from E
42	Hatt Terrace from SW
43	Hatt Farm Cottage from E
44	New Cottage from W
45	Houses in Spearywell from SE
46	Cadbury Farm from Spearywell (from SE)
47	Wych Elm from S
48	Victorian post-box at Wych Elm from E
49	Spearywell Farm House from W
50	Spearywell Cottage from E
51	Newland Farm from S
52	Duck Ground from SW
53	Embanked walk to Duck Ground from E
54	Interior of Walled (Rose) Garden from S

Appendix 7: glossary of archaeological terms

Archaeology: the study of man's past by means of the material relics he has left behind him. By material relics, this means both materials buried within the soil (artefacts and remains of structures), and those surviving above the surface such as buildings, structures (e.g. stone circles) and earthworks (e.g. hillforts, old field boundaries etc.). Even the study of old tree or shrub alignments, where they have been artificially planted in the past, can give vital information on past activity.

Artefacts: any object made by man that finds itself discarded (usually as a broken object) or lost in the soil. The most common finds are usually pottery sherds, or waste flint flakes from prehistoric stone tool making. Metal finds are generally rare except in specialist areas such as the site of an old forge. The absence of finds from the activity of metal detectorists is not usually given much credibility by professional archaeologists as a means of defining if archaeology is present

Assart: usually taken to be a clearing made from former common or waste. This term tends to imply a medieval date for colonising of former uncleared or unenclosed land.

Bote: the right to take certain materials from the common. The prefix usually denotes the type of material. For example heybote, means the right to take wood to make fences or hedges; housebote means the right to take wood for repairing houses.

Burnt flint: in prehistoric times, before metal containers were available, water was often boiled in pottery or wooden containers by dropping stones/flints heated in a fire into the container. The process of suddenly cooling hot stone, particularly flint, causes the stone to crack, and form distinctive crazed markings all over its surface. Finds of large quantities of such stone are usually taken as a preliminary indication of past human presence nearby.

Desk-based assessment: an assessment of a known or potential archaeological resource within a specific land unit or area, consisting of a collation of existing written or graphic information, in order to identify the likely character, extent and relative quality of the actual or potential resource.

Environmental evidence: evidence of the potential effect of environmental considerations on man's past activity. This can range from the remains of wood giving an insight into the type of trees available for building materials etc, through to evidence of crops grown, and food eaten, locally.

Evaluation: a limited programme of intrusive fieldwork (mainly test-trenching) which determines the presence or absence of archaeological features, structures, deposits, artefacts or ecofacts within a specified land unit or area. If they are present, this will define their character,

extent, and relative quality, and allow an assessment of their worth in local, regional and national terms.

Furlong: when used as an open field term, it means the length of a furrow. In time 'furlongs' came to apply to a block of furrows.

Hedgebanks: banks of earth, usually with a ditch, that have been set up in the past on which is planted a stock-proof line of shrubs. There is written evidence that they were made from at least Roman times, but they are suspected as existing in prehistoric times.

Hide: the amount of land that could be ploughed in a year by one family. Usually 120 acres, but local variations existed from 60 to 180 acres dependent on soil quality.

Hundred: administrative division of the shire that declined in importance in the later medieval period. Exact definitions can not be made, but a hundred usually comprised a number of later parishes or manors. Often thought to represent 100 taxable hides.

Lord/Lordship: a man, woman or institution (such as an abbey) who holds manorial rights.

Manor: land held by a lord, usually with the right to hold its own manorial court to enforce the local agricultural customs. Some manors later developed into parishes, but many parishes could contain four, five or more manors within them. Occasionally manors can be spread over two or more parishes.

Open Fields: also known as Common Fields, a system of communal agricultural without permanent internal fences. These fields were farmed by the village as a whole, each tenant ploughing a series of strips, often distributed at random throughout the field.

Perch: variable measure between nine and 26 feet, often standardised at 16 1/2 feet.

Period: time periods within British chronology are usually defined as Prehistoric (comprising the Palaeolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age), Roman, Saxon, Medieval and Post-medieval. Although exact definitions are often challenged, the general date ranges are as given below.

Prehistoric c. 100,000 BC - AD 43. This is usually defined as the time before man began making written records of his activities.

Palaeolithic or Old Stone Age 100,000 - 8300 BC

Mesolithic or Middle Stone Age 8300 - 4000 BC

Neolithic or New Stone Age 4000 - 2500 BC

Bronze Age 2500 - 700 BC

Iron Age 700 BC - AD 43

Roman AD 43-410

Saxon AD 410-1066

Medieval AD 1066-1540

Post-medieval AD 1540-present

Pottery sherds: small pieces of broken baked clay vessels that find their way into ancient soils. These can be common in all periods from the Neolithic onwards. They often find their way into the soil by being dumped on the settlement rubbish tip, when broken, and subsequently taken out and scattered in fields with farmyard manure.

Site: usually defined as an area where human activity has taken place in the past. It does not require the remains of buildings to be present. A scatter of prehistoric flint-working debris can be defined as a 'site', with or without evidence for permanent or temporary habitation.

Project Design: a written statement on the project's objectives, methods, timetable and resources set out in sufficient detail to be quantifiable, implemented and monitored.

Settlement: usually defined as a site where human habitation in the form of permanent or temporary buildings or shelters in wood, stone, brick or any other building material has existed in the past.

Stint: the number of animals a tenant is allowed to put on the common.

Stratigraphy: sequence of man-made soils overlying undisturbed soils; the lowest layers generally represent the oldest periods of man's past, with successive layers reaching forwards to the present. It is within these soils that archaeological information is obtained.

Villein: term for medieval tenant farmer, often holding by unfree tenure. In the earlier medieval centuries, would have performed services to the lord for his land, but from c. 1300 this was often commuted to a rent.

Virgate: unit of land in medieval England, usually 30 acres, but it could vary from 8 to 60 acres depending on the locality.

Watching brief: work, usually involving ground disturbances, that requires an archaeologist to be present because there is a possibility that archaeological deposits might be disturbed.

Worked flint or stone: usually taken to mean pieces of chipped stone or flint used to make prehistoric stone tools. A worked flint can comprise the tools themselves (arrowheads, blades etc.), or the waste material produced in their making (often called flint flakes, cores etc.).
